

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. .	11.3
Land in farms.....acres. .	7.7
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹\$1,000. .	4.7
Market value of agricultural products sold ..\$1,000. .	4.5
Harvested croplandacres. .	6.0
Corn for grain or seedacres. .	4.6
Wheat for grainacres. .	5.1
Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Cattle and calvesnumber. .	7.9
Hogs and pigsnumber. .	4.1
Hens and pullets of laying age.....number. .	.5

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	4.2
75	3.4
100	2.9
150	2.3
200	2.0
300	1.5
500	1.1
7508
1,0005
1,5004
2,0004
SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:	
25	38.1
50	27.3
75	22.6
100	19.8
150	16.6
200	14.7
300	12.5
500	10.5
750	9.3
1,000	8.6
1,500	7.9
2,000	7.5

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--	98 082	1.4	Total farm production expenses -----farms--	98 082	1.4
Land in farms -----acres--	28 546 875	1.3	Average per farm -----farms--	3 395 093	.9
Average size of farm -----acres--	291	1.9	Average per farm -----dollars--	34 615	1.7
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			Livestock and poultry purchased -----farms--		
Total sales (see text) -----farms--	98 082	1.4	-----farms--	33 768	1.7
Average per farm -----farms--	4 303 148	.8	-----\$1,000--	469 893	1.1
-----dollars--	43 873	1.6	Feed for livestock and poultry -----farms--	65 888	1.5
Farms by value of sales:			-----farms--	751 669	.9
Less than \$1,000 (see text) -----farms--	9 652	1.1	Commercially mixed formula feeds -----farms--	25 074	1.8
-----farms--	2 794	1.1	-----farms--	420 827	.8
\$1,000 to \$2,499 -----farms--	10 986	1.0	-----\$1,000--		
-----farms--	18 720	1.1	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees -----farms--	42 272	1.7
\$2,500 to \$4,999 -----farms--	13 881	1.2	-----farms--	130 007	1.1
-----farms--	50 439	1.2	Commercial fertilizer -----farms--	63 374	1.6
\$5,000 to \$9,999 -----farms--	16 350	1.5	-----farms--	301 298	1.2
-----farms--	116 660	1.5	Agricultural chemicals -----farms--	48 013	1.6
\$10,000 to \$19,999 -----farms--	14 793	1.9	-----farms--	170 477	1.1
-----farms--	208 770	1.9	Petroleum products -----farms--	92 699	1.4
\$20,000 to \$24,999 -----farms--	4 205	2.3	-----farms--	193 235	1.2
-----farms--	93 486	2.3	-----\$1,000--		
-----farms--			Electricity -----farms--	64 743	1.6
\$25,000 to \$39,999 -----farms--	7 199	2.3	-----farms--	51 802	1.2
-----farms--	226 504	2.3	Hired farm labor -----farms--	26 290	1.7
\$40,000 to \$49,999 -----farms--	2 891	2.4	-----farms--	190 051	.8
-----farms--	128 852	2.4	Contract labor -----farms--	9 246	2.6
\$50,000 to \$99,999 -----farms--	7 525	2.2	-----farms--	20 629	3.3
-----farms--	534 088	2.2	Repair and maintenance -----farms--	79 860	1.5
\$100,000 to \$249,999 -----farms--	7 204	.9	-----farms--	241 745	1.2
-----farms--	1 117 960	.7	Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment -----farms--	32 252	1.8
\$250,000 to \$499,999 -----farms--	2 369	—	-----farms--	67 426	2.1
-----farms--	809 864	—	-----farms--	45 875	1.7
-----farms--	1 027	—	Interest expense -----farms--	288 478	1.3
\$500,000 or more -----farms--	995 012	—	-----farms--	33 363	1.7
-----farms--			Secured by real estate -----farms--	195 556	1.5
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			-----farms--	26 240	1.9
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops -----farms--	46 400	1.5	Not secured by real estate -----farms--	92 922	1.4
-----farms--	1 861 613	.8	-----farms--		
Grains -----farms--	32 440	1.6	Cash rent -----farms--	18 723	2.0
-----farms--	1 547 635	.9	-----farms--	119 876	1.5
Corn for grain -----farms--	17 357	1.6	Property taxes -----farms--	94 428	1.4
-----farms--	511 731	.8	-----farms--	79 052	1.5
Wheat -----farms--	16 776	1.5	All other farm production expenses -----farms--	88 932	1.5
-----farms--	169 251	.9	-----farms--	319 456	1.0
Soybeans -----farms--	26 537	1.6	NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹		
-----farms--	738 973	.9	All farms -----number--	98 082	1.4
Sorghum for grain -----farms--	5 786	1.7	Average per farm -----farms--	889 365	1.2
-----farms--	84 585	1.1	-----dollars--	9 068	1.8
Barley -----farms--	88	2.6	Farms with net gains ² -----number--	54 330	1.6
-----farms--	208	2.3	-----farms--	1 125 818	1.1
Oats -----farms--	791	1.9	Average net gain -----farms--	20 722	1.9
-----farms--	1 376	2.2	-----dollars--		
Other grains -----farms--	679	1.4	Farms with net losses -----number--	43 752	1.5
-----farms--	41 513	.8	-----farms--	236 453	2.0
Cotton and cottonseed -----farms--	1 045	1.3	Average net loss -----farms--	5 404	2.5
-----farms--	132 111	.4	-----dollars--		
Tobacco -----farms--	453	1.8	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
-----farms--	5 432	2.4	Government payments -----farms--	26 437	1.7
Hay, silage, and field seeds -----farms--	19 435	1.4	-----farms--	179 086	1.4
-----farms--	79 668	1.5	Other farm-related income ¹ -----farms--	21 708	2.0
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons -----farms--	953	1.5	-----farms--	83 861	2.7
-----farms--	13 644	.9	Customwork and other agricultural services -----farms--	8 454	2.8
Fruits, nuts, and berries -----farms--	551	1.5	-----farms--	39 735	3.6
-----farms--	10 671	1.0	Gross cash rent or share payments -----farms--	7 502	3.0
Nursery and greenhouse crops -----farms--	701	1.2	-----farms--	32 791	4.1
-----farms--	63 392	.3	Forest products and Christmas trees -----farms--	1 914	5.4
Other crops -----farms--	143	2.3	-----farms--	5 095	8.3
-----farms--	9 060	.2	Other farm-related income sources -----farms--	7 604	2.7
Livestock, poultry, and their products -----farms--	73 809	1.4	-----farms--	6 240	7.1
-----farms--	2 441 535	.8	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Poultry and poultry products -----farms--	2 153	1.0	Total -----farms--	3 763	1.4
-----farms--	409 071	.1	-----farms--	125 843	.6
Dairy products -----farms--	4 149	1.7	-----\$1,000--		
-----farms--	336 804	1.4	Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) -----farms--	2 655	1.3
Cattle and calves -----farms--	67 044	1.4	-----farms--	7 346	1.3
-----farms--	1 171 170	1.1	-----\$1,000--		
Hogs and pigs -----farms--	12 133	1.5			
-----farms--	495 000	.7			
Sheep, lambs, and wool -----farms--	2 469	1.5			
-----farms--	5 290	1.8			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) -----farms--	4 168	1.3			
-----farms--	24 201	1.3			

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 ..	86 617	1.4	All operators ----- farms ..	98 082	1.4
Harvested cropland ----- farms ..	19 228 832	1.3	Full owners ----- farms ..	28 546 875	1.3
1 to 9 acres ----- farms ..	74 240	1.4	Part owners ----- farms ..	63 421	1.3
10 to 19 acres ----- farms ..	12 158 832	1.1	Tenants ----- farms ..	11 745 633	1.6
20 to 29 acres ----- farms ..	4 941	1.1	----- farms ..	26 498	1.5
30 to 49 acres ----- farms ..	25 544	1.1	----- farms ..	14 365 319	1.1
50 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	8 730	1.1	----- farms ..	8 163	1.8
100 to 199 acres ----- farms ..	117 717	1.1	----- farms ..	2 435 923	1.6
200 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	7 966	1.3	OWNED AND RENTED LAND		
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	180 012	1.3	Land owned ----- farms ..	90 165	1.4
1,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	11 979	1.5	----- farms ..	19 923 420	1.4
----- farms ..	442 924	1.5	Owned land in farms ----- farms ..	89 919	1.4
----- farms ..	14 353	1.8	----- farms ..	18 304 409	1.4
----- farms ..	977 648	1.8	Land rented or leased from others ----- farms ..	34 836	1.5
----- farms ..	10 899	2.1	----- farms ..	10 331 101	1.1
----- farms ..	1 474 493	2.0	----- farms ..	77 270	1.4
----- farms ..	9 146	2.0	----- farms ..	34 661	1.5
----- farms ..	2 824 352	1.9	----- farms ..	10 242 466	1.1
----- farms ..	4 181	1.0	Land rented or leased to others ----- farms ..	11 207	1.5
----- farms ..	2 887 358	.9	----- farms ..	1 707 646	1.7
----- farms ..	2 045	—	OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS		
----- farms ..	3 228 784	—	Operators by place of residence:		
Cropland:			On farm operated ----- farms ..	72 664	1.3
Pasture or grazing only ----- farms ..	52 093	1.4	Not on farm operated ----- farms ..	18 482	1.6
----- farms ..	5 402 329	1.6	Not reported ----- farms ..	6 936	1.4
Other cropland ----- farms ..	24 144	1.5	Operators by principal occupation:		
----- farms ..	1 667 671	1.7	Farming ----- farms ..	49 248	1.5
Total woodland ----- farms ..	53 119	1.4	Other ----- farms ..	48 834	1.3
----- farms ..	4 505 178	1.4	Operators by days worked off farm:		
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured ----- farms ..	28 224	1.4	Any ----- farms ..	53 243	1.4
----- farms ..	3 731 021	1.3	200 days or more ----- farms ..	37 799	1.3
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. ----- farms ..	56 940	1.4	Operators by sex:		
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	1 081 844	1.4	Male ----- farms ..	90 965	1.4
----- farms ..	2 914	1.1	----- farms ..	27 157 812	1.3
----- farms ..	708 864	.4	Female ----- farms ..	7 117	1.4
----- farms ..	827	1.4	----- farms ..	1 389 063	1.7
----- farms ..	2 023	1.7	Average age of operator ----- years ..	53.8	1.9
----- farms ..	386	2.0	FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
----- farms ..	9 916	2.1	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) ----- farms ..	86 776	1.4
----- farms ..	256	2.3	----- farms ..	22 718 187	1.4
----- farms ..	18 137	2.3	Partnership ----- farms ..	8 537	1.8
----- farms ..	439	2.0	----- farms ..	3 700 419	1.3
----- farms ..	63 255	2.0	Corporation:		
----- farms ..	541	1.0	Family held ----- farms ..	2 071	1.3
----- farms ..	168 893	.9	----- farms ..	1 826 683	.7
----- farms ..	316	.3	More than 10 stockholders ----- farms ..	60	3.3
----- farms ..	219 367	.2	10 or less stockholders ----- farms ..	2 011	1.3
----- farms ..	149	—	Other than family held ----- farms ..	212	2.5
----- farms ..	227 273	—	----- farms ..	125 949	1.9
Harvested cropland irrigated ----- farms ..	2 825	1.1	More than 10 stockholders ----- farms ..	25	4.3
----- farms ..	704 928	.4	10 or less stockholders ----- farms ..	187	2.7
Pasture and other land irrigated ----- farms ..	133	2.6	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. ----- farms ..	486	2.0
----- farms ..	3 936	3.5	----- farms ..	175 637	1.8
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:			HIRED FARM LABOR		
Diverted under annual commodity programs ----- farms ..	12 974	1.5	Hired workers by days worked:		
----- farms ..	206 458	.9	150 days or more ----- farms ..	10 310	36.5
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..	10 380	1.9	----- farms ..	17 164	23.7
----- farms ..	1 038 935	2.2	Less than 150 days ----- farms ..	23 775	54.1
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS ¹			INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Estimated market value of land and buildings ----- farms ..	98 082	1.4	Farm-related injuries:		
----- farms ..	22 069 969	1.3	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	739	1.6
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	225 015	1.9	----- farms ..	847	1.7
Average per acre ----- dollars ..	774	1.9	Hired workers ----- farms ..	295	1.1
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT ¹			AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS ¹		
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ----- farms ..	97 833	1.4	Commercial fertilizer ----- farms ..	63 272	1.6
----- farms ..	3 537 197	1.3	----- farms ..	9 693 513	1.3
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	36 155	1.9	acres on which used ----- farms ..		
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS ¹			Farm-related deaths:		
Commercial fertilizer ----- farms ..	63 272	1.6	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	28	4.9
acres on which used ----- farms ..	9 693 513	1.3	----- farms ..	28	4.9
			Hired workers ----- farms ..	1	—
			----- 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—Con.		
1 to 9 acres ----- farms ..	3 926	1.3	Cattle and calves sold ----- farms ..	67 044	1.4
----- acres..	13 282	1.2	----- number..	2 349 975	1.2
10 to 49 acres ----- farms ..	16 211	1.0	----- \$1,000..	1 171 170	1.1
----- acres..	474 347	1.1	Hogs and pigs inventory ----- farms ..	11 894	1.5
50 to 69 acres ----- farms ..	5 462	1.2	----- number..	2 908 509	.8
----- acres..	319 396	1.2	Hogs and pigs sold ----- farms ..	12 133	1.5
70 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	10 224	1.3	----- number..	5 547 530	.8
----- acres..	837 552	1.3	----- \$1,000..	495 000	.7
100 to 139 acres ----- farms ..	10 397	1.4	Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory ----- farms ..	2 505	1.5
----- acres..	1 211 345	1.4	----- number..	111 362	1.8
140 to 179 acres ----- farms ..	8 571	1.7	Sheep and lambs sold ----- farms ..	2 372	1.6
----- acres..	1 347 711	1.7	----- number..	97 975	1.8
180 to 219 acres ----- farms ..	6 249	1.8	Horses and ponies inventory ----- farms ..	14 173	1.3
----- acres..	1 234 062	1.8	----- number..	64 628	1.3
220 to 259 acres ----- farms ..	5 209	1.9	Horses and ponies sold ----- farms ..	2 894	1.3
----- acres..	1 237 946	1.9	----- number..	11 717	2.0
260 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	16 115	2.0	POULTRY		
----- acres..	5 754 221	2.0	Chickens 3 months old or older inventory ----- farms ..	4 544	1.3
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	10 292	1.7	----- number..	8 343 409	.3
----- acres..	7 029 340	1.7	Hens and pullets of laying age ----- farms ..	4 452	1.2
1,000 to 1,999 acres ----- farms ..	4 289	.8	----- number..	6 894 100	.2
----- acres..	5 715 627	.8	Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold ----- farms ..	341	1.1
2,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	1 137	—	----- number..	82 990 149	.1
----- acres..	3 372 046	—	CROPS HARVESTED		
FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION			Corn for grain or seed ----- farms ..	21 382	1.6
Cash grains (011) ----- farms ..	20 795	1.7	----- acres..	2 445 489	.9
----- acres..	10 276 605	1.2	----- bushels..	308 784 225	.8
Field crops, except cash grains (013) ----- farms ..	7 275	1.3	Corn for silage or green chop ----- farms ..	2 387	1.3
----- acres..	1 523 187	1.3	----- acres..	81 543	1.0
Vegetables and melons (016) ----- farms ..	317	2.1	----- tons, green ..	1 114 626	1.0
----- acres..	26 984	2.2	Sorghum for grain or seed ----- farms ..	6 998	1.6
Fruits and tree nuts (017) ----- farms ..	442	1.7	----- acres..	586 559	1.2
----- acres..	43 845	2.3	----- bushels..	53 046 665	1.1
Horticultural specialties (018) ----- farms ..	552	1.2	Wheat for grain ----- farms ..	16 970	1.5
----- acres..	39 103	1.8	----- acres..	1 319 575	1.0
General farms, primarily crop (019) ----- farms ..	2 115	1.2	Oats for grain ----- farms ..	58 143 633	1.0
----- acres..	403 748	1.6	----- acres..	2 402	1.8
Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties (021) ----- farms ..	58 818	1.4	----- bushels..	46 262	1.8
----- acres..	14 317 247	1.5	Rice ----- farms ..	2 363 989	1.7
Dairy farms (024) ----- farms ..	3 469	1.7	----- acres..	475	1.5
----- acres..	1 184 079	1.1	Cotton ----- farms ..	102 679	.9
Poultry and eggs (025) ----- farms ..	920	.7	----- cwt..	5 023 699	.9
----- acres..	173 688	.5	----- farms ..	1 045	1.3
Animal specialties (027) ----- farms ..	2 202	1.3	----- acres..	313 226	.5
----- acres..	204 422	1.6	----- bales..	500 430	.4
General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029) ----- farms ..	1 177	2.3	Tobacco ----- farms ..	454	1.8
----- acres..	353 967	2.6	----- acres..	1 846	2.2
LIVESTOCK			----- pounds..	3 717 341	2.3
Cattle and calves inventory ----- farms ..	68 413	1.4	Soybeans for beans ----- farms ..	26 600	1.6
----- number..	4 165 357	1.4	----- acres..	4 208 729	1.0
Beef cows ----- farms ..	58 024	1.4	----- bushels..	150 385 224	1.0
----- number..	1 876 845	1.5	Irish potatoes ----- farms ..	149	2.4
Milk cows ----- farms ..	5 626	1.6	----- acres..	6 636	.1
----- number..	215 920	1.1	----- cwt..	1 781 604	(L)
			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) ----- farms ..	57 749	1.4
			----- acres..	3 470 298	1.5
			----- tons, dry ..	6 109 410	1.5
			Alfalfa hay ----- farms ..	18 889	1.5
			----- acres..	749 327	1.6
			----- tons, dry ..	1 674 912	1.5
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) ----- farms ..	954	1.5
			----- acres..	18 881	.9
			Land in orchards ----- farms ..	886	1.5
			----- acres..	13 253	1.9

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 ..	47 213	1.8	Total farm production expenses ----- farms ..	47 252	1.8
Land in farms ----- acres ..	22 514 327	1.3	Average per farm ----- \$1,000 ..	3 121 405	.9
Average size of farm ----- acres ..	477	2.2	----- dollars ..	66 059	2.0
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹		
Total sales (see text) ----- farms ..	47 213	1.8	All farms ----- number ..	47 252	1.8
Average per farm ----- \$1,000 ..	4 114 535	.8	----- \$1,000 ..	973 592	1.1
----- dollars ..	87 148	1.9	Average per farm ----- dollars ..	20 604	2.1
Farms by value of sales:			Farms with net gains ² ----- number ..	35 874	1.8
\$10,000 to \$19,999 ----- farms ..	14 793	1.9	----- \$1,000 ..	1 088 503	1.1
----- \$1,000 ..	208 770	1.9	Average net gain ----- dollars ..	30 342	2.1
\$20,000 to \$24,999 ----- farms ..	4 205	2.3	Farms with net losses ----- number ..	11 378	2.7
----- \$1,000 ..	93 486	2.3	----- \$1,000 ..	114 911	2.8
\$25,000 to \$39,999 ----- farms ..	7 199	2.3	Average net loss ----- dollars ..	10 099	3.8
----- \$1,000 ..	226 504	2.3	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
\$40,000 to \$49,999 ----- farms ..	2 891	2.4	Government payments ----- farms ..	19 325	1.7
----- \$1,000 ..	128 852	2.4	----- \$1,000 ..	151 847	1.1
\$50,000 to \$99,999 ----- farms ..	7 525	2.2	Other farm-related income ¹ ----- farms ..	13 416	2.3
----- \$1,000 ..	534 088	2.2	----- \$1,000 ..	64 232	2.9
\$100,000 to \$249,999 ----- farms ..	7 204	.9	Customwork and other agricultural services ----- farms ..	6 178	3.0
----- \$1,000 ..	1 117 960	.7	----- \$1,000 ..	34 277	3.9
\$250,000 to \$499,999 ----- farms ..	2 369	—	Gross cash rent or share payments ----- farms ..	3 192	4.2
----- \$1,000 ..	809 864	—	----- \$1,000 ..	21 583	4.8
\$500,000 or more ----- farms ..	1 027	—	Forest products and Christmas trees ----- farms ..	1 040	7.0
----- \$1,000 ..	995 012	—	----- \$1,000 ..	3 294	10.5
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			Other farm-related income sources ----- farms ..	5 973	2.9
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms ..	30 443	1.7	----- \$1,000 ..	5 077	6.4
----- \$1,000 ..	1 815 512	.8	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Grains ----- farms ..	25 266	1.7	Total ----- farms ..	3 603	1.4
----- \$1,000 ..	1 521 865	.9	----- \$1,000 ..	125 622	.6
Corn for grain ----- farms ..	15 065	1.7			
----- \$1,000 ..	505 809	.8			
Wheat ----- farms ..	14 465	1.6			
----- \$1,000 ..	165 150	.9			
Soybeans ----- farms ..	21 996	1.7			
----- \$1,000 ..	725 071	.9			
Sorghum for grain ----- farms ..	5 097	1.7			
----- \$1,000 ..	82 988	1.1			
Barley ----- farms ..	71	2.6			
----- \$1,000 ..	190	2.3			
Oats ----- farms ..	613	2.0			
----- \$1,000 ..	1 214	2.4			
Other grains ----- farms ..	657	1.3			
----- \$1,000 ..	41 443	.8			
Cotton and cottonseed ----- farms ..	999	1.3			
----- \$1,000 ..	131 937	.4			
Tobacco ----- farms ..	315	2.1			
----- \$1,000 ..	4 963	2.6			
Hay, silage, and field seeds ----- farms ..	10 238	1.7			
----- \$1,000 ..	62 096	1.6			
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ----- farms ..	532	1.9			
----- \$1,000 ..	12 859	.9			
Fruits, nuts, and berries ----- farms ..	220	2.0			
----- \$1,000 ..	10 142	1.0			
Nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms ..	444	1.3			
----- \$1,000 ..	62 625	.3			
Other crops ----- farms ..	88	2.8			
----- \$1,000 ..	9 025	.2			
Livestock, poultry, and their products ----- farms ..	37 555	1.8			
----- \$1,000 ..	2 299 023	.8			
Poultry and poultry products ----- farms ..	1 268	1.1			
----- \$1,000 ..	408 718	.1			
Dairy products ----- farms ..	3 999	1.8			
----- \$1,000 ..	336 335	1.0			
Cattle and calves ----- farms ..	34 487	1.8			
----- \$1,000 ..	1 043 153	1.1			
Hogs and pigs ----- farms ..	9 160	1.7			
----- \$1,000 ..	486 895	.7			
Sheep, lambs, and wool ----- farms ..	1 238	2.0			
----- \$1,000 ..	3 942	2.0			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ----- farms ..	1 583	1.9			
----- \$1,000 ..	19 981	1.4			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ----- farms ..	1 098	2.0			
----- \$1,000 ..	5 488	1.4			

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 --	1 544	1.9	Rice ----- farms..	468	1.5
-----number..	8 268 326	.3	-----acres..	102 506	.9
Hens and pullets of laying age -----farms --	1 495	1.9	-----cwt..	5 017 220	.9
-----number..	6 829 568	.2	Cotton ----- farms..	999	1.3
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold -----farms --	282	1.0	-----acres..	312 606	.4
-----number..	82 982 015	.1	-----bales..	499 678	.4
CROPS HARVESTED			Tobacco ----- farms..	315	2.1
Corn for grain or seed -----farms --	18 460	1.6	-----acres..	16 263	2.4
-----acres..	2 399 521	.9	-----pounds..	3 391 052	2.4
-----bushels..	304 854 768	.8	Soybeans for beans ----- farms..	22 014	1.7
Corn for silage or green chop -----farms --	2 245	1.3	-----acres..	4 094 588	1.0
-----acres..	79 502	1.0	-----bushels..	147 165 221	.9
-----tons, green..	1 089 606	1.0	-----farms --	70	3.1
Sorghum for grain or seed -----farms --	6 214	1.7	-----acres..	6 592	.1
-----acres..	569 916	1.1	-----cwt..	1 774 899	(L)
-----bushels..	51 982 934	1.1	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass		
Wheat for grain -----farms --	14 582	1.6	-----farms --	30 437	1.8
-----acres..	1 274 238	1.0	-----acres..	2 608 332	1.6
-----bushels..	56 600 813	1.0	-----tons, dry..	4 897 614	1.5
Oats for grain -----farms --	1 998	1.9	Alfalfa hay ----- farms..	11 742	1.8
-----acres..	41 707	1.9	-----acres..	585 161	1.6
-----bushels..	2 172 789	1.8	-----tons, dry..	1 410 241	1.5
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) -----farms --	532	1.9
			-----acres..	17 721	.9
			Land in orchards ----- farms..	284	2.2
			-----acres..	9 270	2.3

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..	-7.6	1.4	-5.2	1.9
Land in farms..... acres ..	-2.3	1.4	-1.0	1.5
Average size of farm.....acres ..	5.8	2.2	4.4	2.6
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹ :				
Average per farm.....dollars ..	28.1	2.8	26.9	3.2
Average per acre.....dollars ..	20.9	2.6	21.7	2.7
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹ :				
Average per farm.....dollars ..	27.2	2.8	21.4	3.2
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres.....	-20.8	1.3	-14.1	2.2
10 to 49 acres.....	-4.8	1.3	15.1	2.5
50 to 179 acres.....	-7.4	1.4	3	2.1
180 to 499 acres.....	-9.4	1.9	-10.1	2.1
500 to 999 acres.....	-9.8	1.8	-10.7	1.7
1,000 to 1,999 acres.....	7.5	1.1	7.5	1.0
2,000 acres or more.....	29.5	-	28.2	-
Total cropland.....farms ..	-7.3	1.4	-5.5	1.8
.....acres ..	-8	1.4	-2	1.5
Harvested cropland.....farms ..	-7.7	1.5	-6.0	1.8
.....acres ..	4.3	1.3	6.0	1.4
Irrigated land.....farms ..	3.2	1.4	2.4	1.5
.....acres ..	32.5	1.1	33.2	1.1
Market value of agricultural products sold.....\$1,000 ..	18.1	1.2	19.7	1.2
Average per farm.....dollars ..	27.7	2.3	26.3	2.8
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops.....\$1,000 ..	27.4	1.3	29.0	1.3
Livestock, poultry, and their products.....\$1,000 ..	11.8	1.1	13.3	1.1
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than \$2,500.....	-10.6	.9	(X)	(X)
\$2,500 to \$4,999.....	-9.6	1.3	(X)	(X)
\$5,000 to \$9,999.....	-8.6	1.5	(X)	(X)
\$10,000 to \$24,999.....	-8.4	2.0	-8.4	2.0
\$25,000 to \$49,999.....	-10.0	2.3	-10.0	2.3
\$50,000 to \$99,999.....	-15.9	2.1	-15.9	2.1
\$100,000 to \$249,999.....	5.9	1.1	5.9	1.1
\$250,000 to \$499,999.....	48.6	.1	48.6	.1
\$500,000 or more.....	108.3	-	108.3	-
Total farm production expenses ¹\$1,000 ..	21.1	1.8	22.6	2.3
Average per farm.....dollars ..	31.0	2.5	29.0	2.9
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹farms..	-7.6	1.4	-4.9	1.9
.....\$1,000 ..	7.2	1.7	10.6	1.6
Average per farm.....dollars ..	15.9	2.6	16.3	2.9
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming.....	-8.3	1.6	-7.5	1.7
Other.....	-6.8	1.4	.6	2.2
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any.....	-8.8	4.7	-5.3	5.1
200 days or more.....	-7.6	4.8	-2	5.4
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory.....farms ..	-7.2	1.4	-5.0	1.9
.....number..	2	1.5	1.8	1.6
Beef cows.....farms ..	-5.0	1.5	-2.0	1.9
.....number..	3.2	1.7	5.9	1.9
Milk cows.....farms ..	-27.0	1.3	-20.9	1.6
.....number..	-10.8	1.3	-9.8	1.3
Cattle and calves sold.....farms ..	-9.3	1.4	-6.4	1.8
.....number..	-6.6	1.3	-3.9	1.3
Hogs and pigs inventory.....farms ..	-20.6	1.3	-20.7	1.5
.....number..	12.6	1.1	13.5	1.1
Hogs and pigs sold.....farms ..	-20.7	1.3	-20.7	1.5
.....number..	15.5	1.2	16.3	1.2
Sheep and lambs inventory.....farms ..	-3.9	1.7	-1.8	2.3
.....number..	9.4	2.4	13.6	3.0
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory.....farms ..	-39.3	.9	-39.3	1.3
.....number..	1.3	.4	2.0	.4
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold.....farms ..	7.9	2.0	16.5	2.1
.....number..	102.5	1.1	102.5	1.1
Selected crops harvested:				
Corn for grain or seed.....farms ..	-17.5	1.5	-12.4	1.6
.....acres ..	18.2	1.3	20.4	1.3
.....bushels..	41.6	1.4	43.6	1.5
Corn for silage or green chop.....farms ..	-15.7	1.3	-14.0	1.4
.....acres ..	-1.1	1.2	-2	1.2
.....tons, green..	1.0	1.3	1.6	1.3
Sorghum for grain or seed.....farms ..	-24.4	1.4	-18.3	1.6
.....acres ..	-6.2	1.3	-3.3	1.3
.....bushels..	4.5	1.4	6.9	1.4
Wheat for grain.....farms ..	33.8	2.3	38.7	2.5
.....acres ..	75.9	2.1	78.8	2.1
.....bushels..	82.0	2.1	84.6	2.1
Cotton.....farms ..	-13.9	1.3	-12.8	1.4
.....acres ..	58.5	1.2	59.0	1.2
.....bales..	63.7	1.1	64.0	1.1
Soybeans for beans.....farms ..	-20.6	1.5	-14.6	1.7
.....acres ..	-12.8	1.1	-11.2	1.1
.....bushels..	1.4	1.2	2.9	1.2
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text).....farms ..	-4.0	1.5	-3.7	1.9
.....acres ..	10.6	1.8	12.6	2.0
.....tons, dry..	12.9	1.8	14.3	1.9

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

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)
Pulaski	494	1.2	138 986	1.8	281	2.2	158 350	7.7	9 534	14.0
Putnam	581	2.1	254 493	2.0	438	2.9	170 352	5.9	20 300	11.4
Ralls	570	1.6	228 936	1.4	402	2.1	317 348	4.8	31 298	4.9
Randolph	745	1.5	221 122	1.6	297	2.2	176 206	6.6	21 076	8.3
Ray	1 045	1.2	277 322	1.1	265	1.7	234 947	3.8	39 048	6.1
Reynolds	298	1.2	89 683	1.9	301	2.3	203 644	30.6	5 338	8.0
Ripley	465	1.6	152 529	2.2	328	2.7	175 752	7.5	14 039	12.1
St. Charles	783	.8	204 171	.8	261	1.2	493 915	4.8	36 425	3.9
St. Clair	726	1.8	257 217	2.1	354	2.8	171 811	5.9	22 267	6.8
Ste. Genevieve	635	1.2	168 586	1.6	265	1.9	192 884	5.0	21 630	5.4
St. Francois	693	.8	116 910	1.5	169	1.7	172 667	7.1	14 914	7.8
St. Louis	295	1.0	54 082	1.8	183	2.1	401 895	12.5	9 862	9.4
Saline	939	1.7	414 394	1.3	441	2.1	381 016	3.2	62 281	4.4
Schuyler	488	1.9	165 225	2.1	339	2.8	133 167	6.3	13 381	10.2
Scotland	530	1.9	216 694	1.7	409	2.5	259 364	11.5	22 417	4.3
Scott	545	1.4	219 042	.9	402	1.7	432 247	3.5	35 257	2.5
Shannon	424	1.7	120 036	2.7	283	3.2	118 708	8.8	7 538	10.0
Shelby	655	1.6	273 393	1.3	417	2.1	255 162	3.3	44 620	5.3
Stoddard	953	1.3	438 142	.7	460	1.4	560 094	2.4	80 521	3.1
Stone	698	1.5	137 747	1.9	197	2.4	168 577	6.4	13 566	6.9
Sullivan	779	1.8	329 999	1.7	424	2.5	169 900	8.3	22 286	5.3
Taney	493	1.3	160 576	1.4	326	1.9	181 140	8.5	10 541	15.6
Texas	1 536	1.2	459 671	1.3	299	1.8	176 913	5.1	35 587	5.5
Vernon	1 249	1.6	402 202	1.8	322	2.4	211 386	4.0	40 437	5.1
Warren	526	1.0	126 474	1.4	240	1.7	393 056	6.5	26 137	9.3
Washington	476	1.2	111 850	1.8	235	2.2	140 317	8.3	10 963	9.6
Wayne	361	1.7	93 053	2.1	258	2.7	118 337	11.5	6 251	14.8
Webster	1 541	1.1	289 729	1.2	188	1.6	147 725	5.1	37 167	4.8
Worth	327	1.7	134 028	1.9	410	2.5	225 646	9.3	10 722	11.6
Wright	1 330	1.4	316 617	1.6	238	2.1	150 584	6.5	32 749	4.9
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)
Missouri	36 155	1.9	4 303 148	.8	43 873	1.6	98 082	1.4	3 395 093	.9
Adair	28 605	7.9	21 151	2.2	26 841	3.0	788	2.0	15 692	4.4
Andrew	48 816	7.7	38 441	1.2	46 314	1.9	830	1.6	27 166	3.4
Atchison	92 109	4.6	62 943	.7	123 661	1.6	509	1.9	42 677	2.5
Audrain	59 927	4.5	76 029	.7	73 458	1.4	1 035	1.4	58 767	1.6
Barry	25 535	7.7	98 086	.6	64 067	1.6	1 530	1.6	86 707	1.3
Barton	53 939	7.1	38 632	1.0	44 713	1.8	864	1.4	30 652	2.7
Bates	38 882	5.0	67 531	.8	55 996	1.8	1 207	1.6	54 722	1.4
Benton	27 814	6.3	27 984	1.3	33 513	2.0	835	1.7	22 815	5.6
Bollinger	25 562	5.9	17 170	2.0	21 845	2.6	785	1.5	12 804	5.0
Boone	25 387	5.5	35 949	.9	28 329	1.4	1 268	1.1	31 249	3.0
Buchanan	43 425	5.4	28 619	1.2	37 956	1.8	754	1.8	20 130	3.7
Butler	54 533	6.0	47 021	1.1	64 062	2.0	735	2.3	35 211	2.3
Caldwell	27 213	8.1	26 285	1.7	32 054	2.7	820	1.9	20 272	3.4
Callaway	30 906	5.2	38 609	1.1	29 699	1.6	1 301	1.3	31 689	3.1
Camden	26 101	8.2	12 426	1.3	21 915	1.8	567	1.4	13 500	6.7
Cape Girardeau	37 143	5.6	43 414	1.0	36 088	1.5	1 203	1.4	34 687	3.0
Carroll	50 136	4.0	62 039	1.0	67 507	2.1	919	1.7	42 520	2.1
Carter	19 842	8.2	2 702	2.4	13 786	3.0	197	2.6	2 620	9.0
Cass	33 508	5.2	50 516	.9	33 300	1.5	1 517	1.3	41 923	2.3
Cedar	23 990	8.3	16 360	1.5	19 927	2.1	821	1.6	15 495	5.5
Chariton	58 254	4.9	75 823	.8	70 533	1.6	1 075	1.6	55 104	2.4
Christian	20 192	6.7	28 241	1.5	22 098	2.3	1 279	1.9	22 865	3.1
Clark	55 215	9.5	31 838	1.4	52 109	2.3	610	2.2	22 268	5.4
Clay	33 840	12.4	22 322	1.0	34 132	1.5	654	1.4	20 244	3.3
Clinton	35 129	5.1	33 641	.8	47 116	1.3	714	1.2	27 291	2.9
Cole	27 816	8.2	18 585	1.6	17 853	2.0	1 041	1.1	16 176	5.9
Cooper	45 460	5.7	54 496	1.0	61 095	1.9	892	1.7	43 868	2.5
Crawford	17 318	7.1	9 594	1.7	14 108	2.1	680	1.5	8 999	5.0
Dade	26 446	5.1	27 825	1.5	32 735	2.3	850	1.8	20 500	2.6
Dallas	20 403	5.7	31 325	1.1	28 765	1.5	1 089	1.2	26 589	3.3
Daviess	37 873	7.0	32 431	1.7	39 074	2.6	831	2.0	22 324	3.3
De Kalb	31 775	7.0	26 474	1.6	36 515	2.6	725	2.5	22 754	3.9
Dent	22 620	14.0	11 224	1.7	15 988	2.1	702	1.3	11 903	6.7
Douglas	20 128	6.3	29 886	1.5	25 178	2.0	1 187	1.4	27 961	3.4
Dunklin	95 780	5.4	82 508	.5	153 646	1.5	537	1.6	56 702	2.7
Franklin	28 360	5.0	37 503	.8	23 646	1.2	1 585	1.0	31 709	3.7
Gasconade	21 647	7.3	14 672	1.4	17 980	1.7	816	1.1	11 110	4.0
Gentry	38 328	6.5	30 998	1.1	49 677	2.1	624	1.5	24 440	3.4
Greene	24 046	5.9	41 703	1.1	19 830	1.5	2 101	1.2	36 313	3.2

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)
Grundy	39 964	8.6	26 566	1.3	42 988	2.2	618	2.2	19 071	3.4
Harrison	37 909	9.2	37 654	1.7	43 784	2.9	860	2.3	30 881	5.1
Henry	41 955	8.7	36 976	1.3	38 840	2.1	952	1.7	28 872	3.1
Hickory	23 214	10.4	15 810	1.0	29 717	1.7	532	1.5	13 451	4.7
Holt	76 854	5.5	46 475	.8	89 721	1.9	518	1.6	31 908	3.2
Howard	42 180	7.4	27 927	1.4	40 651	2.1	687	1.6	22 536	2.9
Howell	21 272	7.2	39 575	1.3	23 197	1.9	1 707	1.5	34 998	2.7
Iron	18 581	10.6	5 226	2.0	18 402	2.4	284	1.9	4 299	7.8
Jackson	32 951	4.6	26 004	.8	34 352	1.5	757	1.2	19 581	3.4
Jasper	31 329	5.8	60 212	.7	45 719	1.5	1 317	1.3	51 819	1.4
Jefferson	23 933	6.8	10 722	1.5	16 546	1.8	648	1.2	8 240	7.6
Johnson	33 728	5.0	57 564	.9	37 722	1.6	1 526	1.5	46 600	2.2
Knox	47 546	5.5	30 030	1.2	51 158	2.1	586	2.1	23 037	3.5
Laclede	24 366	5.4	34 702	1.2	27 282	1.7	1 273	1.3	29 267	3.5
Lafayette	45 180	4.3	83 405	.6	63 571	1.3	1 312	1.1	60 686	1.5
Lawrence	35 779	5.5	76 904	.8	46 105	1.5	1 668	1.3	69 822	2.5
Lewis	42 631	6.0	35 251	1.1	53 249	2.2	662	2.0	27 507	3.1
Lincoln	42 394	5.2	52 217	.8	51 547	1.5	1 014	1.4	41 873	2.8
Linn	39 542	8.6	40 995	1.1	48 400	2.0	848	1.6	32 205	3.0
Livingston	40 877	7.1	32 535	1.3	45 376	2.2	717	2.0	22 456	3.8
McDonald	34 350	4.2	81 724	.3	80 437	1.1	1 016	1.1	75 265	1.1
Macon	29 602	5.0	32 675	1.4	28 993	2.3	1 127	2.1	26 110	3.6
Madison	19 047	16.1	7 339	1.5	19 313	2.0	380	1.9	6 252	8.0
Maries	20 062	6.4	17 127	1.4	21 067	1.9	813	1.3	15 937	4.5
Marion	41 807	6.7	33 376	1.2	47 544	2.0	702	1.8	26 011	3.3
Mercer	46 324	11.7	25 203	1.5	51 965	2.8	485	2.2	19 089	6.2
Miller	26 535	6.3	52 995	.5	49 069	1.2	1 080	1.2	47 044	1.3
Mississippi	170 611	2.8	75 683	.4	258 304	1.4	294	1.7	51 997	1.3
Moniteau	25 721	6.7	37 646	.9	38 064	1.5	989	1.2	30 077	2.5
Monroe	49 608	4.7	44 877	1.1	53 873	2.1	833	1.9	34 639	2.3
Montgomery	50 070	6.5	35 549	.9	49 580	1.4	717	1.2	26 318	2.9
Morgan	30 766	9.5	46 237	.8	54 461	1.6	849	1.7	39 326	1.9
New Madrid	140 844	3.3	95 734	.4	216 592	1.5	442	1.7	58 771	1.5
Newton	24 696	4.9	87 993	.4	53 524	1.1	1 645	1.0	81 256	.9
Nodaway	42 859	4.2	81 915	1.0	60 723	1.9	1 348	1.6	62 072	1.9
Oregon	22 780	8.9	26 134	1.3	33 039	2.1	791	1.7	23 907	3.5
Osage	28 468	5.0	53 426	.7	45 624	1.2	1 171	1.1	43 567	2.1
Ozark	23 181	6.9	26 016	1.5	32 439	2.2	801	1.7	21 619	2.9
Pemiscot	147 301	4.8	75 212	.5	216 127	1.7	348	1.6	46 605	2.7
Perry	41 355	5.0	33 367	1.1	37 198	1.6	897	1.3	26 681	3.5
Pettis	41 978	4.8	56 042	.9	45 749	1.6	1 225	1.6	42 904	2.4
Phelps	20 111	8.1	10 003	1.6	13 971	2.0	716	1.5	9 471	9.1
Pike	42 350	4.8	56 563	.9	58 433	1.7	968	1.5	41 736	1.8
Platte	40 574	7.5	26 478	1.0	37 611	1.5	703	1.1	18 801	2.0
Polk	26 003	4.7	52 655	1.0	32 909	1.6	1 600	1.3	44 633	2.2
Pulaski	19 299	14.1	8 553	1.3	17 314	1.8	494	1.2	7 896	10.5
Putnam	34 880	11.7	27 485	1.6	47 306	2.6	582	2.3	24 006	4.9
Ralls	54 718	5.1	32 441	1.0	56 914	1.9	572	1.6	22 497	2.2
Randolph	28 252	8.4	22 712	1.2	30 486	1.9	746	1.4	17 880	3.1
Ray	38 245	6.3	42 366	.8	40 542	1.4	1 045	1.4	32 426	2.1
Reynolds	18 343	8.5	3 472	2.0	11 652	2.3	298	2.2	3 451	23.1
Ripley	30 192	12.2	9 096	2.1	19 561	2.6	465	1.7	9 708	9.5
St. Charles	46 940	4.1	43 840	.6	55 990	1.0	782	.9	29 497	2.4
St. Clair	30 670	7.0	20 961	1.9	28 872	2.6	726	1.8	17 390	4.4
Ste. Genevieve	34 117	5.5	18 287	1.1	28 799	1.6	634	1.2	14 353	2.5
St. Francois	21 521	7.9	16 951	.7	24 460	1.1	693	1.1	14 026	9.1
St. Louis	33 546	9.5	16 460	.7	55 798	1.2	294	1.3	11 284	3.2
Saline	66 327	4.8	87 158	.8	92 820	1.9	939	1.9	59 723	1.6
Schuyler	27 421	10.4	14 116	1.9	28 927	2.7	488	1.9	11 683	5.1
Scotland	42 297	4.7	29 278	1.3	55 242	2.3	530	1.9	24 103	3.0
Scott	64 572	2.8	51 749	.6	94 952	1.6	546	1.4	36 440	2.1
Shannon	17 779	10.2	5 404	2.9	12 745	3.3	424	1.8	4 388	7.9
Shelby	68 122	5.5	46 521	.9	71 024	1.8	655	1.5	34 425	1.8
Stoddard	84 492	3.3	117 261	.4	123 044	1.3	953	1.1	88 667	1.7
Stone	19 463	7.1	17 679	1.7	25 327	2.2	697	1.6	15 291	3.8
Sullivan	28 905	5.6	25 815	1.3	33 139	2.2	779	1.8	21 963	3.6
Taney	21 338	15.7	7 472	1.8	15 157	2.2	494	1.5	6 531	6.1
Texas	23 184	5.7	41 578	1.4	27 069	1.8	1 535	1.5	35 217	2.9
Vernon	32 584	5.4	41 392	1.3	33 140	2.1	1 249	1.6	35 030	2.8
Warren	49 690	9.4	22 476	1.0	42 730	1.4	526	1.2	19 255	5.3
Washington	23 032	9.7	13 797	.9	28 986	1.5	476	1.4	12 084	5.1
Wayne	17 316	15.0	4 476	2.4	12 399	2.9	361	2.3	4 502	14.8
Webster	24 135	5.0	52 125	.9	33 825	1.4	1 540	1.2	43 805	3.0
Worth	34 038	12.0	12 281	1.6	37 558	2.3	326	2.0	8 333	5.9
Wright	24 623	5.2	48 232	1.3	36 265	2.0	1 330	1.5	39 628	2.6

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)
Pettis	449	7.7	7 388	6.2	775	4.9	8 899	3.5	635	5.2	1 655	6.4
Phelps	274	10.4	1 373	22.2	558	4.5	1 899	7.3	98	21.9	79	24.4
Pike	369	8.3	7 174	2.6	625	5.7	7 771	3.4	585	5.5	2 001	3.8
Platte	146	16.6	712	21.6	329	8.5	1 309	14.3	440	6.7	1 555	3.9
Polk	675	7.0	8 150	6.0	1 245	3.7	14 615	3.7	333	10.4	479	6.5
Pulaski	184	14.4	2 401	18.2	346	6.6	1 508	8.7	82	23.8	90	4.7
Putnam	234	11.6	6 972	10.8	374	8.1	2 929	9.1	270	11.3	583	18.6
Ralls	141	14.7	1 761	7.0	302	8.5	2 585	8.6	410	4.4	1 331	4.2
Randolph	210	12.5	4 682	6.5	416	6.4	2 336	9.8	395	8.1	643	5.6
Ray	243	11.4	5 755	2.9	609	5.5	3 844	7.0	544	5.9	2 046	5.1
Reynolds	104	17.5	1 047	52.7	215	8.9	599	19.5	46	33.3	12	44.7
Ripley	115	18.4	1 501	25.8	327	7.0	1 245	23.0	145	15.7	291	16.7
St. Charles	148	15.5	2 053	15.2	285	9.1	3 066	4.8	505	4.1	2 445	8.7
St. Clair	285	9.9	2 226	13.9	482	6.0	3 928	9.2	262	9.8	402	9.3
Ste. Genevieve	240	10.5	2 215	8.6	447	5.1	3 555	4.2	267	9.0	503	8.2
St. Francois	235	13.9	1 777	7.1	464	5.9	5 223	15.2	146	18.9	369	8.6
St. Louis	41	37.0	53	31.0	84	21.4	238	56.7	160	10.7	2 043	2.3
Saline	307	10.2	8 809	6.8	507	6.7	7 815	4.6	726	3.7	3 734	3.7
Schuyler	211	12.6	2 018	19.9	298	8.9	1 647	10.9	238	11.1	346	10.4
Scotland	249	12.1	3 128	7.4	317	8.5	2 978	12.8	375	6.0	1 451	7.1
Scott	137	14.0	2 924	3.9	231	10.1	2 351	6.0	368	5.1	2 418	3.7
Shannon	142	15.5	499	26.1	361	4.4	1 049	17.5	37	35.0	8	39.7
Shelby	243	9.9	4 725	5.1	425	6.2	6 764	3.2	463	5.6	1 524	3.7
Stoddard	185	13.3	4 315	2.5	311	9.8	10 992	1.0	649	3.8	5 236	2.0
Stone	220	10.7	1 575	11.3	578	4.3	6 099	6.3	31	28.1	59	21.7
Sullivan	201	13.9	4 227	14.9	490	6.5	3 070	6.7	246	10.4	521	15.2
Taney	147	17.2	963	33.3	390	5.4	1 994	10.9	53	30.4	39	16.5
Texas	570	8.3	3 893	12.0	1 217	3.3	12 258	4.9	234	14.1	216	14.0
Vernon	398	9.5	4 765	8.1	861	4.7	4 519	6.4	530	7.2	1 620	10.0
Warren	217	9.7	1 873	7.2	369	5.5	4 145	11.1	260	7.1	890	7.4
Washington	199	12.4	3 321	16.4	360	6.0	4 357	2.2	48	29.8	8	30.8
Wayne	142	15.5	676	29.9	254	10.0	1 071	39.0	142	16.5	119	25.1
Webster	720	6.2	7 792	8.7	1 200	3.4	16 958	5.4	368	9.3	277	11.0
Worth	56	23.3	491	8.7	182	11.5	1 287	20.0	197	9.8	350	11.4
Wright	647	6.7	4 505	9.4	1 103	3.2	16 423	3.3	254	12.8	175	14.4

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)
Missouri	63 374	1.6	301 298	1.2	48 013	1.6	170 477	1.1	92 699	1.4	193 235	1.2
Adair	383	7.4	1 367	8.3	397	7.9	918	9.4	743	2.9	1 234	5.3
Andrew	608	4.9	2 547	6.4	661	4.2	2 149	7.6	805	2.2	1 639	5.1
Atchison	456	3.7	6 064	4.7	459	3.7	4 492	3.2	500	2.4	2 896	3.8
Audrain	800	3.6	6 962	4.0	677	4.6	3 723	3.6	997	2.1	3 209	3.3
Barry	820	5.6	1 928	9.7	452	8.9	360	7.1	1 448	2.0	2 212	3.0
Barton	643	4.0	4 474	4.8	531	5.0	1 842	7.2	822	2.3	2 138	4.7
Bates	772	5.1	5 283	4.1	676	5.8	2 561	5.7	1 184	1.9	2 431	3.0
Benton	420	7.5	1 545	10.2	496	7.2	553	8.8	780	2.7	1 146	6.8
Bollinger	604	4.6	1 743	7.9	317	9.6	575	7.8	754	2.2	1 069	5.8
Boone	650	5.9	2 465	5.1	633	5.7	1 744	13.2	1 162	2.2	1 664	7.1
Buchanan	496	5.3	2 445	5.9	584	4.3	1 742	7.2	703	2.8	1 521	4.7
Butler	521	5.8	5 845	3.7	445	7.3	2 937	4.7	735	2.3	3 118	3.7
Caldwell	504	6.5	1 717	7.6	533	5.9	1 272	6.9	791	2.6	1 443	5.1
Callaway	730	5.3	3 111	5.7	650	6.0	1 880	9.0	1 210	2.1	1 977	4.0
Camden	274	10.8	540	11.2	210	12.3	54	14.1	554	2.1	485	11.2
Cape Girardeau	900	3.8	3 075	5.0	767	5.4	1 604	6.4	1 152	2.0	2 076	5.6
Carroll	672	5.1	4 657	7.1	667	5.0	3 474	4.5	895	2.1	2 788	3.6
Carter	107	7.1	252	14.1	39	17.4	15	27.3	192	2.9	214	8.4
Cass	867	5.3	4 256	4.5	705	6.0	2 133	7.4	1 436	1.7	3 025	4.2
Cedar	506	6.3	925	13.6	227	13.3	135	22.0	766	2.7	830	6.2
Chariton	790	4.3	5 312	6.0	847	3.8	4 059	4.5	1 031	2.3	3 495	4.7
Christian	776	5.3	1 903	7.9	403	9.9	184	16.5	1 218	2.3	1 030	6.3
Clark	446	6.1	3 328	8.5	448	6.3	1 833	9.9	583	3.1	1 702	7.5
Clay	264	10.3	1 045	7.8	358	9.0	882	8.2	597	3.0	987	6.7
Clinton	404	6.8	2 224	5.8	392	6.5	1 229	7.1	689	1.7	1 507	5.2
Cole	760	4.2	1 423	8.2	291	11.3	401	15.1	1 007	1.6	975	6.8
Cooper	644	5.1	3 522	5.2	545	5.6	2 009	4.1	839	2.6	2 220	4.5
Crawford	424	6.5	851	10.2	172	17.1	66	19.5	637	2.7	641	8.2
Dade	556	6.2	2 086	5.8	446	7.5	718	6.9	752	3.2	1 063	5.1
Dallas	609	6.3	1 371	7.8	250	12.6	151	28.1	1 023	2.4	1 029	5.3
Dauiess	531	6.3	2 100	7.2	518	6.5	1 686	8.3	741	4.0	1 610	5.1
De Kalb	453	6.8	2 242	11.4	486	6.3	1 350	8.9	679	3.2	1 453	5.5
Dent	478	6.5	1 245	12.7	294	11.5	137	45.4	650	3.2	636	9.3
Douglas	776	5.3	1 927	6.8	209	14.6	63	21.7	1 109	2.4	1 260	4.8

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.											
	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)
Dunklin	507	2.8	8 007	2.9	481	3.1	9 335	3.2	528	2.0	4 544	4.1
Franklin	1 044	4.4	2 581	6.0	608	7.6	1 049	10.7	1 513	1.9	1 880	5.2
Gasconade	661	4.1	1 180	6.3	481	6.9	312	9.6	781	2.0	721	8.0
Gentry	425	6.1	2 134	6.4	456	6.7	1 594	5.9	598	2.9	1 374	5.1
Greene	1 179	4.5	2 474	8.6	602	7.6	306	7.9	1 929	1.9	1 913	6.6
Grundy	316	7.6	1 856	7.1	431	7.0	1 580	10.6	555	4.4	1 365	4.3
Harrison	549	6.4	2 803	5.1	480	7.4	1 873	8.4	800	2.7	2 192	8.3
Henry	613	5.4	2 994	7.2	535	5.9	1 558	7.9	897	2.7	1 861	3.8
Hickory	323	8.1	951	12.6	103	19.4	113	9.6	488	3.0	731	7.0
Holt	441	4.4	4 021	3.4	430	4.8	3 595	6.9	501	2.4	1 994	5.8
Howard	506	6.0	2 179	7.4	511	5.6	1 693	7.7	642	3.1	1 622	6.3
Howell	1 094	4.2	2 435	6.1	362	10.4	157	8.1	1 548	2.3	1 485	6.2
Iron	152	12.2	260	22.5	68	22.4	40	35.1	271	3.3	231	11.2
Jackson	397	8.7	1 361	9.3	361	8.3	1 272	12.0	650	3.6	1 223	3.8
Jasper	679	6.1	2 790	4.9	486	8.0	941	7.4	1 253	1.9	2 085	4.4
Jefferson	339	8.3	724	12.8	222	10.8	280	10.6	595	2.7	650	8.9
Johnson	977	4.3	3 558	5.0	647	5.9	1 695	7.2	1 473	1.9	2 328	3.5
Knox	463	5.0	2 519	5.9	364	8.2	1 668	8.3	559	3.5	1 614	5.2
Laclede	772	5.1	2 122	7.1	424	9.0	177	9.1	1 180	2.2	1 425	4.6
Lafayette	950	3.7	5 513	3.4	924	4.1	4 399	4.2	1 287	1.5	3 137	2.4
Lawrence	941	5.2	3 589	10.2	686	7.5	600	13.8	1 525	2.3	2 606	5.7
Lewis	439	6.2	3 498	5.0	422	7.0	2 102	7.7	598	3.3	1 797	3.9
Lincoln	626	5.6	3 611	4.7	626	6.0	1 730	5.3	944	2.5	2 024	6.2
Linn	584	5.1	2 646	6.1	458	6.5	1 423	7.2	833	1.9	1 981	4.0
Livingston	495	6.1	2 069	4.8	494	6.9	2 176	7.2	693	2.4	1 619	4.6
McDonald	420	8.1	682	9.5	253	11.4	104	19.5	953	2.1	2 431	3.2
Macon	657	5.6	2 570	4.9	644	6.5	1 800	9.1	1 050	2.9	1 952	4.3
Madison	270	9.2	507	16.4	30	37.3	18	13.8	366	3.1	366	9.3
Marion	536	5.6	1 203	7.4	154	17.1	110	13.8	774	2.1	730	6.6
Marion	519	5.1	3 158	6.1	478	5.7	1 777	5.1	632	3.7	1 613	4.4
Mercer	292	8.2	1 313	11.9	303	9.7	693	10.5	476	2.7	1 072	7.3
Miller	635	5.8	1 212	8.1	328	10.6	161	20.0	1 037	1.9	1 436	3.5
Mississippi	237	4.9	5 867	2.4	245	5.0	5 630	3.6	293	1.7	3 768	2.1
Moniteau	601	5.8	1 771	7.9	355	8.4	609	17.2	947	2.0	1 386	6.5
Monroe	585	4.9	4 026	5.1	484	6.3	2 332	6.8	775	2.9	2 072	4.2
Montgomery	554	4.3	3 465	4.5	566	4.0	1 872	3.6	693	2.1	1 562	3.9
Morgan	554	5.7	1 742	8.2	347	10.3	560	14.1	808	2.2	1 372	3.7
New Madrid	428	2.4	9 516	1.8	392	4.0	7 885	2.0	434	2.2	5 233	2.0
Newton	864	5.0	1 698	8.0	489	8.2	174	11.5	1 542	1.7	2 040	3.4
Nodaway	1 033	4.1	6 089	3.5	1 046	3.7	4 678	3.2	1 309	1.9	4 080	3.9
Oregon	521	6.3	1 865	12.0	322	10.6	164	14.6	777	1.9	976	6.5
Osage	816	4.1	2 167	6.6	625	6.2	618	8.3	1 141	1.7	1 599	3.8
Ozark	471	7.1	1 427	9.7	195	14.8	121	34.0	773	2.5	804	6.3
Pemiscot	286	7.6	4 629	3.0	336	3.1	7 626	3.6	348	1.6	3 948	3.3
Perry	668	4.6	2 480	5.0	655	4.8	1 500	9.2	829	2.7	1 651	5.2
Pettis	814	4.3	4 765	5.5	619	5.1	2 029	4.7	1 156	2.1	2 327	4.9
Phelps	485	6.3	906	13.1	185	14.4	86	27.6	643	3.4	685	11.7
Pike	694	4.2	4 541	3.0	603	4.7	2 077	5.0	900	2.8	2 313	3.4
Platte	492	5.6	2 203	5.6	533	4.9	1 866	3.7	661	2.4	1 372	4.3
Polk	993	4.5	2 732	4.6	663	7.4	520	9.6	1 470	2.5	1 904	4.2
Pulaski	273	9.0	427	12.3	120	19.0	80	48.9	464	2.7	437	14.0
Putnam	396	6.5	1 905	8.8	272	11.5	694	16.1	568	2.8	1 212	8.3
Ralls	434	4.6	3 511	3.8	387	5.7	1 723	4.4	560	2.1	1 636	4.2
Randolph	448	7.2	1 549	6.4	431	7.4	1 053	8.0	677	3.3	974	5.7
Ray	611	5.5	3 057	5.8	534	6.5	2 436	6.9	949	2.4	2 022	6.6
Reynolds	180	11.1	342	31.1	43	34.6	16	38.9	265	4.7	240	12.0
Ripley	338	6.2	1 298	8.5	158	14.4	411	14.6	452	2.4	721	10.7
St. Charles	592	3.8	3 072	3.7	571	4.3	2 561	5.2	756	1.6	2 019	3.8
St. Clair	503	6.7	2 022	6.1	258	11.1	538	10.8	696	2.5	1 200	6.1
Ste. Genevieve	447	5.6	1 262	6.7	203	11.0	550	12.5	592	2.6	870	5.2
St. Francois	423	6.8	634	16.4	111	22.0	136	26.6	650	2.5	643	6.1
St. Louis	182	7.5	434	10.1	196	9.8	477	22.0	276	4.2	705	5.5
Saline	694	4.1	5 938	3.0	737	4.3	4 594	4.2	900	2.4	4 025	2.7
Schuyler	277	9.8	917	13.6	270	10.3	494	14.0	471	2.9	967	6.6
Scotland	376	6.0	2 867	5.6	369	6.9	1 621	8.2	506	3.1	1 537	6.1
Scott	410	5.3	4 413	2.6	367	6.4	3 231	2.9	516	2.7	2 750	2.6
Shannon	283	8.0	595	12.9	103	20.8	23	26.9	409	2.9	321	10.8
Shelby	492	5.2	3 688	4.7	466	5.3	2 064	4.4	624	2.2	2 069	2.7
Stoddard	732	3.6	12 830	1.9	593	4.8	6 756	2.6	919	1.8	6 656	2.4
Stone	402	8.1	763	10.5	184	14.4	54	14.1	681	2.2	772	7.1
Sullivan	378	8.0	1 421	6.9	311	9.6	975	15.1	703	3.6	1 467	5.4
Taney	199	12.5	450	11.4	185	14.2	76	19.1	477	2.7	403	7.4
Texas	1 046	4.3	3 265	6.4	414	10.1	168	17.0	1 470	2.0	1 730	5.6
Vernon	791	5.2	4 130	4.3	638	6.6	2 083	11.8	1 189	2.1	2 493	4.5
Warren	344	5.0	1 863	7.1	328	6.8	1 122	6.5	508	1.9	998	5.2
Washington	257	9.5	300	13.1	77	22.3	12	32.3	420	3.9	398	8.7
Wayne	211	12.9	468	26.4	109	23.7	179	27.6	348	3.2	324	16.4
Webster	1 051	4.1	2 468	6.1	670	6.5	172	8.3	1 477	1.7	1 541	4.7
Worth	183	9.8	634	9.9	201	9.1	402	8.8	308	3.4	656	6.6
Wright	880	4.5	2 584	7.3	410	9.0	165	13.7	1 256	2.0	1 634	6.1

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.											
	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)
Pettis	893	4.0	637	4.6	282	11.7	1 745	5.4	130	17.1	220	13.0
Phelps	448	7.5	191	9.7	232	13.6	637	35.6	74	29.0	160	27.1
Pike	580	5.8	544	4.8	332	9.9	2 762	2.1	57	31.3	98	16.4
Platte	419	7.2	262	6.6	182	14.3	777	3.9	96	21.2	227	15.7
Polk	975	4.3	774	7.6	433	8.9	1 935	4.7	157	15.6	325	12.5
Pulaski	298	8.7	126	21.3	177	14.0	288	7.9	38	38.3	20	30.5
Putnam	418	7.2	357	10.5	203	12.7	1 086	9.2	67	28.4	217	39.0
Ralls	384	5.7	361	5.7	185	13.7	1 381	11.4	36	26.4	90	8.2
Randolph	447	6.5	233	10.7	168	15.3	528	10.9	24	23.2	72	7.1
Ray	606	5.5	316	5.7	206	12.1	1 947	9.5	117	19.8	315	37.0
Reynolds	159	12.9	53	36.8	126	15.9	105	12.3	19	59.3	18	74.3
Ripley	200	11.3	100	11.7	124	15.9	571	23.7	53	28.6	86	26.8
St. Charles	521	4.8	541	5.9	211	10.5	3 420	5.1	51	30.1	230	12.3
St. Clair	453	6.3	263	7.3	208	13.3	543	16.8	83	23.5	84	38.0
Ste. Genevieve	424	5.7	224	5.9	140	13.6	574	3.5	22	50.0	15	51.9
St. Francois	328	10.1	204	10.9	160	16.6	1 701	15.2	13	77.4	21	69.9
St. Louis	159	13.3	197	7.2	85	18.4	2 606	3.8	24	39.6	45	36.7
Saline	671	5.1	862	4.3	295	9.1	3 523	1.0	87	21.3	115	30.9
Schuyler	346	7.7	193	12.0	115	20.3	585	10.6	49	29.7	73	27.1
Scotland	382	7.0	369	7.0	181	12.5	772	8.7	37	36.0	88	34.9
Scott	429	5.0	423	4.2	193	9.6	3 472	2.7	49	22.9	129	6.1
Shannon	260	7.8	73	12.0	98	18.4	136	37.6	60	26.5	68	30.9
Shelby	466	5.2	571	4.8	193	11.2	1 169	3.5	76	23.4	139	16.0
Stoddard	696	4.3	1 339	4.6	414	7.3	6 416	2.7	105	20.2	744	56.2
Stone	471	6.0	351	7.5	172	15.2	889	6.3	71	22.9	151	15.7
Sullivan	499	6.0	332	7.5	212	13.9	757	6.4	52	31.0	94	44.6
Taney	230	12.6	126	14.0	95	21.4	295	11.1	62	29.1	85	34.7
Texas	993	4.7	744	5.0	420	9.2	2 291	7.3	208	13.9	299	13.7
Vernon	774	5.4	461	5.5	386	9.8	1 499	3.7	193	15.2	209	10.5
Warren	392	5.3	293	7.2	154	13.0	1 399	15.0	30	37.9	148	5.3
Washington	214	11.8	67	8.1	143	14.8	621	3.9	48	32.3	101	48.7
Wayne	174	12.8	71	22.6	83	23.3	167	10.6	22	51.5	26	70.8
Webster	1 012	4.1	753	5.1	403	9.4	1 578	7.8	254	12.7	678	6.8
Worth	237	7.6	159	10.3	77	18.6	198	14.2	19	46.5	34	41.5
Wright	970	3.5	828	3.3	443	8.4	2 024	12.9	155	17.6	261	11.9

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)
Missouri	79 860	1.5	241 745	1.2	32 252	1.8	67 426	2.1	45 875	1.7	288 478	1.3
Adair	593	5.4	1 419	7.9	240	11.7	370	20.8	384	7.8	1 735	10.3
Andrew	718	3.7	2 511	8.1	329	8.8	443	10.4	438	7.2	2 719	10.2
Atchison	435	4.4	3 295	3.9	300	7.1	1 285	9.0	362	6.0	4 058	5.8
Audrain	886	3.3	4 356	5.6	381	7.7	905	17.4	524	6.2	5 054	5.4
Barry	1 174	3.7	2 600	7.3	394	9.0	526	12.2	672	6.8	3 784	6.1
Barton	778	2.9	2 563	4.2	277	10.6	644	11.1	494	7.0	3 277	7.4
Bates	1 026	3.3	2 921	4.6	393	9.5	909	7.5	650	6.8	4 411	7.6
Benton	719	3.8	1 389	11.3	150	18.8	146	23.2	460	7.8	2 143	10.5
Bollinger	661	3.9	1 028	7.6	161	14.5	117	19.3	362	9.2	1 266	16.3
Boone	1 008	3.5	2 449	8.2	423	8.4	708	13.5	567	7.3	3 187	8.0
Buchanan	601	4.4	2 207	8.2	287	10.6	530	17.2	288	10.5	1 522	9.9
Butler	582	5.5	3 600	5.2	330	9.1	1 594	5.5	419	7.1	4 029	6.0
Caldwell	623	4.7	1 452	8.0	363	8.5	909	13.3	382	8.8	2 073	8.9
Callaway	1 098	3.0	2 644	4.3	386	9.6	655	14.6	649	6.2	3 375	7.3
Camden	418	5.8	599	8.5	91	19.5	172	13.8	279	10.2	1 167	16.5
Cape Girardeau	997	3.3	3 054	6.0	428	9.2	598	10.7	386	9.1	2 082	7.8
Carroll	794	3.6	3 121	4.1	457	7.8	1 049	9.1	511	6.7	4 194	5.1
Carter	162	4.4	266	12.4	62	13.0	36	17.3	81	9.3	206	15.3
Cass	1 160	3.5	3 189	4.9	462	9.1	1 004	14.5	660	6.2	4 211	6.3
Cedar	691	4.0	1 216	13.7	210	14.4	193	18.0	351	10.0	1 223	12.5
Chariton	844	3.9	3 423	4.5	547	7.2	1 756	11.6	573	6.8	4 670	6.1
Christian	1 005	3.9	1 560	7.1	352	11.1	348	16.0	426	9.4	1 744	14.2
Clark	566	3.5	2 199	7.5	250	11.3	534	16.0	357	9.0	2 451	14.3
Clay	513	4.9	1 197	7.2	210	13.7	443	7.7	244	12.2	1 316	11.9
Clinton	577	4.2	1 915	4.4	277	9.2	833	12.2	353	7.7	2 416	8.2
Cole	881	2.9	1 700	10.4	333	9.8	270	14.3	404	8.9	1 272	12.9
Cooper	741	3.8	2 503	5.3	335	9.6	839	12.6	478	7.2	3 811	6.9
Crawford	550	4.7	1 090	12.3	177	15.2	288	26.8	267	11.3	768	13.5
Dade	644	4.2	1 380	6.0	312	9.8	336	16.0	340	8.9	1 772	9.2
Dallas	821	4.4	1 392	7.4	260	11.9	332	17.5	542	7.6	2 045	8.8
Daviess	667	4.4	2 033	5.5	341	9.2	837	20.3	452	8.1	2 176	7.3
De Kalb	619	4.3	1 796	5.8	375	8.1	809	19.3	372	8.7	2 492	9.1
Dent	527	5.7	744	11.5	128	20.5	118	34.6	297	9.9	1 288	14.0
Douglas	953	3.8	1 752	8.4	332	11.1	392	27.4	591	6.9	2 574	9.4

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)
Dunklin	466	4.4	5 304	4.7	284	8.3	2 566	16.2	388	5.7	4 380	3.2
Franklin	1 231	3.3	2 676	7.0	366	11.0	2 877	9.8	466	9.4	1 724	9.6
Gasconade	662	4.3	990	8.1	220	12.9	172	16.9	282	11.7	741	18.3
Gentry	495	6.0	1 773	7.9	290	10.4	652	16.1	319	9.0	2 836	8.1
Greene	1 589	2.9	2 861	7.0	596	8.3	428	9.2	735	7.1	3 114	12.6
Grundy	476	6.2	1 663	4.5	226	12.6	373	11.7	293	11.2	2 258	9.7
Harrison	711	4.5	2 395	9.3	387	10.4	1 020	17.0	451	7.8	3 872	8.2
Henry	789	3.3	2 629	7.1	327	9.5	525	13.5	457	7.9	2 696	10.3
Hickory	425	5.0	867	15.0	151	16.0	203	15.6	284	10.2	1 291	11.3
Holt	442	4.5	2 684	5.3	276	9.6	678	8.8	308	7.3	3 612	6.7
Howard	606	3.8	2 083	5.4	298	11.0	606	20.5	377	8.9	2 652	9.0
Howell	1 353	3.3	2 006	6.0	454	10.0	279	12.0	786	6.5	3 209	6.3
Iron	217	7.8	360	13.1	59	24.6	36	35.6	94	17.9	367	22.1
Jackson	611	4.5	1 374	5.6	250	10.4	676	10.0	316	9.3	1 450	9.2
Jasper	1 001	4.2	2 504	5.4	374	9.6	649	10.1	485	8.3	3 183	6.6
Jefferson	482	5.1	825	9.8	52	22.8	49	40.8	144	15.6	570	18.9
Johnson	1 233	3.1	3 018	6.2	419	9.4	764	12.5	697	6.3	4 182	6.9
Knox	477	4.4	1 921	5.8	224	13.2	448	15.3	285	10.2	2 313	9.1
Laclede	1 065	3.0	1 973	5.4	188	14.4	267	12.3	578	6.2	3 172	9.0
Lafayette	1 127	2.7	4 259	4.6	618	6.4	1 156	13.9	679	6.2	5 819	5.8
Lawrence	1 368	3.0	3 714	7.0	442	9.4	654	22.2	770	6.3	4 993	7.9
Lewis	516	5.1	2 244	6.0	250	10.6	653	9.6	351	8.2	2 438	9.3
Lincoln	816	3.9	2 619	4.3	315	11.3	527	12.6	428	9.5	2 588	9.0
Linn	703	3.3	2 357	4.8	412	6.7	867	15.9	498	6.7	3 567	7.7
Livingston	592	4.7	1 851	6.1	265	12.0	689	13.2	387	9.3	2 990	11.1
McDonald	798	3.9	2 061	5.5	246	10.7	348	11.0	387	8.1	2 839	4.4
Macon	898	4.2	2 499	7.4	368	9.5	539	18.0	571	7.5	2 843	9.1
Madison	318	6.1	528	16.0	64	27.1	59	35.0	139	17.3	583	21.0
Maries	654	4.3	1 135	7.9	120	17.6	124	21.4	370	9.9	1 346	15.6
Marion	585	4.9	2 602	6.5	332	9.4	669	14.1	356	8.7	2 343	8.0
Mercer	389	5.8	1 036	10.8	192	15.2	265	21.1	241	11.5	2 222	10.3
Miller	868	3.3	1 832	7.7	302	10.9	225	10.4	499	7.3	2 768	7.9
Mississippi	267	3.8	4 097	1.9	163	8.4	1 697	4.2	219	4.8	4 572	4.5
Moniteau	825	3.3	1 616	6.8	340	9.5	759	31.7	495	7.1	2 420	8.7
Monroe	702	4.0	2 784	5.6	358	8.6	591	10.0	492	6.2	3 324	9.8
Montgomery	606	3.8	2 311	6.9	274	9.3	455	11.4	350	8.0	2 607	9.2
Morgan	718	4.0	1 736	8.5	238	12.5	528	24.9	405	9.0	2 053	11.4
New Madrid	399	3.0	6 032	2.8	251	8.7	2 665	14.1	311	6.2	5 149	6.2
Newton	1 333	3.0	2 448	5.4	448	8.3	592	10.7	738	5.9	4 340	5.4
Nodaway	1 161	3.2	4 831	3.6	690	6.3	2 085	11.2	774	5.5	5 835	4.8
Oregon	631	4.6	1 139	7.1	325	10.6	397	12.9	365	10.2	1 375	10.1
Osage	1 018	3.1	2 356	5.9	443	8.5	504	6.6	465	8.6	1 644	9.8
Ozark	610	5.3	1 044	7.8	188	14.8	288	19.7	368	9.5	1 768	8.1
Pemiscot	332	3.6	5 030	3.7	203	9.6	1 814	6.9	279	7.8	4 233	3.9
Perry	776	3.3	2 363	7.6	352	9.2	432	9.5	406	8.5	2 249	9.7
Pettis	980	3.6	3 007	5.2	387	9.4	808	15.6	559	7.5	3 960	8.4
Phelps	600	4.0	749	9.8	120	19.6	130	28.3	276	11.5	1 234	15.9
Pike	840	3.5	3 533	5.4	331	9.9	651	8.8	503	6.8	3 502	5.9
Platte	551	5.1	1 726	5.8	270	10.7	592	11.9	321	8.2	2 163	8.5
Polk	1 310	3.4	2 692	5.2	551	8.5	612	14.2	769	6.4	3 644	7.1
Pulaski	340	6.6	404	11.4	128	19.0	124	33.9	164	16.0	819	32.4
Putnam	466	5.5	1 396	8.9	192	14.0	529	26.0	395	7.4	2 573	9.9
Ralls	486	4.0	2 218	3.9	195	12.1	335	21.8	300	8.1	1 743	6.2
Randolph	568	5.0	1 347	8.5	318	10.5	323	11.3	309	9.9	1 637	9.8
Ray	826	3.6	2 322	4.6	482	8.0	847	16.7	483	7.3	3 024	6.6
Reynolds	227	8.3	233	26.4	53	28.8	66	31.8	82	23.9	287	31.7
Ripley	354	6.4	916	16.2	129	15.3	182	14.1	171	13.5	920	15.4
St. Charles	644	3.3	2 398	4.7	298	9.8	333	7.8	292	8.7	1 751	9.0
St. Clair	640	4.1	1 393	8.1	232	12.8	341	17.8	399	8.5	1 526	13.6
Ste. Genevieve	536	3.8	1 295	9.1	155	14.5	121	13.8	216	11.5	1 143	13.4
St. Francois	522	5.4	759	7.2	106	22.5	98	22.0	140	17.3	565	25.7
St. Louis	256	5.0	690	8.1	30	33.0	348	5.5	89	17.8	605	9.8
Saline	782	3.8	4 968	3.5	400	8.1	1 371	11.6	495	6.5	5 881	4.4
Schuyler	416	5.2	1 039	9.5	152	14.0	134	18.7	195	13.4	1 073	8.9
Scotland	452	4.9	2 136	8.1	232	12.0	430	15.5	309	8.6	2 737	7.7
Scott	452	4.5	3 134	3.3	179	8.6	867	11.3	274	7.3	3 091	4.6
Shannon	326	6.3	401	13.1	53	28.2	54	42.1	161	15.0	403	18.7
Shelby	570	3.8	2 645	5.8	314	8.3	577	11.7	401	6.7	3 512	6.8
Stoddard	820	3.1	7 324	4.9	403	8.1	2 275	8.7	586	5.4	6 875	5.0
Stone	550	5.1	893	7.8	214	14.7	214	16.7	241	10.7	1 360	11.3
Sullivan	568	4.9	1 649	6.3	226	13.3	553	15.6	386	8.1	2 856	7.9
Taney	414	5.3	451	14.4	61	27.5	81	31.6	186	13.9	579	16.2
Texas	1 288	3.2	2 328	5.7	379	10.3	575	16.4	847	5.8	3 189	9.0
Vernon	1 089	3.0	3 090	4.0	481	8.4	1 049	11.2	598	7.2	3 310	6.2
Warren	417	5.1	1 563	8.5	139	15.2	171	18.5	211	11.9	1 286	10.1
Washington	393	4.9	625	9.4	119	18.2	189	20.6	126	17.6	429	15.1
Wayne	278	7.4	476	30.0	101	26.5	67	37.6	88	20.5	322	35.3
Webster	1 208	3.3	2 133	5.2	322	11.0	312	13.8	754	6.1	2 910	6.7
Worth	263	7.1	780	14.2	176	10.8	380	12.5	179	10.3	1 293	17.1
Wright	1 055	3.5	2 038	6.0	331	11.3	495	11.5	667	6.4	3 234	7.1

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.											
	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)
Pettis	233	13.0	1 476	20.7	1 159	2.3	1 040	5.0	1 110	2.8	2 947	4.1
Phelps	93	23.8	187	12.7	698	2.0	323	6.9	636	3.3	833	9.7
Pike	81	12.3	762	6.2	942	2.1	717	4.4	899	2.6	3 291	3.5
Platte	213	11.4	1 081	5.3	642	3.2	744	6.8	623	3.6	2 211	3.7
Polk	359	9.9	919	8.0	1 534	1.9	943	10.3	1 488	2.3	4 387	4.6
Pulaski	67	25.0	188	32.0	486	1.8	210	8.9	429	4.2	773	11.0
Putnam	115	19.4	649	15.7	565	3.0	791	5.7	548	3.1	2 114	8.4
Ralls	114	16.2	1 070	10.4	539	3.0	604	8.9	543	2.7	2 148	6.1
Randolph	125	17.4	300	10.4	719	2.2	715	11.1	677	3.4	1 487	7.9
Ray	149	16.5	1 125	5.7	1 015	1.9	1 002	4.3	925	3.0	2 368	6.1
Reynolds	32	22.4	63	35.4	298	2.2	127	7.0	265	5.4	243	11.9
Ripley	77	22.5	301	27.5	421	3.9	199	6.5	395	4.7	967	15.5
St. Charles	175	12.5	1 728	16.0	711	2.6	841	5.3	680	2.9	3 038	5.1
St. Clair	179	14.4	606	10.7	709	2.4	496	5.7	678	3.2	1 822	6.5
Ste. Genevieve	102	18.0	360	10.4	594	2.6	435	6.2	580	3.0	1 230	4.7
St. Francois	101	23.5	135	23.1	672	2.2	395	7.1	615	3.0	1 366	12.5
St. Louis	74	18.7	643	29.1	255	5.5	264	10.2	266	3.2	1 936	1.9
Saline	162	14.6	1 794	6.3	869	2.7	1 033	6.8	904	2.4	5 261	3.2
Schuyler	68	21.0	326	24.3	472	3.0	550	8.3	450	4.0	1 318	7.4
Scotland	116	17.3	743	7.0	522	2.3	747	5.9	498	3.4	2 498	10.1
Scott	137	12.2	2 716	5.6	493	3.4	663	12.1	512	2.7	3 857	5.0
Shannon	48	31.2	45	34.1	424	1.8	140	9.7	395	3.5	572	12.8
Shelby	101	15.7	825	5.7	649	1.6	867	3.6	637	2.2	3 287	4.0
Stoddard	303	9.2	7 601	6.0	910	1.9	1 239	4.3	852	2.7	8 070	3.2
Stone	115	16.1	208	18.1	671	2.6	342	5.9	601	4.1	1 561	4.9
Sullivan	133	15.9	1 390	23.7	738	2.8	705	4.3	690	3.3	1 944	5.9
Taney	96	23.5	175	12.9	470	3.1	160	7.6	456	3.1	653	9.5
Texas	189	15.3	591	16.0	1 502	1.8	718	6.4	1 373	2.6	2 951	4.8
Vernon	290	10.7	1 423	11.6	1 238	1.7	933	4.2	1 174	2.3	3 446	5.1
Warren	105	13.7	1 026	25.4	493	3.1	553	7.7	493	2.2	1 926	9.1
Washington	76	26.1	100	36.9	459	2.5	250	8.0	417	4.0	1 304	4.1
Wayne	29	55.9	58	65.0	354	2.8	106	8.4	335	3.7	372	14.4
Webster	234	14.8	792	44.6	1 497	1.6	729	5.0	1 384	2.3	4 713	6.2
Worth	82	19.3	388	24.5	296	5.0	443	7.8	270	4.6	838	7.5
Wright	148	15.7	363	15.3	1 293	1.9	601	12.1	1 170	2.5	4 300	8.1

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)
	Missouri	98 082	1.4	889 365	1.2	86 617	1.4	19 228 832	1.3	74 240	1.4	12 158 832
Adair	788	2.0	4 538	15.5	716	2.2	173 896	2.5	646	2.3	96 205	2.4
Andrew	830	1.6	11 050	6.2	770	1.5	179 227	1.5	718	1.6	130 846	1.4
Atchison	509	1.9	21 895	4.7	473	1.5	273 297	.9	455	1.5	226 386	.8
Audrain	1 035	1.4	18 649	3.9	942	1.3	311 761	1.0	871	1.3	255 117	.9
Barry	1 530	1.6	10 951	6.8	1 284	1.6	169 999	1.9	987	1.7	68 716	1.9
Barton	864	1.4	7 815	7.9	778	1.5	228 138	1.5	694	1.6	160 469	1.4
Bates	1 207	1.6	13 784	4.9	1 101	1.6	300 970	1.4	977	1.7	198 096	1.2
Benton	835	1.7	4 102	13.7	707	1.7	118 305	2.0	616	1.8	67 254	1.9
Bollinger	785	1.5	2 011	21.5	718	1.7	120 164	2.1	636	1.8	67 953	2.2
Boone	1 268	1.1	5 642	11.0	1 131	1.1	188 376	1.3	949	1.1	117 322	1.3
Buchanan	754	1.8	7 578	9.3	700	1.4	141 785	1.4	655	1.4	110 341	1.4
Butler	735	2.3	12 499	7.0	670	1.8	220 706	1.2	595	1.9	192 873	1.2
Caldwell	820	1.9	5 535	13.1	764	2.1	170 663	2.3	685	2.1	102 795	2.1
Callaway	1 301	1.3	6 890	10.7	1 134	1.3	211 668	1.4	962	1.4	131 429	1.4
Camden	567	1.4	(D)	(D)	467	1.4	63 421	2.0	344	1.7	20 866	2.2
Cape Girardeau	1 203	1.4	9 408	12.1	1 103	1.2	195 310	1.2	985	1.3	128 205	1.2
Carroll	919	1.7	20 789	4.1	864	1.8	310 455	1.4	803	1.9	228 553	1.3
Carter	197	2.6	(D)	(D)	165	2.2	21 035	3.5	106	3.1	6 088	4.6
Cass	1 517	1.3	9 177	8.4	1 344	1.3	235 144	1.3	1 180	1.3	160 587	1.2
Cedar	821	1.6	2 423	41.2	700	1.6	97 342	2.3	589	1.7	43 125	2.3
Chariton	1 075	1.6	21 814	6.3	1 003	1.4	331 534	1.2	933	1.4	241 827	1.1
Christian	1 279	1.9	3 594	15.6	1 068	1.7	121 946	2.2	801	1.9	47 651	2.1
Clark	610	2.2	9 567	10.8	571	1.9	180 691	1.6	548	2.0	129 379	1.5
Clay	654	1.4	3 404	19.7	548	1.3	90 414	1.8	467	1.5	61 748	1.5
Clinton	714	1.2	6 367	8.9	650	1.1	153 377	1.2	596	1.1	98 085	1.1
Cole	1 041	1.1	2 061	35.3	928	1.3	109 130	1.7	812	1.4	53 875	1.8
Cooper	892	1.7	11 697	6.1	813	1.7	221 894	1.4	735	1.7	146 990	1.4
Crawford	680	1.5	(D)	(D)	577	1.4	80 861	1.8	446	1.5	27 264	1.8
Dade	850	1.8	5 080	10.6	735	1.8	153 961	2.0	621	1.9	80 419	1.9
Dallas	1 089	1.2	4 200	16.4	933	1.2	121 073	1.4	767	1.3	52 381	1.4
Davies	831	2.0	9 009	5.3	765	2.0	203 533	2.1	696	2.0	136 971	1.8
De Kalb	725	2.5	3 822	14.6	661	2.2	162 357	2.2	588	2.3	91 923	2.1
Dent	702	1.3	1 593	74.5	604	1.4	97 424	2.0	446	1.6	24 651	1.9
Douglas	1 187	1.4	3 224	23.3	977	1.5	131 362	1.7	714	1.6	38 131	1.9

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	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)
Pettis	19	4.9	565	8.7	826	1.3	49 840	1.1	720	1.3	21 994	1.4
Phelps	10	8.0	211	9.9	585	1.5	30 662	1.8	527	1.6	17 053	2.1
Pike	12	6.7	1 190	7.0	569	1.7	37 339	1.5	477	1.8	15 960	1.8
Platte	13	6.9	602	4.3	354	1.3	14 686	1.6	313	1.4	8 055	1.6
Polk	20	6.2	774	10.6	1 365	1.3	97 478	1.3	1 062	1.4	38 038	1.6
Pulaski	8	9.9	53	17.2	412	1.3	22 760	1.7	359	1.5	11 495	1.9
Putnam	3	16.6	53	16.9	440	2.3	46 899	2.2	391	2.4	22 298	2.6
Ralls	8	7.9	771	.1	322	1.8	18 980	1.6	293	1.9	9 243	1.8
Randolph	6	5.9	408	4.4	450	1.8	23 444	1.9	394	1.8	10 383	2.2
Ray	23	4.0	3 141	.8	598	1.5	31 478	1.6	546	1.6	13 918	2.0
Reynolds	2	25.2	(D)	(D)	240	1.5	9 815	2.0	212	1.7	5 248	2.0
Ripley	31	4.9	6 060	2.5	343	2.0	18 633	2.4	325	2.0	9 919	2.5
St. Charles	43	3.2	2 305	.9	317	1.4	12 422	1.4	259	1.6	4 409	2.0
St. Clair	10	9.7	450	11.6	585	1.9	47 178	2.2	542	2.0	25 406	2.2
Ste. Genevieve	3	18.4	3	18.4	485	1.4	27 252	1.7	427	1.5	12 741	1.8
St. Francois	12	7.5	265	11.1	522	1.0	23 022	1.3	467	1.1	11 333	1.5
St. Louis	64	2.9	997	3.4	67	3.7	2 112	4.9	54	4.1	(D)	(D)
Saline	14	7.2	1 294	3.9	498	1.8	37 008	1.2	424	1.9	15 456	1.5
Schuyler	6	14.1	(D)	(D)	344	2.1	23 551	2.3	299	2.1	12 301	2.4
Scotland	4	6.6	(D)	(D)	332	2.1	22 854	2.2	247	2.1	8 561	2.2
Scott	112	1.9	47 030	.7	227	1.9	12 065	1.9	177	2.1	3 161	2.8
Shannon	3	15.9	5	19.0	358	1.9	17 434	2.8	323	2.0	9 840	2.8
Shelby	17	4.4	1 928	5.5	357	1.8	28 335	1.5	309	1.9	12 024	1.8
Stoddard	325	1.2	184 512	.5	310	1.9	11 027	2.1	269	2.0	4 873	2.5
Stone	11	7.9	109	15.3	618	1.6	35 417	1.9	490	1.6	13 497	2.2
Sullivan	4	16.3	319	26.2	580	1.8	51 309	1.7	540	1.9	29 001	1.8
Taney	9	10.0	39	5.0	412	1.4	23 827	1.6	350	1.5	12 509	1.6
Texas	19	7.8	407	1.5	1 318	1.3	90 836	1.4	1 017	1.4	38 145	1.5
Vernon	16	5.4	2 242	4.3	909	1.7	60 813	1.9	820	1.8	30 669	2.1
Warren	16	5.9	968	4.8	319	1.4	12 148	1.8	282	1.5	(D)	(D)
Washington	3	18.0	10	17.3	403	1.4	19 230	2.3	355	1.5	9 157	2.4
Wayne	4	15.8	11	15.3	270	1.8	11 379	2.4	240	2.0	6 004	2.4
Webster	13	7.2	211	9.4	1 320	1.1	72 354	1.1	874	1.2	21 822	1.6
Worth	—	—	—	—	228	2.1	18 331	2.0	214	2.2	9 920	2.0
Wright	13	7.8	221	9.1	1 173	1.5	78 110	1.4	743	1.6	22 850	1.9

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)
Missouri	5 626	1.6	215 920	1.1	11 894	1.5	2 908 509	.8	2 505	1.5	111 362	1.8
Adair	27	5.8	539	6.1	99	3.6	12 263	3.8	40	5.4	2 008	6.8
Andrew	45	3.9	2 107	2.3	169	2.5	37 194	2.1	37	4.6	1 479	7.9
Atchison	6	15.1	82	15.7	71	3.0	22 030	1.8	9	9.8	103	11.7
Audrain	73	3.5	1 289	3.7	279	1.7	69 930	1.2	81	3.2	3 113	7.7
Barry	146	3.0	6 215	2.4	75	3.7	12 281	1.4	29	5.7	861	10.2
Barton	38	3.8	1 597	2.0	63	3.1	19 771	1.8	18	6.5	741	9.5
Bates	54	3.0	2 576	2.1	124	2.5	21 541	1.6	29	5.5	1 837	19.8
Benton	67	3.6	2 038	3.3	80	3.6	17 967	2.0	16	7.5	1 802	10.0
Bollinger	31	5.2	353	4.4	138	2.9	18 903	3.3	11	9.6	359	19.7
Boone	16	7.3	334	1.3	104	2.8	31 541	1.6	69	3.7	3 933	13.1
Buchanan	23	4.8	1 042	3.8	86	2.8	14 476	2.0	12	9.4	337	10.5
Butler	9	11.5	33	12.5	33	5.8	1 287	7.8	8	10.9	253	12.0
Caldwell	25	5.9	393	7.6	132	2.8	33 408	1.7	48	4.7	2 544	7.4
Callaway	27	4.6	569	4.8	153	2.4	35 658	1.8	31	4.9	1 718	6.8
Camden	45	4.2	1 420	3.6	23	6.5	892	8.3	11	10.1	496	14.9
Cape Girardeau	58	3.1	3 312	2.0	164	2.2	24 321	1.9	13	8.7	451	5.9
Carroll	20	7.1	450	5.4	176	2.5	55 234	1.6	31	5.1	2 144	5.7
Carter	7	10.3	(D)	(D)	23	7.0	4 060	3.4	3	19.6	55	18.3
Cass	55	3.7	1 708	3.6	112	2.7	33 453	.9	40	4.5	1 655	5.8
Cedar	30	5.2	836	4.3	34	5.1	6 866	2.1	21	6.5	1 008	8.1
Chariton	21	5.8	441	4.2	166	1.9	51 444	1.3	26	4.4	1 911	2.8
Christian	111	3.1	5 544	2.0	38	4.6	2 383	7.2	27	6.6	818	9.3
Clark	26	7.0	245	11.9	106	2.7	32 034	1.6	43	4.6	1 998	5.7
Clay	4	12.8	36	16.9	46	4.2	7 071	3.3	16	9.0	333	11.0
Clinton	21	4.3	890	2.5	95	2.2	29 141	1.7	28	4.6	1 287	5.9
Cole	59	3.9	1 433	3.6	127	2.7	18 857	2.7	16	6.8	563	9.8
Cooper	32	4.8	667	1.9	187	2.6	60 094	1.8	15	8.3	521	11.3
Crawford	25	5.9	319	3.3	58	3.8	5 962	5.6	8	10.3	181	12.8
Dade	34	4.2	1 460	2.6	41	4.3	11 437	2.2	14	8.3	355	10.8
Dallas	170	2.0	8 082	1.5	68	3.4	4 002	4.5	19	6.9	926	8.9
Daviess	66	4.3	696	4.5	139	3.0	25 111	3.1	35	5.0	1 297	6.1
De Kalb	36	4.8	1 368	3.6	126	3.0	21 507	2.8	13	8.4	967	12.4
Dent	20	6.7	400	7.4	41	4.5	4 808	5.0	13	8.2	244	9.9
Douglas	208	2.5	9 181	2.2	45	4.7	2 279	7.8	13	8.1	177	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)
Dunklin	—	—	—	—	17	7.7	880	9.1	—	—	—	—
Franklin	63	2.7	2 684	1.5	208	1.9	65 831	1.0	40	4.5	885	9.0
Gasconade	28	4.8	644	3.9	100	2.5	29 086	1.5	13	7.7	471	8.6
Gentry	18	6.7	333	2.8	142	2.5	38 335	1.4	18	8.2	882	14.1
Greene	133	2.3	7 932	1.5	44	4.7	5 287	2.7	29	5.5	847	7.9
Grundy	33	5.1	474	4.7	98	3.3	17 880	3.3	25	6.0	828	8.9
Harrison	19	7.1	443	7.5	90	3.6	20 438	2.0	42	5.2	1 853	6.6
Henry	35	3.9	1 346	2.2	111	3.0	25 851	1.8	12	9.6	424	11.8
Hickory	44	3.4	2 173	1.6	32	4.7	4 817	2.5	5	13.7	96	13.6
Holt	4	16.3	(D)	(D)	89	3.2	20 602	1.8	9	8.3	543	10.8
Howard	13	6.6	203	3.2	113	2.8	22 298	2.7	20	6.3	923	8.7
Howell	181	2.4	6 925	1.9	152	2.7	14 733	2.6	21	6.1	757	9.8
Iron	7	13.8	7	13.8	20	6.1	523	10.4	7	8.9	369	10.7
Jackson	15	8.0	407	6.7	32	4.9	2 698	2.9	9	11.9	98	13.5
Jasper	79	3.1	3 821	1.7	66	3.9	6 007	6.0	31	5.4	918	9.2
Jefferson	31	4.6	2 104	2.0	46	4.5	3 127	7.2	4	16.7	(D)	(D)
Johnson	45	3.3	1 034	2.2	165	2.3	28 412	1.7	37	4.7	1 571	15.1
Knox	39	4.8	784	4.6	125	2.6	34 932	2.0	29	5.1	989	4.2
Laclede	176	2.2	9 867	1.4	79	3.3	4 463	3.2	15	6.9	954	4.9
Lafayette	38	3.7	1 721	1.9	281	1.6	103 655	.8	26	6.6	772	9.8
Lawrence	183	1.9	9 657	1.1	83	3.4	8 937	4.4	38	4.5	1 005	5.1
Lewis	30	6.6	418	7.1	130	2.9	33 737	2.0	23	6.5	1 246	15.8
Lincoln	38	4.3	1 682	1.9	267	2.0	72 482	1.2	30	5.7	927	7.8
Linn	46	4.6	1 269	3.4	127	2.7	31 966	1.9	45	4.6	2 338	5.1
Livingston	20	6.5	503	5.2	104	3.1	17 548	2.5	20	6.1	627	8.5
McDonald	65	3.4	1 972	3.8	64	3.7	19 461	.5	13	9.1	627	15.1
Macon	38	5.6	492	6.2	163	3.0	27 336	2.8	58	4.1	3 488	3.8
Madison	4	15.6	15	17.7	30	5.5	11 636	1.3	5	14.2	163	11.9
Maries	40	4.2	1 113	1.5	119	2.7	20 091	2.2	18	6.7	347	5.8
Marion	29	5.3	1 228	3.4	136	2.7	31 576	1.8	28	5.6	1 376	9.9
Mercer	19	7.8	226	9.5	49	4.6	(D)	(D)	21	7.1	589	11.4
Miller	30	4.9	599	5.5	164	2.2	60 555	1.0	18	5.7	586	7.2
Mississippi	1	—	(D)	(D)	8	11.2	277	16.0	—	—	—	—
Moniteau	46	3.8	1 138	4.0	172	2.2	48 473	1.3	18	5.6	846	6.2
Monroe	30	4.8	765	1.8	211	2.2	74 782	1.2	35	5.3	2 234	11.0
Montgomery	16	5.8	66	11.8	171	2.0	50 430	1.3	40	4.3	3 121	5.9
Morgan	96	3.4	2 027	3.2	154	2.6	40 387	2.0	25	6.2	614	7.7
New Madrid	—	—	—	—	13	7.0	3 297	2.0	—	—	—	—
Newton	112	2.2	4 846	1.6	83	3.0	1 403	4.6	26	5.4	795	9.4
Nodaway	39	4.1	769	4.0	367	1.8	97 453	1.0	46	3.8	1 649	5.2
Oregon	55	4.2	1 895	3.9	146	2.9	20 352	2.4	8	10.1	722	22.3
Osage	56	2.9	1 491	3.1	295	1.7	91 126	1.2	15	5.7	711	9.4
Ozark	107	2.9	5 964	2.1	40	4.5	5 165	1.7	11	8.4	102	15.0
Pemiscot	—	—	—	—	6	9.5	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Perry	44	3.2	2 063	2.2	202	2.0	35 150	1.8	11	6.8	360	6.0
Pettis	48	3.3	1 264	1.8	236	2.0	63 310	1.3	21	5.7	730	8.7
Phelps	18	7.3	202	7.1	46	3.8	5 540	3.0	20	7.1	697	6.6
Pike	49	5.3	423	6.1	291	2.1	96 223	1.2	27	5.2	1 546	2.1
Platte	9	9.0	112	3.6	70	3.2	13 966	1.3	10	9.7	152	10.8
Polk	190	2.2	10 556	1.5	110	3.2	11 442	3.9	29	6.3	766	10.1
Pulaski	15	5.8	651	1.1	25	5.5	1 114	6.7	4	15.4	58	20.8
Putnam	24	6.5	396	12.6	52	4.2	6 011	3.5	30	6.6	2 148	3.4
Ralls	12	8.6	283	7.5	115	2.5	27 193	1.5	21	6.0	688	6.1
Randolph	25	6.5	263	8.3	99	2.9	15 750	2.6	38	4.8	1 200	8.9
Ray	23	6.4	196	10.1	147	2.5	21 344	2.4	38	4.8	1 198	8.2
Reynolds	13	8.5	70	14.2	45	3.9	3 089	6.5	2	25.2	(D)	(D)
Ripley	8	9.8	31	15.9	52	4.4	3 653	7.6	4	20.0	170	19.0
St. Charles	15	4.8	1 256	.3	102	2.1	33 603	.8	12	7.7	213	6.5
St. Clair	35	4.9	947	5.3	94	3.3	14 190	4.1	23	7.0	647	10.7
Ste. Genevieve	13	5.5	222	5.5	98	2.6	22 558	1.7	8	7.6	197	12.0
St. Francois	19	6.8	377	9.6	34	4.8	2 967	8.4	13	7.6	289	8.5
St. Louis	1	—	(D)	(D)	8	10.5	361	16.0	2	19.0	(D)	(D)
Saline	12	6.7	97	15.5	186	2.1	112 479	.6	18	6.5	424	18.2
Schuyler	24	6.2	546	6.3	42	4.5	8 061	4.8	111	2.8	12 217	3.3
Scotland	51	4.5	1 696	4.9	100	2.7	21 949	1.8	51	4.2	1 840	5.9
Scott	8	9.9	357	3.4	69	3.5	12 719	1.8	1	49.5	(D)	(D)
Shannon	19	7.4	285	7.6	69	3.7	3 662	8.8	3	16.6	521	18.6
Shelby	8	8.2	30	16.7	213	2.0	91 226	1.0	36	4.7	2 638	3.4
Stoddard	14	7.7	105	11.4	68	3.3	9 469	2.9	8	12.5	255	26.5
Stone	107	3.3	4 972	2.4	29	5.9	1 120	11.8	6	10.3	82	14.9
Sullivan	23	6.0	327	5.4	93	2.9	15 842	2.3	27	5.7	1 175	10.5
Taney	39	4.4	690	7.1	25	5.6	955	8.3	8	9.1	90	12.7
Texas	245	2.2	12 223	1.9	60	4.2	3 553	7.0	15	8.5	419	13.1
Vernon	52	3.8	2 025	3.0	115	2.8	75 277	.5	43	4.5	1 331	8.1
Warren	8	9.0	(D)	(D)	127	2.1	40 824	1.1	22	5.7	509	6.3
Washington	13	7.2	56	10.3	33	4.9	4 579	4.6	3	24.3	(D)	(D)
Wayne	11	9.1	26	13.6	48	4.5	4 850	6.3	5	14.6	106	16.6
Webster	325	2.0	14 019	1.3	142	2.9	17 949	3.8	27	5.9	565	11.5
Worth	9	10.4	127	12.0	46	3.4	10 702	2.4	16	6.5	768	11.0
Wright	361	2.0	20 004	1.5	70	3.6	11 060	1.6	16	8.9	438	11.0

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)
Missouri	4 452	1.2	6 894 100	.2	341	1.1	82 990 149	.1
Adair	27	6.7	930	13.1	—	—	—	—
Andrew	45	4.8	1 954	7.1	3	16.8	30	16.8
Atchison	8	12.4	314	13.5	—	—	—	—
Audrain	89	2.9	32 939	.3	3	17.4	405	22.0
Barry	73	3.8	67 011	13.9	108	.7	37 834 203	.1
Barton	20	6.9	543	9.6	—	—	—	—
Bates	30	5.2	760	7.7	—	—	—	—
Benton	35	5.6	1 274	7.7	2	22.0	(D)	(D)
Bollinger	50	4.5	909	5.8	4	14.1	(D)	(D)
Boone	56	3.9	3 225	2.2	—	—	—	—
Buchanan	17	7.0	313	7.1	1	—	(D)	(D)
Butler	19	7.5	308	8.5	2	28.9	(D)	(D)
Caldwell	30	5.4	1 134	6.7	—	—	—	—
Callaway	46	4.3	1 337	7.1	—	—	—	—
Camden	42	4.9	978	6.7	—	—	—	—
Cape Girardeau	34	4.7	700	6.3	—	—	—	—
Carroll	25	5.5	3 894	11.0	—	—	—	—
Carter	15	7.8	356	9.3	1	39.3	(D)	(D)
Cass	54	4.1	6 264	1.2	2	21.2	(D)	(D)
Cedar	51	4.2	1 948	7.1	—	—	—	—
Chariton	29	4.9	1 193	7.2	—	—	—	—
Christian	54	4.2	1 473	18.8	4	13.9	(D)	(D)
Clark	25	6.9	1 018	8.0	3	18.6	435	23.1
Clay	26	6.5	889	16.1	—	—	—	—
Clinton	24	5.9	463	8.9	—	—	—	—
Cole	60	3.7	3 864	2.7	—	—	—	—
Cooper	35	5.5	849	9.5	1	26.7	(D)	(D)
Crawford	33	5.4	606	6.7	—	—	—	—
Dade	37	4.9	793	7.2	1	30.5	(D)	(D)
Dallas	68	3.3	48 889	.4	2	9.8	(D)	(D)
Daviess	57	4.0	(D)	(D)	7	9.7	1 805	13.9
De Kalb	20	7.7	560	14.4	3	12.4	(D)	(D)
Dent	24	6.0	375	7.3	—	—	—	—
Douglas	78	3.5	1 504	4.3	1	50.0	(D)	(D)
Dunklin	6	11.9	76	23.9	—	—	—	—
Franklin	106	2.8	7 490	1.7	4	12.0	176	15.6
Gasconade	41	4.2	5 932	.8	—	—	—	—
Gentry	21	7.3	499	10.1	—	—	—	—
Greene	76	3.5	1 774	14.1	—	—	—	—
Grundy	38	4.9	861	5.6	1	37.0	(D)	(D)
Harrison	36	5.1	1 052	6.6	—	—	—	—
Henry	45	4.5	4 048	5.4	1	25.4	(D)	(D)
Hickory	36	4.7	701	5.5	—	—	—	—
Holt	16	7.9	652	15.9	1	—	(D)	(D)
Howard	29	5.0	682	5.0	—	—	—	—
Howell	109	3.1	92 523	.1	5	15.9	(D)	(D)
Iron	12	9.0	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Jackson	30	6.0	614	7.4	—	—	—	—
Jasper	48	4.4	293 758	.9	—	—	—	—
Jefferson	53	4.2	1 582	9.4	—	—	—	—
Johnson	89	3.2	(D)	(D)	4	16.2	191	20.9
Knox	17	7.9	362	9.3	—	—	—	—
Laclede	61	4.0	1 445	4.8	1	23.3	(D)	(D)
Lafayette	49	4.4	1 019	8.0	1	38.7	(D)	(D)
Lawrence	56	3.8	1 344	4.8	1	32.0	(D)	(D)
Lewis	37	5.7	1 631	7.2	2	17.4	(D)	(D)
Lincoln	38	5.2	(D)	(D)	1	34.2	(D)	(D)
Linn	27	6.0	692	11.5	—	—	—	—
Livingston	24	6.3	410	6.4	—	—	—	—
McDonald	77	3.0	1 581 424	.6	81	1.2	20 369 857	.3
Macon	40	5.2	850	7.9	1	37.9	(D)	(D)
Madison	24	6.4	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Maries	47	4.5	1 968	14.3	—	—	—	—
Marion	29	6.0	812	8.0	—	—	—	—
Mercer	17	8.0	632	11.7	—	—	—	—
Miller	38	4.8	830	6.0	—	—	—	—
Mississippi	3	26.1	40	28.6	—	—	—	—
Moniteau	47	4.2	1 204	5.4	1	23.0	(D)	(D)
Monroe	28	6.0	620	7.2	—	—	—	—
Montgomery	22	4.9	1 939	13.8	1	19.6	(D)	(D)
Morgan	63	3.8	2 792	6.9	3	15.4	130	18.4
New Madrid	2	21.1	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Newton	82	3.0	1 413 669	.1	45	2.7	12 536 568	.3
Nodaway	29	4.6	738	3.9	2	22.6	(D)	(D)
Oregon	33	5.0	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Osage	48	3.5	1 191	4.3	8	6.3	334 099	3.2
Ozark	48	4.5	1 162	5.8	1	26.1	(D)	(D)
Pemiscot	1	32.7	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Perry	26	6.0	1 651	20.7	—	—	—	—

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)
Pettis	55	3.8	2 333	7.2	2	15.0	(D)	(D)
Phelps	40	5.0	696	5.3	—	—	—	—
Pike	53	4.8	1 699	6.0	3	18.7	1 500	20.1
Platte	22	6.5	331	8.1	—	—	—	—
Polk	72	3.7	(D)	(D)	1	20.7	(D)	(D)
Pulaski	20	6.9	331	7.5	—	—	—	—
Putnam	17	7.2	738	8.4	—	—	—	—
Ralls	11	10.4	544	13.5	—	—	—	—
Randolph	49	4.6	1 162	5.4	—	—	—	—
Ray	45	4.8	968	5.9	2	12.3	(D)	(D)
Reynolds	18	7.0	297	9.6	—	—	—	—
Ripley	33	5.6	1 043	6.7	—	—	—	—
St. Charles	40	4.6	1 499	4.6	4	13.7	448	18.8
St. Clair	36	5.4	1 253	8.6	—	—	—	—
Ste. Genevieve	44	4.3	108 696	.2	1	21.6	(D)	(D)
St. Francois	38	4.4	394 488	(L)	1	46.0	(D)	(D)
St. Louis	14	8.9	291	9.9	—	—	—	—
Saline	33	4.8	1 135	10.3	1	—	(D)	(D)
Schuyler	25	6.3	581	8.0	—	—	—	—
Scotland	23	6.9	899	13.7	2	24.7	(D)	(D)
Scott	16	7.8	227	8.0	—	—	—	—
Shannon	35	5.3	503	6.0	—	—	—	—
Shelby	12	9.9	294	15.8	—	—	—	—
Stoddard	30	5.3	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)
Stone	37	4.9	567	6.1	1	—	(D)	(D)
Sullivan	31	5.3	825	8.8	—	—	—	—
Taney	43	4.4	673	6.1	1	—	(D)	(D)
Texas	94	3.3	1 955	5.1	3	17.0	24	18.7
Vernon	59	3.8	1 369	4.1	2	30.4	(D)	(D)
Warren	23	5.2	953	5.1	2	17.1	(D)	(D)
Washington	30	5.1	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Wayne	33	5.7	646	9.3	—	—	—	—
Webster	98	3.0	50 982	1.3	1	21.2	(D)	(D)
Worth	8	11.2	388	16.4	—	—	—	—
Wright	75	3.7	1 307	6.1	—	—	—	—

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed					Corn for silage or green chop						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, green	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Missouri	21 382	1.6	2 445 489	.9	308 784 225	.8	2 387	1.3	81 543	1.0	1 114 626	1.0
Adair	244	2.8	15 474	2.6	1 563 257	2.6	27	4.9	691	4.8	9 252	5.5
Andrew	397	1.9	41 620	1.7	5 093 952	1.7	36	3.5	1 028	3.5	12 830	3.6
Atchison	413	1.5	115 138	.9	15 977 258	.8	17	4.4	521	6.9	5 640	4.8
Audrain	408	1.5	44 313	1.0	5 517 378	.9	110	2.2	2 250	1.3	31 919	1.1
Barry	18	5.2	587	3.8	66 261	3.6	28	4.5	784	3.7	11 750	3.9
Barton	125	2.4	9 569	1.4	1 244 106	1.1	21	3.4	551	2.5	6 536	2.0
Bates	289	2.0	31 655	1.2	3 800 151	1.2	45	2.7	4 108	.7	53 215	.8
Benton	100	3.1	5 088	2.9	618 279	3.0	22	5.3	592	4.8	8 593	3.8
Bollinger	194	2.9	16 677	2.4	2 052 826	2.4	6	6.3	290	1.4	3 476	1.1
Boone	179	1.9	16 174	1.8	1 913 465	1.6	15	5.8	785	7.6	11 320	6.6
Buchanan	320	1.8	33 540	1.3	4 343 865	1.3	18	4.1	369	4.5	4 629	4.9
Butler	87	2.2	12 305	1.2	1 589 573	1.1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Caldwell	263	2.6	19 736	2.2	2 282 415	2.2	11	6.4	721	11.7	5 480	8.0
Callaway	220	2.2	18 603	1.5	2 462 579	1.4	22	5.3	817	4.9	9 349	3.6
Camden	5	15.7	245	17.0	15 025	15.4	3	13.8	58	14.1	670	13.8
Cape Girardeau	427	1.7	31 345	1.1	3 992 092	1.0	56	2.9	1 714	1.4	27 995	1.5
Carroll	456	2.0	57 976	1.1	7 693 352	1.1	29	3.8	1 141	2.1	13 182	1.9
Carter	2	27.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Cass	226	2.1	25 244	1.3	3 063 804	1.3	23	3.9	970	2.9	15 536	3.5
Cedar	18	7.4	611	5.1	68 380	6.1	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Chariton	497	1.7	60 222	1.0	7 990 223	1.0	25	4.2	1 402	3.3	21 639	3.0
Christian	19	4.8	702	3.4	83 507	3.3	11	5.0	408	3.9	4 047	3.6
Clark	363	2.2	49 016	1.4	6 313 287	1.3	31	5.3	509	7.3	6 171	6.3
Clay	84	3.0	9 061	1.8	1 120 091	1.8	4	9.4	97	2.3	1 415	1.9
Clinton	217	1.7	27 124	1.2	3 422 183	1.1	23	2.0	1 022	1.4	15 713	1.3
Cole	178	2.5	7 367	2.5	958 914	2.4	27	3.6	445	3.7	6 967	3.0
Cooper	377	2.0	40 989	1.3	5 108 904	1.2	32	4.4	1 199	6.7	17 118	7.0
Crawford	29	4.4	758	2.7	45 484	3.5	5	9.8	102	9.0	1 239	9.2
Dade	31	4.5	2 476	1.8	315 157	1.5	3	9.1	155	2.6	2 455	2.8
Dallas	7	2.8	389	3.4	30 834	6.3	25	4.1	799	4.1	11 156	4.2
Davies	277	2.4	25 813	1.7	2 993 727	1.7	29	5.3	311	5.6	4 181	5.9
De Kalb	252	3.0	22 206	2.3	2 483 550	2.2	27	4.6	820	3.2	11 410	3.5
Dent	13	7.7	285	9.5	26 908	9.4	1	24.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Douglas	3	25.4	47	29.7	2 700	34.5	4	19.0	185	33.1	2 300	30.8

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.											
	Sorghum for grain or seed					Wheat for grain						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Pettis	250	1.9	17 204	1.7	1 700 121	1.4	378	1.8	30 945	1.4	1 369 864	1.5
Phelps	7	5.2	226	3.1	11 280	4.8	10	7.1	178	8.4	6 195	11.4
Pike	84	3.2	6 612	2.1	682 247	2.0	360	1.9	25 565	1.2	1 224 676	1.2
Platte	47	3.9	2 806	3.7	256 859	2.4	146	2.2	12 073	1.4	436 740	1.3
Polk	17	6.4	720	10.6	58 588	12.3	45	3.8	1 495	3.6	55 238	3.4
Pulaski	4	5.6	140	6.4	6 850	3.9	8	7.0	206	7.1	6 782	4.5
Putnam	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	7.3	429	10.8	13 981	7.8
Ralls	98	3.0	12 592	2.7	1 331 681	2.5	267	2.1	26 470	1.7	1 252 956	1.6
Randolph	25	4.4	1 469	3.5	135 293	3.8	203	2.4	13 308	2.0	502 361	1.9
Ray	62	3.4	3 031	5.9	216 166	4.1	267	1.8	18 899	1.1	791 086	1.1
Reynolds	3	11.7	150	13.4	10 370	13.3	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ripley	32	4.8	4 592	3.6	405 536	3.3	36	5.1	1 771	5.0	72 307	4.9
St. Charles	34	3.5	1 588	4.6	152 157	4.8	307	1.4	20 786	1.3	920 439	1.3
St. Clair	102	3.1	7 785	3.0	688 168	3.2	169	2.8	13 626	2.3	579 724	2.5
Ste. Genevieve	40	4.1	1 171	7.3	94 016	6.6	138	2.3	6 081	2.3	265 998	2.1
St. Francois	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	22	4.4	636	4.0	20 790	3.3
St. Louis	7	10.9	443	11.2	32 888	15.7	58	3.3	6 224	2.8	289 956	2.6
Saline	39	4.3	1 671	4.6	140 252	4.8	403	1.8	29 374	1.2	1 434 415	1.1
Schuyler	1	38.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	30	4.5	1 198	4.0	44 165	3.9
Scotland	6	10.0	251	12.7	15 640	13.1	102	2.7	4 473	2.9	171 494	3.3
Scott	129	2.2	14 699	1.6	1 360 762	1.6	266	1.8	36 062	.9	1 650 427	.9
Shannon	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	28.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Shelby	135	2.5	11 469	2.0	1 027 691	1.9	304	1.8	19 734	1.6	778 967	1.6
Stoddard	333	1.8	36 119	1.5	3 406 455	1.4	372	1.5	46 060	1.0	2 306 141	.9
Stone	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	12.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Sullivan	12	7.4	713	6.7	59 180	6.7	30	4.5	1 816	3.0	69 304	3.0
Taney	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	10.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Texas	3	11.5	10	12.2	440	12.9	8	6.9	150	3.6	6 500	2.7
Vernon	233	2.3	22 448	1.9	1 944 636	2.1	326	2.3	36 759	1.7	1 599 069	1.6
Warren	35	3.7	1 798	4.7	168 631	4.4	178	1.9	10 403	1.6	416 845	1.8
Washington	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	49.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Wayne	27	5.6	1 754	6.5	132 216	6.6	10	6.0	891	2.5	34 882	2.2
Webster	3	7.1	28	7.6	898	4.2	28	4.4	365	3.4	10 083	4.6
Worth	6	10.9	353	12.3	26 973	11.9	9	6.0	300	4.7	8 280	5.8
Wright	4	—	269	—	15 607	—	9	5.4	389	5.0	10 826	3.7

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested —Con.											
	Cotton					Soybeans for beans						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bales	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Missouri	1 045	1.3	313 226	.5	500 430	.4	26 600	1.6	4 208 729	1.0	150 385 224	1.0
Adair	—	—	—	—	—	—	269	2.9	28 925	2.8	922 268	2.9
Andrew	—	—	—	—	—	—	451	1.8	62 057	1.4	2 255 286	1.3
Atchison	—	—	—	—	—	—	410	1.5	102 720	.9	4 072 077	.8
Audrain	—	—	—	—	—	—	626	1.4	115 150	1.0	4 078 140	.9
Barry	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	6.8	622	7.4	18 724	7.5
Barton	—	—	—	—	—	—	387	1.9	49 357	1.5	1 362 508	1.5
Bates	—	—	—	—	—	—	410	2.0	63 110	1.2	2 237 236	1.2
Benton	—	—	—	—	—	—	139	2.8	12 328	2.7	475 272	2.9
Bollinger	—	—	—	—	—	—	173	2.9	15 952	2.1	534 418	2.2
Boone	—	—	—	—	—	—	311	1.8	43 250	1.5	1 456 144	1.5
Buchanan	—	—	—	—	—	—	423	1.7	54 569	1.5	1 796 845	1.5
Butler	15	4.5	1 281	6.1	1 592	5.8	385	2.2	81 805	1.2	2 853 324	1.0
Caldwell	—	—	—	—	—	—	361	2.7	38 889	2.4	1 483 567	2.5
Callaway	—	—	—	—	—	—	325	2.0	49 860	1.6	1 871 851	1.6
Camden	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	23.6	180	22.3	6 000	22.2
Cape Girardeau	—	—	—	—	—	—	410	1.7	41 458	1.3	1 439 606	1.3
Carroll	—	—	—	—	—	—	572	2.0	106 063	1.3	4 138 565	1.2
Carter	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	25.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Cass	—	—	—	—	—	—	387	1.9	65 123	1.2	2 531 026	1.2
Cedar	—	—	—	—	—	—	50	4.4	3 830	4.2	131 650	4.0
Chariton	—	—	—	—	—	—	624	1.6	115 918	1.1	4 382 651	1.1
Christian	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	8.9	184	9.0	6 246	12.6
Clark	—	—	—	—	—	—	353	2.1	51 198	1.6	1 882 026	1.6
Clay	—	—	—	—	—	—	135	2.6	25 159	2.2	985 418	1.9
Clinton	—	—	—	—	—	—	262	1.6	36 206	1.4	1 429 666	1.3
Cole	—	—	—	—	—	—	141	2.6	7 789	2.9	302 946	2.9
Cooper	—	—	—	—	—	—	428	2.0	47 511	1.5	1 788 189	1.4
Crawford	—	—	—	—	—	—	14	7.0	896	5.8	27 996	5.5
Dade	—	—	—	—	—	—	132	2.8	17 175	2.4	461 955	2.5
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Daviess	—	—	—	—	—	—	429	2.3	71 338	1.9	2 447 835	1.8
De Kalb	—	—	—	—	—	—	287	2.8	32 959	2.1	1 217 841	2.0
Dent	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	12.9	206	14.9	6 262	15.0
Douglas	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	25.0	(D)	(D)	(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.											
	Cotton						Soybeans for beans					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bales	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Dunklin	364	1.5	126 863	.6	198 962	.5	380	1.6	76 327	1.2	2 276 640	1.1
Franklin	1	21.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	250	1.8	19 435	2.1	706 847	2.1
Gasconade	–	–	–	–	–	–	127	2.5	7 099	2.8	256 356	3.1
Gentry	–	–	–	–	–	–	323	2.1	42 818	1.8	1 438 119	1.6
Greene	–	–	–	–	–	–	14	8.1	1 052	6.3	28 915	5.7
Grundy	–	–	–	–	–	–	304	2.3	65 845	1.9	2 240 821	1.7
Harrison	–	–	–	–	–	–	368	2.7	53 884	2.1	1 853 988	2.0
Henry	–	–	–	–	–	–	334	2.1	40 208	1.8	1 344 294	1.9
Hickory	–	–	–	–	–	–	16	5.4	1 644	3.3	52 259	3.1
Holt	–	–	–	–	–	–	401	1.7	86 141	1.0	3 159 611	1.0
Howard	–	–	–	–	–	–	283	2.3	35 056	1.8	1 260 315	1.7
Howell	–	–	–	–	–	–	3	17.2	38	11.3	1 194	7.7
Iron	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Jackson	–	–	–	–	–	–	189	2.3	35 371	1.2	1 474 301	1.1
Jasper	–	–	–	–	–	–	230	2.2	27 125	1.8	760 732	1.8
Jefferson	–	–	–	–	–	–	82	3.2	7 389	2.7	250 900	2.5
Johnson	–	–	–	–	–	–	447	1.9	43 593	1.3	1 690 730	1.3
Knox	–	–	–	–	–	–	383	1.9	57 408	1.4	1 991 271	1.4
Laclede	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	25.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lafayette	–	–	–	–	–	–	727	1.3	96 364	.9	4 112 572	.9
Lawrence	–	–	–	–	–	–	106	3.6	7 033	3.5	212 035	3.6
Lewis	–	–	–	–	–	–	365	2.3	50 383	1.7	1 899 487	1.6
Lincoln	–	–	–	–	–	–	420	1.7	39 971	1.3	1 388 033	1.3
Linn	–	–	–	–	–	–	372	1.9	56 121	1.5	1 840 811	1.4
Livingston	–	–	–	–	–	–	453	2.2	94 335	1.6	3 115 557	1.6
McDonald	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Macon	–	–	–	–	–	–	482	2.2	67 453	1.7	2 095 763	1.6
Madison	–	–	–	–	–	–	5	13.5	201	25.8	7 540	25.9
Maries	–	–	–	–	–	–	11	7.0	562	7.3	18 129	7.3
Marion	–	–	–	–	–	–	394	2.0	45 548	1.5	1 748 802	1.4
Mercer	–	–	–	–	–	–	193	3.0	22 107	2.2	712 529	2.3
Miller	–	–	–	–	–	–	47	4.0	4 703	6.6	57 154	6.7
Mississippi	18	3.8	3 995	1.8	5 723	2.0	246	1.5	134 789	.7	5 246 209	.6
Moniteau	–	–	–	–	–	–	176	2.2	12 322	2.9	437 448	2.7
Monroe	–	–	–	–	–	–	453	2.1	67 502	1.3	2 047 207	1.3
Montgomery	–	–	–	–	–	–	399	1.4	46 765	1.1	1 728 143	1.2
Morgan	–	–	–	–	–	–	115	2.9	8 643	2.2	305 392	2.0
New Madrid	279	1.4	78 798	.5	129 107	.4	394	1.5	145 785	.8	5 342 669	.7
Newton	–	–	–	–	–	–	59	3.2	3 586	4.0	101 805	3.9
Nodaway	–	–	–	–	–	–	863	1.7	124 457	1.2	4 461 936	1.2
Oregon	–	–	–	–	–	–	3	11.9	180	16.8	6 160	16.9
Osage	–	–	–	–	–	–	157	2.0	9 675	1.8	388 511	1.8
Ozark	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Pemiscot	235	1.8	71 170	.7	112 539	.6	327	1.6	145 418	.7	5 333 553	.7
Perry	–	–	–	–	–	–	297	1.8	28 255	1.5	937 170	1.6
Pettis	–	–	–	–	–	–	492	1.8	65 025	1.3	2 381 858	1.2
Phelps	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	6	9.0	459	12.9	14 810	12.5
Pike	–	–	–	–	–	–	433	1.9	54 811	1.3	1 925 159	1.2
Platte	–	–	–	–	–	–	270	1.9	54 767	1.1	1 800 333	1.0
Polk	–	–	–	–	–	–	16	5.9	799	6.7	29 549	7.4
Pulaski	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Putnam	–	–	–	–	–	–	113	3.2	13 496	2.4	460 666	2.2
Ralls	–	–	–	–	–	–	308	2.0	61 580	1.3	2 217 231	1.1
Randolph	–	–	–	–	–	–	264	2.2	33 327	1.7	1 037 903	1.6
Ray	–	–	–	–	–	–	428	1.6	75 346	.9	2 734 052	.9
Reynolds	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Ripley	–	–	–	–	–	–	38	4.6	8 819	2.6	315 417	2.7
St. Charles	–	–	–	–	–	–	383	1.3	58 468	.9	2 244 942	.8
St. Clair	–	–	–	–	–	–	154	3.0	17 822	2.2	587 869	2.3
Ste. Genevieve	–	–	–	–	–	–	111	2.5	9 811	1.9	384 232	1.8
St. Francois	–	–	–	–	–	–	16	6.8	909	7.9	26 494	8.5
St. Louis	1	43.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	71	3.0	11 323	2.8	398 533	2.6
Saline	–	–	–	–	–	–	623	1.9	117 224	1.2	4 909 064	1.1
Schuyler	–	–	–	–	–	–	126	2.9	14 296	3.0	460 108	2.6
Scotland	–	–	–	–	–	–	302	2.2	41 435	1.5	1 546 076	1.4
Scott	47	2.7	9 411	1.1	15 390	.8	335	1.7	84 893	1.0	2 801 711	1.0
Shannon	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	28.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Shelby	–	–	–	–	–	–	441	1.7	76 432	1.4	2 604 712	1.4
Stoddard	84	1.3	21 616	.4	37 017	.4	586	1.4	138 409	.8	4 815 690	.7
Stone	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Sullivan	–	–	–	–	–	–	192	2.7	23 958	2.0	755 040	2.0
Taney	–	–	–	–	–	–	3	9.8	125	11.9	2 564	14.8
Texas	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Vernon	–	–	–	–	–	–	378	2.3	53 570	1.7	1 588 709	1.6
Warren	–	–	–	–	–	–	184	1.8	20 471	1.5	753 361	1.5
Washington	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	27.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Wayne	–	–	–	–	–	–	32	5.4	3 296	4.4	87 281	4.6
Webster	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Worth	–	–	–	–	–	–	163	2.3	15 188	2.4	527 449	2.4
Wright	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	12.0	(D)	(D)	(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.					
	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Missouri	57 749	1.4	3 470 298	1.5	6 109 410	1.5
Adair	573	2.4	51 527	2.6	76 849	2.7
Andrew	469	1.7	20 336	1.7	47 594	1.8
Atchison	198	1.7	7 264	1.7	19 808	1.4
Audrain	487	1.5	20 321	1.5	38 843	1.5
Barry	942	1.7	56 586	1.9	101 358	2.1
Barton	530	1.6	36 792	1.8	62 853	1.7
Bates	789	1.7	61 742	1.7	106 795	1.9
Benton	559	1.8	37 373	2.1	62 064	2.2
Bollinger	523	1.8	26 833	2.4	44 496	2.5
Boone	712	1.3	38 269	1.9	59 423	2.0
Buchanan	363	1.7	13 496	1.7	25 147	1.8
Butler	180	2.5	7 612	3.6	10 932	3.7
Caldwell	487	2.2	32 739	2.3	60 120	2.3
Callaway	757	1.4	39 027	1.7	65 158	1.9
Camden	340	1.7	20 045	2.1	29 779	2.3
Cape Girardeau	787	1.4	38 039	1.5	75 446	1.6
Carroll	438	1.9	24 637	2.0	43 793	2.0
Carter	100	3.2	5 825	4.5	8 055	5.7
Cass	934	1.4	49 957	1.6	94 240	1.7
Cedar	547	1.8	34 317	2.3	55 810	2.5
Chariton	562	1.6	32 826	1.7	54 793	1.5
Christian	781	1.9	45 694	2.1	92 254	2.1
Clark	381	2.1	22 906	2.2	43 149	2.4
Clay	356	1.7	21 800	1.8	36 349	1.9
Clinton	458	1.3	28 193	1.6	48 051	1.8
Cole	752	1.4	33 603	1.8	59 064	1.9
Cooper	548	1.8	30 225	1.8	54 587	1.9
Crawford	420	1.6	24 859	1.8	37 843	1.9
Dade	558	2.0	39 759	2.2	72 756	2.4
Dallas	760	1.3	49 972	1.4	76 507	1.5
Daviess	470	2.0	25 130	2.3	44 964	2.1
De Kalb	453	2.3	29 071	2.7	54 006	2.7
Dent	432	1.6	23 381	1.9	42 985	2.0
Douglas	703	1.6	37 191	1.7	62 743	1.8
Dunklin	25	6.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Franklin	1 119	1.1	48 846	1.3	81 474	1.3
Gasconade	617	1.2	29 165	1.7	47 204	1.9
Gentry	393	1.8	32 863	1.8	62 137	1.7
Greene	1 283	1.3	76 988	1.5	137 005	1.6
Grundy	343	2.1	22 280	2.8	38 607	2.7
Harrison	561	2.4	48 737	2.4	93 018	2.4
Henry	627	1.9	51 157	2.1	86 790	2.3
Hickory	413	1.6	34 251	1.7	49 677	1.9
Holt	173	2.2	5 810	2.0	16 240	2.0
Howard	376	2.0	23 235	2.4	40 832	2.9
Howell	920	1.7	46 318	1.8	80 826	1.7
Iron	190	1.9	9 023	2.7	13 233	3.3
Jackson	384	1.7	16 434	2.2	27 973	2.3
Jasper	815	1.6	49 029	2.0	89 069	1.9
Jefferson	397	1.5	18 984	2.2	31 438	2.6
Johnson	1 072	1.4	68 006	1.7	113 129	1.7
Knox	344	2.1	30 368	2.2	56 295	2.1
Laclede	776	1.5	52 954	1.6	96 229	1.6
Lafayette	742	1.3	29 222	1.3	59 646	1.2
Lawrence	1 118	1.5	83 965	1.7	168 137	1.6
Lewis	325	2.2	18 427	2.2	40 706	2.3
Lincoln	508	1.6	18 788	1.9	36 098	1.9
Linn	555	1.8	51 489	1.8	83 183	1.9
Livingston	382	1.9	19 997	1.9	35 175	2.0
McDonald	594	1.4	31 574	1.7	58 639	1.9
Macon	687	1.8	53 664	2.0	85 626	2.0
Madison	247	1.7	17 035	2.2	22 615	2.5
Maries	549	1.6	33 746	1.9	50 630	2.2
Marion	389	1.9	18 368	2.1	35 106	1.9
Mercer	315	2.7	30 775	3.0	62 199	3.4
Miller	718	1.4	37 493	1.6	58 548	1.7
Mississippi	18	5.8	1 948	4.3	2 417	3.5
Moniteau	659	1.4	38 128	1.6	59 457	1.8
Monroe	478	2.1	29 438	2.1	50 291	2.5
Montgomery	352	1.4	16 345	1.7	27 981	1.8
Morgan	579	1.7	34 683	2.0	55 578	2.1
New Madrid	7	11.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Newton	1 014	1.2	57 075	1.5	105 240	1.7
Nodaway	821	1.5	45 085	1.5	102 204	1.4
Oregon	397	2.2	21 886	2.1	42 185	2.2
Osage	847	1.2	43 685	1.4	85 921	1.5
Ozark	402	2.0	18 846	1.9	33 166	1.9
Pemiscot	11	7.5	990	14.9	1 503	8.0
Perry	556	1.4	25 457	1.6	53 836	1.5

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	Selected crops harvested — Con.					
	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Pettis	735	1.4	41 331	1.3	70 459	1.3
Phelps	440	1.4	23 198	1.4	38 289	1.6
Pike	486	1.9	24 312	2.4	45 922	2.4
Platte	314	1.4	13 052	1.6	22 355	1.8
Polk	1 110	1.3	77 531	1.4	136 664	1.5
Pulaski	278	1.7	15 684	2.2	22 465	2.0
Putnam	426	2.4	44 805	2.5	86 226	2.6
Ralls	294	1.9	15 544	2.1	27 466	2.0
Randolph	446	1.8	27 089	1.9	38 262	1.9
Ray	576	1.5	28 539	2.0	47 372	2.1
Reynolds	185	1.9	9 639	2.3	12 559	2.3
Ripley	233	2.4	12 976	2.8	21 593	3.0
St. Charles	314	1.4	11 487	1.6	25 034	1.5
St. Clair	502	2.1	46 237	2.5	78 479	2.7
Ste. Genevieve	450	1.4	23 219	1.8	40 690	2.0
St. Francois	480	1.1	24 556	1.5	37 479	1.9
St. Louis	77	3.3	3 091	5.0	4 853	5.4
Saline	455	1.8	22 779	2.1	41 167	2.1
Schuyler	373	2.0	32 090	2.2	56 000	2.2
Scotland	345	2.1	25 243	2.4	47 508	2.4
Scott	165	2.2	5 905	2.3	12 022	3.1
Shannon	252	2.3	15 487	3.2	26 147	3.5
Shelby	333	1.9	22 687	1.7	38 425	1.8
Stoddard	231	2.3	7 479	2.8	12 529	3.6
Stone	356	2.0	18 893	2.2	36 063	2.3
Sullivan	518	1.9	59 461	1.8	93 746	1.8
Taney	230	1.9	11 410	1.8	19 477	1.8
Texas	988	1.5	64 826	1.6	110 387	1.6
Vernon	768	1.8	54 181	2.1	93 973	2.2
Warren	275	1.5	9 928	1.8	17 022	2.0
Washington	309	1.7	15 183	2.5	18 990	2.7
Wayne	198	2.2	8 989	2.9	13 582	3.1
Webster	1 065	1.3	63 839	1.3	116 689	1.3
Worth	226	2.0	19 928	2.5	39 936	2.6
Wright	869	1.6	58 357	1.6	111 868	1.5

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--	98 082	1.4	9 600	19.2	8.9	1.6
Land in farms ----- acres --	28 546 875	1.3	894 711	23.4	3.0	.7
Average size of farm ----- acres --	291.1	.3	93.2	23.0	(X)	(X)
Farms by size:						
Less than 10 acres -----	3 926	1.3	636	44.8	13.9	5.9
10 to 49 acres -----	16 211	1.0	5 429	28.6	25.1	5.4
Less than 50 acres -----	20 137	1.0	6 065	25.9	23.1	4.7
50 acres or more -----	77 945	1.5	3 536	22.6	4.3	.9
50 to 99 acres -----	15 686	1.2	1 566	35.7	9.1	2.9
100 to 179 acres -----	18 968	1.5	1 144	39.1	5.7	2.1
180 acres or more -----	43 291	1.7	825	41.8	1.9	.8
Harvested cropland ----- farms --	74 240	1.4	5 088	21.1	6.4	1.3
----- acres--	12 158 832	1.1	226 771	23.9	1.8	.4
Farms by value of sales:						
Less than \$1,000 -----	9 652	1.1	2 729	34.4	22.0	5.9
\$1,000 to \$2,499 -----	10 986	1.0	3 196	39.1	22.5	6.8
Less than \$2,500 -----	20 638	1.0	5 925	27.8	22.3	4.8
\$2,500 or more -----	77 444	1.5	3 675	22.2	4.5	1.0
\$2,500 to \$9,999 -----	30 231	1.3	2 843	26.7	8.6	2.1
\$10,000 or more -----	47 213	1.8	833	32.4	1.7	.5
Market value of agricultural products sold -----\$1,000 --	4 303 148	.8	58 636	31.7	1.3	.4
Farms by standard industrial classification:						
Crops (01) -----	31 496	1.5	2 688	28.4	7.9	2.0
Livestock (02) -----	66 586	1.4	6 704	23.1	9.1	2.0
Farms by type of organization:						
Individual or family -----	86 776	1.4	8 637	20.0	9.1	1.7
Partnership or corporation -----	10 820	1.7	963	46.1	8.2	3.4
Other -----	486	2.0	--	(X)	--	(X)
Farms by tenure of operator:						
Full owners -----	63 421	1.3	7 421	20.2	10.5	1.9
Part owners and tenants -----	34 661	1.5	2 180	48.8	5.9	2.7
Part owners -----	26 498	1.5	1 791	59.0	6.3	3.5
Tenants -----	8 163	1.8	389	69.9	4.5	3.0
Operators by place of residence:						
On farm operated -----	72 664	1.3	8 404	21.1	10.4	2.0
Not on farm operated -----	18 482	1.6	855	41.2	4.4	1.7
Not reported -----	6 936	1.4	341	63.0	4.7	2.8
Operators by principal occupation:						
Farming -----	49 248	1.5	2 441	47.9	4.7	2.1
Other -----	48 834	1.3	6 295	20.2	11.4	2.1
Operators by sex:						
Male -----	90 965	1.4	9 075	19.3	9.1	1.6
Female -----	7 117	1.4	525	57.1	6.9	3.7
Operators by race:						
White -----	97 662	1.4	8 667	20.6	8.2	1.6
Black and other races -----	420	1.9	--	(X)	--	(X)
Operators by years on present farm:						
4 years or less -----	11 783	1.6	2 286	30.0	16.2	4.3
5 years or more -----	69 807	1.4	5 078	27.4	6.8	1.7
Average years on present farm -----	19.9	2.0	12.4	40.2	(X)	(X)
Not reported -----	16 492	1.4	2 237	30.6	11.9	3.2
Average age of operator -----	53.8	.1	53.8	20.9	(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.