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
Farms ---- number	15.3
Land in farms ---- acres	9.2
Estimated market value of land and buildings[1] ---- $1,000	4.3
Market value of agricultural products sold ---- $1,000	3.4
Harvested cropland ---- acres	7.1
Corn for grain or seed ---- acres	6.7
Wheat for grain ---- acres	6.1
Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Cattle and calves ---- number	10.6
Hogs and pigs ---- number	1.0
Hens and pullets of laying age ---- number	3.6

[1]Data 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	6.0
50	3.8
75	2.6
100	1.8
150	1.5
200	1.3
300	1.1
500	.8
750	.7
1,000	.6
1,500	.5
2,000	(X)
SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:	
25	26.3
50	21.0
75	18.9
100	17.7
150	16.5
200	15.8
300	15.2
500	14.6
750	14.3
1,000	14.2
1,500	14.0
2,000	(X)

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

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

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

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

CENSUS NONSAMPLING ERROR

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

Census Coverage

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

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

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

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

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

Mail List Coverage

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

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

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

Respondent and Enumerator Error

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

Item Nonresponse

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

Processing Error

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

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

Classification Error

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

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

EDITING DATA AND IMPUTATION FOR ITEM NONRESPONSE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			
Farms	number	51 854	1.0
Land in farms	acres	8 936 015	.7
Average size of farm	acres	172	1.2
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			
Total sales (see text)	farms	51 854	1.0
	$1,000	4 834 218	.3
Average per farm	dollars	93 227	1.0
Farms by value of sales:			
Less than $1,000 (see text)	farms	5 574	1.0
	$1,000	1 810	1.2
$1,000 to $2,499	farms	7 042	1.0
	$1,000	11 801	1.0
$2,500 to $4,999	farms	7 250	1.1
	$1,000	25 911	1.1
$5,000 to $9,999	farms	6 968	1.1
	$1,000	49 348	1.1
$10,000 to $19,999	farms	6 025	1.5
	$1,000	85 260	1.6
$20,000 to $24,999	farms	1 616	2.0
	$1,000	35 877	2.0
$25,000 to $39,999	farms	3 116	2.0
	$1,000	98 171	2.1
$40,000 to $49,999	farms	1 281	2.2
	$1,000	56 911	2.2
$50,000 to $99,999	farms	3 640	2.1
	$1,000	261 413	2.1
$100,000 to $249,999	farms	4 444	.8
	$1,000	716 851	.6
$250,000 to $499,999	farms	2 810	–
	$1,000	985 744	–
$500,000 or more	farms	2 088	–
	$1,000	2 505 121	–
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	farms	32 939	1.1
	$1,000	1 996 452	.6
Grains	farms	17 369	1.3
	$1,000	441 349	.7
Corn for grain	farms	10 167	1.4
	$1,000	189 188	.7
Wheat	farms	6 531	1.2
	$1,000	69 639	.6
Soybeans	farms	12 739	1.4
	$1,000	175 628	.7
Sorghum for grain	farms	200	2.2
	$1,000	996	1.9
Barley	farms	400	1.6
	$1,000	2 161	1.0
Oats	farms	881	1.4
	$1,000	2 011	1.2
Other grains	farms	374	1.5
	$1,000	1 727	1.1
Cotton and cottonseed	farms	2 031	1.3
	$1,000	126 090	.4
Tobacco	farms	17 611	1.2
	$1,000	956 323	.7
Hay, silage, and field seeds	farms	5 224	.9
	$1,000	20 020	.9
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons	farms	2 774	1.2
	$1,000	63 082	.7
Fruits, nuts, and berries	farms	1 202	1.3
	$1,000	26 039	1.2
Nursery and greenhouse crops	farms	2 028	1.1
	$1,000	183 777	.3
Other crops	farms	3 591	1.5
	$1,000	179 771	.5
Livestock, poultry, and their products	farms	27 732	.8
	$1,000	2 837 765	.1
Poultry and poultry products	farms	4 058	.5
	$1,000	1 551 291	.1
Dairy products	farms	1 014	.8
	$1,000	199 003	.2
Cattle and calves	farms	20 771	.8
	$1,000	158 790	.7
Hogs and pigs	farms	4 012	1.2
	$1,000	898 624	.1
Sheep, lambs, and wool	farms	499	1.6
	$1,000	777	3.1
Other livestock and livestock products (see text)	farms	2 237	1.1
	$1,000	29 280	.8
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text)	farms	2 134	1.2
	$1,000	7 113	1.6

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES[1]			
Total farm production expenses	farms	51 858	1.0
	$1,000	3 817 833	.3
Average per farm	dollars	73 621	1.0
Livestock and poultry purchased	farms	12 925	1.7
	$1,000	431 873	.4
Feed for livestock and poultry	farms	23 132	1.3
	$1,000	1 288 719	.2
Commercially mixed formula feeds	farms	10 715	1.8
	$1,000	941 007	.2
Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees	farms	29 662	1.4
	$1,000	85 959	.9
Commercial fertilizer	farms	40 585	1.1
	$1,000	233 479	1.0
Agricultural chemicals	farms	30 449	1.4
	$1,000	151 341	.8
Petroleum products	farms	49 736	1.0
	$1,000	184 299	.8
Electricity	farms	32 089	1.3
	$1,000	66 747	.6
Hired farm labor	farms	21 919	1.4
	$1,000	388 338	.4
Contract labor	farms	6 362	2.5
	$1,000	41 893	1.6
Repair and maintenance	farms	42 818	1.1
	$1,000	171 928	.8
Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment	farms	16 441	1.7
	$1,000	42 312	1.8
Interest expense	farms	19 038	1.5
	$1,000	143 502	.8
Secured by real estate	farms	13 588	1.7
	$1,000	102 028	1.0
Not secured by real estate	farms	9 391	2.1
	$1,000	41 474	.9
Cash rent	farms	16 600	1.7
	$1,000	163 376	.9
Property taxes	farms	49 192	1.0
	$1,000	59 169	1.1
All other farm production expenses	farms	45 144	1.1
	$1,000	364 899	.4
NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT) [1]			
All farms	number	51 858	1.0
	$1,000	912 136	.7
Average per farm	dollars	17 589	1.2
Farms with net gains [2]	number	30 837	1.2
	$1,000	1 023 730	.6
Average net gain	dollars	33 198	1.4
Farms with net losses	number	21 021	1.4
	$1,000	111 594	1.9
Average net loss	dollars	5 309	2.3
GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME			
Government payments	farms	9 805	1.2
	$1,000	40 414	.6
Other farm-related income [1]	farms	12 408	2.0
	$1,000	73 394	2.7
Customwork and other agricultural services	farms	3 939	3.3
	$1,000	31 476	4.2
Gross cash rent or share payments	farms	6 381	2.8
	$1,000	20 423	3.6
Forest products and Christmas trees	farms	2 096	4.6
	$1,000	18 068	6.3
Other farm-related income sources	farms	1 867	4.5
	$1,000	3 426	5.4
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS			
Total	farms	1 609	1.3
	$1,000	27 715	.6

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 1
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			
Total cropland	farms	47 497	1.0
	acres	5 578 191	.7
Harvested cropland	farms	42 135	1.0
	acres	3 998 685	.7
Farms by acres harvested:			
1 to 9 acres	farms	12 257	1.0
	acres	50 753	1.0
10 to 19 acres	farms	7 606	1.0
	acres	102 198	1.0
20 to 29 acres	farms	4 631	1.2
	acres	107 236	1.2
30 to 49 acres	farms	4 900	1.3
	acres	181 328	1.4
50 to 99 acres	farms	4 753	1.7
	acres	324 005	1.7
100 to 199 acres	farms	3 236	1.8
	acres	444 308	1.8
200 to 499 acres	farms	2 932	1.1
	acres	912 900	1.0
500 to 999 acres	farms	1 195	.3
	acres	816 732	.3
1,000 acres or more	farms	625	–
	acres	1 059 225	–
Cropland:			
Pasture or grazing only	farms	21 103	.9
	acres	835 097	.9
Other cropland	farms	18 949	1.0
	acres	744 409	.8
Total woodland	farms	32 870	.9
	acres	2 613 514	.8
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured	farms	8 133	.9
	acres	376 344	.8
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc.	farms	31 757	.9
	acres	367 966	.8
Irrigated land	farms	4 337	1.1
	acres	112 630	.5
Acres irrigated:			
1 to 9 acres	farms	2 467	1.3
	acres	7 837	1.5
10 to 49 acres	farms	1 329	1.4
	acres	28 962	1.2
50 to 99 acres	farms	323	.8
	acres	21 273	.8
100 to 199 acres	farms	134	.9
	acres	17 527	1.1
200 to 499 acres	farms	62	.7
	acres	17 589	.5
500 to 999 acres	farms	18	–
	acres	11 797	–
1,000 acres or more	farms	4	–
	acres	7 645	–
Harvested cropland irrigated	farms	4 167	1.1
	acres	105 667	.5
Pasture and other land irrigated	farms	293	1.5
	acres	6 963	1.6
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:			
Diverted under annual commodity programs	farms	3 847	1.3
	acres	59 335	.5
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs	farms	2 858	1.1
	acres	93 414	1.0
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS [1]			
Estimated market value of land and buildings	farms	51 858	1.0
	$1,000	13 949 825	1.0
Average per farm	dollars	269 000	1.4
Average per acre	dollars	1 573	1.4
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT [1]			
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment	farms	51 785	1.0
	$1,000	1 991 218	.9
Average per farm	dollars	38 452	1.3
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS [1]			
Commercial fertilizer	farms	40 317	1.1
	acres on which used	3 741 135	.9

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
TENURE OF OPERATOR			
All operators	farms	51 854	1.0
	acres	8 936 015	.7
Full owners	farms	29 242	.9
	acres	3 003 960	.9
Part owners	farms	17 572	1.1
	acres	5 133 947	.7
Tenants	farms	5 040	1.3
	acres	798 108	1.0
OWNED AND RENTED LAND			
Land owned	farms	46 908	.9
	acres	5 513 843	.9
Owned land in farms	farms	46 814	.9
	acres	5 036 380	.8
Land rented or leased from others	farms	22 813	1.1
	acres	3 951 170	.7
	landlords	80 157	.9
Rented or leased land in farms	farms	22 612	1.1
	acres	3 899 635	.6
Land rented or leased to others	farms	8 912	1.1
	acres	528 998	4.2
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
Operators by place of residence:			
On farm operated		36 678	.9
Not on farm operated		10 223	1.1
Not reported		4 953	1.0
Operators by principal occupation:			
Farming		27 376	1.1
Other		24 478	1.0
Operators by days worked off farm:			
Any		25 958	1.0
200 days or more		17 989	1.0
Operators by sex:			
Male	farms	47 914	1.0
	acres	8 539 047	.7
Female	farms	3 940	1.1
	acres	396 968	1.1
Average age of operator	years	54.7	1.4
FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION			
Individual or family (sole proprietorship)	farms	45 273	1.0
	acres	6 681 020	.8
Partnership	farms	4 750	1.1
	acres	1 247 359	.6
Corporation:			
Family held	farms	1 415	.8
	acres	866 762	.3
More than 10 stockholders	farms	28	3.5
10 or less stockholders	farms	1 387	.8
Other than family held	farms	174	2.0
	acres	58 700	1.1
More than 10 stockholders	farms	27	3.5
10 or less stockholders	farms	147	2.3
Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc.	farms	242	2.1
	acres	82 174	1.2
HIRED FARM LABOR			
Hired workers by days worked:			
150 days or more	farms	8 881	1.7
	workers	27 185	.8
Less than 150 days	farms	20 281	1.5
	workers	126 611	1.7
INJURIES AND DEATHS			
Farm-related injuries:			
Operator and family members	farms	348	1.7
	number	417	1.8
Hired workers	farms	434	.8
	number	825	.5
Farm-related deaths:			
Operator and family members	farms	12	6.9
	number	12	6.9
Hired workers	farms	5	8.2
	number	5	8.2

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 2
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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)
FARMS BY SIZE			
1 to 9 acres	farms	4 651	1.1
	acres	19 965	1.1
10 to 49 acres	farms	15 852	.9
	acres	440 538	.9
50 to 69 acres	farms	5 526	1.1
	acres	321 549	1.1
70 to 99 acres	farms	5 697	1.1
	acres	470 022	1.1
100 to 139 acres	farms	5 002	1.3
	acres	582 745	1.3
140 to 179 acres	farms	3 141	1.4
	acres	493 259	1.4
180 to 219 acres	farms	2 134	1.5
	acres	421 191	1.5
220 to 259 acres	farms	1 555	1.6
	acres	370 818	1.6
260 to 499 acres	farms	4 318	1.3
	acres	1 522 972	1.3
500 to 999 acres	farms	2 564	.8
	acres	1 727 593	.7
1,000 to 1,999 acres	farms	1 054	–
	acres	1 413 788	–
2,000 acres or more	farms	360	–
	acres	1 151 575	–
FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION			
Cash grains (011)	farms	5 451	1.4
	acres	1 402 672	1.0
Field crops, except cash grains (013)	farms	17 395	1.2
	acres	3 422 698	.8
Vegetables and melons (016)	farms	1 105	1.5
	acres	93 864	1.5
Fruits and tree nuts (017)	farms	992	1.4
	acres	86 000	1.4
Horticultural specialties (018)	farms	1 714	1.2
	acres	88 431	1.3
General farms, primarily crop (019)	farms	2 142	1.3
	acres	955 022	.6
Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties (021)	farms	16 560	.9
	acres	1 959 464	.8
Dairy farms (024)	farms	900	.8
	acres	339 426	.5
Poultry and eggs (025)	farms	3 596	.5
	acres	422 891	.2
Animal specialties (027)	farms	1 698	1.2
	acres	90 462	1.7
General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029)	farms	301	2.0
	acres	75 085	2.0
LIVESTOCK			
Cattle and calves inventory	farms	22 718	.8
	number	901 980	.7
Beef cows	farms	19 531	.9
	number	385 428	.9
Milk cows	farms	1 552	.9
	number	99 291	.3
Cattle and calves sold	farms	20 771	.8
	number	399 035	.7
	$1,000	158 790	.7
LIVESTOCK—Con.			
Hogs and pigs inventory	farms	4 311	1.1
	number	5 100 979	.1
Hogs and pigs sold	farms	4 012	1.2
	number	10 776 400	.1
	$1,000	898 624	.1
Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms	574	1.5
	number	19 546	2.4
Sheep and lambs sold	farms	440	1.7
	number	13 601	2.4
Horses and ponies inventory	farms	6 003	.9
	number	30 492	1.1
Horses and ponies sold	farms	1 363	1.2
	number	5 160	1.7
POULTRY			
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory	farms	2 064	1.1
	number	18 133 946	.6
Hens and pullets of laying age	farms	1 895	1.1
	number	14 337 192	.5
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms	2 116	.4
	number	499 071 743	.1
CROPS HARVESTED			
Corn for grain or seed	farms	13 052	1.3
	acres	1 019 871	.7
	bushels	96 617 840	.7
Corn for silage or green chop	farms	1 727	1.0
	acres	97 117	.4
	tons, green	1 421 282	.4
Sorghum for grain or seed	farms	390	1.8
	acres	13 996	1.5
	bushels	613 710	1.4
Wheat for grain	farms	6 883	1.2
	acres	490 214	.7
	bushels	23 164 935	.6
Barley for grain	farms	794	1.3
	acres	30 798	.9
	bushels	1 830 777	.8
Oats for grain	farms	1 993	1.2
	acres	36 407	.9
	bushels	2 190 860	1.0
Cotton	farms	2 035	1.3
	acres	357 766	.4
	bales	445 466	.4
Tobacco	farms	17 625	1.2
	acres	283 900	.8
	pounds	604 014 807	.7
Soybeans for beans	farms	13 080	1.4
	acres	1 287 573	.8
	bushels	34 176 793	.7
Irish potatoes	farms	857	1.4
	acres	18 775	.3
	cwt	3 839 359	.3
Sweetpotatoes	farms	954	1.4
	acres	38 682	.5
	bushels	8 536 954	.4
Peanuts for nuts	farms	2 371	1.8
	acres	149 210	.7
	pounds	398 611 000	.7
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms	18 268	.8
	acres	466 944	.8
	tons, dry	922 347	.8
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms	2 775	1.2
	acres	57 315	.7
Land in orchards	farms	1 522	1.2
	acres	20 535	1.5

[1]Data are based on a sample of farms.
[2]Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains of less than $1,000.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 3
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS		
Farms — number	25 020	1.2
Land in farms — acres	7 034 857	.8
Average size of farm — acres	281	1.5
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD		
Total sales (see text) — farms	25 020	1.2
$1,000	4 745 348	.3
Average per farm — dollars	189 662	1.3
Farms by value of sales:		
$10,000 to $19,999 — farms	6 025	1.5
$1,000	85 260	1.6
$20,000 to $24,999 — farms	1 616	2.0
$1,000	35 877	2.0
$25,000 to $39,999 — farms	3 116	2.0
$1,000	98 171	2.1
$40,000 to $49,999 — farms	1 281	2.2
$1,000	56 911	2.2
$50,000 to $99,999 — farms	3 640	2.1
$1,000	261 413	2.1
$100,000 to $249,999 — farms	4 444	.8
$1,000	716 851	.6
$250,000 to $499,999 — farms	2 810	–
$1,000	985 744	–
$500,000 or more — farms	2 088	–
$1,000	2 505 121	–
Sales by commodity or commodity group:		
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops — farms	19 647	1.4
$1,000	1 950 945	.6
Grains — farms	12 433	1.5
$1,000	429 048	.7
Corn for grain — farms	7 818	1.5
$1,000	184 506	.7
Wheat — farms	5 461	1.3
$1,000	68 007	.6
Soybeans — farms	9 776	1.5
$1,000	170 054	.7
Sorghum for grain — farms	152	2.4
$1,000	920	1.9
Barley — farms	307	1.7
$1,000	2 063	1.0
Oats — farms	624	1.6
$1,000	1 830	1.3
Other grains — farms	322	1.5
$1,000	1 668	1.1
Cotton and cottonseed — farms	1 916	1.3
$1,000	125 730	.4
Tobacco — farms	12 837	1.4
$1,000	936 652	.7
Hay, silage, and field seeds — farms	2 157	1.2
$1,000	14 778	1.0
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons — farms	1 670	1.5
$1,000	60 379	.7
Fruits, nuts, and berries — farms	598	1.7
$1,000	24 737	1.2
Nursery and greenhouse crops — farms	1 260	1.3
$1,000	181 070	.3
Other crops — farms	2 959	1.6
$1,000	178 551	.5
Livestock, poultry, and their products — farms	12 767	1.0
$1,000	2 794 403	.1
Poultry and poultry products — farms	3 747	.5
$1,000	1 551 114	.1
Dairy products — farms	946	.8
$1,000	198 732	.2
Cattle and calves — farms	8 030	1.1
$1,000	121 960	.8
Hogs and pigs — farms	2 817	1.3
$1,000	895 656	.1
Sheep, lambs, and wool — farms	179	2.3
$1,000	490	4.5
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) — farms	671	1.6
$1,000	26 452	.9
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) — farms	805	1.7
$1,000	5 355	1.9

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES[1]		
Total farm production expenses — farms	24 858	1.3
$1,000	3 691 500	.3
Average per farm — dollars	148 504	1.4
Livestock and poultry purchased — farms	7 936	1.8
$1,000	422 851	.4
Feed for livestock and poultry — farms	11 163	1.6
$1,000	1 278 166	.2
Commercially mixed formula feeds — farms	6 698	1.8
$1,000	938 169	.2
Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees — farms	18 302	1.6
$1,000	82 807	.9
Commercial fertilizer — farms	20 880	1.5
$1,000	216 242	1.0
Agricultural chemicals — farms	19 072	1.6
$1,000	146 936	.8
Petroleum products — farms	24 365	1.3
$1,000	172 634	.8
Electricity — farms	20 674	1.4
$1,000	63 948	.6
Hired farm labor — farms	15 935	1.5
$1,000	384 511	.4
Contract labor — farms	4 697	2.7
$1,000	40 644	1.6
Repair and maintenance — farms	23 099	1.4
$1,000	156 180	.8
Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment — farms	10 773	2.0
$1,000	39 423	1.9
Interest expense — farms	14 051	1.6
$1,000	132 363	.8
Secured by real estate — farms	9 801	1.8
$1,000	92 301	.9
Not secured by real estate — farms	7 546	2.1
$1,000	40 062	.9
Cash rent — farms	12 097	1.9
$1,000	160 463	.9
Property taxes — farms	23 682	1.3
$1,000	40 841	1.2
All other farm production expenses — farms	24 858	1.3
$1,000	353 490	.4
NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT) [1]		
All farms — number	24 858	1.3
$1,000	948 855	.7
Average per farm — dollars	38 171	1.5
Farms with net gains [2] — number	20 777	1.4
$1,000	1 002 456	.6
Average net gain — dollars	48 248	1.5
Farms with net losses — number	4 081	3.4
$1,000	53 601	2.8
Average net loss — dollars	13 134	4.4
GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
Government payments — farms	6 890	1.3
$1,000	37 470	.6
Other farm-related income [1] — farms	6 476	2.5
$1,000	57 457	3.1
Customwork and other agricultural services — farms	2 342	3.9
$1,000	27 856	4.6
Gross cash rent or share payments — farms	2 906	3.9
$1,000	12 983	4.2
Forest products and Christmas trees — farms	995	6.3
$1,000	13 734	7.5
Other farm-related income sources — farms	1 447	4.6
$1,000	2 884	5.4
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Total — farms	1 455	1.4
$1,000	27 533	.6

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 4
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE		
Total cropland — farms	23 197	1.3
acres	4 748 796	.7
Harvested cropland — farms	21 896	1.3
acres	3 673 314	.7
Cropland:		
Pasture or grazing only — farms	8 268	1.1
acres	482 412	1.0
Total woodland — farms	15 575	1.2
acres	1 811 477	.8
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured — farms	3 302	1.2
acres	229 116	.9
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. — farms	15 455	1.2
acres	245 468	.9
Irrigated land — farms	3 307	1.2
acres	108 446	.5
Harvested cropland irrigated — farms	3 208	1.2
acres	102 483	.5
Pasture and other land irrigated — farms	200	1.3
acres	5 963	1.5
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:		
Diverted under annual commodity programs — farms	3 494	1.3
acres	58 657	.5
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs — farms	1 813	1.2
acres	65 390	1.0
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS [1]		
Estimated market value of land and buildings — farms	24 858	1.3
$1,000	10 117 831	1.1
Average per farm — dollars	407 025	1.7
Average per acre — dollars	1 451	1.5
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT [1]		
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment — farms	24 849	1.3
$1,000	1 624 191	1.0
Average per farm — dollars	65 362	1.6
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS [1]		
Commercial fertilizer — farms	20 813	1.5
acres on which used	3 378 474	1.0
TENURE OF OPERATOR		
All operators — farms	25 020	1.2
acres	7 034 857	.8
Full owners — farms	10 336	1.2
acres	1 673 679	1.0
Part owners — farms	11 578	1.3
acres	4 637 781	.7
Tenants — farms	3 106	1.7
acres	723 397	1.0
OWNED AND RENTED LAND		
Land owned — farms	21 968	1.2
acres	3 681 866	.9
Owned land in farms — farms	21 914	1.2
acres	3 445 296	.9
Land rented or leased from others — farms	14 781	1.4
acres	3 632 260	.6
landlords	66 251	.9
Rented or leased land in farms — farms	14 684	1.3
acres	3 589 561	.6
Land rented or leased to others — farms	4 426	1.4
acres	279 269	1.2
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS		
Operators by place of residence:		
On farm operated	17 610	1.2
Not on farm operated	5 226	1.4
Not reported	2 184	1.3
Operators by principal occupation:		
Farming	17 954	1.2
Other	7 066	1.4
Operators by days worked off farm:		
Any	9 662	1.4
200 days or more	5 660	1.4
Operators by sex:		
Male	23 493	1.3
Female	1 527	1.4
Average age of operator — years	52.5	1.8

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
Individual or family (sole proprietorship) — farms	20 480	1.3
acres	4 975 101	.9
Partnership — farms	3 111	1.2
acres	1 110 104	.6
Corporation:		
Family held — farms	1 188	.7
acres	835 667	.3
More than 10 stockholders — farms	24	3.3
10 or less stockholders — farms	1 164	.7
Other than family held — farms	136	2.0
acres	52 049	.9
More than 10 stockholders — farms	26	3.7
10 or less stockholders — farms	110	2.3
Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. — farms	105	2.8
acres	61 936	1.2
HIRED FARM LABOR		
Hired workers by days worked:		
150 days or more — farms	7 186	1.5
workers	25 475	.8
Less than 150 days — farms	14 368	1.7
workers	110 760	1.9
INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Farm-related injuries:		
Operator and family members — farms	212	1.9
number	263	2.1
Hired workers — farms	410	.7
number	799	.5
Farm-related deaths:		
Operator and family members — farms	7	10.5
number	(D)	(D)
Hired workers — farms	5	8.2
number	(D)	(D)
FARMS BY SIZE		
1 to 9 acres	1 494	1.3
10 to 49 acres	4 578	1.3
50 to 69 acres	1 908	1.6
70 to 99 acres	2 405	1.6
100 to 139 acres	2 649	1.7
140 to 179 acres	1 982	1.8
180 to 219 acres	1 490	1.8
220 to 259 acres	1 131	1.8
260 to 499 acres	3 630	1.4
500 to 999 acres	2 375	.8
1,000 to 1,999 acres	1 026	–
2,000 acres or more	352	–
FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION		
Cash grains (011)	2 221	2.0
Field crops, except cash grains (013)	11 243	1.5
Vegetables and melons (016)	395	2.3
Fruits and tree nuts (017)	325	2.0
Horticultural specialties (018)	1 041	1.3
General farms, primarily crop (019)	1 248	1.7
Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties (021)	3 894	1.1
Dairy farms (024)	845	.8
Poultry and eggs (025)	3 507	.5
Animal specialties (027)	262	2.4
General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029)	39	3.7
LIVESTOCK		
Cattle and calves inventory — farms	8 390	1.1
number	604 729	.8
Beef cows — farms	6 834	1.2
number	223 600	1.1
Milk cows — farms	1 078	.9
number	98 154	.3
Cattle and calves sold — farms	8 030	1.1
number	288 879	.8
$1,000	121 960	.8
Hogs and pigs inventory — farms	2 851	1.3
number	5 063 722	.1
Hogs and pigs sold — farms	2 817	1.3
number	10 731 369	.1
$1,000	895 656	.1
Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory — farms	196	2.3
number	10 588	3.6
Sheep and lambs sold — farms	165	2.4
number	7 875	3.5
Horses and ponies inventory — farms	1 781	1.2
number	9 039	1.7
Horses and ponies sold — farms	368	1.8
number	2 893	2.5

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 5
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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)
POULTRY			
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory	farms	1 046	1.3
	number	18 030 265	.6
Hens and pullets of laying age	farms	905	1.4
	number	14 317 615	.5
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms	2 093	.4
	number	498 947 375	.1
CROPS HARVESTED			
Corn for grain or seed	farms	9 206	1.5
	acres	978 104	.7
	bushels	93 864 221	.7
Corn for silage or green chop	farms	1 284	1.0
	acres	92 895	.4
	tons, green	1 371 716	.4
Sorghum for grain or seed	farms	268	2.0
	acres	12 603	1.5
	bushels	567 914	1.4
Wheat for grain	farms	5 637	1.3
	acres	473 429	.7
	bushels	22 581 195	.6
CROPS HARVESTED—Con.			
Barley for grain	farms	586	1.4
	acres	29 059	.9
	bushels	1 745 456	.8
Oats for grain	farms	1 264	1.4
	acres	30 636	1.0
	bushels	1 923 852	1.0
Cotton	farms	1 917	1.3
	acres	356 223	.4
	bales	444 017	.4
Tobacco	farms	12 841	1.4
	acres	2 751 096	.8
	pounds	590 292 239	.7
Soybeans for beans	farms	9 923	1.5
	acres	1 233 009	.7
	bushels	33 011 658	.7
Irish potatoes	farms	362	2.0
	acres	18 244	.3
	cwt	3 785 720	.3
Sweetpotatoes	farms	762	1.4
	acres	38 178	.5
	bushels	8 474 836	.4
Peanuts for nuts	farms	2 090	1.8
	acres	147 606	.7
	pounds	396 032 515	.6
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms	7 137	1.1
	acres	278 899	1.0
	tons, dry	624 395	.9
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms	1 670	1.5
	acres	53 636	.7
Land in orchards	farms	547	1.7
	acres	14 807	1.7

[1]Data are based on a sample of farms.
[2]Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains of less than $1,000.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 6
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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	–12.5	.9	–2.7	1.3
Land in farms	acres	–5.4	.7	–.8	.8
Average size of farm	acres	8.2	1.4	1.8	1.6
Estimated market value of land and buildings [1]:					
Average per farm	dollars	34.6	2.1	25.8	2.4
Average per acre	dollars	24.5	2.0	22.9	2.1
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment [1]:					
Average per farm	dollars	26.5	2.0	21.2	2.3
Farms by size:					
1 to 9 acres		–11.5	1.1	–1.6	1.4
10 to 49 acres		–12.4	1.0	11.1	1.5
50 to 179 acres		–14.6	1.0	–3.0	1.6
180 to 499 acres		–14.2	1.2	–12.8	1.4
500 to 999 acres		–4.2	.9	–4.1	.8
1,000 to 1,999 acres		12.4	–	11.9	–
2,000 acres or more		15.4	–	15.8	–
Total cropland	farms	–13.6	.9	–3.2	1.3
	acres	–2.4	.7	1.3	.8
Harvested cropland	farms	–15.9	.9	–4.1	1.3
	acres	5.8	.8	9.6	.8
Irrigated land	farms	–32.7	.8	–30.0	.9
	acres	–18.3	.5	–17.4	.5
Market value of agricultural products sold	$1,000	36.5	.5	38.2	.5
Average per farm	dollars	56.1	1.7	42.1	1.9
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	$1,000	38.9	.9	41.8	.9
Livestock, poultry, and their products	$1,000	34.8	.2	35.8	.2
Farms by value of sales:					
Less than $2,500		–24.7	.7	(X)	(X)
$2,500 to $4,999		–14.3	1.1	(X)	(X)
$5,000 to $9,999		–16.5	1.1	(X)	(X)
$10,000 to $24,999		–10.3	1.5	–10.3	1.5
$25,000 to $49,999		–8.7	2.0	–8.7	2.0
$50,000 to $99,999		–14.8	1.9	–14.8	1.9
$100,000 to $249,999		–8.5	.8	–8.5	.8
$250,000 to $499,999		29.1	–	29.1	–
$500,000 or more		92.6	–	92.6	–
Total farm production expenses [1]	$1,000	37.4	1.4	39.7	1.9
Average per farm	dollars	57.0	1.7	43.8	2.1
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) [1]	farms	–12.5	.9	–2.9	1.3
	$1,000	32.5	1.3	32.4	1.2
Average per farm	dollars	51.5	2.1	36.3	2.3
Operators by principal occupation:					
Farming		–10.8	1.0	–6.4	1.2
Other		–14.4	.9	8.2	1.6
Operators by days worked off farm:					
Any		–18.7	4.1	–7.1	4.8
200 days or more		–17.1	4.2	.7	5.2
Livestock and poultry:					
Cattle and calves inventory	farms	–9.1	.9	1.0	1.2
	number	15.0	.9	16.5	1.0
Beef cows	farms	–5.3	.9	6.8	1.3
	number	20.2	1.2	29.3	1.5
Milk cows	farms	–33.6	.7	–22.8	.8
	number	–9.8	.3	–9.1	.3
Cattle and calves sold	farms	–8.4	.9	1.1	1.2
	number	.8	.8	7.1	.9
Hogs and pigs inventory	farms	–37.7	.8	–29.0	1.0
	number	100.3	.3	102.7	.3
Hogs and pigs sold	farms	–36.2	.8	–28.3	1.0
	number	108.0	.3	110.3	.3
Sheep and lambs inventory	farms	5.9	2.1	3.2	3.1
	number	23.6	4.1	30.0	6.5
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory	farms	–38.0	.8	–27.9	1.1
	number	–9.6	.5	–9.9	.5
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms	–1.7	.5	–1.8	.5
	number	22.1	.2	22.1	.2
Selected crops harvested:					
Corn for grain or seed	farms	–37.8	.8	–28.6	1.1
	acres	–3.4	.7	.1	.8
	bushels	34.6	1.0	38.9	1.0
Wheat for grain	farms	–11.2	1.1	–1.4	1.4
	acres	29.4	1.0	34.4	1.0
	bushels	53.5	1.1	58.3	1.1
Cotton	farms	107.4	3.1	115.4	3.2
	acres	279.9	2.2	282.8	2.2
	bales	375.3	2.6	378.4	2.6
Tobacco	farms	–20.8	1.0	–7.3	1.4
	acres	18.6	1.0	22.8	1.0
	pounds	26.3	1.0	29.9	1.0
Soybeans for beans	farms	–24.9	1.1	–17.2	1.3
	acres	1.1	.8	4.0	.8
	bushels	9.0	.8	11.4	.9
Peanuts for nuts	farms	–22.0	1.4	–17.7	1.6
	acres	3.1	.8	4.1	.8
	pounds	4.9	.7	5.9	.8
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms	–11.9	.8	2.5	1.2
	acres	2.3	.9	7.9	1.1
	tons, dry	15.9	1.0	20.0	1.2

[1] Data are based on a sample of farms.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 7
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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

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

Geographic area	Farms		Land in farms		Average size of farm		Average market value of land and buildings per farm [1]		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment [1]	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
North Carolina	**51 854**	**1.0**	**8 936 015**	**.7**	**172**	**1.2**	**269 000**	**1.4**	**1 991 218**	**.9**
Alamance	725	1.3	101 073	1.8	139	2.2	254 296	8.3	27 317	8.0
Alexander	507	.6	52 974	1.1	104	1.2	162 949	4.6	14 334	5.5
Alleghany	490	.6	72 621	1.4	148	1.5	224 056	6.8	12 457	7.0
Anson	344	.7	70 697	1.3	206	1.4	296 115	4.8	11 986	4.2
Ashe	1 033	.6	104 426	1.1	101	1.3	141 806	5.6	15 038	4.5
Avery	274	1.1	19 712	2.2	72	2.5	176 730	9.7	6 895	13.4
Beaufort	447	1.8	144 529	1.1	323	2.1	365 269	2.9	29 260	4.2
Bertie	456	2.0	170 006	1.1	373	2.2	442 992	3.7	30 645	3.7
Bladen	607	1.4	127 760	1.3	210	1.9	212 372	5.6	23 488	2.9
Brunswick	225	1.5	39 667	1.7	176	2.2	263 612	10.5	6 261	7.6
Buncombe	1 097	.9	93 584	1.1	85	1.5	301 302	7.7	22 219	8.5
Burke	348	.8	31 671	2.0	91	2.1	200 118	12.4	9 419	6.4
Cabarrus	430	.6	63 067	1.6	147	1.7	333 871	12.5	12 324	11.6
Caldwell	329	1.0	31 184	1.9	95	2.1	188 897	10.9	8 174	7.4
Camden	89	2.1	43 056	1.4	484	2.5	521 895	3.7	9 027	2.8
Carteret	113	1.4	64 031	.6	567	1.5	1 075 231	4.4	9 458	7.1
Caswell	601	1.0	125 428	1.3	209	1.6	180 834	7.7	17 293	5.9
Catawba	507	.5	62 854	1.1	124	1.3	316 974	6.9	13 319	5.7
Chatham	926	.5	108 363	.8	117	.9	200 210	5.4	23 911	4.7
Cherokee	220	1.1	23 929	3.1	109	3.3	208 459	19.2	7 933	17.6
Chowan	179	2.1	53 902	1.2	301	2.5	354 437	4.4	14 357	6.6
Clay	161	1.0	16 405	2.8	102	2.9	218 928	8.8	3 886	7.7
Cleveland	714	.8	93 970	1.2	132	1.4	201 804	9.8	14 235	8.1
Columbus	1 109	1.6	162 634	1.2	147	2.0	178 032	3.8	35 364	8.1
Craven	327	1.7	88 386	1.1	270	2.0	330 032	6.1	20 563	3.3
Cumberland	437	1.1	98 531	1.1	225	1.5	336 461	8.6	21 163	10.6
Currituck	90	1.9	41 750	1.5	464	2.4	746 766	5.6	5 260	3.0
Dare	7	1.6	7 046	5.3	1 007	5.6	643 807	8.1	437	7.5
Davidson	864	.6	92 192	1.1	107	1.3	227 511	8.0	22 309	7.0
Davie	548	.8	68 718	1.3	125	1.5	182 889	5.6	12 574	5.2
Duplin	1 359	1.7	248 518	1.4	183	2.2	248 916	3.7	55 477	2.2
Durham	160	.7	19 676	2.5	123	2.6	528 417	12.2	5 100	4.6
Edgecombe	376	1.4	180 400	.6	480	1.5	483 450	3.2	30 554	4.3
Forsyth	647	.8	47 837	1.6	74	1.7	291 047	15.2	17 302	8.0
Franklin	549	1.8	118 291	1.5	215	2.3	295 966	4.7	27 205	4.4
Gaston	293	.8	34 717	1.5	118	1.7	180 997	7.9	7 677	9.5
Gates	199	.8	64 532	.6	324	1.0	384 815	4.0	14 146	3.2
Graham	147	1.8	8 882	4.2	60	4.6	126 364	10.6	2 294	7.5
Granville	724	1.5	156 027	1.5	216	2.1	261 834	6.3	20 942	4.2
Greene	407	1.0	112 291	.8	276	1.3	477 081	4.7	32 218	2.7
Guilford	970	1.0	113 654	1.2	117	1.6	361 152	6.4	31 450	4.3
Halifax	346	1.6	204 443	.7	591	1.7	517 846	2.3	34 076	1.5
Harnett	754	1.0	127 663	.9	169	1.3	294 531	5.2	32 447	7.9
Haywood	812	.9	69 961	1.5	86	1.8	203 054	4.3	16 384	4.9
Henderson	511	1.0	52 281	1.1	102	1.5	316 388	4.5	17 840	4.7
Hertford	195	2.0	75 496	1.5	387	2.6	419 271	4.3	14 223	7.3
Hoke	173	1.6	56 693	1.2	328	2.0	305 306	4.9	9 345	3.4
Hyde	136	1.8	93 728	.9	689	2.0	617 700	3.1	15 196	2.4
Iredell	1 143	.7	148 135	.8	130	1.1	281 314	4.9	35 399	5.0
Jackson	187	1.2	13 310	3.8	71	4.0	168 127	8.0	3 107	10.8
Johnston	1 406	.8	230 402	.7	164	1.1	276 838	4.8	59 858	3.3
Jones	195	2.1	68 577	1.7	352	2.6	421 124	20.4	15 140	11.7
Lee	301	.7	37 434	1.1	124	1.3	190 854	5.2	7 969	5.6
Lenoir	531	.9	141 761	.7	267	1.1	409 663	2.8	41 820	4.1
Lincoln	425	1.1	58 384	1.9	137	2.2	206 923	5.6	9 813	6.1
McDowell	194	1.0	21 218	3.0	109	3.1	215 948	9.8	5 754	16.3
Macon	290	.9	22 089	2.0	76	2.2	186 388	14.4	4 118	12.9
Madison	1 178	1.4	93 320	2.0	79	2.4	151 058	6.1	16 343	7.6
Martin	487	2.0	131 767	1.2	271	2.3	320 063	3.8	29 382	2.3
Mecklenburg	280	.7	27 901	1.9	100	2.0	543 395	12.9	20 697	3.5
Mitchell	322	.9	23 007	2.9	71	3.1	118 536	14.2	4 502	10.0
Montgomery	236	.4	36 975	1.5	157	1.6	199 213	12.1	7 480	11.2
Moore	701	.7	86 982	1.2	124	1.4	190 603	5.1	23 528	2.7
Nash	560	.7	179 051	.4	320	.8	459 445	2.5	44 366	2.7
New Hanover	68	1.6	3 486	6.3	51	6.5	299 574	8.4	2 308	2.9
Northampton	381	1.7	155 213	1.0	407	2.0	329 075	4.3	28 635	3.4
Onslow	425	1.1	63 992	1.3	151	1.6	219 059	4.7	16 041	13.2
Orange	433	.7	67 491	1.0	156	1.2	449 587	6.7	17 245	6.0
Pamlico	82	.8	44 000	.7	537	1.0	559 192	2.9	10 098	.9
Pasquotank	199	2.3	83 218	1.2	418	2.6	539 626	4.6	17 410	7.0
Pender	331	1.4	65 136	1.7	197	2.2	262 850	7.0	11 334	5.0
Perquimans	226	2.4	68 736	1.8	304	3.0	459 058	14.0	14 901	6.0
Person	476	1.1	115 854	1.0	243	1.5	264 787	7.1	19 770	8.4
Pitt	583	1.0	194 015	.6	333	1.1	547 147	3.3	46 370	1.8
Polk	161	.8	23 140	1.8	144	1.9	250 395	6.3	3 679	8.0
Randolph	1 293	.8	144 858	1.1	112	1.3	206 061	4.6	36 136	5.2
Richmond	222	.5	51 916	1.3	234	1.4	223 744	7.8	8 923	8.9
Robeson	1 193	2.0	292 152	1.4	245	2.5	238 469	4.0	53 107	3.3
Rockingham	902	1.5	130 879	1.6	145	2.2	199 490	6.2	29 405	5.9
Rowan	751	.8	104 874	1.3	140	1.5	210 665	5.4	21 335	5.7
Rutherford	464	.6	55 309	1.5	119	1.6	148 607	6.4	7 660	6.7
Sampson	1 342	2.1	266 067	1.5	198	2.6	257 899	4.3	72 959	1.5
Scotland	125	1.8	53 690	1.4	430	2.3	382 080	4.5	7 264	3.9
Stanly	550	.7	89 063	.8	162	1.1	222 340	5.6	18 006	2.9

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 8
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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)
Stokes	1 075	.8	104 733	1.3	97	1.5	143 231	6.1	25 909	5.6
Surry	1 269	.9	121 404	.9	96	1.3	158 810	5.8	38 488	5.0
Swain	80	2.0	5 897	6.8	74	7.1	165 992	6.5	2 584	4.4
Transylvania	175	1.2	12 388	3.1	71	3.3	219 579	9.0	5 288	5.2
Tyrrell	96	.7	67 698	.6	705	1.0	647 274	2.6	9 809	1.1
Union	1 037	.5	167 379	.7	161	.8	352 937	7.2	38 401	2.4
Vance	289	1.0	67 716	1.2	234	1.5	284 120	19.9	15 597	10.3
Wake	833	1.0	119 855	1.0	144	1.4	443 323	4.7	32 184	3.9
Warren	325	1.1	87 478	1.1	269	1.6	247 150	7.8	12 882	8.4
Washington	228	1.3	102 944	.8	452	1.5	486 248	3.8	21 818	4.7
Watauga	673	.6	46 726	1.3	69	1.4	147 169	7.2	11 582	7.3
Wayne	902	.8	179 554	.7	199	1.1	314 936	5.1	47 529	4.6
Wilkes	1 139	.6	115 106	.8	101	1.0	197 530	4.4	30 570	5.2
Wilson	489	.8	142 312	.6	291	1.0	446 178	2.8	44 626	4.1
Yadkin	968	1.2	103 773	1.5	107	1.9	196 593	7.3	28 402	5.8
Yancey	671	1.1	38 394	2.3	57	2.5	109 579	9.2	8 907	5.3

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]			
							Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
	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)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
North Carolina	**38 452**	**1.3**	**4 834 218**	**.3**	**93 227**	**1.0**	**51 858**	**1.0**	**3 817 833**	**.3**
Alamance	37 679	8.2	32 491	1.2	44 815	1.8	725	1.4	24 286	2.5
Alexander	28 272	5.5	35 216	.5	69 460	.8	507	.9	30 335	2.7
Alleghany	25 422	7.0	16 639	.8	33 958	1.1	490	.9	13 828	4.6
Anson	34 945	4.3	62 130	.2	180 611	.7	343	1.0	51 967	.7
Ashe	14 571	4.5	11 172	1.2	10 815	1.3	1 032	.7	7 783	6.0
Avery	25 255	13.5	6 241	1.2	22 776	1.7	273	1.6	4 192	3.2
Beaufort	65 605	4.6	53 853	.8	120 476	2.0	446	1.9	43 204	1.8
Bertie	67 204	4.3	75 804	.6	166 236	2.1	456	2.3	56 320	1.0
Bladen	38 695	3.3	57 229	.5	94 281	1.5	607	1.5	46 746	1.0
Brunswick	27 825	7.8	11 626	1.0	51 669	1.8	225	1.8	8 954	2.7
Buncombe	20 365	8.6	22 249	.6	20 281	1.1	1 096	1.1	17 126	2.4
Burke	27 066	6.5	20 072	.5	57 677	.9	348	1.2	16 855	1.3
Cabarrus	28 595	11.6	12 465	1.1	28 988	1.3	431	1.0	10 672	5.0
Caldwell	24 996	7.6	12 621	1.0	38 363	1.4	327	1.6	9 716	6.5
Camden	102 575	4.0	16 630	.7	186 853	2.2	88	2.8	15 028	1.2
Carteret	84 443	7.5	12 671	.6	112 136	1.5	112	2.2	11 302	.9
Caswell	28 726	6.1	20 956	1.1	34 869	1.5	602	1.2	13 106	3.7
Catawba	26 270	5.7	14 579	.7	28 756	.9	507	.9	12 034	2.4
Chatham	25 794	4.7	92 619	.2	100 021	.5	927	.6	72 498	.8
Cherokee	35 733	17.6	10 972	1.1	49 871	1.5	222	1.5	10 871	7.6
Chowan	80 208	7.0	24 319	.9	135 861	2.3	179	2.3	19 565	2.3
Clay	24 137	8.0	4 640	1.5	28 821	1.7	161	2.1	3 481	2.5
Cleveland	19 882	8.2	24 706	.6	34 602	1.0	716	1.0	20 561	4.8
Columbus	31 860	8.2	54 663	1.0	49 290	1.9	1 110	1.6	45 890	2.4
Craven	63 077	3.8	45 366	.7	138 735	1.8	326	1.9	34 954	1.3
Cumberland	48 540	10.7	34 634	.6	79 254	1.3	436	1.3	27 375	1.9
Currituck	58 448	3.9	14 453	.8	160 589	2.1	90	2.5	11 928	1.6
Dare	62 364	10.5	554	7.9	79 144	8.1	7	7.3	598	3.4
Davidson	25 851	7.1	20 448	.9	23 667	1.1	863	.9	14 079	2.5
Davie	22 987	5.3	13 772	1.4	25 131	1.6	547	1.1	11 574	6.2
Duplin	40 852	3.0	433 169	.2	318 741	1.7	1 358	2.0	362 171	.3
Durham	31 482	4.8	6 637	1.7	41 481	1.8	162	1.3	5 140	4.5
Edgecombe	81 477	4.6	73 156	.4	194 563	1.4	375	1.4	57 297	1.4
Forsyth	26 742	8.0	13 400	1.2	20 710	1.4	647	1.0	9 459	8.3
Franklin	49 464	4.8	46 818	.8	85 278	1.9	550	1.9	37 271	1.7
Gaston	26 201	9.6	7 510	.7	25 633	1.0	293	1.2	6 086	4.5
Gates	70 729	3.4	29 558	.4	148 534	.9	200	1.2	24 589	1.4
Graham	15 606	7.8	1 239	4.5	8 432	4.9	147	2.4	744	7.9
Granville	28 925	4.5	30 960	1.3	42 762	2.0	724	1.7	19 467	3.5
Greene	78 965	3.0	118 128	.2	290 241	1.0	408	1.4	92 197	1.1
Guilford	32 422	4.4	39 100	.8	40 310	1.3	970	1.1	28 210	1.4
Halifax	100 817	3.3	85 901	.3	248 268	1.7	347	1.9	71 041	.7
Harnett	43 090	8.0	61 897	.6	82 092	1.1	753	1.1	46 788	2.0
Haywood	20 152	5.0	14 380	1.1	17 709	1.4	813	1.1	11 283	3.6
Henderson	34 912	4.8	42 413	.4	83 000	1.1	511	1.2	34 297	1.2
Hertford	72 938	7.6	38 608	.7	197 992	2.1	195	2.1	29 734	1.6
Hoke	54 018	4.0	31 930	.6	184 567	1.7	173	2.1	25 258	.8
Hyde	112 566	3.5	24 914	.8	183 190	2.0	135	2.6	20 275	1.2
Iredell	30 970	5.1	63 611	.5	55 653	.9	1 143	.8	54 197	1.1
Jackson	16 702	11.0	3 582	1.9	19 153	2.3	186	1.8	2 130	3.0
Johnston	42 604	3.4	113 654	.4	80 835	.9	1 405	.8	83 123	1.1
Jones	77 643	11.9	29 000	.8	148 718	2.2	195	2.3	22 466	3.1
Lee	26 476	5.7	15 621	.7	51 896	1.0	301	1.0	12 256	2.6
Lenoir	78 609	4.3	99 052	.3	186 538	.9	532	1.2	80 585	1.0

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 9
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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]			
							Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
	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)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Lincoln	23 144	6.2	14 110	1.1	33 199	1.5	424	1.3	11 068	2.2
McDowell	29 658	16.4	8 673	1.1	44 707	1.5	194	1.4	6 335	1.9
Macon	14 811	13.2	3 878	1.3	13 374	1.5	291	1.1	2 751	8.2
Madison	13 861	7.7	10 296	2.2	8 741	2.6	1 179	1.4	5 352	5.3
Martin	60 209	3.3	57 112	.8	117 272	2.2	488	2.4	42 534	1.5
Mecklenburg	73 916	3.7	35 112	.2	125 400	.7	280	1.1	28 337	.7
Mitchell	13 981	10.1	3 157	3.2	9 805	3.3	322	1.3	1 971	10.3
Montgomery	31 696	11.3	37 809	.1	160 208	.4	236	1.0	30 067	.6
Moore	33 516	2.9	79 135	.3	112 889	.8	702	.8	62 219	.9
Nash	79 084	2.8	124 474	.2	222 274	.7	561	.9	99 178	.6
New Hanover	33 937	5.3	2 535	2.4	37 286	2.9	68	4.4	1 930	3.3
Northampton	75 158	3.9	71 498	.5	187 659	1.8	381	1.8	54 113	.9
Onslow	37 744	13.2	58 691	.4	138 096	1.1	425	1.4	50 798	1.3
Orange	39 919	6.1	33 710	.5	77 852	.8	432	1.0	26 471	2.3
Pamlico	123 146	2.8	16 788	.4	204 730	.9	82	2.7	13 459	.6
Pasquotank	87 486	7.4	28 176	.8	141 586	2.4	199	2.3	23 291	1.2
Pender	34 140	5.3	37 197	.6	112 378	1.5	332	1.7	30 554	1.7
Perquimans	65 934	6.6	29 569	1.1	130 836	2.6	226	2.7	23 274	3.1
Person	41 534	8.5	25 718	.9	54 029	1.4	476	1.3	18 326	7.0
Pitt	79 537	2.1	134 082	.2	229 986	1.0	583	1.2	105 691	.6
Polk	22 710	8.2	2 961	1.7	18 391	1.9	162	1.8	3 023	3.7
Randolph	27 969	5.2	102 960	.3	79 629	.8	1 292	.9	77 384	1.1
Richmond	40 376	8.9	38 336	.3	172 686	.6	221	.9	30 379	1.0
Robeson	44 892	4.0	107 959	1.0	90 493	2.3	1 192	2.3	77 817	1.4
Rockingham	32 892	6.2	31 169	1.6	34 556	2.1	901	1.5	18 184	2.8
Rowan	29 591	6.1	26 163	.7	34 838	1.0	750	1.0	20 819	2.5
Rutherford	16 509	6.8	4 827	2.0	10 402	2.1	464	.9	4 809	6.2
Sampson	54 285	2.7	355 154	.3	264 645	2.1	1 344	2.2	290 677	.5
Scotland	58 111	4.6	25 673	.5	205 384	1.8	125	2.5	22 449	1.1
Stanly	32 738	3.0	44 856	.3	81 556	.7	550	.8	40 763	1.2
Stokes	24 124	5.7	27 586	1.1	25 662	1.3	1 074	.9	15 596	3.3
Surry	30 329	5.1	58 753	.7	46 299	1.1	1 269	1.1	42 233	1.9
Swain	32 299	6.1	2 010	1.9	25 127	2.7	80	4.2	1 625	2.5
Transylvania	30 048	5.6	6 230	1.5	35 602	1.9	176	2.0	4 919	3.6
Tyrrell	102 176	2.2	22 690	.3	236 353	.8	96	1.9	16 516	.9
Union	36 960	2.5	240 859	.1	232 265	.5	1 039	.9	204 532	.3
Vance	53 968	10.4	18 222	1.1	63 052	1.5	289	1.6	12 110	4.6
Wake	38 590	4.0	66 051	.5	79 293	1.1	834	1.1	40 933	1.6
Warren	39 517	8.5	29 849	.4	91 843	1.2	326	1.2	19 959	3.2
Washington	95 694	5.0	53 522	.3	234 746	1.3	228	1.7	46 421	1.6
Watauga	17 184	7.4	7 557	1.3	11 228	1.4	674	.8	5 447	9.0
Wayne	52 751	4.7	193 952	.2	215 025	.9	902	1.2	156 989	.5
Wilkes	26 816	5.3	156 851	.2	137 709	.6	1 140	.8	126 342	1.2
Wilson	91 446	4.3	89 697	.3	183 430	.8	488	1.1	61 427	.9
Yadkin	29 341	6.0	43 133	1.2	44 559	1.7	968	1.3	32 201	2.7
Yancey	13 274	5.4	5 449	1.9	8 121	2.2	671	1.3	3 672	7.4

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)
North Carolina	**12 925**	**1.7**	**431 873**	**.4**	**23 132**	**1.3**	**1 288 719**	**.2**	**29 662**	**1.4**	**85 959**	**.9**
Alamance	205	11.6	2 280	4.7	385	7.2	7 119	1.8	378	7.3	484	9.4
Alexander	224	8.9	3 850	5.6	343	6.9	15 209	4.9	140	16.2	129	6.6
Alleghany	179	12.9	1 756	28.5	330	7.3	4 378	5.0	181	13.4	145	10.8
Anson	116	9.2	5 291	.4	204	8.3	27 866	.2	126	14.5	247	20.1
Ashe	290	9.6	1 812	22.1	520	5.9	1 016	9.9	488	7.3	111	16.5
Avery	13	75.0	5	21.5	70	17.9	78	15.9	115	13.5	740	1.7
Beaufort	71	18.6	948	.9	95	15.3	6 089	1.3	401	3.4	2 319	3.7
Bertie	103	7.1	4 644	.5	172	11.7	17 102	1.2	379	4.2	2 110	2.0
Bladen	100	16.3	4 431	2.4	196	13.9	16 031	2.2	455	5.5	1 034	5.0
Brunswick	43	43.7	600	13.4	67	26.3	1 574	3.4	180	8.8	318	20.8
Buncombe	303	10.5	1 164	10.8	544	6.5	3 231	2.8	554	7.3	580	2.1
Burke	85	20.5	3 713	1.6	188	9.0	5 214	1.0	119	15.1	482	5.6
Cabarrus	105	19.0	964	18.2	239	10.3	3 837	6.9	184	13.7	249	6.6
Caldwell	66	21.8	1 226	44.5	171	11.4	2 836	3.8	99	18.5	124	8.6
Camden	18	20.8	1 210	11.7	27	16.3	1 573	1.7	79	3.7	1 417	.9
Carteret	11	21.0	82	21.3	31	16.9	229	9.8	83	7.3	805	.8
Caswell	111	23.5	176	15.1	209	16.9	842	3.3	440	5.1	253	7.9
Catawba	151	13.4	1 446	4.1	296	7.7	2 122	2.2	142	12.8	305	8.0
Chatham	433	6.7	18 485	1.3	672	4.1	31 636	.3	262	10.8	179	12.2
Cherokee	28	47.4	670	17.3	92	23.5	5 354	4.4	95	20.5	111	17.6
Chowan	51	37.1	949	6.6	58	32.6	3 234	1.5	147	13.1	1 191	3.7
Clay	30	17.8	(D)	(D)	80	7.7	488	4.7	64	9.6	27	5.9
Cleveland	223	14.5	2 200	6.3	373	10.6	7 936	1.8	154	20.0	473	24.5
Columbus	117	21.6	1 099	3.6	237	15.0	2 714	7.5	844	4.1	1 655	5.3

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 10
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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)
Craven	47	16.7	3 597	.8	87	17.1	8 150	1.8	257	5.6	813	4.1
Cumberland	44	30.7	1 177	1.1	148	16.0	8 601	.8	299	8.0	806	9.1
Currituck	17	18.5	(D)	(D)	28	18.4	421	5.1	75	5.0	1 035	1.7
Dare	–	–	–	–	1	32.8	(D)	(D)	6	5.5	73	2.8
Davidson	176	15.5	919	7.3	363	9.3	3 610	3.8	509	6.8	337	10.5
Davie	123	18.0	1 054	19.7	312	8.9	2 742	5.0	226	10.3	173	8.6
Duplin	568	5.4	55 930	.8	707	5.5	203 810	.3	967	3.9	2 710	4.3
Durham	27	35.5	381	8.0	82	12.0	179	9.3	97	11.1	178	13.5
Edgecombe	113	18.3	2 631	1.7	177	13.8	10 622	3.9	265	8.7	2 430	4.6
Forsyth	115	19.7	276	24.0	337	9.8	932	27.1	328	8.1	552	19.7
Franklin	65	19.0	3 279	1.9	194	11.7	8 839	1.5	371	5.4	752	4.3
Gaston	48	27.6	495	26.4	197	8.2	1 687	5.9	109	17.7	100	6.6
Gates	78	21.3	1 325	3.3	93	17.9	6 289	1.0	176	5.7	1 371	2.4
Graham	42	14.3	63	22.9	48	12.0	71	24.4	82	7.7	5	22.5
Granville	146	15.8	936	4.2	262	9.8	1 590	2.8	440	6.9	360	7.1
Greene	87	12.5	11 545	.3	119	11.6	34 048	.1	362	2.8	1 511	7.3
Guilford	178	15.7	1 807	6.9	431	7.6	3 157	2.6	525	5.4	1 298	2.8
Halifax	87	15.5	9 150	.2	143	11.5	11 450	.3	222	8.4	2 892	1.2
Harnett	137	16.3	1 893	6.6	309	9.4	8 920	.6	513	4.4	875	3.2
Haywood	218	13.0	1 298	13.7	420	7.0	2 711	1.5	409	7.4	175	10.3
Henderson	53	22.3	879	9.7	102	14.9	2 886	.9	202	10.0	817	1.9
Hertford	41	13.1	1 596	2.8	49	18.1	8 865	2.3	162	6.1	1 424	6.5
Hoke	53	12.4	2 288	.4	75	9.5	4 450	.5	119	5.6	539	5.0
Hyde	20	17.9	322	1.8	26	17.6	1 308	7.6	126	3.2	1 512	1.5
Iredell	410	7.2	6 775	3.0	721	4.6	21 517	2.1	325	8.8	740	23.6
Jackson	27	36.9	61	23.4	100	14.1	103	14.3	58	20.5	90	4.6
Johnston	284	12.4	4 031	10.8	549	8.1	13 091	1.2	1 078	3.2	2 738	2.4
Jones	58	28.7	1 133	10.4	78	21.9	5 158	5.2	138	10.7	622	7.5
Lee	82	20.0	820	7.0	146	11.4	2 973	1.6	166	7.2	221	5.4
Lenoir	105	14.0	7 816	1.2	140	12.9	25 655	.4	472	2.4	1 519	3.4
Lincoln	111	18.7	728	5.8	222	11.6	4 008	1.4	112	17.7	192	12.5
McDowell	54	30.1	271	7.7	96	19.0	995	3.9	88	17.6	41	16.6
Macon	68	19.4	122	24.0	125	19.1	578	9.7	59	26.1	26	14.0
Madison	158	18.8	218	26.4	337	10.8	328	9.7	764	5.5	129	15.8
Martin	103	16.9	1 464	2.5	177	13.0	4 526	1.0	444	3.7	2 651	10.9
Mecklenburg	79	22.6	243	21.0	158	12.5	1 133	6.3	77	20.5	1 159	1.2
Mitchell	56	31.6	135	50.2	99	20.2	140	27.6	106	17.8	45	26.7
Montgomery	81	12.7	5 110	.2	153	7.0	16 490	.1	83	13.0	75	14.1
Moore	229	8.1	12 455	.6	363	6.7	27 199	1.3	326	7.6	496	4.2
Nash	165	12.7	8 082	3.2	214	10.9	27 842	.3	379	5.8	1 982	3.2
New Hanover	5	17.1	13	16.8	12	9.7	180	19.1	42	5.6	169	1.1
Northampton	73	14.4	6 742	.3	108	13.2	11 765	.7	329	3.8	2 680	1.9
Onslow	130	14.7	6 656	1.1	195	12.3	25 252	.8	310	5.4	854	6.5
Orange	125	15.4	2 752	3.5	214	10.6	10 262	.4	195	9.8	359	11.6
Pamlico	10	7.2	364	.4	14	7.1	1 600	.4	65	2.9	1 085	.7
Pasquotank	8	–	144	–	18	34.3	339	1.4	153	9.0	2 042	1.8
Pender	88	20.8	2 785	3.5	136	12.8	9 479	.6	242	8.2	818	8.0
Perquimans	45	2.2	1 582	.2	94	14.9	6 161	.4	199	6.7	1 294	5.4
Person	69	24.5	235	9.5	132	16.7	1 491	7.4	301	8.7	293	3.6
Pitt	115	13.1	4 626	.5	215	8.6	21 725	.3	503	2.8	2 816	2.4
Polk	35	17.4	229	5.2	78	9.3	586	1.6	51	13.0	36	18.4
Randolph	513	6.8	12 648	1.4	850	4.2	37 373	1.2	439	8.2	588	5.5
Richmond	93	9.2	3 961	.6	140	10.1	15 488	.3	129	7.9	339	6.1
Robeson	169	16.6	4 242	8.3	300	12.1	14 972	2.8	970	4.2	3 011	2.9
Rockingham	98	20.6	537	24.2	257	10.6	559	4.9	574	5.5	457	14.6
Rowan	207	12.0	1 453	18.6	428	7.1	4 961	4.0	283	10.6	500	11.1
Rutherford	88	20.0	496	15.8	282	7.9	1 294	5.7	116	13.6	47	17.9
Sampson	391	8.2	48 547	.3	619	7.0	134 920	.2	1 028	3.9	3 301	4.5
Scotland	21	17.3	1 331	.2	47	11.1	9 871	.8	94	5.1	395	5.4
Stanly	167	13.3	4 464	6.8	334	7.6	19 127	.7	211	11.4	704	5.3
Stokes	198	13.9	1 190	4.7	341	10.1	1 188	10.0	760	4.4	278	11.6
Surry	308	10.6	5 539	7.5	614	6.8	11 002	4.3	753	4.9	765	10.9
Swain	14	9.7	(D)	(D)	40	5.7	(D)	(D)	29	6.6	17	6.9
Transylvania	61	10.7	289	26.2	102	6.7	1 423	5.4	59	10.6	270	3.2
Tyrrell	18	13.2	274	.2	29	12.0	2 285	.1	76	4.1	1 153	2.8
Union	505	5.5	31 452	.3	644	4.3	120 729	.1	358	8.0	1 307	3.6
Vance	27	30.6	167	2.3	87	18.1	561	4.8	187	9.0	522	17.1
Wake	114	19.7	805	5.4	281	10.5	2 031	5.2	479	5.9	1 435	2.0
Warren	98	17.5	1 559	9.6	121	16.4	6 120	3.7	175	11.7	196	11.0
Washington	52	20.7	7 107	3.9	56	19.2	12 468	1.8	194	5.3	1 996	3.4
Watauga	163	13.7	892	19.0	265	10.0	606	29.4	364	8.2	99	12.2
Wayne	310	8.1	31 324	.4	367	7.5	63 277	.8	703	3.7	2 281	4.4
Wilkes	592	6.4	26 353	1.8	897	3.8	67 939	1.5	302	11.9	279	8.0
Wilson	69	26.6	4 941	1.0	98	15.9	7 922	.7	419	3.1	1 818	6.6
Yadkin	246	12.4	2 868	6.7	490	7.3	8 359	3.3	519	6.4	732	11.0
Yancey	71	25.3	176	19.0	240	12.6	239	12.9	420	6.9	74	13.8

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 11
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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)
North Carolina	**40 585**	**1.1**	**233 479**	**1.0**	**30 449**	**1.4**	**151 341**	**.8**	**49 736**	**1.0**	**184 299**	**.8**
Alamance	569	4.3	2 006	7.3	347	7.7	646	12.0	691	2.5	1 455	5.0
Alexander	332	6.8	870	7.6	170	14.1	456	31.8	491	2.0	1 051	2.8
Alleghany	430	4.2	983	7.0	235	11.0	233	12.9	469	2.8	744	5.5
Anson	152	14.0	984	10.1	129	15.0	583	11.0	303	5.3	721	3.2
Ashe	841	3.4	578	7.7	511	6.5	118	8.1	988	1.4	596	8.1
Avery	254	3.5	296	4.1	184	8.4	239	13.8	262	3.2	252	8.6
Beaufort	396	3.6	5 846	3.9	395	4.0	3 879	1.5	440	2.3	3 207	3.0
Bertie	379	3.7	4 052	3.7	401	3.9	4 340	2.2	450	2.3	3 003	4.2
Bladen	496	4.5	2 976	5.6	424	5.9	2 179	2.8	567	2.4	2 228	2.9
Brunswick	167	13.4	922	5.8	141	16.3	718	8.6	225	1.8	634	5.2
Buncombe	887	3.7	1 154	8.2	411	9.2	372	7.2	1 037	1.6	1 109	4.3
Burke	262	5.5	402	13.2	179	9.9	251	14.8	342	1.7	615	4.7
Cabarrus	325	6.8	863	12.7	128	19.1	159	8.5	411	3.3	434	6.6
Caldwell	238	7.3	282	10.4	144	13.3	165	10.7	308	3.3	412	5.4
Camden	75	4.2	2 040	2.2	72	5.7	1 375	1.1	83	3.6	611	1.8
Carteret	90	6.0	1 970	.8	80	5.9	1 693	1.3	109	3.0	668	1.9
Caswell	527	3.2	1 263	7.0	397	7.8	477	10.0	591	1.7	1 739	5.0
Catawba	395	5.0	1 163	7.5	154	12.1	294	13.7	465	2.9	696	7.0
Chatham	418	7.3	992	7.6	314	9.4	321	8.5	880	1.8	1 531	5.1
Cherokee	199	6.1	460	24.9	124	16.9	113	29.4	220	1.4	320	18.3
Chowan	165	2.4	2 286	2.4	148	13.0	2 148	3.9	178	2.3	1 164	11.2
Clay	133	4.0	190	7.1	64	9.1	34	12.3	146	2.9	153	4.2
Cleveland	509	6.0	1 377	18.7	250	14.4	734	27.9	682	1.8	860	10.1
Columbus	979	2.8	6 780	7.3	872	4.3	3 470	4.8	1 081	1.9	4 789	4.0
Craven	259	5.7	3 267	3.1	228	6.5	2 007	3.3	306	2.9	2 307	1.8
Cumberland	342	5.0	2 510	2.8	323	6.2	1 576	12.2	419	2.3	1 861	5.6
Currituck	77	4.8	1 560	4.8	78	4.8	991	2.3	87	2.6	783	.9
Dare	3	6.8	(D)	(D)	6	5.5	87	3.9	7	7.3	43	2.4
Davidson	706	4.0	1 392	8.5	388	8.0	352	12.3	854	1.2	1 177	5.0
Davie	432	4.9	1 308	9.3	223	10.2	332	17.2	523	2.2	771	11.5
Duplin	990	3.4	8 497	4.9	971	3.7	4 590	4.4	1 336	2.0	8 497	2.1
Durham	132	7.3	475	7.5	101	11.3	272	7.8	162	1.3	533	10.8
Edgecombe	294	6.6	5 180	1.7	294	7.3	4 990	2.4	343	5.0	3 780	1.5
Forsyth	511	4.5	981	9.9	268	9.0	304	8.4	633	1.7	1 012	5.7
Franklin	437	5.0	2 697	9.9	372	6.3	1 429	4.2	539	2.4	2 937	3.3
Gaston	246	5.7	528	6.2	78	21.4	68	8.1	290	1.6	325	12.5
Gates	173	5.8	2 473	1.7	167	6.0	2 800	2.1	199	1.2	1 213	2.5
Graham	121	4.5	86	13.4	97	6.6	14	11.1	140	2.9	55	9.9
Granville	640	3.5	1 672	6.2	429	6.1	647	4.4	716	1.8	2 336	4.7
Greene	348	3.6	5 211	10.3	364	2.8	3 415	4.5	395	2.0	4 234	2.8
Guilford	800	3.2	2 796	4.0	519	5.5	1 277	3.7	937	1.3	2 341	2.6
Halifax	255	5.4	5 507	1.6	201	7.6	6 471	.8	305	6.0	3 779	1.7
Harnett	631	3.0	4 989	4.2	545	5.3	2 884	7.3	702	1.9	3 868	4.0
Haywood	712	3.0	669	6.5	484	6.7	274	11.6	782	1.8	584	5.5
Henderson	426	4.0	1 262	4.0	428	3.8	3 062	5.2	484	2.2	1 929	2.3
Hertford	160	6.2	2 374	8.4	169	4.9	2 012	2.9	190	2.1	1 516	3.4
Hoke	127	4.8	1 953	2.7	117	6.4	1 267	2.5	162	3.4	1 036	3.0
Hyde	125	3.5	3 574	1.4	116	4.3	2 096	1.3	131	3.1	1 389	1.8
Iredell	714	4.2	2 606	3.9	351	8.7	700	6.3	1 086	1.5	1 630	3.5
Jackson	149	7.5	126	8.4	82	17.3	70	3.6	186	1.8	124	6.8
Johnston	1 250	2.5	8 966	2.2	1 059	3.1	4 848	2.4	1 369	1.4	6 394	2.0
Jones	150	9.3	2 424	10.9	155	10.6	1 488	4.2	194	2.3	1 510	9.1
Lee	208	7.3	1 078	9.8	179	8.3	616	5.8	272	3.4	843	4.7
Lenoir	467	2.5	6 202	2.9	435	3.9	4 115	3.5	526	1.5	4 743	2.0
Lincoln	366	4.6	948	7.3	178	13.5	303	8.3	384	4.3	483	3.3
McDowell	144	10.7	353	19.4	83	21.9	71	11.6	194	1.4	483	2.4
Macon	243	5.4	376	33.3	103	20.0	123	65.6	275	2.9	147	11.4
Madison	1 090	2.0	811	12.7	799	5.1	215	13.2	1 158	1.6	456	10.1
Martin	428	4.3	4 528	3.5	430	4.3	5 143	3.3	471	3.2	3 551	2.1
Mecklenburg	209	7.9	553	6.3	77	20.3	405	5.0	258	4.2	1 519	1.8
Mitchell	277	5.6	222	17.5	166	12.6	83	19.6	295	4.2	159	14.8
Montgomery	146	7.6	419	11.9	114	11.4	296	13.3	225	2.5	408	3.8
Moore	466	5.1	1 622	8.7	408	6.3	787	4.9	650	1.8	1 652	3.1
Nash	426	3.9	6 332	2.6	392	5.5	4 893	1.4	541	1.5	5 567	1.2
New Hanover	51	5.1	102	3.8	48	5.2	48	7.9	64	4.5	72	4.4
Northampton	314	4.4	4 159	2.4	318	4.4	5 160	1.9	362	3.4	2 523	2.2
Onslow	366	3.4	2 398	5.4	329	4.9	1 136	3.9	398	2.7	1 835	4.9
Orange	285	6.6	1 172	8.6	207	10.4	445	15.1	413	2.3	1 197	8.1
Pamlico	67	2.9	2 024	.9	60	3.0	1 174	.7	79	2.7	841	.9
Pasquotank	164	8.1	3 927	3.1	164	6.2	2 253	2.2	199	2.3	1 340	3.8
Pender	283	4.7	2 201	7.7	226	9.2	1 295	4.3	317	3.4	1 552	4.3
Perquimans	199	6.7	2 678	7.4	167	11.4	2 011	5.3	210	6.4	1 170	8.4
Person	419	4.4	1 808	7.0	350	6.1	675	8.0	475	1.3	2 405	10.1
Pitt	499	3.2	7 425	1.4	486	3.5	5 932	2.0	562	1.9	6 524	1.7
Polk	126	4.9	276	9.9	77	8.9	138	19.8	152	2.7	138	7.2
Randolph	796	4.9	1 855	5.3	418	8.4	674	10.8	1 210	1.9	1 931	3.9
Richmond	130	9.3	1 091	17.1	129	8.8	473	6.2	216	.9	951	4.1
Robeson	1 035	3.6	8 656	2.6	928	4.7	5 517	3.0	1 127	2.8	6 301	2.8
Rockingham	777	3.5	1 806	3.3	507	5.7	994	4.2	878	2.0	2 499	3.8

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 12
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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)
Rowan	520	5.6	1 800	5.2	244	11.2	622	8.9	704	2.4	1 115	3.5
Rutherford	325	6.5	474	10.5	169	12.7	50	18.3	442	2.7	327	8.9
Sampson	1 093	3.4	10 420	3.6	1 002	4.3	5 877	2.8	1 283	2.8	7 899	2.3
Scotland	104	3.4	1 441	4.8	85	5.4	1 073	3.4	121	2.7	912	2.3
Stanly	356	6.8	2 039	3.8	223	11.7	1 135	5.4	497	3.1	1 417	3.7
Stokes	987	1.9	1 662	5.0	749	4.4	516	5.9	1 067	1.0	2 229	4.8
Surry	1 058	2.8	3 115	5.4	657	5.1	1 267	5.9	1 242	1.4	3 206	3.6
Swain	60	4.7	(D)	(D)	46	5.3	23	3.7	77	4.3	64	4.6
Transylvania	123	4.9	155	14.9	88	8.0	56	9.2	164	2.5	181	5.7
Tyrrell	79	2.8	2 412	1.5	71	5.1	1 725	1.1	90	3.1	883	.8
Union	520	5.7	3 337	5.8	448	6.5	2 627	4.7	956	1.7	3 503	2.3
Vance	243	6.9	1 341	8.1	186	8.2	925	18.4	280	3.5	1 286	6.1
Wake	633	3.8	3 619	3.9	592	4.8	2 164	2.1	796	2.0	4 057	2.4
Warren	254	6.0	970	4.6	161	12.1	554	5.7	296	3.8	1 206	5.5
Washington	199	4.1	3 509	4.5	194	5.3	2 323	2.0	216	4.0	1 549	2.1
Watauga	593	3.0	488	9.6	395	7.5	106	13.1	656	1.3	368	11.3
Wayne	703	3.8	5 935	4.2	676	4.4	3 665	2.7	894	1.2	5 824	2.2
Wilkes	520	7.3	1 171	12.0	407	8.5	608	17.2	1 092	1.4	3 467	3.2
Wilson	455	2.3	5 117	1.7	458	2.0	4 471	1.7	484	1.1	3 960	2.3
Yadkin	734	3.9	2 927	6.0	498	6.6	1 145	4.4	923	2.2	2 345	4.2
Yancey	617	2.9	610	17.2	435	6.4	113	7.9	649	2.1	253	8.2

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)
North Carolina	**32 089**	**1.3**	**66 747**	**.6**	**21 919**	**1.4**	**388 338**	**.4**	**6 362**	**2.5**	**41 893**	**1.6**
Alamance	497	5.4	550	3.7	226	10.9	2 332	2.5	74	23.5	164	43.3
Alexander	324	7.2	715	6.9	151	14.5	1 420	3.3	63	27.9	237	27.8
Alleghany	189	11.5	272	10.0	241	8.5	1 420	5.0	38	34.5	57	13.9
Anson	171	8.9	710	.7	101	13.3	4 264	.8	40	19.1	130	11.7
Ashe	281	11.3	60	10.9	326	10.7	444	15.2	138	18.2	111	14.6
Avery	118	15.4	49	8.0	88	20.2	1 049	2.6	48	21.3	107	14.7
Beaufort	309	6.5	941	3.3	249	8.3	5 457	3.7	79	19.0	301	3.4
Bertie	334	5.2	1 109	4.0	251	8.2	4 722	1.3	40	1.2	177	.1
Bladen	367	6.7	593	3.9	263	9.9	4 985	2.0	95	19.2	925	5.3
Brunswick	170	10.5	217	7.7	124	16.6	1 126	4.7	39	40.9	153	38.9
Buncombe	474	7.9	405	4.9	336	10.1	2 596	1.4	148	18.7	225	23.4
Burke	171	11.1	311	1.8	98	16.3	1 865	1.9	74	20.4	378	6.9
Cabarrus	257	8.9	182	15.1	109	19.3	1 243	4.1	38	40.3	97	55.1
Caldwell	133	13.1	144	5.4	67	21.1	1 712	1.5	51	25.8	287	28.9
Camden	57	8.1	128	1.5	44	8.6	1 144	.7	10	10.6	(D)	(D)
Carteret	72	9.9	196	2.1	43	11.8	2 318	.5	14	29.5	140	4.6
Caswell	409	8.1	423	8.0	325	10.4	1 926	7.4	100	24.6	232	44.7
Catawba	269	7.8	281	3.7	79	15.5	1 870	2.0	37	30.4	72	28.4
Chatham	544	5.6	1 226	1.9	271	9.5	4 069	2.5	169	14.6	371	11.7
Cherokee	123	17.0	216	19.0	61	24.4	1 589	8.5	41	37.4	75	17.5
Chowan	109	25.6	194	5.3	105	26.6	2 119	6.9	22	2.1	416	.8
Clay	81	8.5	53	4.7	62	9.9	356	5.5	18	21.8	(D)	(D)
Cleveland	359	10.1	309	8.4	190	17.8	1 522	10.3	25	36.1	263	2.2
Columbus	775	5.1	1 267	4.9	620	6.0	6 330	5.2	244	13.4	1 376	24.0
Craven	232	6.8	704	4.4	159	12.0	3 868	1.2	41	24.7	284	2.3
Cumberland	263	8.4	584	7.4	201	11.3	3 143	1.7	54	24.7	317	8.8
Currituck	56	10.4	148	4.0	42	11.5	2 360	.7	13	24.2	(D)	(D)
Dare	3	10.9	3	4.1	4	8.2	8	6.1	1	20.4	(D)	(D)
Davidson	494	6.9	337	7.3	189	14.5	1 281	7.3	43	32.5	104	30.4
Davie	317	7.7	352	10.2	184	12.6	936	8.0	20	31.3	33	10.9
Duplin	1 065	3.8	3 923	1.7	672	5.1	21 092	1.4	338	9.5	2 932	6.5
Durham	86	13.1	124	9.4	96	11.0	929	10.9	21	26.5	283	31.2
Edgecombe	317	6.7	1 033	3.3	199	8.3	6 807	2.2	64	1.2	891	.2
Forsyth	389	6.6	300	11.1	251	11.0	1 269	5.9	32	43.8	164	12.0
Franklin	383	6.5	859	3.3	325	6.8	4 730	2.6	85	16.4	640	6.5
Gaston	109	17.7	161	19.5	70	22.7	699	2.6	7	7.4	20	7.8
Gates	166	8.1	305	3.2	96	14.8	1 656	1.6	35	32.4	119	2.7
Graham	41	14.3	12	17.3	67	9.8	66	20.7	17	24.3	15	29.0
Granville	484	6.6	566	5.1	397	8.1	3 532	7.3	46	26.0	211	5.4
Greene	366	4.7	1 795	2.7	279	5.9	8 723	2.9	71	22.8	766	3.8
Guilford	570	5.1	728	2.6	480	6.4	5 136	1.8	67	20.8	271	16.0
Halifax	253	8.0	1 524	1.8	224	8.9	9 695	1.2	45	1.4	525	.7
Harnett	499	5.8	1 168	2.5	429	5.6	6 019	3.0	81	20.5	810	6.5
Haywood	250	11.6	238	5.2	239	11.0	1 679	6.6	78	23.6	161	26.8
Henderson	258	7.5	670	2.7	276	7.6	10 423	1.2	87	15.0	651	9.7
Hertford	144	10.2	526	1.2	95	12.5	3 355	1.1	34	31.2	344	3.8
Hoke	113	5.8	756	1.8	77	7.0	4 577	.4	24	14.1	146	1.8
Hyde	111	4.7	200	2.7	91	6.2	1 821	1.0	22	2.2	387	.2
Iredell	716	4.5	1 346	2.8	399	7.5	5 685	3.3	112	15.9	331	39.6

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 13
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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)
Jackson	67	19.8	37	21.4	47	30.6	518	1.3	41	23.0	76	5.2
Johnston	992	4.3	1 871	2.5	583	6.2	10 983	1.7	209	12.7	2 550	5.4
Jones	141	10.5	440	5.0	104	14.3	2 981	4.7	22	39.1	147	4.1
Lee	234	4.6	325	4.4	147	8.9	1 157	4.1	25	33.8	158	12.4
Lenoir	480	3.0	1 638	1.7	382	5.5	9 259	1.1	111	15.7	762	13.5
Lincoln	218	11.4	273	3.2	86	18.8	996	2.3	28	37.8	32	50.5
McDowell	64	25.2	96	2.7	52	26.9	1 453	3.2	26	38.3	72	14.6
Macon	87	17.9	67	12.7	116	16.9	348	5.1	15	64.8	18	8.4
Madison	282	11.8	53	14.5	421	9.8	435	12.1	139	20.6	198	26.6
Martin	425	4.2	1 107	2.6	296	7.9	5 332	1.9	49	22.0	273	8.5
Mecklenburg	165	12.2	440	5.2	91	17.9	9 649	.1	13	43.1	88	9.6
Mitchell	96	20.9	26	35.7	155	14.0	253	9.6	29	42.8	42	22.2
Montgomery	152	8.9	360	1.4	83	13.5	1 019	1.2	30	28.6	68	14.7
Moore	442	5.2	1 054	2.4	271	9.2	3 900	3.4	66	12.5	973	.8
Nash	441	5.7	2 143	1.3	343	6.0	14 459	.9	145	9.2	2 368	1.0
New Hanover	52	5.1	64	4.1	36	5.4	631	2.8	11	12.1	26	15.0
Northampton	283	6.4	943	1.8	230	8.5	5 641	1.4	30	27.5	87	5.5
Onslow	312	5.9	689	3.7	192	11.7	3 238	2.8	65	25.7	293	16.9
Orange	283	8.4	579	4.5	193	9.8	3 504	4.1	51	27.3	79	17.3
Pamlico	58	2.9	233	.9	46	3.1	1 790	.5	11	6.1	249	.4
Pasquotank	125	12.6	226	5.4	90	14.5	3 120	.5	30	26.6	1 614	2.9
Pender	242	9.3	453	3.9	144	10.4	4 129	1.3	55	15.9	746	2.8
Perquimans	167	13.2	280	11.7	83	22.1	1 145	4.9	17	2.8	110	.9
Person	361	5.5	637	6.1	283	7.9	3 742	6.3	51	32.5	139	28.7
Pitt	496	3.6	2 406	.9	412	4.9	13 437	.8	116	13.9	1 023	8.3
Polk	97	6.7	66	3.7	52	12.3	340	10.8	33	17.6	85	16.1
Randolph	813	4.9	1 264	3.5	311	9.6	4 814	2.2	118	15.6	399	13.7
Richmond	156	9.8	513	2.6	109	13.7	2 208	2.9	38	24.5	236	27.2
Robeson	744	5.2	1 597	3.1	567	6.4	8 712	2.5	143	15.0	891	4.4
Rockingham	620	4.8	588	4.4	503	6.3	3 876	4.1	37	34.6	181	20.3
Rowan	383	7.7	434	4.6	141	15.4	3 407	4.2	24	36.4	65	37.2
Rutherford	275	7.8	106	8.8	108	17.5	209	9.1	33	38.5	36	61.5
Sampson	986	4.2	3 267	1.6	706	6.0	27 103	1.2	289	10.8	3 025	6.1
Scotland	92	4.2	273	2.6	60	9.5	2 293	4.5	25	18.7	128	2.3
Stanly	316	7.6	517	3.5	116	14.9	2 258	.7	31	36.1	52	10.3
Stokes	760	4.3	505	5.2	528	6.6	1 909	6.1	53	28.0	187	32.9
Surry	869	4.1	934	3.4	597	5.4	3 744	5.5	118	19.5	438	8.9
Swain	43	5.5	35	12.4	31	6.2	323	3.7	6	13.8	15	10.9
Transylvania	83	7.6	92	8.8	46	12.4	932	2.6	26	16.1	96	29.1
Tyrrell	63	6.2	193	.9	46	9.7	1 943	.7	15	15.5	129	1.1
Union	652	4.5	1 630	1.2	285	8.6	6 931	1.3	92	14.8	860	7.3
Vance	200	7.2	400	7.7	159	9.5	2 210	3.3	66	26.8	206	15.4
Wake	614	4.7	1 674	3.4	368	6.7	9 095	1.1	161	13.0	1 079	24.0
Warren	173	11.2	540	2.5	164	9.5	3 192	2.6	35	36.7	52	34.6
Washington	181	8.3	523	8.5	118	13.3	3 076	.5	36	21.9	557	.7
Watauga	251	10.8	83	17.9	170	15.4	620	29.2	77	25.5	81	32.8
Wayne	701	4.0	2 225	1.2	542	5.6	10 861	1.2	112	9.7	1 385	2.1
Wilkes	773	4.5	1 723	1.9	349	7.6	3 670	8.4	89	24.7	255	7.4
Wilson	357	4.1	1 327	1.7	329	6.9	10 575	1.2	103	18.7	1 293	4.0
Yadkin	718	4.8	847	4.4	376	8.1	3 305	8.3	45	22.8	374	5.6
Yancey	226	12.1	40	9.5	281	9.7	249	13.0	89	22.4	161	49.6

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)
North Carolina	**42 818**	**1.1**	**171 928**	**.8**	**16 441**	**1.7**	**42 312**	**1.8**	**19 038**	**1.5**	**143 502**	**.8**
Alamance	634	3.2	1 630	5.2	213	12.4	301	7.1	236	11.3	1 375	10.3
Alexander	451	3.4	1 018	5.8	132	14.6	119	9.3	211	10.0	1 254	6.7
Alleghany	396	5.3	899	9.3	108	20.1	136	11.4	184	11.0	878	15.9
Anson	274	6.5	1 308	2.6	82	15.0	150	6.7	151	13.3	1 530	5.4
Ashe	747	3.8	604	8.6	187	15.2	68	17.0	262	12.8	576	16.0
Avery	183	10.3	248	10.2	47	30.1	35	10.7	35	15.1	130	9.8
Beaufort	384	4.2	3 158	3.9	175	11.5	583	6.8	275	7.2	2 579	3.1
Bertie	399	5.1	3 103	2.6	206	9.8	1 043	3.2	244	8.0	2 037	2.1
Bladen	474	5.1	1 963	3.6	196	13.8	441	14.6	213	11.6	2 049	3.3
Brunswick	175	10.1	564	10.3	56	34.4	108	29.5	100	19.3	609	9.7
Buncombe	804	4.2	1 362	4.2	168	17.3	107	11.5	187	15.4	896	11.7
Burke	299	2.0	646	8.3	98	19.6	92	24.6	59	16.7	573	4.2
Cabarrus	352	5.7	596	10.0	61	26.1	36	15.8	122	18.5	520	20.7
Caldwell	251	6.6	509	9.5	68	22.1	50	19.8	79	21.1	326	12.1
Camden	82	3.0	1 055	3.2	39	11.2	230	3.6	38	9.3	742	4.7
Carteret	102	5.0	872	2.2	38	12.6	759	3.3	53	10.4	287	6.6
Caswell	487	4.6	1 304	8.5	216	16.3	235	12.3	188	15.7	974	13.9
Catawba	365	6.0	836	7.3	74	16.0	82	16.8	101	17.2	470	11.1
Chatham	781	2.9	2 344	4.4	227	11.9	239	11.6	371	7.5	1 897	5.5

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 14
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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)
Cherokee	187	8.9	368	17.9	29	45.8	12	14.6	69	24.0	189	26.0
Chowan	137	20.5	1 183	4.3	123	16.8	443	25.8	100	20.7	1 111	13.6
Clay	129	4.4	178	11.7	30	16.9	16	19.4	54	11.8	228	11.3
Cleveland	572	4.8	995	14.3	123	22.7	189	59.7	216	14.9	683	13.0
Columbus	913	4.1	3 291	4.0	522	8.2	1 252	10.3	563	7.7	2 910	8.1
Craven	282	4.9	1 808	5.1	137	14.2	518	7.3	146	12.2	1 323	2.8
Cumberland	335	6.2	1 454	6.4	126	14.6	302	6.8	162	12.9	1 224	6.0
Currituck	83	2.6	930	1.7	28	15.9	97	5.7	39	11.9	519	2.4
Dare	7	7.3	25	3.6	5	6.6	99	3.6	3	–	34	–
Davidson	726	4.0	1 261	7.7	193	15.6	187	18.7	109	18.5	755	12.0
Davie	460	4.4	1 169	20.1	105	20.4	102	12.5	128	15.7	923	21.4
Duplin	1 102	3.6	5 914	2.3	669	5.9	2 068	3.5	713	5.2	8 521	1.7
Durham	149	4.6	601	6.3	44	22.4	45	11.2	53	15.5	124	13.3
Edgecombe	324	6.0	3 247	2.7	186	12.2	1 100	4.9	200	10.4	3 058	2.7
Forsyth	529	4.5	1 005	13.9	98	20.6	89	23.5	178	16.1	627	12.9
Franklin	488	4.1	2 052	6.5	169	10.9	389	5.8	285	8.9	1 817	7.0
Gaston	253	4.6	455	7.1	47	27.6	28	11.2	53	27.4	362	12.6
Gates	185	3.8	1 524	5.1	115	12.6	524	8.5	108	16.1	834	6.0
Graham	113	5.3	96	12.5	8	32.2	1	41.1	37	12.9	87	19.4
Granville	619	3.7	1 487	5.8	246	12.1	376	8.7	242	11.5	739	11.6
Greene	377	3.4	3 400	3.1	222	10.0	1 271	8.1	238	8.7	2 510	1.5
Guilford	848	2.3	2 093	2.6	316	9.6	378	8.4	270	9.4	1 433	6.6
Halifax	315	4.6	3 720	2.0	176	10.5	1 497	3.0	179	7.1	3 072	.9
Harnett	651	3.0	2 594	6.8	255	11.9	335	5.0	321	9.2	2 690	9.1
Haywood	648	3.9	667	5.7	90	21.1	120	23.4	192	13.4	523	14.2
Henderson	427	4.2	2 738	1.7	110	14.5	368	7.1	153	10.8	1 396	6.9
Hertford	177	5.4	1 452	4.2	80	15.5	420	8.0	126	11.9	1 404	3.4
Hoke	142	4.8	1 100	1.6	52	8.9	429	2.2	74	5.7	980	3.3
Hyde	126	3.4	1 363	2.0	63	8.8	600	3.7	88	6.2	1 209	3.7
Iredell	988	2.4	2 630	2.9	317	8.4	523	6.8	388	6.7	2 580	5.3
Jackson	141	10.5	170	15.2	36	26.1	53	4.7	38	35.4	121	7.8
Johnston	1 227	2.8	5 823	2.8	701	6.5	1 485	7.4	640	6.7	4 075	4.7
Jones	194	2.3	1 095	6.9	124	15.4	332	11.1	116	14.1	840	11.4
Lee	246	4.7	745	10.2	112	14.3	89	16.8	140	11.6	719	5.6
Lenoir	492	3.3	3 412	2.2	281	6.8	1 726	31.2	295	8.5	2 731	3.8
Lincoln	338	6.2	586	5.7	86	19.5	93	14.4	106	18.3	555	17.5
McDowell	155	9.4	274	13.9	49	26.3	56	20.4	25	31.8	327	5.7
Macon	254	4.0	281	14.0	46	31.2	38	18.6	32	36.0	126	21.4
Madison	812	5.2	540	8.5	89	26.0	25	27.2	216	14.9	514	18.2
Martin	427	4.6	2 844	3.1	305	7.9	1 051	7.0	229	8.8	1 823	3.5
Mecklenburg	219	6.7	1 911	2.9	75	23.3	93	27.4	35	30.0	750	4.8
Mitchell	225	8.9	255	16.2	55	30.9	31	49.5	54	29.3	139	27.5
Montgomery	171	7.5	485	4.4	59	15.3	77	20.6	89	12.2	910	4.8
Moore	548	3.9	1 671	2.8	202	11.5	298	3.7	231	7.7	1 526	3.1
Nash	495	3.3	4 396	1.5	228	8.8	934	4.4	314	7.7	4 250	1.3
New Hanover	56	4.9	143	2.6	11	11.1	9	14.1	19	8.0	71	7.2
Northampton	311	5.6	2 723	2.6	201	8.2	1 398	6.3	200	9.0	2 740	2.6
Onslow	384	3.6	1 417	4.6	181	12.3	665	19.0	179	11.0	1 277	4.8
Orange	389	3.9	1 366	5.7	166	12.2	242	18.2	127	14.5	1 075	11.6
Pamlico	68	2.7	804	1.2	36	3.3	206	1.4	43	3.0	600	.5
Pasquotank	175	5.7	1 998	3.0	73	16.3	816	5.9	78	13.1	1 227	2.1
Pender	284	6.3	1 272	7.5	139	12.8	338	8.5	157	11.9	1 099	5.0
Perquimans	208	7.2	1 508	6.9	112	17.8	503	9.9	132	15.1	834	11.9
Person	399	4.4	1 506	8.1	147	14.6	269	5.6	188	15.1	989	14.2
Pitt	546	2.2	5 670	2.2	336	6.1	1 483	3.5	308	6.3	3 701	1.5
Polk	130	4.3	256	9.0	44	12.4	84	6.9	51	12.0	223	9.6
Randolph	1 063	2.9	2 818	3.8	343	10.3	588	7.6	312	7.8	1 964	5.2
Richmond	192	5.8	808	4.7	68	17.5	127	15.8	129	9.6	885	5.4
Robeson	887	4.8	4 428	3.2	475	7.8	1 461	8.2	513	7.3	3 478	5.0
Rockingham	757	3.9	1 699	5.0	248	13.0	223	9.0	256	10.8	977	9.5
Rowan	610	4.0	1 246	4.6	162	15.4	310	3.7	266	10.8	1 664	11.7
Rutherford	391	4.6	453	13.6	106	19.2	54	19.7	121	17.2	376	22.8
Sampson	1 233	3.1	7 359	2.3	745	6.0	2 050	6.2	606	6.5	7 387	3.1
Scotland	97	5.1	984	2.8	36	14.3	289	15.2	53	10.4	671	3.5
Stanly	423	4.9	1 691	6.3	120	16.9	196	15.6	195	11.3	1 501	7.4
Stokes	930	3.0	1 446	6.1	276	10.4	161	11.2	338	9.6	1 397	11.6
Surry	1 117	2.5	2 625	4.6	454	8.1	422	7.5	618	6.7	2 907	6.5
Swain	68	4.5	114	5.5	14	9.1	32	2.4	16	8.0	123	7.3
Transylvania	127	5.0	247	6.2	32	18.4	13	32.8	35	14.2	212	13.9
Tyrrell	85	4.9	881	2.8	39	10.4	318	2.1	53	9.7	728	1.4
Union	831	3.1	3 785	3.5	344	9.2	503	12.0	433	6.3	4 771	1.9
Vance	222	9.7	1 102	9.0	78	22.2	120	4.4	101	18.8	390	9.6
Wake	707	3.4	3 427	2.4	238	11.5	431	10.5	313	8.8	1 833	8.6
Warren	267	6.2	1 181	4.4	89	20.7	133	15.3	124	14.6	932	6.6
Washington	208	5.4	3 956	2.2	133	10.9	592	10.5	117	10.7	2 476	1.4
Watauga	439	6.6	394	11.6	96	23.6	89	31.7	181	14.6	486	21.8
Wayne	791	2.9	4 538	2.4	435	8.3	1 378	6.2	503	6.5	3 902	4.1
Wilkes	864	3.9	2 802	3.2	226	13.1	275	17.2	413	8.1	2 868	5.1
Wilson	422	4.3	3 422	2.3	272	9.0	1 019	3.4	239	9.6	2 273	5.8
Yadkin	803	3.8	2 135	4.6	342	10.2	500	5.3	324	10.2	1 987	8.4
Yancey	458	5.8	417	12.4	101	21.8	41	36.5	141	16.6	506	19.3

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 15
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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)
North Carolina	**16 600**	**1.7**	**163 376**	**.9**	**49 192**	**1.0**	**59 169**	**1.1**	**45 144**	**1.1**	**364 899**	**.4**
Alamance	221	11.3	782	7.4	699	2.1	610	5.8	647	3.1	2 552	3.6
Alexander	155	14.6	617	26.3	491	2.2	325	4.7	435	4.3	3 067	3.7
Alleghany	134	14.9	351	11.7	488	.9	453	6.4	412	4.4	1 125	4.6
Anson	120	16.7	570	9.5	320	.9	525	6.8	276	6.4	7 087	.6
Ashe	121	20.7	111	30.7	1 002	1.3	876	7.4	846	2.9	702	6.4
Avery	69	26.2	114	23.3	262	3.3	167	16.2	210	8.4	683	2.7
Beaufort	256	6.4	3 692	2.7	417	3.0	536	3.4	404	3.9	3 668	3.7
Bertie	240	8.1	3 429	4.4	412	4.1	839	4.1	412	4.1	4 610	1.4
Bladen	205	13.0	2 488	3.8	584	2.4	824	11.9	530	4.0	3 597	2.5
Brunswick	98	22.8	511	7.3	211	5.6	179	5.9	213	1.8	722	8.5
Buncombe	182	15.7	338	8.4	1 055	1.5	1 374	4.9	826	4.1	2 212	5.2
Burke	56	25.2	185	9.4	331	3.1	302	11.6	284	6.0	1 826	2.3
Cabarrus	94	20.5	195	12.0	431	1.0	463	6.0	356	5.7	835	9.3
Caldwell	113	16.7	262	21.8	316	1.7	231	6.8	262	4.9	1 152	3.1
Camden	45	8.5	1 350	1.6	85	2.9	(D)	(D)	84	3.5	1 528	.8
Carteret	34	6.6	307	3.3	109	2.6	444	1.2	94	7.1	533	2.7
Caswell	193	14.1	1 025	18.1	568	3.2	641	7.8	535	3.4	1 596	7.1
Catawba	127	15.0	269	18.8	486	1.5	463	6.6	434	3.9	1 665	1.9
Chatham	255	10.5	548	5.2	884	1.8	885	4.6	790	2.9	7 775	1.6
Cherokee	72	28.4	70	32.9	221	1.5	154	11.2	198	6.8	1 169	8.5
Chowan	48	3.0	1 109	1.3	178	2.3	323	4.6	178	2.3	1 695	1.3
Clay	32	14.2	38	11.4	155	2.6	114	10.1	128	4.2	214	4.5
Cleveland	181	17.2	488	25.2	664	3.2	594	6.9	612	3.6	1 940	8.0
Columbus	470	8.0	4 267	6.1	1 093	1.7	1 173	9.3	1 006	3.1	3 519	4.5
Craven	155	10.9	2 798	3.4	301	3.5	465	4.2	284	3.9	3 046	2.4
Cumberland	136	14.0	1 238	5.6	413	3.6	680	6.9	399	3.6	1 901	4.0
Currituck	47	12.3	1 299	6.5	85	4.3	158	7.0	82	2.6	1 079	2.7
Dare	6	9.2	143	5.9	4	8.2	(D)	(D)	7	7.3	28	2.6
Davidson	277	10.5	381	12.3	823	2.1	578	6.4	786	2.7	1 408	3.8
Davie	101	20.2	245	4.7	530	2.0	484	7.4	453	4.7	951	7.2
Duplin	455	8.0	5 607	3.4	1 283	2.6	2 540	8.9	1 244	2.8	25 539	1.0
Durham	59	18.0	323	2.9	160	1.3	269	8.6	150	4.6	420	8.3
Edgecombe	178	11.4	5 772	2.1	356	3.6	1 008	4.4	349	4.5	4 747	1.3
Forsyth	152	16.2	419	20.2	599	3.1	574	6.2	580	2.7	954	9.9
Franklin	229	7.6	3 331	5.3	509	3.4	688	4.4	479	3.8	2 834	3.4
Gaston	109	15.4	126	10.9	272	3.8	255	7.8	253	4.7	777	3.6
Gates	95	9.4	1 665	.7	180	7.6	366	5.1	176	5.2	2 129	4.9
Graham	37	16.4	16	24.5	133	4.0	58	8.4	112	5.3	99	11.6
Granville	214	10.8	1 935	10.9	688	2.3	695	5.2	657	3.4	2 386	2.4
Greene	151	11.4	3 973	3.7	381	4.0	933	11.3	393	2.4	8 862	2.4
Guilford	276	8.8	1 288	5.2	936	1.6	1 168	6.3	904	2.4	3 038	2.0
Halifax	199	10.6	5 665	.9	330	3.4	718	3.8	291	6.6	5 377	.7
Harnett	300	9.0	4 370	3.6	704	2.6	974	9.5	645	2.7	4 399	1.3
Haywood	222	12.6	319	18.1	737	3.0	744	4.6	640	4.2	1 122	5.8
Henderson	191	9.9	1 100	4.8	448	3.9	509	4.3	452	2.9	5 606	.8
Hertford	98	12.8	1 350	2.7	189	2.1	388	4.4	186	4.6	2 707	1.9
Hoke	56	8.8	1 051	3.4	162	3.1	232	6.3	150	4.5	4 453	.6
Hyde	73	7.0	2 355	2.1	133	2.5	475	2.9	132	3.1	1 663	1.4
Iredell	348	9.0	842	5.9	1 098	1.5	1 009	5.3	950	3.0	5 285	2.8
Jackson	28	43.3	27	26.5	179	4.0	99	8.8	143	9.1	455	4.7
Johnston	584	6.6	7 480	2.7	1 338	1.7	1 591	4.5	1 267	2.3	7 198	1.8
Jones	61	16.3	1 571	1.1	180	6.1	292	12.4	173	6.3	2 433	2.3
Lee	96	10.7	960	6.5	288	2.9	316	7.4	247	6.2	1 237	1.8
Lenoir	209	10.5	4 600	3.5	500	1.9	753	3.7	505	2.4	5 652	1.3
Lincoln	139	15.3	196	12.8	406	2.7	341	8.4	341	5.8	1 335	3.6
McDowell	45	23.1	38	15.2	184	4.4	148	11.4	148	10.4	1 656	1.5
Macon	38	34.1	56	34.9	279	2.3	124	12.6	217	8.0	319	5.7
Madison	172	17.8	134	22.4	1 118	2.3	724	8.5	840	4.6	573	7.2
Martin	250	8.6	3 565	2.8	472	2.9	667	4.1	488	2.4	4 010	1.5
Mecklenburg	57	24.1	427	8.8	272	2.8	589	9.7	238	6.2	9 378	.3
Mitchell	31	37.8	18	42.7	313	2.7	164	8.3	257	6.9	260	12.0
Montgomery	48	22.8	85	14.5	223	3.1	240	5.2	205	5.0	4 024	.6
Moore	157	13.4	1 090	3.8	698	.8	659	3.2	619	3.3	6 839	1.7
Nash	246	8.1	6 941	1.6	548	1.6	1 107	5.2	526	3.0	7 881	.7
New Hanover	16	8.9	24	7.4	60	4.8	55	6.5	56	4.8	324	1.6
Northampton	233	8.4	2 880	2.8	337	4.7	635	2.9	360	2.9	4 038	1.4
Onslow	164	10.1	1 551	7.6	396	3.9	381	4.9	378	3.6	3 154	4.3
Orange	144	12.5	473	19.8	416	2.5	622	7.6	336	5.6	2 342	6.8
Pamlico	45	2.8	1 049	1.0	81	2.7	197	1.4	75	2.8	1 243	.5
Pasquotank	91	14.3	2 059	3.1	182	5.1	408	8.0	184	5.0	1 779	1.6
Pender	131	10.5	1 025	5.5	328	1.8	465	6.8	293	5.1	2 897	1.9
Perquimans	161	13.7	2 109	16.1	225	2.8	241	8.9	226	2.7	1 649	6.8
Person	188	14.5	1 786	30.7	437	4.1	520	4.7	420	3.5	1 832	8.4
Pitt	289	6.7	8 104	2.1	502	3.3	1 145	3.7	555	2.0	19 674	.4
Polk	27	20.5	52	17.6	159	2.0	154	7.1	130	4.0	361	4.8
Randolph	292	10.6	573	7.6	1 238	1.7	1 207	6.2	1 119	2.6	8 687	1.6
Richmond	84	8.3	374	10.0	220	.9	358	9.1	212	3.4	2 568	1.8
Robeson	524	7.4	6 115	3.4	1 089	3.3	1 697	4.2	1 068	3.4	6 739	1.6
Rockingham	235	11.8	1 140	9.2	840	2.7	631	4.4	825	2.8	2 018	4.1

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 16
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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)
Rowan	161	14.5	417	2.8	728	1.7	705	6.9	681	2.7	2 120	2.4
Rutherford	70	21.1	48	31.3	447	2.2	384	8.9	349	5.9	455	9.1
Sampson	572	7.5	6 510	2.5	1 287	2.7	1 916	3.9	1 223	3.0	21 097	1.3
Scotland	57	9.1	821	3.7	117	3.6	247	5.0	112	3.7	1 719	1.0
Stanly	148	13.7	1 156	4.5	505	3.3	501	5.3	462	4.4	4 004	1.1
Stokes	240	12.3	771	15.7	1 018	1.7	733	5.4	964	2.2	1 426	5.1
Surry	323	9.6	1 324	8.9	1 215	1.9	893	4.5	1 108	2.7	4 051	3.5
Swain	22	7.4	37	2.6	76	4.3	(D)	(D)	68	4.5	138	3.3
Transylvania	55	10.8	92	30.3	172	2.5	139	5.8	141	4.1	724	2.5
Tyrrell	37	9.6	1 563	.8	95	1.9	323	2.9	81	5.5	1 706	.9
Union	238	8.2	2 274	2.8	1 007	1.3	1 490	3.5	908	2.6	19 332	.4
Vance	159	13.7	1 227	10.3	254	5.4	329	6.0	260	4.7	1 325	8.2
Wake	293	9.2	3 465	5.3	772	2.5	1 019	8.2	707	2.8	4 800	2.2
Warren	123	11.1	821	16.9	295	5.1	427	4.5	310	2.9	2 078	1.9
Washington	109	14.9	1 779	8.8	208	5.4	585	2.6	218	3.9	3 923	1.0
Watauga	137	17.1	197	29.5	631	2.5	433	9.9	534	4.7	506	12.7
Wayne	380	9.4	5 367	3.8	846	2.5	1 034	5.3	826	2.4	13 992	1.4
Wilkes	290	11.4	892	4.0	1 088	1.9	894	5.1	969	3.1	13 146	1.4
Wilson	274	7.5	6 152	1.7	437	3.1	746	4.0	471	2.2	6 392	2.8
Yadkin	319	10.1	1 152	4.3	928	2.2	794	4.9	866	3.0	2 729	3.2
Yancey	123	19.0	81	26.9	642	2.4	312	6.1	509	5.2	401	11.7

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)
North Carolina	**51 858**	**1.0**	**912 136**	**.7**	**47 497**	**1.0**	**5 578 191**	**.7**	**42 135**	**1.0**	**3 998 685**	**.7**
Alamance	725	1.4	6 155	7.7	670	1.4	55 949	1.8	577	1.5	27 629	2.1
Alexander	507	.9	5 036	9.7	419	.8	29 654	1.1	342	1.0	14 940	1.3
Alleghany	490	.9	2 439	20.5	459	.7	39 685	1.7	412	.9	14 057	1.5
Anson	343	1.0	9 783	2.9	261	1.0	34 648	1.6	184	1.5	20 619	2.2
Ashe	1 032	.7	3 284	20.6	986	.6	47 741	1.3	898	.7	12 308	1.3
Avery	273	1.6	1 540	9.9	262	1.2	8 063	2.2	248	1.3	4 529	2.2
Beaufort	446	1.9	9 541	5.4	430	1.9	128 705	1.0	410	2.0	120 549	1.0
Bertie	456	2.3	18 185	3.0	403	2.1	97 382	1.0	391	2.2	84 264	1.0
Bladen	607	1.5	10 173	4.2	575	1.4	81 127	1.3	542	1.5	59 791	1.3
Brunswick	225	1.8	1 807	14.0	216	1.5	24 746	1.8	188	1.8	17 100	1.7
Buncombe	1 096	1.1	4 613	12.7	1 030	1.0	39 513	1.2	923	1.0	16 367	1.0
Burke	348	1.2	2 711	7.5	327	.9	15 179	1.8	294	1.1	7 486	2.4
Cabarrus	431	1.0	1 890	30.0	376	.8	36 809	1.8	310	1.1	20 074	2.1
Caldwell	327	1.6	2 536	25.8	302	1.1	14 312	1.9	260	1.4	6 700	1.8
Camden	88	2.8	1 693	4.5	84	2.3	39 357	1.0	79	2.6	38 192	1.0
Carteret	112	2.2	1 375	4.7	104	1.8	37 237	.7	95	2.1	35 174	.6
Caswell	602	1.2	6 181	5.9	575	1.0	50 233	1.4	537	1.1	19 813	1.4
Catawba	507	.9	1 957	11.5	473	.6	39 910	1.3	386	.9	20 385	1.8
Chatham	927	.6	15 423	4.5	741	.6	49 411	1.0	555	.8	18 181	1.2
Cherokee	222	1.5	967	50.6	201	1.3	9 293	3.3	162	1.8	4 627	3.1
Chowan	179	2.3	3 072	17.8	163	2.3	41 420	1.3	155	2.4	35 932	1.3
Clay	161	2.1	671	14.5	147	1.3	8 235	2.8	127	1.7	3 730	3.6
Cleveland	716	1.0	3 023	19.1	656	.8	61 984	1.4	516	1.0	26 227	1.8
Columbus	1 110	1.6	8 337	10.0	1 070	1.6	110 638	1.2	994	1.6	84 313	1.1
Craven	326	1.9	9 142	3.8	294	1.8	65 311	1.1	271	2.0	53 028	1.1
Cumberland	436	1.3	6 507	13.2	397	1.3	64 007	1.1	349	1.4	48 701	1.1
Currituck	90	2.5	1 894	6.7	83	2.2	37 025	1.5	79	2.3	35 826	1.6
Dare	7	7.3	–44	22.2	6	8.3	5 834	4.5	6	8.3	4 827	5.3
Davidson	863	.9	4 833	10.5	821	.7	53 826	1.1	744	.7	30 811	1.2
Davie	547	1.1	850	58.7	510	.9	41 749	1.4	433	1.1	22 569	1.7
Duplin	1 358	2.0	67 370	1.8	1 161	1.8	162 326	1.4	1 038	2.0	131 620	1.4
Durham	162	1.3	2 043	17.5	151	.9	9 849	1.7	121	1.4	4 802	2.3
Edgecombe	375	1.4	13 448	2.4	344	1.5	119 444	.6	317	1.6	96 898	.5
Forsyth	647	1.0	2 219	20.4	615	.8	27 273	1.9	540	.9	13 558	2.4
Franklin	550	1.9	9 111	6.2	520	1.8	58 833	1.6	462	2.0	37 876	1.7
Gaston	293	1.2	1 245	20.0	262	1.0	19 563	1.5	229	1.2	11 103	1.6
Gates	200	1.2	4 731	3.4	173	1.1	48 273	.6	159	1.2	44 612	.6
Graham	147	2.4	186	30.6	137	2.0	3 338	4.2	127	2.2	964	6.5
Granville	724	1.7	9 335	5.3	686	1.6	60 925	1.6	640	1.6	25 443	1.5
Greene	408	1.4	27 137	3.9	385	1.0	89 453	.8	371	1.1	75 992	.8
Guilford	970	1.1	10 871	4.2	899	1.1	64 033	1.4	810	1.2	35 891	1.4
Halifax	347	1.9	12 062	2.2	309	1.7	134 782	.7	286	1.8	105 404	.6
Harnett	753	1.1	14 293	5.5	704	1.0	80 239	.8	627	1.1	54 174	.9
Haywood	813	1.1	2 632	10.4	740	1.0	27 390	1.8	665	1.1	9 680	1.4
Henderson	511	1.2	6 548	5.2	489	1.0	33 069	1.0	450	1.1	24 194	1.0
Hertford	195	2.1	7 097	3.6	171	2.3	44 468	1.3	169	2.3	38 582	1.2
Hoke	173	2.1	6 491	3.5	151	1.9	43 813	1.2	132	2.2	35 693	1.3
Hyde	135	2.6	4 784	2.2	135	1.8	84 084	.9	128	2.0	77 146	.8
Iredell	1 143	.8	8 739	5.2	999	.8	93 292	.9	850	.9	52 907	.9

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 17
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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

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

Geographic area	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text)[1]				Total cropland				Harvested cropland			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Acres		Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Jackson	186	1.8	1 000	9.9	176	1.4	5 458	4.0	162	1.6	2 420	3.6
Johnston	1 405	.8	28 506	4.4	1 347	.9	156 034	.6	1 225	.9	119 029	.6
Jones	195	2.3	6 799	10.6	180	2.2	49 881	1.7	172	2.3	39 832	1.7
Lee	301	1.0	3 498	7.0	280	.8	16 605	1.1	234	1.2	9 113	1.3
Lenoir	532	1.2	17 570	4.0	484	.9	107 110	.6	455	1.0	92 598	.6
Lincoln	424	1.3	1 512	14.0	393	1.2	36 030	2.2	351	1.4	21 533	2.6
McDowell	194	1.4	1 277	32.9	181	1.2	8 366	2.5	156	1.6	4 254	3.0
Macon	291	1.1	861	28.2	262	1.1	10 787	2.1	238	1.3	4 296	2.2
Madison	1 179	1.4	4 022	13.3	1 132	1.4	32 830	2.5	1 045	1.5	7 835	2.4
Martin	488	2.4	12 969	2.7	458	2.1	91 627	1.2	447	2.1	79 943	1.2
Mecklenburg	280	1.1	6 433	2.6	249	.9	17 518	2.3	210	1.3	10 448	2.8
Mitchell	322	1.3	528	46.9	309	1.0	8 538	3.2	286	1.1	2 817	3.7
Montgomery	236	1.0	6 316	2.5	193	.7	13 836	1.6	150	1.1	7 031	2.2
Moore	702	.8	13 991	2.1	594	.8	33 993	1.3	450	1.1	15 937	2.0
Nash	561	.9	22 416	3.0	491	.8	110 273	.4	443	.8	84 773	.3
New Hanover	68	4.4	606	4.0	62	2.0	2 052	3.7	58	2.4	1 669	3.8
Northampton	381	1.8	15 644	3.4	335	1.8	99 588	.9	311	1.9	78 928	.8
Onslow	425	1.4	5 981	6.8	388	1.1	43 991	1.3	342	1.3	35 890	1.4
Orange	432	1.0	6 966	5.6	400	.8	38 067	1.2	350	1.0	20 435	1.2
Pamlico	82	2.7	3 329	.9	72	1.4	38 516	.7	70	1.5	35 535	.8
Pasquotank	199	2.3	3 866	3.7	188	2.4	77 330	1.2	181	2.4	74 841	1.2
Pender	332	1.7	4 812	7.1	304	1.6	39 855	1.7	262	1.8	31 390	1.9
Perquimans	226	2.7	7 436	10.3	207	2.6	58 873	1.9	196	2.6	55 546	1.9
Person	476	1.3	8 734	10.4	457	1.1	54 569	1.0	431	1.2	25 199	1.0
Pitt	583	1.2	27 488	1.8	530	1.0	150 705	.5	485	1.1	123 154	.5
Polk	162	1.8	–183	45.2	144	1.1	8 551	2.4	119	1.6	3 886	2.7
Randolph	1 292	.9	19 330	3.0	1 107	.9	75 239	1.2	873	1.0	38 831	1.2
Richmond	221	.9	8 500	7.6	187	.8	27 476	1.6	146	1.2	17 348	2.3
Robeson	1 192	2.3	28 302	3.8	1 135	2.1	223 813	1.4	1 097	2.1	194 364	1.4
Rockingham	901	1.5	11 243	4.7	877	1.5	59 019	1.7	815	1.6	29 195	1.6
Rowan	750	1.0	4 495	8.1	705	.8	67 294	1.4	609	1.0	39 792	1.7
Rutherford	464	.9	–632	32.2	424	.7	26 784	1.6	349	1.0	10 674	2.3
Sampson	1 344	2.2	61 372	2.2	1 204	2.3	182 913	1.3	1 078	2.4	153 180	1.3
Scotland	125	2.5	3 476	6.4	114	1.9	43 046	1.4	106	2.2	36 041	1.5
Stanly	550	.8	2 228	13.6	494	.8	67 819	.9	394	1.0	48 636	1.0
Stokes	1 074	.9	10 806	5.3	1 055	.8	46 757	1.6	990	.9	18 584	2.4
Surry	1 269	1.1	12 960	4.8	1 189	.9	66 672	.9	1 054	.9	35 721	.9
Swain	80	4.2	385	2.9	70	2.4	1 942	7.7	63	2.8	947	5.5
Transylvania	176	2.0	1 313	5.5	156	1.3	6 692	3.2	120	2.0	3 698	3.9
Tyrrell	96	1.9	5 728	1.2	84	1.3	58 823	.5	81	1.5	56 466	.5
Union	1 039	.9	31 809	1.3	845	.6	125 673	.7	583	.9	98 608	.8
Vance	289	1.6	5 350	15.7	273	1.1	26 742	1.5	257	1.2	16 162	1.6
Wake	834	1.1	23 656	2.5	768	1.0	66 373	1.0	678	1.1	44 287	1.0
Warren	326	1.2	10 461	4.1	299	1.2	36 481	1.2	251	1.4	16 931	1.4
Washington	228	1.7	7 579	4.7	198	1.6	86 949	.8	180	1.8	82 419	.7
Watauga	674	.8	2 155	18.5	646	.6	23 386	1.5	600	.7	6 087	1.5
Wayne	902	1.2	33 406	2.2	804	.9	134 342	.7	732	1.0	117 481	.7
Wilkes	1 140	.8	26 223	3.1	961	.7	51 523	.8	785	.8	23 214	.8
Wilson	488	1.1	23 874	2.0	468	.8	107 059	.5	453	.9	91 248	.4
Yadkin	968	1.3	8 104	10.4	893	1.3	66 873	1.5	804	1.4	40 997	1.7
Yancey	671	1.3	1 719	16.7	653	1.2	14 088	2.4	620	1.2	4 154	2.3

Geographic area	Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry							
					Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
	Farms		Acres		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)
North Carolina	**4 337**	**1.1**	**112 630**	**.5**	**22 718**	**.8**	**901 980**	**.7**	**19 531**	**.9**	**385 428**	**.9**
Alamance	93	3.9	1 246	3.4	457	1.6	22 262	2.1	389	1.7	8 445	3.0
Alexander	6	11.0	178	2.6	377	.9	18 765	1.0	317	1.1	6 762	1.4
Alleghany	11	9.9	28	10.9	364	1.0	23 301	1.4	253	1.5	7 015	2.7
Anson	10	9.8	141	12.6	185	1.5	9 166	2.5	167	1.7	4 674	3.5
Ashe	17	6.6	113	3.3	652	.9	21 714	1.3	517	1.1	9 076	1.4
Avery	22	7.1	178	12.0	77	3.5	1 500	3.7	72	3.7	786	3.8
Beaufort	17	6.5	352	3.3	43	5.4	925	5.9	33	6.6	(D)	(D)
Bertie	21	3.8	4 726	.6	40	4.6	1 778	3.0	36	4.8	(D)	(D)
Bladen	32	4.6	993	4.1	128	3.1	5 363	3.2	111	3.3	3 221	4.4
Brunswick	15	6.5	272	1.0	35	5.9	840	5.4	32	6.3	376	5.9
Buncombe	74	3.7	361	2.0	674	1.2	22 963	1.2	555	1.4	8 201	1.7
Burke	30	4.9	483	3.0	187	1.7	5 021	2.3	165	1.9	2 275	2.8
Cabarrus	18	6.5	249	2.4	299	1.1	13 961	2.4	276	1.2	7 055	2.6
Caldwell	42	4.5	650	4.6	196	1.7	6 577	1.9	173	1.9	2 908	2.6
Camden	5	14.1	64	4.8	14	8.3	349	4.2	13	8.1	(D)	(D)
Carteret	17	7.0	100	4.9	11	9.4	(D)	(D)	10	10.3	(D)	(D)
Caswell	146	2.1	2 061	2.0	285	1.5	9 875	2.0	249	1.6	4 155	2.3
Catawba	23	4.2	330	12.2	372	.9	16 761	1.7	329	1.0	7 204	2.5
Chatham	44	3.7	490	2.0	662	.7	32 647	.9	587	.8	16 047	1.0

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 18
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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			
					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)
Cherokee	19	7.8	86	11.7	153	1.9	5 028	3.7	134	2.2	2 429	4.0
Chowan	24	5.0	1 714	5.1	28	6.4	924	6.6	23	7.3	(D)	(D)
Clay	2	27.0	(D)	(D)	124	1.8	4 734	2.6	108	2.1	2 211	3.2
Cleveland	33	4.5	486	6.1	493	1.0	21 905	1.6	449	1.1	11 343	1.9
Columbus	31	5.8	363	8.1	214	2.6	5 950	3.4	189	2.7	2 985	4.4
Craven	19	6.7	440	5.7	61	3.9	1 789	4.2	53	4.1	(D)	(D)
Cumberland	76	3.0	2 156	2.4	131	2.5	4 287	3.3	118	2.7	2 521	3.3
Currituck	9	11.3	573	11.6	9	9.7	182	8.2	9	9.7	121	6.5
Dare	1	–	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Davidson	79	3.3	666	3.3	539	1.0	17 380	1.2	490	1.0	7 267	1.7
Davie	28	6.0	258	6.7	410	1.1	18 565	1.8	337	1.3	8 112	2.1
Duplin	88	2.8	3 023	.9	263	2.4	9 485	2.4	222	2.5	5 130	2.8
Durham	16	7.2	35	6.8	67	2.7	2 412	2.9	61	3.0	(D)	(D)
Edgecombe	32	3.4	4 096	.4	83	3.2	3 725	3.1	77	3.4	(D)	(D)
Forsyth	61	3.6	563	2.4	286	1.6	6 629	2.2	248	1.8	3 017	2.6
Franklin	82	3.6	3 219	2.9	188	2.7	10 181	2.4	169	2.9	(D)	(D)
Gaston	21	5.9	57	5.3	203	1.4	9 713	1.5	165	1.7	2 996	2.8
Gates	6	5.4	1 601	.2	37	3.7	1 328	5.4	34	3.9	553	6.4
Graham	2	32.3	(D)	(D)	56	4.4	1 712	7.4	41	5.4	688	8.0
Granville	132	3.1	2 992	3.4	319	2.1	14 401	2.2	276	2.2	6 630	2.5
Greene	25	2.5	1 259	.4	45	3.5	1 616	3.0	42	3.6	(D)	(D)
Guilford	164	2.5	2 986	1.7	508	1.4	17 022	1.6	442	1.5	6 352	2.3
Halifax	25	5.1	2 838	.3	93	3.2	11 214	1.7	86	3.3	4 848	2.6
Harnett	106	2.8	2 728	1.7	279	1.7	8 270	1.9	232	2.0	3 799	2.4
Haywood	66	4.0	276	6.1	535	1.3	19 975	1.6	459	1.4	8 554	2.3
Henderson	71	3.6	1 601	2.9	169	2.2	10 808	1.2	134	2.6	2 338	2.7
Hertford	20	3.4	2 084	1.2	18	8.1	415	7.0	14	8.4	(D)	(D)
Hoke	14	6.1	324	.4	49	4.1	1 757	3.3	47	4.2	(D)	(D)
Hyde	9	9.4	(D)	(D)	11	8.4	526	1.9	10	8.4	(D)	(D)
Iredell	36	4.8	719	6.5	832	.9	48 510	.9	664	1.1	15 301	1.5
Jackson	27	6.1	129	6.2	103	2.7	1 898	4.3	98	2.8	982	4.7
Johnston	168	1.9	3 588	.9	468	1.3	13 717	1.5	411	1.4	7 359	1.6
Jones	17	7.8	527	4.7	39	4.6	1 907	2.0	35	4.9	595	3.9
Lee	92	2.4	1 445	2.2	127	2.1	2 995	3.1	108	2.4	1 418	3.3
Lenoir	25	4.9	786	3.4	70	3.0	2 656	4.3	59	3.4	(D)	(D)
Lincoln	28	6.4	249	9.1	279	1.6	13 317	1.9	249	1.7	4 883	2.8
McDowell	14	6.3	225	3.2	112	2.3	3 295	3.7	93	2.7	1 039	4.6
Macon	13	7.9	99	8.2	207	1.5	6 193	2.1	188	1.7	2 902	2.6
Madison	47	5.5	189	4.8	570	1.9	11 666	2.4	506	2.0	6 179	2.6
Martin	13	7.8	423	6.3	74	3.6	3 768	4.7	69	3.6	(D)	(D)
Mecklenburg	29	4.6	364	7.4	185	1.5	7 507	2.2	156	1.8	2 762	3.1
Mitchell	12	9.1	44	19.2	120	2.6	2 480	5.6	105	2.9	1 326	5.4
Montgomery	25	4.8	566	4.2	124	1.5	5 369	2.9	102	1.8	2 400	3.7
Moore	143	2.1	4 109	1.4	295	1.4	10 873	1.4	253	1.6	4 514	2.1
Nash	61	2.5	7 402	.3	136	2.0	8 174	2.2	129	2.1	(D)	(D)
New Hanover	29	4.8	103	4.5	2	29.0	(D)	(D)	2	29.0	(D)	(D)
Northampton	11	4.3	1 863	1.0	50	4.3	2 797	3.9	48	4.5	(D)	(D)
Onslow	33	3.8	654	2.8	91	3.1	2 184	3.1	79	3.4	1 010	3.6
Orange	62	3.3	955	2.6	251	1.4	14 275	1.4	190	1.8	4 362	2.3
Pamlico	8	4.8	2 050	(L)	12	8.5	215	10.0	8	10.3	59	11.1
Pasquotank	3	16.3	4	12.2	29	6.2	728	8.7	25	6.7	(D)	(D)
Pender	23	5.0	377	3.8	55	5.1	1 120	6.6	44	5.9	(D)	(D)
Perquimans	14	9.3	521	10.4	47	5.1	1 319	4.7	45	5.2	662	5.2
Person	116	2.3	2 338	1.3	190	1.9	8 093	1.9	177	2.0	3 903	2.3
Pitt	35	3.7	1 115	1.2	117	2.6	3 842	3.6	97	2.9	(D)	(D)
Polk	7	10.9	133	4.1	88	2.1	4 179	2.0	76	2.5	2 151	2.5
Randolph	59	3.5	755	4.1	845	1.0	39 885	.9	727	1.1	14 382	1.3
Richmond	57	2.6	2 710	.9	66	2.8	3 087	3.6	60	3.0	1 577	4.4
Robeson	50	5.1	1 689	4.0	203	2.9	5 155	3.5	187	3.0	2 786	4.1
Rockingham	234	2.7	4 048	2.0	366	1.9	9 882	2.3	329	2.0	4 451	2.8
Rowan	47	4.3	785	12.0	533	1.1	23 583	1.5	465	1.2	8 478	2.3
Rutherford	15	7.4	38	8.0	333	1.0	11 485	1.7	309	1.1	6 135	1.8
Sampson	191	2.5	8 189	1.3	323	2.6	15 217	1.7	269	2.7	7 124	2.2
Scotland	12	9.6	(D)	(D)	29	5.8	610	6.3	22	6.6	(D)	(D)
Stanly	20	3.9	530	3.9	372	1.0	18 746	1.4	331	1.1	8 653	1.7
Stokes	61	3.8	501	2.7	422	1.4	12 718	1.8	362	1.5	5 026	2.3
Surry	48	3.9	641	3.5	703	1.0	25 701	1.3	582	1.2	10 435	1.5
Swain	16	7.6	95	13.5	39	4.4	1 081	6.1	33	5.1	(D)	(D)
Transylvania	12	10.1	49	8.0	93	2.6	2 828	4.9	80	3.0	(D)	(D)
Tyrrell	2	24.5	(D)	(D)	11	9.5	174	10.4	10	10.2	(D)	(D)
Union	35	3.6	370	4.9	512	.9	19 376	1.2	467	1.0	10 479	1.3
Vance	57	3.4	1 252	1.8	88	2.9	3 231	5.0	78	3.2	1 506	4.8
Wake	162	2.3	2 587	1.4	245	1.8	9 190	2.0	216	1.9	3 983	2.5
Warren	34	3.2	1 246	3.5	149	2.0	8 411	1.8	133	2.1	4 064	2.2
Washington	8	5.7	2 004	(L)	50	4.3	1 592	3.3	46	4.6	764	3.4
Watauga	15	7.7	55	12.3	358	1.2	10 207	1.6	260	1.5	4 066	1.9
Wayne	67	2.9	1 288	1.9	182	2.0	6 862	2.4	157	2.1	3 091	2.8
Wilkes	17	5.7	87	5.1	795	.8	31 738	.9	686	.8	15 442	1.0
Wilson	31	3.4	950	1.2	72	3.1	1 677	4.5	62	3.4	(D)	(D)
Yadkin	67	4.0	1 005	2.9	548	1.5	22 164	1.8	448	1.6	7 484	2.6
Yancey	25	7.0	49	8.3	279	2.0	5 452	3.1	243	2.2	2 868	4.1

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 19
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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)
North Carolina	**1 552**	**.9**	**99 291**	**.3**	**4 311**	**1.1**	**5 100 979**	**.1**	**574**	**1.5**	**19 546**	**2.4**
Alamance	49	3.4	4 170	1.5	29	6.9	3 786	9.3	7	12.8	553	18.5
Alexander	34	3.3	3 179	.8	6	10.2	(D)	(D)	8	10.8	66	15.0
Alleghany	74	2.5	5 128	1.1	6	12.2	29	15.0	17	6.6	1 379	8.1
Anson	8	10.1	369	4.4	20	6.0	7 729	2.4	1	–	(D)	(D)
Ashe	42	4.3	577	5.6	14	7.5	309	18.6	14	7.4	684	8.5
Avery	6	14.4	24	20.1	7	15.2	24	19.0	2	27.8	(D)	(D)
Beaufort	6	10.0	(D)	(D)	63	3.6	72 180	.5	1	42.7	(D)	(D)
Bertie	1	–	(D)	(D)	86	3.7	40 309	1.3	1	–	(D)	(D)
Bladen	9	13.8	63	23.5	89	3.5	214 113	.1	2	24.5	(D)	(D)
Brunswick	–	–	–	–	71	3.8	23 794	1.6	2	24.8	(D)	(D)
Buncombe	57	3.2	3 906	.8	13	9.5	349	9.5	24	6.4	642	9.0
Burke	7	11.6	329	4.9	13	8.2	(D)	(D)	5	14.1	122	22.8
Cabarrus	13	7.3	595	6.9	26	5.8	4 753	4.8	13	9.3	305	14.9
Caldwell	11	7.8	957	.1	13	8.6	2 981	.4	6	14.0	43	15.2
Camden	2	24.9	(D)	(D)	17	7.7	17 733	1.3	4	12.5	58	17.2
Carteret	1	–	(D)	(D)	12	9.6	2 408	12.3	1	–	(D)	(D)
Caswell	23	5.2	694	2.0	48	3.6	3 266	.8	9	8.9	126	16.3
Catawba	27	3.7	1 970	1.1	15	6.8	996	4.0	4	12.9	35	10.7
Chatham	28	2.3	2 688	.8	58	2.9	6 462	2.9	9	8.8	399	12.3
Cherokee	10	10.6	360	9.9	8	12.4	362	19.5	1	36.1	(D)	(D)
Chowan	2	23.6	(D)	(D)	44	4.7	19 027	2.4	9	13.0	209	18.7
Clay	12	6.9	519	5.7	4	17.1	33	25.2	3	19.4	88	19.7
Cleveland	25	5.5	977	3.1	16	7.0	5 386	1.6	6	13.6	122	22.1
Columbus	10	11.2	389	.8	175	2.6	43 271	1.1	–	–	–	–
Craven	5	12.2	(D)	(D)	54	3.8	59 046	.9	–	–	–	–
Cumberland	3	18.1	3	18.1	67	3.7	33 264	1.3	2	28.8	(D)	(D)
Currituck	–	–	–	–	11	8.6	3 164	.7	1	–	(D)	(D)
Dare	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Davidson	34	3.7	2 628	1.7	77	3.1	3 840	4.6	16	6.9	158	9.7
Davie	55	3.2	2 923	2.7	19	6.5	6 782	3.8	5	14.6	72	26.1
Duplin	14	7.0	229	1.3	338	1.7	1 149 704	.1	7	12.4	167	19.0
Durham	2	20.7	(D)	(D)	6	10.4	691	1.9	5	13.3	172	15.1
Edgecombe	1	–	(D)	(D)	47	4.1	51 283	.3	–	–	–	–
Forsyth	17	7.2	408	6.1	11	8.8	108	11.0	8	11.0	98	13.4
Franklin	5	18.4	(D)	(D)	41	5.3	16 806	.7	4	19.3	520	20.1
Gaston	23	2.6	2 449	.1	21	6.0	1 544	3.3	4	12.8	(D)	(D)
Gates	–	–	–	–	59	2.7	20 856	1.5	1	32.2	(D)	(D)
Graham	4	20.1	11	30.7	1	46.1	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Granville	14	7.6	1 100	1.5	38	5.5	4 979	4.2	7	14.3	31	20.1
Greene	1	35.9	(D)	(D)	58	1.6	299 454	.1	–	–	–	–
Guilford	28	4.2	2 601	1.5	36	5.8	7 172	3.9	6	13.0	188	9.8
Halifax	5	14.1	558	8.5	55	4.3	97 328	.1	2	24.9	(D)	(D)
Harnett	7	8.0	719	2.2	77	3.7	54 628	.9	7	14.2	50	18.5
Haywood	43	4.5	2 214	.5	18	7.7	(D)	(D)	18	7.2	298	6.8
Henderson	32	3.9	4 287	.3	18	7.6	278	12.3	6	13.7	110	13.2
Hertford	2	24.0	(D)	(D)	11	9.7	(D)	(D)	1	47.9	(D)	(D)
Hoke	1	39.0	(D)	(D)	17	8.6	3 117	2.0	3	19.1	150	21.4
Hyde	1	37.3	(D)	(D)	16	6.1	16 497	2.5	1	37.3	(D)	(D)
Iredell	127	1.9	11 642	.8	23	6.3	3 102	.5	10	9.7	334	10.2
Jackson	12	10.4	164	13.8	6	15.1	63	17.4	4	15.8	58	18.3
Johnston	7	11.1	195	1.5	219	1.9	98 470	.7	7	11.8	201	13.9
Jones	–	–	–	–	51	4.4	40 239	1.2	–	–	–	–
Lee	3	20.2	12	19.2	19	6.8	2 076	5.9	1	36.5	(D)	(D)
Lenoir	3	11.5	(D)	(D)	71	2.2	125 293	.4	3	16.8	80	21.0
Lincoln	22	5.1	2 616	1.5	17	7.5	2 269	11.2	5	13.2	277	23.0
McDowell	12	8.7	526	4.7	15	8.5	432	9.7	2	27.9	(D)	(D)
Macon	13	6.2	592	2.4	11	8.5	37	12.0	4	20.7	(D)	(D)
Madison	43	5.8	319	9.2	16	10.0	57	19.0	18	8.8	490	11.7
Martin	1	–	(D)	(D)	79	3.7	25 334	1.4	1	–	(D)	(D)
Mecklenburg	15	5.7	1 253	1.8	7	11.0	129	23.0	11	8.3	130	22.0
Mitchell	7	13.0	76	28.0	11	10.7	31	15.9	6	11.6	97	12.7
Montgomery	6	4.5	560	.1	16	3.7	14 690	.5	4	13.7	(D)	(D)
Moore	5	13.5	27	18.5	62	3.5	32 367	.6	3	17.8	(D)	(D)
Nash	4	8.6	(D)	(D)	58	3.1	73 211	.6	4	12.9	27	14.4
New Hanover	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Northampton	2	23.5	(D)	(D)	47	4.8	77 063	.3	1	–	(D)	(D)
Onslow	9	9.7	147	2.5	76	3.0	133 930	.1	5	14.4	54	26.9
Orange	36	2.9	3 415	1.5	19	5.7	(D)	(D)	15	8.0	536	13.8
Pamlico	–	–	–	–	7	8.3	6 529	1.5	–	–	–	–
Pasquotank	2	24.3	(D)	(D)	17	7.6	3 400	2.0	6	11.8	139	14.3
Pender	1	–	(D)	(D)	60	4.0	63 052	.7	5	17.1	120	21.5
Perquimans	–	–	–	–	49	4.1	26 140	1.7	6	–	341	–
Person	6	8.0	357	2.2	35	4.4	11 626	1.3	2	16.9	(D)	(D)
Pitt	2	28.8	(D)	(D)	85	2.5	107 424	.6	14	7.9	522	9.0
Polk	5	8.4	488	3.6	3	12.3	19	15.5	1	21.8	(D)	(D)
Randolph	60	3.0	6 493	.4	82	3.2	15 982	1.5	13	8.9	217	15.4
Richmond	3	10.7	4	8.1	18	5.8	12 459	.2	4	15.3	52	21.8
Robeson	13	11.1	52	5.3	170	3.2	141 916	.5	3	18.8	40	34.0
Rockingham	14	6.6	757	.2	39	5.5	2 716	1.6	6	14.7	76	26.4

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 20
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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)
Rowan	49	2.8	4 440	1.1	32	5.9	4 126	8.3	10	9.8	513	8.2
Rutherford	12	7.4	399	6.9	10	8.4	731	6.4	16	7.2	900	9.1
Sampson	13	9.5	1 319	.4	358	2.1	1 085 425	.1	7	13.9	70	28.0
Scotland	2	22.4	(D)	(D)	12	10.3	(D)	(D)	1	44.8	(D)	(D)
Stanly	14	4.3	1 597	.3	34	4.0	3 525	4.1	12	8.0	451	11.0
Stokes	21	6.0	387	3.2	43	4.8	1 572	5.9	7	11.1	538	16.4
Surry	54	3.2	2 948	.8	47	4.3	3 607	6.6	8	11.3	421	13.0
Swain	4	14.8	(D)	(D)	5	16.4	19	17.3	–	–	–	–
Transylvania	1	42.1	(D)	(D)	7	13.2	53	13.8	3	20.6	(D)	(D)
Tyrrell	1	27.1	(D)	(D)	19	5.3	49 622	.1	2	18.8	(D)	(D)
Union	14	5.7	713	1.5	51	2.8	33 620	.8	21	6.3	552	13.0
Vance	5	11.2	147	2.4	7	9.1	(D)	(D)	2	22.8	(D)	(D)
Wake	11	6.3	937	1.7	43	4.3	9 049	4.4	14	9.0	823	16.2
Warren	11	5.6	628	.3	49	3.7	56 215	.1	7	7.3	1 987	8.3
Washington	–	–	–	–	35	5.1	72 622	.7	2	23.0	(D)	(D)
Watauga	23	5.8	195	7.8	11	9.6	48	14.1	14	7.6	302	11.2
Wayne	8	9.3	424	.2	126	2.0	199 619	.2	12	7.8	162	7.7
Wilkes	43	3.7	1 646	1.8	26	5.3	523	8.0	8	10.5	140	18.9
Wilson	1	–	(D)	(D)	35	3.7	40 927	.1	1	–	(D)	(D)
Yadkin	48	4.1	4 151	1.7	13	9.9	4 883	2.8	5	16.7	26	20.5
Yancey	30	6.0	312	1.0	11	10.5	19	10.9	5	17.8	87	22.5

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)
North Carolina	**1 895**	**1.1**	**14 337 192**	**.5**	**2 116**	**.4**	**499 071 743**	**.1**
Alamance	42	4.8	437 559	2.6	12	–	2 398 050	–
Alexander	71	3.0	581 035	2.6	45	1.8	10 144 195	.4
Alleghany	11	9.8	133	10.6	2	16.0	(D)	(D)
Anson	8	11.5	(D)	(D)	31	2.3	8 387 948	.7
Ashe	31	5.0	399	6.3	1	26.9	(D)	(D)
Avery	8	14.1	198	16.2	–	–	–	–
Beaufort	7	14.2	282	16.2	–	–	–	–
Bertie	10	12.4	(D)	(D)	62	2.1	17 362 063	.5
Bladen	22	8.6	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Brunswick	17	8.7	472	12.4	–	–	–	–
Buncombe	46	4.9	1 071	4.2	1	40.4	(D)	(D)
Burke	13	9.1	(D)	(D)	20	–	6 204 885	–
Cabarrus	15	6.6	64 646	9.3	3	16.6	340 000	13.2
Caldwell	20	6.9	58 382	6.0	15	6.0	1 771 616	3.1
Camden	2	24.9	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Carteret	1	–	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Caswell	21	5.5	473	6.7	1	31.6	(D)	(D)
Catawba	12	7.9	41 274	6.1	6	7.6	1 185 524	2.0
Chatham	42	3.2	499 176	1.2	189	.9	34 621 417	.3
Cherokee	12	9.2	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Chowan	3	22.6	30	23.9	10	–	2 204 500	–
Clay	7	12.8	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Cleveland	13	6.8	145 659	(L)	16	2.1	3 765 471	.9
Columbus	37	6.0	7 280	1.0	–	–	–	–
Craven	12	8.5	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Cumberland	15	9.0	(D)	(D)	2	27.2	(D)	(D)
Currituck	5	13.3	112	17.5	–	–	–	–
Dare	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Davidson	26	5.4	(D)	(D)	7	4.4	1 734 030	(L)
Davie	19	6.1	110 630	5.5	1	–	(D)	(D)
Duplin	48	4.1	921 006	1.1	122	1.6	27 367 237	.5
Durham	6	12.8	128	13.6	2	23.6	(D)	(D)
Edgecombe	14	8.8	132 600	(L)	22	–	6 962 288	–
Forsyth	28	5.8	6 867	1.3	2	18.9	(D)	(D)
Franklin	26	6.1	728 351	1.3	7	–	1 507 000	–
Gaston	10	7.3	280	10.4	–	–	–	–
Gates	4	15.0	(D)	(D)	21	2.2	4 948 297	.8
Graham	9	12.4	121	15.4	–	–	–	–
Granville	25	7.8	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Greene	4	14.0	(D)	(D)	12	–	5 003 375	–
Guilford	36	5.5	32 424	6.3	2	–	(D)	(D)
Halifax	5	13.9	(D)	(D)	24	4.2	4 329 968	1.6
Harnett	8	13.1	92	18.5	21	2.3	6 356 400	.8
Haywood	40	5.3	530	6.0	–	–	–	–
Henderson	17	8.9	319	16.1	–	–	–	–
Hertford	8	12.1	(D)	(D)	32	3.6	8 668 246	.8
Hoke	7	11.1	(D)	(D)	2	–	(D)	(D)
Hyde	1	49.7	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Iredell	127	2.5	1 325 805	1.7	7	6.3	872 900	1.3

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 21
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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)
Jackson	9	11.6	206	14.6	–	–	–	–
Johnston	27	5.8	(D)	(D)	8	–	1 921 200	–
Jones	7	14.2	106	15.5	–	–	–	–
Lee	6	14.9	130	14.5	12	–	3 441 168	–
Lenoir	11	8.7	116 536	6.7	9	–	2 208 899	–
Lincoln	11	9.1	(D)	(D)	14	5.5	3 001 924	1.3
McDowell	10	9.6	38 098	(L)	5	9.1	956 000	3.1
Macon	20	6.5	346	6.2	–	–	–	–
Madison	47	5.5	589	8.8	–	–	–	–
Martin	11	11.6	455	24.0	14	4.1	3 856 000	.9
Mecklenburg	8	10.9	62	14.9	2	23.0	(D)	(D)
Mitchell	13	9.6	170	11.0	–	–	–	–
Montgomery	1	–	(D)	(D)	51	.6	15 824 550	.1
Moore	17	6.5	55 691	.1	165	.9	31 214 154	.4
Nash	33	3.1	1 352 441	.3	41	.7	13 630 717	.2
New Hanover	3	22.3	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Northampton	4	19.7	(D)	(D)	37	2.9	8 675 000	1.0
Onslow	17	7.8	407	13.2	2	–	(D)	(D)
Orange	21	6.5	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Pamlico	1	38.1	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Pasquotank	3	16.2	59	18.1	–	–	–	–
Pender	18	9.5	350	12.8	6	7.4	1 259 500	1.1
Perquimans	2	–	(D)	(D)	21	3.3	6 433 100	.8
Person	6	14.9	149	17.2	–	–	–	–
Pitt	18	6.5	1 291 073	(L)	17	–	6 541 000	–
Polk	4	11.5	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Randolph	60	3.1	536 550	2.0	192	.9	38 568 148	.4
Richmond	4	15.3	(D)	(D)	64	1.1	15 365 512	.4
Robeson	39	6.0	1 039	11.7	15	3.2	5 436 902	(L)
Rockingham	27	7.0	517	8.4	–	–	–	–
Rowan	33	5.1	120 176	2.9	4	7.7	(D)	(D)
Rutherford	13	7.4	(D)	(D)	3	17.6	217 419	18.2
Sampson	25	7.4	55 370	.1	14	–	2 543 047	–
Scotland	5	14.7	94	8.4	8	–	2 951 501	–
Stanly	19	4.2	626 694	1.0	12	2.9	2 962 000	.3
Stokes	31	5.5	3 777	33.3	–	–	–	–
Surry	30	4.9	217 874	2.3	89	1.9	10 557 045	.9
Swain	8	11.5	134	12.8	–	–	–	–
Transylvania	7	13.8	341	26.6	–	–	–	–
Tyrrell	2	13.6	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Union	30	4.2	901 383	.9	161	.4	50 070 352	.1
Vance	5	11.0	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Wake	19	7.4	(D)	(D)	2	–	(D)	(D)
Warren	20	5.4	50 802	7.5	13	3.8	2 060 372	.5
Washington	4	16.7	74	23.2	18	–	5 781 077	–
Watauga	21	6.4	431	7.4	1	25.0	(D)	(D)
Wayne	29	4.5	311 466	3.1	87	1.1	18 346 511	.3
Wilkes	78	2.5	752 935	1.5	298	.7	81 219 669	.2
Wilson	8	10.9	(D)	(D)	9	5.6	2 544 300	1.2
Yadkin	58	4.1	585 099	3.3	22	6.2	2 990 018	3.4
Yancey	21	7.1	222	8.9	–	–	–	–

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn 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)
North Carolina	**13 052**	**1.3**	**1 019 871**	**.7**	**96 617 840**	**.7**	**6 883**	**1.2**	**490 214**	**.7**	**23 164 935**	**.6**
Alamance	128	3.2	4 134	3.2	344 746	3.2	138	3.2	3 728	4.1	144 310	4.8
Alexander	52	3.5	1 540	3.9	104 536	3.7	14	6.4	569	2.5	20 386	2.0
Alleghany	4	12.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	2	13.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Anson	42	4.4	5 718	3.3	360 696	3.7	45	4.0	3 202	3.4	132 119	3.0
Ashe	16	6.5	35	10.4	1 569	11.5	–	–	–	–	–	–
Avery	1	28.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Beaufort	273	2.3	46 401	1.0	5 006 916	.9	188	2.4	33 719	1.0	1 801 380	1.0
Bertie	323	2.3	29 991	1.3	3 247 523	1.3	16	6.6	1 364	3.5	76 613	3.4
Bladen	333	1.8	29 347	1.9	2 013 873	2.3	39	5.1	1 636	4.6	73 734	4.4
Brunswick	89	3.2	5 460	1.9	426 627	1.3	28	5.7	1 104	2.8	52 693	3.1
Buncombe	35	5.2	235	2.4	22 239	3.6	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Burke	52	4.1	1 463	5.4	115 467	6.1	5	14.2	156	20.7	8 400	22.6
Cabarrus	62	3.5	2 366	4.7	116 891	4.4	56	3.5	2 849	3.3	108 412	2.9
Caldwell	49	4.4	590	4.3	38 681	4.4	9	10.7	297	6.5	10 955	7.6
Camden	60	3.2	14 542	1.3	1 816 596	1.3	42	3.9	8 688	1.6	459 504	1.7
Carteret	26	4.6	14 822	.4	1 686 581	.3	10	6.4	2 513	1.5	156 859	1.4
Caswell	114	2.5	1 848	3.9	130 169	3.2	151	2.1	3 144	2.0	129 837	2.0
Catawba	61	3.3	1 901	3.7	127 070	4.2	52	3.6	2 925	4.5	119 452	4.7
Chatham	77	2.7	2 416	2.8	190 321	3.4	33	3.8	935	2.6	37 868	2.8

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 22
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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											
	Corn 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)
Cherokee	35	5.5	958	3.2	93 388	3.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Chowan	98	3.0	8 519	1.7	1 037 749	1.5	16	5.2	879	1.9	43 751	1.9
Clay	13	8.4	341	14.4	30 550	15.5	–	–	–	–	–	–
Cleveland	46	4.2	1 424	4.7	74 582	4.6	70	3.4	4 091	3.7	168 655	3.8
Columbus	539	1.7	30 936	1.3	2 571 540	1.3	88	3.0	3 801	2.1	171 046	2.3
Craven	179	2.4	18 159	1.4	1 581 188	1.3	30	5.3	2 729	2.3	139 667	2.8
Cumberland	155	2.2	15 023	1.3	1 038 632	1.3	68	3.2	6 266	1.8	277 524	2.1
Currituck	40	3.9	12 314	1.9	1 556 459	2.0	35	4.0	7 773	1.1	429 987	1.1
Dare	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	3	–	1 652	–	46 268	–
Davidson	252	1.6	5 085	1.9	366 148	2.0	111	2.6	2 283	2.9	90 754	2.6
Davie	73	3.3	3 141	2.6	260 884	2.3	49	4.0	2 405	3.2	91 335	3.0
Duplin	703	2.2	54 675	1.7	3 938 469	1.6	162	3.0	13 678	1.9	594 663	1.8
Durham	10	8.6	119	9.8	7 333	9.3	19	5.9	581	6.9	22 878	7.3
Edgecombe	219	1.9	26 155	.8	2 632 073	.8	101	2.2	7 853	.8	371 193	.9
Forsyth	108	3.0	1 301	7.2	90 626	7.9	52	4.1	1 189	5.9	47 653	4.6
Franklin	60	4.7	2 245	3.8	225 955	3.7	160	3.0	7 408	2.2	322 394	2.1
Gaston	23	6.2	338	3.8	21 518	3.2	11	9.2	377	14.1	14 435	14.9
Gates	139	1.4	16 230	.7	1 822 291	.7	22	3.3	975	1.6	48 150	1.1
Graham	16	9.6	36	10.5	2 630	11.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
Granville	102	3.4	1 476	2.6	116 646	1.9	146	3.0	3 847	2.1	144 252	1.9
Greene	276	1.4	30 177	1.1	3 304 728	1.0	86	2.6	4 842	1.8	248 443	1.8
Guilford	201	2.4	6 049	2.2	443 485	2.4	215	2.3	7 386	2.5	307 267	2.1
Halifax	148	2.1	15 668	.4	1 464 545	.3	72	2.3	4 476	1.4	197 339	1.0
Harnett	209	2.0	8 757	1.5	753 353	1.3	110	2.4	5 578	1.6	278 258	1.5
Haywood	42	5.2	185	4.5	15 012	4.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
Henderson	36	4.8	4 380	1.7	414 543	1.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hertford	133	2.7	12 932	1.7	1 437 921	1.7	8	13.2	183	15.2	7 250	14.8
Hoke	48	3.8	5 278	2.1	483 376	1.8	35	4.8	5 306	2.1	261 668	2.1
Hyde	95	2.5	35 198	.9	4 445 412	1.0	69	2.7	18 082	1.1	992 495	1.0
Iredell	120	2.5	5 493	2.8	475 657	3.1	86	2.8	4 440	2.0	202 792	1.6
Jackson	22	7.7	37	10.5	2 796	11.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
Johnston	470	1.3	17 462	1.0	1 581 783	1.1	342	1.4	16 234	1.0	720 807	1.1
Jones	126	2.9	15 633	1.8	1 071 617	2.1	18	6.9	973	4.4	44 789	3.1
Lee	51	3.4	1 028	2.1	52 584	2.1	29	4.6	548	4.0	27 922	4.5
Lenoir	345	1.2	38 021	.8	3 399 242	.8	89	2.2	6 283	1.4	288 145	1.3
Lincoln	42	4.6	1 925	3.0	131 430	2.2	55	4.5	2 322	5.2	82 739	5.1
McDowell	33	5.4	857	7.8	80 328	8.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Macon	41	5.2	202	7.4	15 877	7.9	–	–	–	–	–	–
Madison	44	5.8	105	7.7	5 955	8.2	–	–	–	–	–	–
Martin	359	2.3	25 700	1.3	2 493 326	1.4	88	3.6	4 473	3.5	211 361	3.8
Mecklenburg	10	10.6	447	31.3	20 774	24.6	23	5.8	1 039	5.6	46 932	4.2
Mitchell	19	7.8	102	11.4	8 940	11.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Montgomery	27	4.7	819	7.5	54 699	9.4	16	6.2	393	8.9	12 559	8.2
Moore	93	2.7	1 717	2.0	114 119	1.6	36	4.5	1 139	4.2	44 968	3.3
Nash	86	2.4	5 228	1.3	473 038	1.5	130	1.5	8 606	.6	349 813	.6
New Hanover	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Northampton	147	2.6	11 167	1.4	1 169 377	1.4	49	2.8	3 489	.7	155 334	.6
Onslow	227	1.8	16 767	1.3	1 488 831	1.1	36	3.9	1 622	2.6	74 510	2.8
Orange	52	3.2	2 164	1.5	203 151	1.4	78	2.7	3 366	2.6	127 044	2.5
Pamlico	43	2.5	13 697	.9	1 533 982	.9	34	3.0	8 325	1.1	426 024	1.2
Pasquotank	128	2.7	23 673	1.4	2 944 451	1.4	78	3.2	13 305	1.7	756 596	1.6
Pender	144	2.6	11 498	2.4	854 919	2.5	25	5.8	1 784	3.4	89 303	3.7
Perquimans	138	3.1	19 553	2.1	2 458 079	2.1	64	4.0	7 424	2.6	421 478	2.6
Person	91	2.7	3 376	1.5	278 034	1.3	170	1.9	7 601	1.2	304 550	1.1
Pitt	301	1.4	35 582	.7	3 554 778	.8	164	1.7	15 468	1.0	698 017	1.1
Polk	14	7.3	149	8.7	11 105	10.8	12	7.8	373	11.0	15 439	11.0
Randolph	236	1.9	7 048	2.3	556 341	2.6	130	2.6	4 574	3.4	183 197	3.5
Richmond	31	4.4	3 014	2.6	208 797	2.3	23	4.7	1 814	7.0	70 760	9.6
Robeson	706	2.3	54 617	1.4	4 654 462	1.4	394	2.4	37 081	1.4	1 804 927	1.2
Rockingham	137	3.1	2 478	1.8	199 761	1.5	260	2.6	6 811	2.4	251 906	2.5
Rowan	137	2.5	3 646	4.1	239 921	3.9	147	2.5	6 698	2.7	285 014	3.1
Rutherford	38	4.4	697	9.5	50 716	12.3	12	8.6	416	13.8	20 076	16.5
Sampson	635	2.6	42 501	1.7	3 224 187	1.7	210	2.9	13 791	1.8	636 977	2.0
Scotland	25	5.5	4 082	1.9	347 287	1.9	18	6.0	4 097	4.5	195 384	4.3
Stanly	103	2.1	13 798	1.1	1 105 380	1.1	79	2.4	9 647	1.6	449 197	1.4
Stokes	169	2.3	1 886	16.0	110 419	13.7	99	3.0	896	4.2	33 600	4.3
Surry	275	1.7	5 828	1.7	567 935	1.8	131	2.3	2 844	1.6	114 330	1.8
Swain	8	13.1	30	17.4	2 230	16.5	–	–	–	–	–	–
Transylvania	37	4.9	892	6.9	81 396	6.2	–	–	–	–	–	–
Tyrrell	63	1.8	22 877	.7	2 793 520	.7	36	2.9	10 680	.5	557 899	.5
Union	155	1.8	22 931	.9	1 762 709	.8	184	1.6	30 576	.9	1 404 438	.7
Vance	30	5.2	192	5.7	10 021	5.2	100	2.5	3 112	2.6	137 435	2.9
Wake	77	3.2	1 898	2.4	147 324	3.4	166	2.2	6 985	1.9	276 937	1.9
Warren	47	3.7	629	7.7	40 811	4.5	45	3.0	1 905	2.1	78 636	2.0
Washington	124	2.2	31 129	.7	3 429 710	.7	84	2.5	20 873	.8	1 132 507	.9
Watauga	8	9.9	36	12.6	1 575	12.8	1	25.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Wayne	399	1.3	32 198	.9	3 080 704	.9	171	1.7	17 402	1.2	793 920	1.2
Wilkes	129	2.3	2 360	2.8	216 081	2.8	16	6.1	300	6.2	9 560	6.6
Wilson	247	1.3	22 797	.6	2 387 528	.6	229	1.4	14 656	.7	768 251	.8
Yadkin	252	2.4	9 477	2.2	892 385	2.2	158	3.0	5 276	3.4	204 913	2.9
Yancey	13	10.4	30	6.3	2 790	6.5	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 23
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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						Tobacco					
	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)	Pounds	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
North Carolina	**2 035**	**1.3**	**357 766**	**.4**	**445 466**	**.4**	**17 625**	**1.2**	**283 900**	**.8**	**604 014 807**	**.7**
Alamance	–	–	–	–	–	–	182	3.0	2 844	3.1	5 529 697	2.9
Alexander	–	–	–	–	–	–	43	4.3	705	3.2	1 214 391	3.4
Alleghany	–	–	–	–	–	–	178	1.9	479	3.0	892 579	3.1
Anson	7	11.4	523	14.4	409	15.6	4	9.8	169	.4	226 420	.5
Ashe	–	–	–	–	–	–	580	1.0	1 226	1.5	1 958 113	1.6
Avery	–	–	–	–	–	–	67	3.7	184	4.8	359 798	4.7
Beaufort	2	23.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	175	3.1	3 949	1.8	8 949 883	1.7
Bertie	81	2.7	15 824	.9	22 121	.8	223	2.7	3 298	1.7	7 180 473	1.7
Bladen	9	6.5	2 258	2.7	3 052	2.8	246	2.1	3 606	1.2	7 493 887	1.2
Brunswick	–	–	–	–	–	–	73	3.3	1 459	2.0	2 609 641	1.9
Buncombe	–	–	–	–	–	–	508	1.4	1 444	2.0	2 320 648	2.3
Burke	–	–	–	–	–	–	8	10.8	55	8.3	64 682	11.5
Cabarrus	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Caldwell	–	–	–	–	–	–	25	6.1	283	6.3	640 440	6.6
Camden	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Carteret	–	–	–	–	–	–	19	4.2	608	1.9	1 333 738	2.0
Caswell	–	–	–	–	–	–	362	1.5	5 024	1.4	9 723 239	1.3
Catawba	1	27.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Chatham	–	–	–	–	–	–	42	4.1	788	3.5	1 390 547	3.5
Cherokee	–	–	–	–	–	–	24	6.6	70	10.0	130 791	10.4
Chowan	87	3.0	11 099	1.6	15 741	1.5	18	5.4	270	2.5	634 000	2.0
Clay	–	–	–	–	–	–	39	4.8	94	6.9	177 741	6.2
Cleveland	22	5.2	2 458	3.0	1 476	3.1	1	30.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Columbus	2	25.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	650	1.7	9 975	1.3	21 059 646	1.3
Craven	28	4.4	8 883	1.6	13 715	1.4	163	2.6	4 767	1.3	10 081 002	1.3
Cumberland	19	6.3	2 372	2.8	2 466	4.0	117	2.5	2 311	1.6	4 836 119	1.7
Currituck	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Dare	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Davidson	–	–	–	–	–	–	160	2.3	1 711	2.6	3 451 125	2.6
Davie	–	–	–	–	–	–	39	5.0	372	5.7	708 889	6.3
Duplin	42	4.3	9 314	2.0	10 933	2.1	509	2.5	9 055	1.5	18 862 995	1.5
Durham	–	–	–	–	–	–	55	2.9	1 639	2.0	3 153 967	2.1
Edgecombe	95	2.2	21 786	.7	26 625	.7	225	1.8	6 624	.9	15 015 626	.8
Forsyth	–	–	–	–	–	–	186	1.9	2 615	1.6	5 070 315	1.6
Franklin	2	30.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	282	2.4	6 146	1.4	13 864 585	1.3
Gaston	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	32.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Gates	67	2.4	12 067	.7	14 484	.6	3	10.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Graham	–	–	–	–	–	–	88	3.2	235	6.9	363 640	7.8
Granville	–	–	–	–	–	–	441	2.0	7 813	1.7	15 029 211	1.6
Greene	78	2.6	8 330	1.1	10 843	1.2	304	1.3	8 840	.7	19 312 569	.6
Guilford	–	–	–	–	–	–	283	2.2	5 143	1.4	10 732 080	1.3
Halifax	166	2.0	40 032	.6	45 333	.6	113	2.4	3 440	.9	7 465 995	.8
Harnett	49	4.1	4 492	3.1	5 076	2.9	373	1.5	9 759	.9	20 723 259	.8
Haywood	–	–	–	–	–	–	378	1.6	878	2.6	1 564 820	2.7
Henderson	–	–	–	–	–	–	16	8.5	46	10.5	75 993	12.4
Hertford	52	3.8	5 701	1.4	7 010	1.5	88	3.4	1 546	2.3	3 390 876	2.5
Hoke	36	4.0	9 826	1.6	14 529	1.6	64	3.7	1 691	2.5	3 571 223	2.5
Hyde	3	16.6	519	6.9	804	6.9	–	–	–	–	–	–
Iredell	–	–	–	–	–	–	67	3.8	698	4.7	1 198 904	4.9
Jackson	–	–	–	–	–	–	17	8.2	66	8.0	157 432	8.4
Johnston	83	2.5	11 451	1.0	11 931	1.1	718	1.2	14 818	.6	32 979 238	.6
Jones	40	3.4	9 765	.9	13 605	.6	123	2.8	3 018	1.5	6 226 446	1.5
Lee	3	–	205	–	150	–	130	1.9	2 359	1.4	4 854 967	1.5
Lenoir	54	2.3	12 549	.3	16 297	.3	312	1.3	8 904	.7	19 393 708	.7
Lincoln	3	12.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
McDowell	–	–	–	–	–	–	5	13.7	14	10.6	25 200	10.6
Macon	–	–	–	–	–	–	36	5.6	87	6.2	131 262	6.5
Madison	–	–	–	–	–	–	940	1.5	2 731	2.2	4 561 074	2.3
Martin	113	2.6	13 187	1.1	18 435	1.1	301	2.4	5 655	1.1	13 548 755	1.0
Mecklenburg	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mitchell	–	–	–	–	–	–	205	1.7	537	2.8	992 036	3.4
Montgomery	1	30.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	14	6.8	393	2.3	839 610	2.2
Moore	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	127	2.2	2 823	1.5	5 716 803	1.5
Nash	58	2.1	13 130	.5	16 245	.5	271	1.2	10 561	.4	24 675 696	.3
New Hanover	–	–	–	–	–	–	3	22.3	18	22.2	40 078	22.4
Northampton	194	2.2	27 883	1.0	34 157	1.1	9	7.4	231	1.7	476 420	1.9
Onslow	6	5.9	1 083	.9	1 549	.5	167	2.1	3 148	1.7	6 601 358	1.6
Orange	–	–	–	–	–	–	95	2.5	1 649	2.1	3 567 857	2.1
Pamlico	4	–	1 110	–	2 016	–	13	4.8	490	1.8	1 025 567	1.9
Pasquotank	4	12.5	776	6.2	913	5.2	–	–	–	–	–	–
Pender	–	–	–	–	–	–	88	3.2	1 695	2.4	3 581 365	2.2
Perquimans	59	4.1	5 039	2.5	6 445	2.9	–	–	–	–	–	–
Person	–	–	–	–	–	–	313	1.5	5 781	1.0	12 151 418	1.0
Pitt	70	2.1	14 473	.7	18 307	.6	328	1.3	14 157	.5	31 847 136	.4
Polk	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Randolph	–	–	–	–	–	–	79	2.9	1 210	2.2	2 524 722	2.4
Richmond	6	9.1	1 325	7.6	1 392	5.6	49	2.9	1 219	1.7	2 682 042	1.6
Robeson	84	3.7	17 362	1.7	21 199	1.5	682	2.5	14 075	1.7	29 821 830	1.6
Rockingham	–	–	–	–	–	–	507	2.2	7 645	1.9	16 084 635	1.9

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 24
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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						Tobacco					
	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)	Pounds	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Rowan	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	26.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Rutherford	5	13.8	310	23.3	216	21.8	6	11.2	6	13.7	7 069	15.2
Sampson	147	3.1	27 961	.8	33 536	.7	543	2.9	9 315	1.5	19 035 042	1.4
Scotland	42	4.2	13 423	1.8	15 604	2.0	19	5.7	634	1.2	1 200 759	1.1
Stanly	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Stokes	–	–	–	–	–	–	716	1.1	6 592	1.5	12 743 630	1.3
Surry	–	–	–	–	–	–	540	1.4	7 179	1.2	14 545 205	1.2
Swain	–	–	–	–	–	–	15	9.0	41	12.2	50 102	12.8
Transylvania	–	–	–	–	–	–	7	13.6	46	3.9	75 804	3.1
Tyrrell	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Union	6	3.9	1 032	1.6	1 047	2.3	–	–	–	–	–	–
Vance	–	–	–	–	–	–	176	1.7	4 040	1.3	8 811 348	1.3
Wake	5	7.6	909	1.0	1 044	.9	356	1.6	10 150	.8	22 379 685	.8
Warren	–	–	–	–	–	–	142	2.0	2 873	1.1	6 386 296	1.0
Washington	13	6.1	3 312	1.4	3 750	1.0	14	7.1	290	2.1	735 982	1.9
Watauga	–	–	–	–	–	–	416	1.1	779	1.8	1 459 009	1.9
Wayne	136	2.0	16 632	1.0	21 202	.8	451	1.3	8 781	.7	19 454 490	.7
Wilkes	–	–	–	–	–	–	47	3.8	758	2.6	1 551 545	2.5
Wilson	45	2.9	7 133	1.7	9 494	1.4	341	1.1	11 159	.5	26 312 016	.5
Yadkin	–	–	–	–	–	–	352	2.2	4 632	2.0	9 757 279	2.0
Yancey	–	–	–	–	–	–	528	1.4	1 303	2.3	2 140 678	2.5

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested —Con.											
	Soybeans for beans						Peanuts for nuts					
	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)	Pounds	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
North Carolina	**13 080**	**1.4**	**1 287 573**	**.8**	**34 176 793**	**.7**	**2 371**	**1.8**	**149 210**	**.7**	**398 611 000**	**.7**
Alamance	61	4.7	2 195	6.9	50 436	7.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
Alexander	15	5.8	487	5.9	14 518	4.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
Alleghany	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Anson	53	3.6	8 314	3.7	192 019	3.5	–	–	–	–	–	–
Ashe	1	30.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Avery	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Beaufort	325	2.2	61 515	1.0	1 681 553	1.0	20	7.6	548	5.5	1 109 941	5.4
Bertie	246	2.6	11 618	1.6	340 806	1.7	323	2.3	20 575	1.1	53 201 810	1.0
Bladen	268	2.0	15 776	1.5	356 589	1.6	136	2.7	3 442	1.9	9 682 984	1.8
Brunswick	85	3.3	8 141	3.0	175 114	2.6	3	23.2	3	23.2	7 600	22.3
Buncombe	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Burke	14	8.9	456	20.3	15 186	23.0	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Cabarrus	47	4.0	4 188	4.5	85 694	2.8	2	14.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Caldwell	16	8.0	459	5.3	10 748	5.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Camden	67	3.1	22 822	1.0	680 220	1.2	–	–	–	–	–	–
Carteret	52	3.3	18 046	1.1	552 819	.8	2	24.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Caswell	50	3.8	895	4.3	20 357	4.2	3	18.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Catawba	75	2.9	4 596	4.1	100 478	3.9	3	16.8	3	16.8	(D)	(D)
Chatham	29	4.3	1 036	6.7	18 861	6.3	–	–	–	–	–	–
Cherokee	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Chowan	105	2.8	7 044	1.7	252 395	1.6	114	2.9	6 143	1.5	18 044 943	1.5
Clay	2	22.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Cleveland	82	3.2	6 723	3.6	164 825	3.6	1	30.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Columbus	615	1.7	35 645	1.2	801 484	1.4	21	7.1	703	1.6	2 066 151	1.8
Craven	180	2.5	20 421	1.3	486 643	1.2	3	16.0	89	6.5	226 539	7.9
Cumberland	172	2.1	19 952	1.3	422 805	1.3	9	6.9	230	4.7	573 000	4.2
Currituck	57	3.1	20 717	1.7	666 301	1.6	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Dare	5	10.0	2 736	9.4	43 338	18.2	–	–	–	–	–	–
Davidson	124	2.4	4 650	2.9	108 833	2.9	–	–	–	–	–	–
Davie	37	4.7	2 254	2.6	50 002	2.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
Duplin	634	2.3	45 790	1.7	1 158 862	1.8	1	49.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Durham	6	8.9	237	8.1	5 021	10.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
Edgecombe	243	1.8	25 471	.7	633 045	.8	178	1.9	13 023	.6	33 459 631	.6
Forsyth	46	4.6	1 226	7.6	24 641	8.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Franklin	206	2.6	16 236	2.7	349 048	2.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
Gaston	13	7.7	637	6.9	13 317	9.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Gates	117	1.6	7 952	.9	259 670	.9	133	1.4	7 650	.6	23 842 834	.6
Graham	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Granville	85	3.8	1 854	3.5	39 459	4.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Greene	293	1.3	25 674	.9	774 784	.8	4	15.3	38	7.1	60 060	3.8
Guilford	131	3.0	4 694	3.4	100 820	2.9	2	26.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Halifax	167	2.1	12 359	1.6	314 220	1.7	193	2.1	25 565	.7	65 313 073	.6
Harnett	306	1.7	20 440	1.3	394 799	1.3	–	–	–	–	–	–
Haywood	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Henderson	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hertford	101	3.1	5 541	2.0	145 568	1.8	149	2.5	12 366	1.2	32 157 462	1.1
Hoke	67	3.4	14 326	1.7	333 266	2.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hyde	108	2.3	38 456	1.0	1 306 162	1.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Iredell	82	3.0	5 672	4.1	131 672	3.5	–	–	–	–	–	–

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 25
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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.											
	Soybeans for beans						Peanuts for nuts					
	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)	Pounds	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Jackson	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Johnston	717	1.1	47 345	.7	1 172 414	.7	13	7.1	227	4.2	605 784	4.0
Jones	118	3.0	11 136	3.2	272 847	3.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
Lee	70	3.0	2 612	2.9	42 164	2.9	–	–	–	–	–	–
Lenoir	322	1.2	28 728	.8	759 653	.9	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lincoln	70	4.0	5 228	5.4	105 302	5.5	2	19.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
McDowell	7	12.7	331	7.4	13 148	5.2	–	–	–	–	–	–
Macon	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Madison	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Martin	331	2.4	16 011	2.0	432 876	2.0	377	2.3	16 954	1.2	45 498 975	1.1
Mecklenburg	7	12.8	545	14.7	10 000	10.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mitchell	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Montgomery	23	4.9	970	5.2	18 408	6.0	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Moore	42	4.1	2 963	8.4	56 650	8.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Nash	263	1.2	32 582	.5	812 517	.5	38	3.0	3 274	.9	8 914 386	.7
New Hanover	10	11.4	1 055	6.2	33 011	7.2	5	16.4	11	24.4	26 264	27.5
Northampton	181	2.3	10 763	1.0	330 035	.9	267	2.1	25 615	.9	74 340 724	.8
Onslow	177	2.0	12 986	2.4	317 529	2.4	4	16.6	32	17.0	49 704	18.3
Orange	26	5.3	2 103	6.4	45 163	5.5	–	–	–	–	–	–
Pamlico	56	2.1	18 749	.9	597 866	.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Pasquotank	162	2.5	42 547	1.3	1 462 477	1.3	4	17.7	126	19.9	280 290	19.8
Pender	127	2.8	13 800	2.4	372 488	2.4	13	9.3	810	9.8	1 597 200	10.8
Perquimans	173	2.9	26 696	2.1	977 823	2.1	89	3.5	3 012	2.2	8 747 998	2.0
Person	59	2.9	3 058	1.6	75 632	2.2	–	–	–	–	–	–
Pitt	389	1.2	47 838	.6	1 231 820	.6	136	1.9	5 005	.9	10 854 068	.7
Polk	7	10.0	78	13.4	2 045	10.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Randolph	121	2.8	4 924	3.4	129 055	3.0	3	17.6	4	21.5	9 284	27.2
Richmond	20	5.1	4 536	3.4	89 301	3.2	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Robeson	811	2.3	92 192	1.5	2 103 974	1.5	12	6.8	139	4.1	391 940	4.1
Rockingham	119	3.4	2 568	2.5	64 692	2.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Rowan	142	2.5	10 469	3.0	257 363	3.4	2	22.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Rutherford	19	6.4	511	10.6	8 807	10.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Sampson	677	2.7	47 244	1.8	1 224 652	1.8	20	9.9	246	13.8	641 714	13.7
Scotland	55	3.6	12 994	2.1	291 594	2.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
Stanly	133	2.0	21 098	1.4	514 437	1.3	–	–	–	–	–	–
Stokes	92	3.1	1 021	4.1	18 938	4.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Surry	144	2.3	3 561	2.2	90 761	2.3	–	–	–	–	–	–
Swain	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Transylvania	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Tyrrell	72	1.7	29 444	.5	866 372	.6	5	7.5	196	4.6	335 168	3.8
Union	254	1.4	58 333	.9	1 637 963	.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Vance	113	2.3	6 394	2.5	149 701	3.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Wake	270	1.7	16 403	1.6	329 831	1.6	2	19.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Warren	79	2.8	5 768	2.5	125 150	2.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Washington	155	2.0	38 945	1.0	1 220 482	.8	64	3.9	2 725	2.3	5 472 612	2.3
Watauga	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Wayne	509	1.2	48 015	.8	1 287 989	.8	5	10.6	70	6.7	164 145	5.7
Wilkes	15	5.4	380	5.6	9 953	6.3	–	–	–	–	–	–
Wilson	343	1.1	37 718	.5	1 087 303	.5	4	8.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Yadkin	209	2.5	9 164	2.8	228 244	2.9	–	–	–	–	–	–
Yancey	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

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)
North Carolina	**18 268**	**.8**	**466 944**	**.8**	**922 347**	**.8**
Alamance	393	1.7	11 543	2.6	21 627	3.0
Alexander	294	1.1	8 588	1.8	21 502	1.6
Alleghany	314	1.2	10 057	2.1	19 208	2.2
Anson	118	2.2	4 424	2.7	10 520	2.8
Ashe	580	1.0	10 007	1.4	19 106	2.0
Avery	69	3.7	1 415	6.5	1 811	5.6
Beaufort	15	9.3	208	9.0	631	8.4
Bertie	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Bladen	97	3.5	2 311	3.3	4 767	2.9
Brunswick	32	5.8	602	6.7	1 088	6.6
Buncombe	552	1.3	11 148	1.4	22 286	1.7
Burke	202	1.6	3 977	2.7	6 641	3.9
Cabarrus	250	1.4	9 297	2.5	17 834	3.2
Caldwell	177	1.9	3 660	2.6	7 989	3.7
Camden	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Carteret	4	16.8	64	7.8	(D)	(D)
Caswell	270	1.6	8 182	1.9	15 227	2.6
Catawba	307	1.1	8 793	1.7	16 030	2.1
Chatham	446	1.0	11 440	1.2	23 439	1.2

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 26
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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)
Cherokee	111	2.6	2 892	3.9	5 913	4.3
Chowan	11	9.7	161	3.6	247	5.3
Clay	104	2.2	3 117	4.0	5 405	4.0
Cleveland	392	1.3	10 808	1.7	18 730	3.2
Columbus	121	3.4	1 879	3.9	3 989	4.9
Craven	26	5.7	686	10.4	2 033	14.1
Cumberland	100	3.0	3 121	3.8	7 710	4.2
Currituck	4	14.3	50	19.6	127	28.2
Dare	–	–	–	–	–	–
Davidson	555	.9	13 980	1.5	26 617	2.1
Davie	347	1.2	10 967	2.6	18 507	2.3
Duplin	123	2.6	3 033	3.2	8 876	2.4
Durham	59	2.9	1 906	4.1	3 753	5.6
Edgecombe	17	5.0	758	2.2	1 831	2.7
Forsyth	333	1.4	6 668	2.4	12 065	3.0
Franklin	140	3.1	5 825	3.7	10 963	3.9
Gaston	193	1.5	6 353	2.4	12 333	2.2
Gates	8	5.9	142	9.4	234	5.6
Graham	42	5.3	607	9.9	1 323	10.5
Granville	298	2.2	10 082	2.5	19 398	2.0
Greene	25	4.0	776	11.4	2 260	7.8
Guilford	504	1.5	10 780	2.2	19 251	2.7
Halifax	31	6.0	3 633	3.2	4 721	1.6
Harnett	173	2.2	3 529	2.3	7 040	2.4
Haywood	411	1.5	6 268	1.8	14 724	1.9
Henderson	143	2.4	4 491	2.1	9 028	2.6
Hertford	2	24.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Hoke	38	4.7	1 279	5.1	3 540	4.5
Hyde	6	8.3	138	.4	211	.2
Iredell	724	1.0	26 867	1.1	56 899	1.2
Jackson	89	3.1	1 338	6.6	2 185	8.6
Johnston	307	1.5	4 690	2.1	10 015	3.1
Jones	18	5.6	268	7.1	576	6.6
Lee	94	2.7	1 523	3.8	2 568	4.2
Lenoir	34	4.1	682	4.1	1 904	3.1
Lincoln	273	1.6	8 788	3.7	16 740	3.5
McDowell	107	2.4	2 048	4.3	3 758	7.9
Macon	171	1.9	3 239	2.8	7 395	4.6
Madison	372	2.2	4 737	3.2	8 350	3.7
Martin	14	8.5	405	8.8	378	12.5
Mecklenburg	172	1.6	5 515	2.5	10 070	3.2
Mitchell	99	3.0	1 665	5.7	2 905	9.7
Montgomery	91	2.1	2 806	4.1	4 655	3.0
Moore	229	1.7	5 290	2.5	12 453	2.5
Nash	88	2.6	2 946	3.2	5 988	3.6
New Hanover	4	16.7	60	16.7	120	16.7
Northampton	13	7.0	722	7.3	1 473	5.1
Onslow	52	3.7	1 146	2.8	2 716	2.3
Orange	258	1.4	9 100	1.9	16 154	1.8
Pamlico	3	15.3	(D)	(D)	149	17.3
Pasquotank	1	43.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Pender	33	6.1	930	6.8	2 665	11.4
Perquimans	8	10.1	258	10.2	508	10.1
Person	192	1.9	5 836	2.1	9 806	2.5
Pitt	36	4.4	1 255	4.4	3 065	5.9
Polk	80	2.4	2 207	3.4	4 920	2.6
Randolph	660	1.1	16 709	1.2	30 305	1.4
Richmond	65	2.7	2 260	3.7	4 324	4.3
Robeson	116	3.7	4 089	5.7	11 905	7.4
Rockingham	379	1.9	8 212	2.5	13 815	2.9
Rowan	506	1.1	15 994	1.6	37 172	1.7
Rutherford	285	1.2	7 969	2.1	11 565	2.6
Sampson	207	2.9	5 649	2.0	10 912	3.1
Scotland	20	6.7	1 299	10.0	1 607	9.6
Stanly	300	1.2	9 892	1.5	18 603	1.6
Stokes	414	1.4	8 124	2.8	14 760	5.2
Surry	643	1.1	12 667	1.5	22 416	1.8
Swain	31	5.4	723	7.1	1 547	6.8
Transylvania	78	3.1	2 210	5.5	4 383	5.9
Tyrrell	3	19.0	21	18.5	22	18.4
Union	317	1.2	8 135	1.9	18 130	2.9
Vance	72	3.2	2 180	5.6	3 380	7.1
Wake	189	2.1	5 180	2.7	9 174	3.9
Warren	122	2.2	4 894	2.2	8 557	2.5
Washington	10	9.7	69	9.6	129	10.9
Watauga	310	1.3	4 714	1.8	8 144	2.1
Wayne	131	2.2	2 984	2.6	9 941	2.7
Wilkes	675	.9	14 702	1.0	35 096	1.3
Wilson	36	4.2	863	4.5	1 159	7.2
Yadkin	501	1.6	10 598	2.0	21 048	2.2
Yancey	195	2.5	2 362	3.5	3 568	5.3

[1]Data are based on a sample of farms.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 27
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01

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	51 854	1.0	9 568	17.4	15.6	2.4
Land in farms ---- acres	8 936 015	.7	362 680	20.5	3.9	.8
Average size of farm ---- acres	172.3	1.2	37.9	13.6	(X)	(X)
Farms by size:						
Less than 10 acres	4 651	1.1	2 769	31.3	37.3	7.5
10 to 49 acres	15 852	.9	4 157	23.2	20.8	4.0
Less than 50 acres	20 503	.9	6 926	19.5	25.2	3.9
50 acres or more	31 351	1.1	2 642	27.0	7.8	1.9
50 to 99 acres	11 223	1.0	2 255	29.3	16.7	4.0
100 to 179 acres	8 143	1.3	279	72.6	3.3	2.3
180 acres or more	11 985	1.0	108	50.0	.9	.4
Harvested cropland ---- farms	42 135	1.0	5 053	21.3	10.7	2.1
acres	3 998 685	.7	110 683	27.7	2.7	.7
Farms by value of sales:						
Less than $1,000	5 574	1.0	4 426	24.7	44.3	6.1
$1,000 to $2,499	7 042	1.0	2 896	28.7	29.1	5.9
Less than $2,500	12 616	1.0	7 322	21.1	36.7	4.9
$2,500 or more	39 238	1.1	2 245	24.4	5.4	1.2
$2,500 to $9,999	14 218	1.0	1 693	28.4	10.6	2.7
$10,000 or more	25 020	1.2	552	48.7	2.2	1.0
Market value of agricultural products sold ---- $1,000	4 834 218	.3	31 694	36.5	.7	.3
Farms by standard industrial classification:						
Crops (01)	28 799	1.2	3 413	25.3	10.6	2.5
Livestock (02)	23 055	.7	6 155	21.8	21.1	3.7
Farms by type of organization:						
Individual or family	45 273	1.0	9 151	17.7	16.8	2.6
Partnership or corporation	6 339	1.0	345	69.5	5.2	3.4
Other	242	2.1	72	(H)	23.0	17.8
Farms by tenure of operator:						
Full owners	29 242	.9	7 173	19.1	19.7	3.2
Part owners and tenants	22 612	1.1	2 395	28.2	9.6	2.4
Part owners	17 572	1.1	1 349	35.5	7.1	2.3
Tenants	5 040	1.3	1 046	42.8	17.2	6.1
Operators by place of residence:						
On farm operated	36 678	.9	4 323	22.3	10.5	2.2
Not on farm operated	10 223	1.1	2 091	31.2	17.0	4.4
Not reported	4 953	1.0	3 154	25.5	38.9	6.3
Operators by principal occupation:						
Farming	27 376	1.1	2 526	28.7	8.4	2.3
Other	24 478	1.0	4 494	21.8	15.5	2.9
Operators by sex:						
Male	47 914	1.0	8 848	18.1	15.6	2.5
Female	3 940	1.1	720	47.0	15.5	6.2
Operators by race:						
White	49 356	.9	5 756	19.6	10.4	1.9
Black and other races	2 498	1.6	1 264	43.4	33.6	9.9
Operators by years on present farm:						
4 years or less	5 040	1.1	1 658	33.3	24.8	6.4
5 years or more	35 164	1.0	3 636	26.0	9.4	2.2
Average years on present farm	21.0	1.4	13.7	31.3	(X)	(X)
Not reported	11 650	1.0	4 274	22.0	26.8	4.4
Average age of operator	54.7	1.4	55.6	17.3	(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.

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

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1907 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/ 7/94 8:52 AM MACHINE: EPCV24 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_56.TIPS;1 * 8/31/94 10:33:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 28
TSF:TIPS92-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 UTF:TIPS93-10335865.DAT;1 8/31/94 10:34:08 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_56.DAT;2 8/31/94 10:38:01