

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.	15.7
Land in farms acres.	8.4
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹ \$1,000.	3.3
Market value of agricultural products sold \$1,000.	3.6
Harvested cropland acres.	6.9
Corn for grain or seed acres.	2.3
Wheat for grain acres.	5.6
Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Cattle and calves number.	7.9
Hogs and pigs number.	5.7
Hens and pullets of laying age number.	1.2

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Sample Estimation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CENSUS SAMPLING ERROR

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
COMPLETE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:	
25	6.3
50	4.4
75	3.5
100	3.0
150	2.4
200	2.0
300	1.5
500	1.0
750	.5
1,000	.5
1,500	.4
2,000	.3
SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:	
25	36.0
50	26.0
75	21.7
100	19.2
150	16.2
200	14.6
300	12.7
500	10.9
750	9.9
1,000	9.4
1,500	8.8
2,000	8.5

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

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

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

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

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

CENSUS NONSAMPLING ERROR

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

Census Coverage

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

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

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

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

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

Mail List Coverage

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

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

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

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

Respondent and Enumerator Error

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

Item Nonresponse

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

Processing Error

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

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

Classification Error

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

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

EDITING DATA AND IMPUTATION FOR ITEM NONRESPONSE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
F FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS					
Farms ----- number	66 937	1.5	F FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES¹		
Land in farms ----- acres	32 143 030	1.0	Total farm production expenses ----- farms	66 936	1.5
Average size of farm ----- acres	480	1.8	Total farm production expenses ----- \$1,000	3 117 869	.5
M MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD					
Total sales (see text) ----- farms	66 937	1.5	Average per farm ----- dollars	46 580	1.6
\$1,000	3 562 646	.4	Livestock and poultry purchased ----- farms	25 260	1.8
Average per farm ----- dollars	53 224	1.6	\$1,000	1 103 395	.3
Farms by value of sales:			Feed for livestock and poultry ----- farms	49 595	1.6
Less than \$1,000 (see text) ----- farms	7 721	1.6	\$1,000	628 412	.4
\$1,000	2 152	1.7	Commercially mixed formula feeds ----- farms	16 787	2.0
\$1,000 to \$2,499 ----- farms	8 181	1.7	\$1,000	268 026	.5
\$1,000	13 967	1.7	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ----- farms	20 447	1.9
\$2,500 to \$4,999 ----- farms	10 189	1.8	\$1,000	41 030	1.2
\$1,000	36 936	1.8	Commercial fertilizer ----- farms	34 703	1.8
\$5,000 to \$9,999 ----- farms	11 208	1.9	\$1,000	140 995	1.1
\$1,000	79 893	1.9	Agricultural chemicals ----- farms	22 332	1.8
\$10,000 to \$19,999 ----- farms	9 907	2.2	\$1,000	57 080	1.3
\$1,000	139 244	2.2	Petroleum products ----- farms	62 807	1.6
\$20,000 to \$24,999 ----- farms	2 636	2.4	\$1,000	146 709	1.0
\$1,000	58 604	2.4	Electricity ----- farms	37 258	1.7
\$25,000 to \$39,999 ----- farms	4 629	2.2	\$1,000	28 232	1.1
\$1,000	146 093	2.2	Hired farm labor ----- farms	20 070	1.9
\$40,000 to \$49,999 ----- farms	1 864	1.9	\$1,000	144 750	.6
\$1,000	83 045	1.9	Contract labor ----- farms	9 892	2.5
\$50,000 to \$99,999 ----- farms	4 609	1.3	\$1,000	23 629	2.3
\$1,000	325 603	1.2	Repair and maintenance ----- farms	53 464	1.6
\$100,000 to \$249,999 ----- farms	3 799	—	\$1,000	158 445	1.2
\$1,000	598 822	—	Custowork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ----- farms	18 775	2.0
\$250,000 to \$499,999 ----- farms	1 461	—	\$1,000	62 841	1.5
\$1,000	504 104	—	Interest expense ----- farms	28 942	1.7
\$500,000 or more ----- farms	733	—	\$1,000	195 857	1.0
\$1,000	1 574 183	—	Secured by real estate ----- farms	19 405	1.9
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			\$1,000	114 700	1.4
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms	25 306	1.4	Not secured by real estate ----- farms	17 144	1.9
\$1,000	778 813	.5	\$1,000	81 157	.9
Grains ----- farms	17 554	1.5	Cash rent ----- farms	21 397	1.9
\$1,000	483 573	.6	\$1,000	102 994	1.1
Corn for grain ----- farms	645	.9	Property taxes ----- farms	63 379	1.6
\$1,000	31 428	.3	\$1,000	56 103	1.3
Wheat ----- farms	16 626	1.5	All other farm production expenses ----- farms	58 968	1.6
\$1,000	401 512	—	\$1,000	227 398	.7
Soybeans ----- farms	1 191	1.2	NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹		
\$1,000	23 547	.5	All farms ----- number	66 936	1.5
Sorghum for grain ----- farms	1 678	1.1	\$1,000	395 182	1.3
\$1,000	23 376	.5	Average per farm ----- dollars	5 904	2.0
Barley ----- farms	76	2.9	Farms with net gains ² ----- number	32 310	1.8
\$1,000	283	2.7	\$1,000	608 861	.8
Oats ----- farms	425	1.8	Average net gain ----- dollars	18 844	2.0
\$1,000	1 123	2.2	Farms with net losses ----- number	34 626	1.7
Other grains ----- farms	350	1.6	\$1,000	213 679	1.7
\$1,000	2 305	1.1	Average net loss ----- dollars	6 171	2.5
Cotton and cottonseed ----- farms	1 726	1.3	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
\$1,000	52 034	.5	Government payments ----- farms	18 228	1.5
Tobacco ----- farms	—	—	\$1,000	144 599	.9
\$1,000	—	—	Other farm-related income ¹ ----- farms	11 605	2.5
Hay, silage, and field seeds ----- farms	9 767	1.4	\$1,000	57 595	3.2
\$1,000	64 320	.9	Customwork and other agricultural services ----- farms	4 655	3.5
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ----- farms	607	1.8	\$1,000	31 533	3.8
\$1,000	13 085	1.1	Gross cash rent or share payments ----- farms	4 846	3.6
Fruits, nuts, and berries ----- farms	694	1.9	\$1,000	20 761	5.6
\$1,000	6 341	1.8	Forest products and Christmas trees ----- farms	535	10.7
Nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms	436	1.3	\$1,000	1 789	13.8
\$1,000	96 063	.1	Other farm-related income sources ----- farms	3 216	3.7
Other crops ----- farms	1 102	1.7	\$1,000	3 512	10.3
\$1,000	63 399	.7	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Livestock, poultry, and their products ----- farms	54 892	1.5	Total ----- farms	2 264	1.5
\$1,000	2 783 832	.4	\$1,000	26 544	.6
Poultry and poultry products ----- farms	1 523	1.1			
\$1,000	270 375	.1			
Dairy products ----- farms	1 365	1.1			
\$1,000	142 826	.3			
Cattle and calves ----- farms	51 240	1.6			
\$1,000	2 290 955	.4			
Hogs and pigs ----- farms	2 776	1.4			
\$1,000	46 243	.5			
Sheep, lambs, and wool ----- farms	1 425	1.6			
\$1,000	5 340	1.3			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ----- farms	4 328	1.4			
\$1,000	28 094	1.0			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ----- farms	1 504	1.6			
\$1,000	3 643	2.0			

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-7

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE					
Total cropland	farms--	53 197	All operators	farms--	66 937
	acres--	14 520 063		acres--	32 143 030
Harvested cropland	farms--	42 015	Full owners	farms--	35 802
	acres--	8 272 889		acres--	8 693 265
Farms by acres harvested:			Part owners	farms--	24 039
1 to 9 acres	farms--	2 480		acres--	19 978 683
	acres--	11 678	Tenants	farms--	7 096
10 to 19 acres	farms--	4 382		acres--	3 471 082
	acres--	58 123			
20 to 29 acres	farms--	4 246	OWNED AND RENTED LAND		
	acres--	94 240	Land owned	farms--	60 129
30 to 49 acres	farms--	6 383		acres--	19 164 577
	acres--	233 479	Owned land in farms	farms--	59 841
50 to 99 acres	farms--	7 510		acres--	17 374 729
	acres--	516 373	Land rented or leased from others	farms--	31 368
100 to 199 acres	farms--	6 179		acres--	14 954 787
	acres--	835 189	Rented or leased land in farms	landlords--	72 097
200 to 499 acres	farms--	6 003		farms--	31 135
	acres--	1 881 614	Rented or leased to others	farms--	14 768 301
500 to 999 acres	farms--	3 188		acres--	
	acres--	2 192 188	Land rented or leased to others	farms--	6 944
1,000 acres or more	farms--	1 644		acres--	1 976 334
	acres--	2 450 005			
Cropland:			OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS		
Pasture or grazing only	farms--	30 691	Operators by place of residence:		
	acres--	4 462 007	On farm operated		44 951
Other cropland	farms--	12 522	Not on farm operated		16 622
	acres--	1 785 167	Not reported		5 364
Total woodland	farms--	17 940	Operators by principal occupation:		
	acres--	1 936 306	Farming		33 279
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and			Other		33 658
woodland pastured	farms--	33 391	Operators by days worked off farm:		
	acres--	15 063 508	Any		36 697
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc.	farms--	29 949	200 days or more		25 827
	acres--	623 153	Operators by sex:		
Irrigated land	farms--	2 581	Male	farms--	61 611
	acres--	512 487		acres--	30 483 782
Acres irrigated:			Female	farms--	5 326
1 to 9 acres	farms--	573		acres--	1 659 248
	acres--	1 492	Average age of operator	years--	55.0
10 to 49 acres	farms--	448			2.1
	acres--	11 909	Individual or family (sole proprietorship)	farms--	60 304
50 to 99 acres	farms--	389		acres--	25 792 124
	acres--	27 574	Partnership	farms--	4 985
100 to 199 acres	farms--	464		acres--	3 903 771
	acres--	62 335	Corporation:		
200 to 499 acres	farms--	447	Family held	farms--	1 085
	acres--	138 911		acres--	1 841 612
500 to 999 acres	farms--	.7	More than 10 stockholders	farms--	18
	acres--	171	10 or less stockholders	farms--	5.1
1,000 acres or more	farms--	.4		farms--	1 067
	acres--	157 595	Other than family held	farms--	111
Harvested cropland irrigated	farms--	2 379		acres--	167 253
	acres--	478 068	More than 10 stockholders	farms--	9
Pasture and other land irrigated	farms--	391	10 or less stockholders	farms--	102
	acres--	34 419			
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:			Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc.	farms--	452
Diverted under annual commodity programs	farms--	8 913		acres--	438 270
	acres--	234 208			
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs	farms--	4 678	Hired Farm Labor		
	acres--	827 597			
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS¹					
Estimated market value of land and buildings	farms--	66 936	Hired workers by days worked:		
\$1,000--		1.5	150 days or more	farms--	6 640
Average per farm	dollars--	15 753 961		workers--	12 613
Average per acre	dollars--	235 359	Less than 150 days	farms--	18 423
		496		workers--	40 582
		1.6			2.0
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT¹					
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment	farms--	66 817	INJURIES AND DEATHS		
\$1,000--		1.5			
Average per farm	dollars--	2 134 331	Farm-related injuries:		
		31 943	Operator and family members	farms--	484
		2.0		number--	540
		1.2	Hired workers	farms--	255
		1.6		number--	582
		1.7			.6
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS¹					
Commercial fertilizer	farms--	34 628	Farm-related deaths:		
acres on which used--		7 725 743	Operator and family members	farms--	19
		1.8		number--	22
		1.1	Hired workers	farms--	1
				number--	(D)

See footnotes at end of table.

C-8 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
F FARMS BY SIZE						
1 to 9 acres	farms--	2 832	Cattle and calves sold	farms--	51 240	
	acres--	9 382	number--	3 953 960	.6	
10 to 49 acres	farms--	9 614	\$1,000--	2 290 955	.4	
	acres--	269 984	number--	3 415	1.4	
50 to 69 acres	farms--	3 150	Hogs and pigs inventory	farms--	260 682	
	acres--	181 672	number--	2 776	1.4	
70 to 99 acres	farms--	6 100	Hogs and pigs sold	farms--	500 299	
	acres--	494 605	number--	46 243	.5	
100 to 139 acres	farms--	5 099	Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms--	1 577	
	acres--	591 391	number--	103 732	1.5	
140 to 179 acres	farms--	6 750	Sheep and lambs sold	farms--	1 367	
	acres--	1 066 051	number--	82 502	1.5	
180 to 219 acres	farms--	3 157	Horses and ponies inventory	farms--	14 868	
	acres--	622 854	number--	70 006	1.3	
220 to 259 acres	farms--	3 176	Horses and ponies sold	farms--	3 204	
	acres--	755 043	number--	13 289	1.4	
260 to 499 acres	farms--	10 901	POULTRY			
	acres--	3 943 403	Chickens 3 months old or older inventory	farms--	3 224	
500 to 999 acres	farms--	8 202	number--	5 051 662	1.6	
	acres--	5 769 794	Hens and pullets of laying age	farms--	3 159	
1,000 to 1,999 acres	farms--	5 133	number--	4 407 866	.4	
2,000 acres or more	farms--	7 061 060	Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms--	529	
	acres--	2 823	number--	138 607 293	.6	
		11 377 791			.1	
F FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION						
Cash grains (011)	farms--	8 078	CROPS HARVESTED			
	acres--	6 174 290	Corn for grain or seed	farms--	791	
Field crops, except cash grains (013)	farms--	4 377	acres--	123 567	.3	
	acres--	1 593 683	bushels--	16 188 972	.3	
Vegetables and melons (016)	farms--	284	Sorghum for grain or seed	farms--	2 076	
	acres--	59 306	acres--	281 244	1.1	
Fruits and tree nuts (017)	farms--	616	bushels--	13 933 273	.5	
	acres--	76 649	Wheat for grain	farms--	16 716	
Horticultural specialties (018)	farms--	358	acres--	5 197 545	1.5	
	acres--	31 319	bushels--	138 121 986	.7	
General farms, primarily crop (019)	farms--	1 585	Barley for grain	farms--	122	
	acres--	978 544	acres--	5 133	2.3	
Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties (021)	farms--	45 970	bushels--	211 357	2.1	
	acres--	21 810 185	Oats for grain	farms--	1 006	
Dairy farms (024)	farms--	1 113	acres--	37 838	1.6	
	acres--	525 482	bushels--	1 278 578	1.6	
Poultry and eggs (025)	farms--	839	Cotton	farms--	1 726	
	acres--	158 302	acres--	296 484	1.3	
Animal specialties (027)	farms--	2 649	bales--	212 041	.6	
	acres--	272 251	Soybeans for beans	farms--	1 196	
General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029)	farms--	1 068	acres--	193 302	.6	
	acres--	463 019	bushels--	4 975 025	3.7	
			Irish potatoes	farms--	68	
L LIVESTOCK						
Cattle and calves inventory	farms--	52 241	acres--	1 318	.3	
	number--	4 736 594	cwt--	284 282	.1	
Beef cows	farms--	44 115	acres--	908	1.8	
	number--	1 728 273	pounds--	88 449	1.0	
Milk cows	farms--	2 297		203 107 412	.8	
	number--	90 312				
			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms--	32 299	
			acres--	2 112 710	1.6	
			tons, dry--	3 992 843	1.3	
			Alfalfa hay	farms--	5 862	
			acres--	323 603	.9	
			tons, dry--	1 048 225	.8	
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms--	607	
			acres--	21 868	1.8	
			Land in orchards	farms--	2 112	
			acres--	50 339	1.6	

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)			
F FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS								
Farms ----- number	29 638	1.6	Total farm production expenses ----- farms	29 617	1.6			
Land in farms ----- acres	26 343 427	.9	\$1,000-----	2 914 286	.4			
Average size of farm ----- acres	889	1.8	Average per farm ----- dollars	98 399	1.7			
M MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD								
Total sales (see text) ----- farms	29 638	1.6	Livestock and poultry purchased ----- farms	14 684	1.8			
\$1,000-----	3 429 697	.4	\$1,000-----	1 078 834	.3			
Average per farm ----- dollars	115 720	1.6	Feed for livestock and poultry ----- farms	24 171	1.7			
Farms by value of sales:			Commercial mixed formula feeds ----- farms	595 713	.4			
\$10,000 to \$19,999 ----- farms	9 907	2.2	\$1,000-----	9 524	2.1			
\$1,000-----	139 244	2.2	1,000-----	261 213	.5			
\$20,000 to \$24,999 ----- farms	2 636	2.4	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ----- farms	14 384	1.9			
\$1,000-----	58 604	2.4	\$1,000-----	38 714	1.2			
\$25,000 to \$39,999 ----- farms	4 629	2.2	Commercial fertilizer ----- farms	21 216	1.8			
\$1,000-----	146 093	2.2	Agricultural chemicals ----- farms	129 900	1.1			
\$40,000 to \$49,999 ----- farms	1 864	1.9	Petroleum products ----- farms	14 657	1.9			
\$1,000-----	83 045	1.9	Electricity ----- farms	53 111	1.3			
\$50,000 to \$99,999 ----- farms	4 609	1.3	Hired farm labor ----- farms	29 257	1.6			
\$1,000-----	325 603	1.2	\$1,000-----	125 559	.9			
\$100,000 to \$249,999 ----- farms	3 799	-	1,000-----	21 309	1.7			
\$1,000-----	598 822	-	Electricity ----- farms	24 019	1.0			
\$250,000 to \$499,999 ----- farms	1 461	-	Hired farm labor ----- farms	13 676	1.8			
\$1,000-----	504 104	-	\$1,000-----	140 712	.6			
\$500,000 or more ----- farms	733	-	Contract labor ----- farms	6 422	2.6			
\$1,000-----	1 574 183	-	\$1,000-----	20 877	2.4			
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			Repair and maintenance ----- farms	26 953	1.7			
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms	17 154	1.4	\$1,000-----	132 860	1.1			
\$1,000-----	755 659	.5	Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ----- farms	12 442	2.0			
Grains ----- farms	14 166	1.4	\$1,000-----	58 017	1.6			
\$1,000-----	471 826	.6	Interest expense ----- farms	17 616	1.7			
Corn for grain ----- farms	609	.9	\$1,000-----	171 721	1.0			
\$1,000-----	31 351	.3	Secured by real estate ----- farms	11 519	1.9			
Wheat ----- farms	13 540	1.4	\$1,000-----	95 823	1.4			
\$1,000-----	390 987	.6	Not secured by real estate ----- farms	11 704	1.9			
Soybeans ----- farms	999	1.1	\$1,000-----	75 898	.9			
\$1,000-----	22 981	.5						
Sorghum for grain ----- farms	1 514	1.1	NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹					
\$1,000-----	23 027	.5	All farms ----- number	29 617	1.6			
Barley ----- farms	67	2.7	\$1,000-----	466 077	1.1			
\$1,000-----	-	-	Average per farm ----- dollars	15 737	1.9			
Oats ----- farms	338	1.8						
\$1,000-----	988	2.3	Farms with net gains ² ----- number	19 973	1.8			
Other grains ----- farms	315	1.5	\$1,000-----	583 954	.8			
\$1,000-----	2 219	1.1	Average net gain ----- dollars	29 237	2.0			
Cotton and cottonseed ----- farms	1 611	1.3	Farms with net losses ----- number	9 644	2.5			
\$1,000-----	51 684	.5	\$1,000-----	117 876	1.9			
Tobacco ----- farms	-	-	Average net loss ----- dollars	12 223	3.1			
\$1,000-----	-	-						
Hay, silage, and field seeds ----- farms	5 240	1.5	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME					
\$1,000-----	55 104	.8	Government payments ----- farms	13 681	1.4			
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ----- farms	353	2.0	\$1,000-----	129 463	.7			
\$1,000-----	12 488	1.1	Other farm-related income ¹ ----- farms	7 201	2.7			
Fruits, nuts, and berries ----- farms	348	2.3	\$1,000-----	46 101	3.5			
\$1,000-----	5 848	1.9	Customwork and other agricultural services ----- farms	3 222	3.7			
Nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms	279	1.3	\$1,000-----	27 879	4.1			
\$1,000-----	95 559	.1	Gross cash rent or share payments ----- farms	2 557	4.5			
Other crops ----- farms	1 012	1.7	\$1,000-----	14 032	7.3			
\$1,000-----	63 150	.7	Forest products and Christmas trees ----- farms	192	17.0			
Livestock, poultry, and their products ----- farms	26 189	1.6	\$1,000-----	997	15.4			
\$1,000-----	2 674 039	.3	Other farm-related income sources ----- farms	2 581	3.7			
Poultry and poultry products ----- farms	870	.8	\$1,000-----	3 193	11.0			
\$1,000-----	270 062	.1						
Dairy products ----- farms	1 253	1.1						
\$1,000-----	142 508	.3						
Cattle and calves ----- farms	25 380	1.6						
\$1,000-----	2 190 285	.4						
Hogs and pigs ----- farms	1 196	1.6						
\$1,000-----	43 627	.5						
Sheep, lambs, and wool ----- farms	587	1.8						
\$1,000-----	4 318	1.3						
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ----- farms	1 572	1.6						
\$1,000-----	23 240	1.1						
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ----- farms	531	2.0	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS					
\$1,000-----	2 635	2.3	Total ----- farms	1 996	1.4			
			\$1,000-----	26 163	.6			

See footnotes at end of table.

C-10 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE					
Total cropland	farms-- acres--	26 321 .9	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) farms-- acres--	25 525 20 576 970	1.6 1.0
Harvested cropland	farms-- acres--	23 935 7 531 406	Partnership--	2 931 3 490 725	1.5 .6
Cropland:			Corporation:		
Pasture or grazing only	farms-- acres--	14 215 2 976 816	Family held	farms-- acres--	.9 .3
Total woodland	farms-- acres--	6 921 1 139 237	More than 10 stockholders	farms-- acres--	14 873
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured	farms-- acres--	17 393 12 863 899	10 or less stockholders	farms-- acres--	3.2 .9
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc.	farms-- acres--	13 153 411 551	Other than family held	farms-- acres--	74 160 439
Irrigated land	farms-- acres--	2 040 502 026	More than 10 stockholders	farms-- acres--	6 68
Harvested cropland irrigated	farms-- acres--	1 947 472 190	10 or less stockholders	farms-- acres--	2.5 2.1
Pasture and other land irrigated	farms-- acres--	258 29 836	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc.	farms-- acres--	221 350 639
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:					
Diverted under annual commodity programs	farms-- acres--	7 811 228 680	Hired workers by days worked:		
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs	farms-- acres--	3 183 617 733	150 days or more	farms-- workers--	5 101 11 041
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS¹					
Estimated market value of land and buildings	farms-- \$1,000--	29 617 11 850 520	Less than 150 days	farms-- workers--	12 103 29 405
Average per farm	dollars--	400 126			2.0 2.1
Average per acre	dollars--	454			
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT¹					
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment	farms-- \$1,000--	29 594 1 646 775	INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Average per farm	dollars--	55 646	Farm-related injuries:		
			Operator and family members	farms-- number--	307 346
			Hired workers	farms-- number--	228 549
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS¹					
Commercial fertilizer	farms-- acres on which used--	21 182 7 111 284	Farm-related deaths:		
			Operator and family members	farms-- number--	13 (D)
			Hired workers	farms-- number--	1 (D)
TENURE OF OPERATOR					
All operators	farms-- acres--	29 638 26 343 427	FARMS BY SIZE		
Full owners	farms-- acres--	10 650 5 499 849	1 to 9 acres	farms--	635
Part owners	farms-- acres--	15 414 17 932 796	10 to 49 acres	farms--	854
Tenants	farms-- acres--	3 574 2 910 782	50 to 69 acres	farms--	399
OWNED AND RENTED LAND					
Land owned	farms-- acres--	26 216 14 416 847	70 to 99 acres	farms--	864
Owned land in farms	farms-- acres--	26 064 13 343 388	100 to 139 acres	farms--	1 073
Land rented or leased from others	farms-- acres--	19 092 13 139 802	140 to 179 acres	farms--	2 025
Rented or leased land in farms	landlords-- farms-- acres--	53 858 18 988 13 000 039	180 to 219 acres	farms--	1 166
Land rented or leased to others	farms-- acres--	3 341 1 213 222	220 to 259 acres	farms--	1 399
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS					
Operators by place of residence:			260 to 499 acres	farms--	6 750
On farm operated		19 670	500 to 999 acres	farms--	6 852
Not on farm operated		7 662	1,000 to 1,999 acres	farms--	4 863
Not reported		2 306	2,000 acres or more	farms--	2 758
Operators by principal occupation:			FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION		
Farming		20 409	Cash grains (011)	farms--	5 762
Other		9 229	Field crops, except cash grains (013)	farms--	1 572
Operators by days worked off farm:			Vegetables and melons (016)	farms--	125
Any		13 084	Fruits and tree nuts (017)	farms--	87
200 days or more		7 880	Horticultural specialties (018)	farms--	236
Operators by sex:			General farms, primarily crop (019)	farms--	780
Male		27 921	Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties (021)	farms--	18 925
Female		1 717	Dairy farms (024)	farms--	1 048
Average age of operator	years--	55.0	Poultry and eggs (025)	farms--	678
			Animal specialties (027)	farms--	351
LIVESTOCK					
			General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029)	farms--	74
			Cattle and calves inventory	farms-- number--	24 749 4 060 050
			Beef cows	farms-- number--	20 142 1 356 977
			Milk cows	farms-- number--	1 485 88 506
			Cattle and calves sold	farms-- number--	25 380 3 692 702
			Hogs and pigs inventory	farms-- number--	\$1,000-- 2 190 285
			Hogs and pigs sold	farms-- number--	1 295 232 009
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms-- number--	1 196 459 874
			Sheep and lambs sold	farms-- number--	\$1,000-- 43 627
			Horses and ponies inventory	farms-- number--	595 76 457
			Horses and ponies sold	farms-- number--	569 63 305
					1.4 1.8 1.6

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
POULTRY					
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory	farms--	850	Barley for grain	farms--	111
number--	4 996 125	.4	acres--	4 960	2.1
Hens and pullets of laying age	farms--	827	bushels--	206 061	1.8
number--	4 362 126	.4	Oats for grain	farms--	820
			acres--	33 044	1.6
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms--	473	bushels--	1 135 749	1.6
number--	138 600 563	.4	Cotton	farms--	1 611
		.1	acres--	293 049	.6
CROPS HARVESTED			bales--	210 414	.5
Corn for grain or seed	farms--	711	Soybeans for beans	farms--	1 003
acres--	122 631	.8	acres--	186 289	1.1
bushels--	16 134 203	.3	bushels--	4 846 659	.6
Sorghum for grain or seed	farms--	1 861	Irish potatoes	farms--	30
acres--	273 733	1.0	acres--	1 293	.2
bushels--	13 697 560	.5	cwt--	280 997	.1
Wheat for grain	farms--	13 566	Peanuts for nuts	farms--	863
acres--	4 998 378	1.4	acres--	87 772	1.8
bushels--	134 095 056	.6	pounds--	202 460 542	1.0
			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass	farms--	17 684
			silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	acres--	1 604 590
			tons, dry--	3 239 609	1.2
			Alfalfa hay	farms--	4 435
			acres--	290 454	1.4
			tons, dry--	976 727	.9
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms--	353
			acres--	20 943	2.0
			Land in orchards	farms--	722
			acres--	30 756	2.0

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

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

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

Item	All farms		Farms with sales of \$10,000 or more	
	Percent change from 1987 to 1992	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1987 to 1992	Standard error of estimate
Farms-----	-4.7	1.6	3.4	1.8
Land in farms -----	1.9	1.1	4.8	1.0
Average size of farm -----	6.9	2.1	1.3	2.0
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹ :				
Average per farm -----	9.5	2.5	4.1	2.4
Average per acre -----	3.3	2.0	3.7	1.9
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹ :				
Average per farm -----	8.4	2.5	3.9	2.5
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres -----	-22.7	1.5	-11.6	2.1
10 to 49 acres -----	-5.1	1.8	22.5	
50 to 179 acres -----	-5.5	1.8	11.6	2.4
180 to 499 acres -----	-4.3	2.1	3.2	2.5
500 to 999 acres -----	-2.4	2.1	-2.0	2.1
1,000 to 1,999 acres -----	-	1.3	.8	1.3
2,000 acres or more -----	10.5	(L)	10.5	(L)
Total cropland -----	-4.6	1.6	2.2	1.8
farms-----	.5	1.2	3.1	1.2
acres-----	-3.5	1.6	2.2	1.8
Harvested cropland -----	13.0	1.1	16.4	1.1
Irrigated land -----	-14.8	1.2	-12.6	1.2
farms-----	7.1	.7	8.1	.7
acres-----	-	-	-	-
Market value of agricultural products sold -----	\$1,000 --	31.2	.7	.6
Average per farm -----	dollars --	37.7	2.4	2.4
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops -----	\$1,000 --	27.7	.9	.9
Livestock, poultry, and their products -----	\$1,000 --	32.3	.6	.6
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than \$2,500 -----	-14.0	1.2	(X)	(X)
\$2,500 to \$4,999 -----	-8.0	1.9	(X)	(X)
\$5,000 to \$9,999 -----	-6.6	2.0	(X)	(X)
\$10,000 to \$24,999 -----	-2.0	2.4	-2.0	2.4
\$25,000 to \$49,999 -----	3.1	2.5	3.1	2.5
\$50,000 to \$99,999 -----	2.9	1.7	2.9	1.3
\$100,000 to \$249,999 -----	10.7	(L)	10.7	(L)
\$250,000 to \$499,999 -----	24.3	(L)	24.3	(L)
\$500,000 or more -----	57.6	.1	57.6	.1
Total farm production expenses ¹ -----	\$1,000--	32.1	2.1	35.9
Average per farm -----	dollars --	38.7	2.5	31.3
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹ -----	farms--	-4.7	1.6	3.5
\$1,000--		33.5	3.0	27.4
Average per farm -----	dollars --	40.1	4.0	23.2
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming -----	.7	1.7	2.1	1.7
Other -----	-9.5	1.6	6.5	2.2
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any -----	-10.1	4.7	.5	5.3
200 days or more -----	-9.4	4.7	5.4	5.6
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory -----	farms--	-2.4	1.6	4.1
number--	4.4	1.1	6.5	1.0
Beef cows -----	farms--	-	1.8	8.5
number--	6.0	1.6	9.7	1.5
Milk cows -----	farms--	-18.8	1.2	-8.4
number--	-2	.6	1.1	.6
Cattle and calves sold -----	farms--	-4.4	1.6	2.5
number--	8.9	.7	11.9	.7
Hogs and pigs inventory -----	farms--	-8.0	1.5	-10.6
number--	39.1	1.4	45.2	1.5
Hogs and pigs sold -----	farms--	-10.2	1.5	-10.6
number--	44.3	1.4	50.7	1.5
Sheep and lambs inventory -----	farms--	-12.3	1.6	-15.8
number--	-	-	-	-
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory -----	farms--	-13.9	1.6	-15.3
number--	-	-	-	-
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold -----	farms--	-4.9	.4	-12.9
number--	54.5	.2	-6.2	.4
Selected crops harvested:				
Sorghum for grain or seed -----	farms--	-29.9	1.0	-25.2
acres--	-17.1	.7	-15.2	.7
bushels--	-7.8	.7	-6.2	.7
Wheat for grain -----	farms--	-10.3	1.5	-1.9
acres--	21.5	1.1	26.2	1.1
bushels--	21.7	1.1	25.4	1.0
Cotton -----	farms--	-40.7	1.0	-37.8
acres--	-17.7	.8	-17.0	.8
bales--	-30.8	.6	-30.4	.6
Soybeans for beans -----	farms--	-23.6	1.1	-16.8
acres--	-15.9	.9	-14.1	.9
bushels--	-11.5	.9	-10.5	.9
Peanuts for nuts -----	farms--	-16.5	1.8	-14.8
acres--	2.3	1.4	3.2	1.4
pounds--	6.6	1.2	7.0	1.2
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) -----	farms--	.3	1.7	4.1
acres--	10.0	1.5	11.5	1.5
tons, dry--	16.4	1.5	17.0	1.4

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-13

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)
Oklahoma -----	66 937	1.5	32 143 030	1.0	480	1.8	235 359	2.0	2 134 331	1.2
Adair -----	1 006	1.4	207 333	1.4	206	2.0	150 207	4.9	22 825	4.2
Alfalfa -----	774	1.2	487 638	.7	630	1.4	416 242	4.0	44 919	2.8
Atoka -----	982	2.4	375 683	2.1	383	3.2	136 227	7.2	18 511	5.0
Beaver -----	736	1.2	986 621	.6	1 341	1.3	374 846	2.4	37 494	2.9
Beckham -----	732	2.8	493 631	2.0	674	3.5	275 207	6.0	25 757	5.0
Blaine -----	825	3.1	513 789	2.0	623	3.7	372 116	9.3	44 977	5.1
Bryan -----	1 360	1.4	412 673	1.4	303	2.0	152 850	4.5	32 544	5.9
Caddo -----	1 441	2.5	726 481	1.6	504	2.9	296 647	7.1	68 916	3.3
Canadian -----	1 071	1.3	499 876	.8	467	1.5	368 322	3.4	52 467	4.7
Carter -----	992	2.5	372 901	2.4	376	3.5	180 147	5.9	20 129	5.7
Cherokee -----	977	2.0	218 803	2.3	224	3.0	150 199	5.8	21 574	4.2
Choctaw -----	833	2.7	300 829	2.5	361	3.6	147 490	5.5	17 723	7.4
Cimarron -----	446	1.0	1 034 980	.3	2 321	1.1	456 670	1.9	34 086	4.5
Cleveland -----	866	1.0	157 105	1.3	181	1.7	180 052	9.9	17 579	6.8
Coal -----	536	1.6	264 890	1.2	494	2.0	186 505	5.8	10 926	7.6
Comanche -----	937	2.4	405 831	2.0	433	3.1	228 009	4.9	29 497	4.8
Cotton -----	540	2.2	358 446	1.4	664	2.6	287 224	4.3	29 200	10.8
Craig -----	1 049	1.3	447 212	1.0	426	1.6	179 450	3.9	28 403	6.1
Creek -----	1 123	1.2	336 285	1.1	299	1.6	151 069	5.9	18 418	7.9
Custer -----	864	1.0	633 874	.6	734	1.2	396 873	4.0	50 623	3.2
Delaware -----	1 144	1.7	242 097	2.0	212	2.6	153 783	4.7	25 406	5.0
Dewey -----	692	1.4	583 098	.9	843	1.7	319 461	3.3	28 159	3.7
Ellis -----	599	2.8	699 515	1.5	1 168	3.2	322 244	6.9	22 747	4.6
Garfield -----	1 152	1.1	662 121	.6	575	1.2	367 163	2.0	62 703	3.1
Garvin -----	1 307	1.4	419 760	1.3	321	1.9	177 113	5.9	35 277	3.9
Grady -----	1 432	1.2	566 152	.9	395	1.5	221 972	4.1	58 284	6.0
Grant -----	764	1.0	599 536	.5	785	1.1	413 366	2.4	49 158	1.9
Greer -----	449	3.0	338 529	2.2	754	3.7	265 391	9.6	17 891	5.5
Harmon -----	332	1.3	286 379	.9	863	1.6	284 191	7.1	13 577	6.4
Harper -----	441	2.3	607 180	1.1	1 377	2.6	396 378	4.5	24 421	4.7
Haskell -----	763	1.6	268 038	1.3	351	2.0	168 239	9.7	15 893	8.1
Hughes -----	772	2.3	346 572	2.1	449	3.1	170 167	7.1	16 461	7.7
Jackson -----	634	2.1	469 883	1.1	741	2.3	365 496	3.9	35 438	4.4
Jefferson -----	468	2.9	405 271	1.5	866	3.3	349 531	11.8	13 899	5.9
Johnston -----	572	1.5	323 534	.9	566	1.7	239 895	8.9	15 645	10.8
Kay -----	964	1.2	477 655	.7	495	1.4	304 481	2.8	49 950	4.9
Kingfisher -----	921	1.3	521 820	.7	567	1.5	362 419	3.7	49 120	3.8
Kiowa -----	692	1.0	558 313	.6	807	1.1	372 699	3.7	37 080	3.6
Latimer -----	547	1.2	194 253	1.2	355	1.7	162 826	6.4	10 886	9.4
Le Flore -----	1 467	1.9	380 529	1.9	259	2.7	178 522	4.7	33 113	4.3
Lincoln -----	1 656	1.3	397 909	1.2	240	1.7	132 189	7.0	27 008	5.3
Logan -----	879	1.4	344 280	1.2	392	1.8	254 446	5.6	27 012	6.8
Love -----	556	2.1	255 538	1.7	460	2.7	247 800	10.2	14 230	6.9
McClain -----	851	1.2	253 652	1.0	298	1.6	218 281	5.1	26 934	7.6
McCurtain -----	1 314	2.2	314 987	2.3	240	3.2	166 222	7.4	28 376	3.3
McIntosh -----	805	1.6	236 766	1.2	294	2.0	149 920	5.9	15 201	5.3
Major -----	848	2.2	494 277	1.6	583	2.8	302 888	4.3	33 414	6.0
Marshall -----	349	2.4	162 690	2.0	466	3.2	305 136	19.7	9 802	8.0
Mayes -----	1 227	1.1	277 981	1.0	227	1.5	164 679	5.0	27 219	5.4
Murray -----	411	1.2	230 832	.9	562	1.5	252 042	6.1	11 392	5.5
Muskogee -----	1 265	1.3	347 480	1.0	275	1.7	175 608	4.7	29 214	4.7
Noble -----	704	2.3	390 957	1.7	555	2.9	257 679	4.1	32 872	4.1
Nowata -----	695	1.1	282 659	.8	407	1.3	169 225	5.9	14 169	7.1
Oktussee -----	677	2.2	257 577	2.3	380	3.2	143 698	6.4	12 629	8.4
Oklahoma -----	848	1.4	156 748	1.6	185	2.1	203 827	7.9	16 593	8.3
Okmulgee -----	931	1.3	280 533	1.1	301	1.7	162 853	6.2	19 031	8.7
Osage -----	1 065	1.2	1 116 090	.4	1 048	1.2	335 863	4.0	28 237	8.6
Ottawa -----	898	1.1	207 118	1.0	231	1.5	165 974	4.6	25 985	5.4
Pawnee -----	631	1.2	282 211	1.1	447	1.6	193 557	5.0	16 368	6.3
Payne -----	1 115	1.4	328 976	1.4	295	1.9	187 719	7.6	23 416	4.2
Pittsburg -----	1 372	2.1	481 244	2.1	351	2.9	138 546	5.9	22 410	6.4
Pontotoc -----	1 037	1.3	353 045	1.2	340	1.8	166 849	5.2	22 465	5.8
Pottawatomie -----	1 184	1.2	299 263	1.2	253	1.8	152 850	5.9	24 324	7.0
Pushmataha -----	646	2.6	239 971	2.5	371	3.6	149 711	8.2	9 760	10.2
Roger Mills -----	677	3.1	660 214	1.9	975	3.6	345 799	10.5	26 017	4.5
Rogers -----	1 258	1.2	309 614	1.0	246	1.6	224 640	6.6	25 553	8.0
Seminole -----	872	2.0	250 958	2.2	288	3.0	125 136	7.0	16 856	16.6
Sequoyah -----	913	1.4	215 222	1.3	236	1.9	139 121	5.0	16 015	5.7
Stephens -----	1 093	1.4	421 233	1.2	385	1.8	158 706	4.5	25 750	6.2
Texas -----	704	.9	1 051 384	.5	1 493	1.1	504 305	2.3	60 793	2.1
Tillman -----	587	1.0	480 948	.6	819	1.2	350 340	3.2	33 925	2.6
Tulsa -----	766	1.2	134 096	1.5	175	2.0	253 630	9.0	17 294	7.3
Wagoner -----	823	1.2	216 638	1.0	263	1.6	227 582	4.3	18 397	4.2
Washington -----	651	1.0	216 268	.9	332	1.3	221 185	13.3	13 078	7.8
Washita -----	1 004	2.5	577 693	1.6	575	3.0	315 038	4.3	57 936	3.9
Woods -----	677	1.2	743 563	.6	1 098	1.3	469 466	3.2	32 962	3.6
Woodward -----	746	1.1	687 299	.7	921	1.3	291 832	4.9	30 018	7.3

See footnotes at end of table.

C-14 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

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

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

Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm ¹		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses ¹			
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total farm production expenses			
							Farms	Value		
Oklahoma -----	31 943	2.0	3 562 646	.4	53 224	1.6	66 936	1.5	3 117 869	.5
Adair -----	22 689	4.5	88 355	.2	87 828	1.4	1 006	1.5	78 729	1.9
Alfalfa -----	58 034	3.1	92 228	.3	119 157	1.2	774	1.3	80 227	1.0
Atoka -----	18 850	5.6	17 725	1.8	18 050	3.1	982	2.5	16 259	3.5
Beaver -----	51 013	3.2	79 414	.3	107 900	1.2	735	1.3	66 284	.7
Beckham -----	35 188	5.6	25 780	1.5	35 219	3.2	732	2.5	21 620	2.6
Blaine -----	54 452	6.1	71 133	.9	86 221	3.2	826	3.4	62 720	1.5
Bryan -----	23 929	6.1	34 097	.9	25 071	1.7	1 360	1.5	28 568	3.7
Caddo -----	48 025	4.1	88 758	1.0	61 594	2.6	1 440	2.4	69 125	1.6
Canadian -----	48 943	5.0	71 943	.5	67 174	1.4	1 072	1.7	59 099	2.0
Carter -----	20 271	6.2	19 985	1.6	20 146	3.0	993	2.5	19 140	3.0
Cherokee -----	22 104	4.6	77 765	.4	79 595	2.0	976	1.9	53 104	1.1
Choctaw -----	21 276	8.0	22 486	1.4	26 994	3.0	833	3.0	20 906	2.7
Cimarron -----	76 771	4.7	177 403	.1	397 764	1.0	445	1.1	155 875	.4
Cleveland -----	20 512	7.0	12 650	.8	14 607	1.3	867	1.2	11 909	3.0
Coal -----	20 384	7.9	13 319	1.0	24 849	1.9	536	1.9	12 351	3.3
Comanche -----	31 480	5.3	30 738	1.4	32 805	2.7	937	2.4	25 748	2.5
Cotton -----	54 073	11.0	30 173	.9	55 875	2.4	540	2.3	26 366	2.0
Craig -----	27 076	6.2	53 990	.4	51 468	1.4	1 049	1.4	47 933	1.4
Creek -----	16 401	8.0	12 360	1.1	11 006	1.6	1 123	1.3	12 249	5.0
Custer -----	58 592	3.4	65 227	.4	75 495	1.1	864	1.2	55 346	1.4
Delaware -----	22 208	5.3	73 668	.5	64 395	1.8	1 144	1.8	64 305	1.3
Dewey -----	40 692	4.0	35 229	.6	50 909	1.5	692	1.6	29 027	2.8
Ellis -----	38 039	5.5	33 591	.9	56 079	2.9	598	3.0	24 625	2.0
Garfield -----	54 477	3.2	77 062	.3	66 894	1.1	1 152	1.0	67 181	1.1
Garvin -----	26 971	4.2	32 282	.8	24 699	1.6	1 308	1.6	27 170	2.4
Grady -----	40 730	6.2	79 081	.4	55 224	1.2	1 431	1.2	70 359	1.0
Grant -----	65 282	2.4	54 306	.4	71 082	1.1	763	1.0	44 615	1.0
Greer -----	39 759	6.3	18 062	1.4	40 227	3.3	450	3.2	14 697	3.4
Harmon -----	40 894	6.6	19 958	.6	60 115	1.4	332	1.4	16 067	1.9
Harper -----	55 377	5.3	88 241	.3	200 093	2.3	441	2.5	84 469	.7
Haskell -----	20 830	8.2	17 897	.8	23 457	1.8	763	1.5	15 360	3.5
Hughes -----	21 546	8.1	15 660	1.6	20 285	2.8	772	2.3	14 461	4.0
Jackson -----	55 895	4.9	50 095	.5	79 014	2.2	634	2.3	43 765	1.8
Jefferson -----	29 699	6.5	30 020	1.0	64 145	3.1	468	2.6	24 430	2.5
Johnston -----	27 739	11.0	27 073	.5	47 331	1.5	572	1.6	22 128	1.9
Kay -----	51 816	5.2	46 877	.5	48 628	1.3	964	1.8	43 146	1.8
Kingfisher -----	53 334	4.1	76 160	.5	82 693	1.4	921	1.6	66 557	1.3
Kiowa -----	53 974	3.8	45 867	.4	66 282	1.1	692	1.0	38 762	1.4
Latimer -----	19 937	9.6	8 798	1.0	16 084	1.6	546	1.6	8 562	5.4
Le Flore -----	22 587	4.8	66 356	.5	45 232	2.0	1 466	2.1	61 740	1.1
Lincoln -----	16 309	5.5	20 702	1.0	12 501	1.6	1 656	1.4	20 184	3.1
Logan -----	30 730	7.0	36 165	.6	41 143	1.5	879	1.5	32 360	2.2
Love -----	26 063	7.5	19 259	1.2	34 639	2.4	556	2.3	16 235	2.9
McClain -----	31 650	7.7	31 730	.5	37 285	1.3	851	1.2	27 148	4.1
McCurtain -----	21 578	4.1	91 484	.4	69 623	2.3	1 315	2.4	79 310	1.1
McIntosh -----	18 883	5.6	12 676	1.2	15 746	2.0	805	1.8	11 863	3.9
Major -----	39 921	6.6	46 519	.8	54 857	2.4	848	2.4	39 843	2.5
Marshall -----	28 085	8.4	9 530	1.7	27 308	3.0	349	2.5	8 691	5.3
Mayes -----	22 292	5.6	27 551	.7	22 454	1.3	1 227	1.2	23 355	2.3
Murray -----	27 785	5.6	19 121	.5	46 522	1.3	410	1.2	16 731	2.8
Muskogee -----	23 204	5.0	37 179	.5	29 391	1.4	1 265	1.4	33 905	3.7
Noble -----	46 693	4.7	33 126	1.0	47 054	2.6	704	2.3	30 170	1.7
Nowata -----	20 416	7.2	26 398	.5	37 982	1.2	694	1.2	22 249	1.9
Oklfuskee -----	18 654	8.8	12 334	1.8	18 218	2.9	677	2.4	11 052	4.0
Oklahoma -----	19 544	8.5	10 867	1.2	12 815	1.8	850	1.6	10 742	6.3
Okmulgee -----	20 441	8.8	16 359	.8	17 571	1.5	931	1.4	15 452	3.8
Osage -----	26 489	8.7	82 566	.3	77 527	1.2	1 066	1.2	71 435	.8
Ottawa -----	28 937	5.5	42 337	.4	47 146	1.2	898	1.2	34 460	2.1
Pawnee -----	25 980	6.5	34 968	.5	55 416	1.3	630	1.4	32 786	1.6
Payne -----	21 000	4.4	26 782	.7	24 020	1.5	1 116	1.4	24 261	2.1
Pittsburg -----	16 345	6.8	24 665	1.8	17 978	2.8	1 371	2.1	22 850	3.9
Pontotoc -----	21 663	6.0	29 598	.6	28 542	1.5	1 037	1.5	25 363	2.1
Pottawatomie -----	20 544	7.1	15 780	1.0	13 328	1.6	1 184	1.4	16 037	4.9
Pushmataha -----	15 492	10.7	10 215	2.2	15 813	3.4	646	2.7	8 737	6.1
Roger Mills -----	38 831	5.5	28 699	1.3	42 392	3.4	677	3.0	25 707	2.4
Rogers -----	20 410	8.2	22 995	.7	18 279	1.4	1 258	1.4	23 332	5.5
Seminole -----	19 330	16.8	9 656	2.2	11 073	3.0	872	2.1	8 747	5.9
Sequoiah -----	17 541	5.9	11 422	1.1	12 510	1.8	913	1.6	10 896	6.1
Stephens -----	23 559	6.4	22 579	1.0	20 658	1.7	1 093	1.6	19 571	3.5
Texas -----	86 231	2.3	504 300	(L)	716 335	.9	705	1.0	462 498	.1
Tillman -----	58 391	2.9	40 442	.4	68 896	1.1	588	1.2	35 206	3.0
Tulsa -----	22 607	7.5	13 649	.7	17 818	1.5	765	1.4	11 367	4.8
Wagoner -----	22 381	4.4	19 928	.7	24 214	1.4	822	1.4	16 122	2.4
Washington -----	20 090	7.8	18 029	.6	27 695	1.1	651	1.0	16 599	3.0
Washita -----	57 705	4.7	69 651	.9	69 374	2.7	1 004	2.6	60 794	1.6
Woods -----	48 688	3.8	68 121	.3	100 621	1.2	677	1.3	58 318	1.1
Woodward -----	40 185	7.4	33 453	.5	44 843	1.2	747	1.2	28 506	1.5

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-15

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)
Oklahoma -----	25 260	1.8	1 103 395	.3	49 595	1.6	628 412	.4	20 447	1.9	41 030	1.2
Adair -----	414	8.4	10 384	2.7	820	4.0	42 406	1.7	145	18.3	111	23.2
Alfalfa -----	449	5.9	36 981	1.9	488	5.4	12 708	.8	391	6.7	624	8.8
Atoka -----	301	11.4	4 555	4.0	767	4.8	3 124	5.6	60	27.8	109	25.4
Beaver -----	259	8.5	27 925	.6	502	4.4	13 946	.9	405	6.3	587	4.2
Beckham -----	312	10.2	4 861	7.8	493	6.1	2 162	4.4	370	8.3	660	8.8
Blaine -----	309	10.2	30 197	1.9	563	6.1	6 553	2.1	397	8.7	767	5.8
Bryan -----	464	8.8	4 635	5.1	1 019	3.8	4 727	6.4	380	9.8	1 169	8.7
Caddo -----	565	8.3	14 473	5.1	1 001	5.0	4 347	3.8	922	5.4	3 344	2.7
Canadian -----	490	7.4	19 605	4.1	794	4.2	7 081	3.1	529	7.0	1 184	12.1
Carter -----	304	10.9	5 649	5.1	792	4.2	2 846	5.7	210	14.1	219	16.8
Cherokee -----	405	9.9	2 733	5.9	780	4.5	11 783	2.4	74	25.0	(D)	(D)
Choctaw -----	355	9.4	6 716	4.3	597	5.4	4 626	3.2	98	22.2	161	9.0
Cimarron -----	208	7.5	92 200	.1	239	6.6	29 825	.1	291	5.6	758	3.6
Cleveland -----	265	12.9	1 597	7.1	600	6.0	2 290	4.8	181	13.2	221	10.3
Coal -----	256	9.8	3 297	5.3	447	5.1	2 668	5.3	79	21.8	80	32.2
Comanche -----	349	9.2	4 109	3.4	717	4.6	4 267	5.4	297	10.4	628	9.7
Cotton -----	178	12.6	6 222	3.7	407	5.4	1 812	4.3	304	7.4	822	5.5
Craig -----	411	9.1	22 280	1.7	830	4.1	8 301	3.9	264	10.9	332	13.6
Creek -----	456	8.5	2 200	13.9	883	3.7	3 137	6.4	139	18.0	135	12.1
Custer -----	468	6.3	19 404	2.5	674	3.8	4 815	5.3	412	7.0	885	7.5
Delaware -----	536	7.3	10 381	3.1	988	3.0	36 295	1.1	150	19.0	171	10.4
Dewey -----	230	9.9	8 825	3.1	499	4.9	3 336	6.1	288	10.3	349	6.2
Ellis -----	216	11.9	6 347	5.8	444	6.9	4 094	3.3	224	12.0	224	8.1
Garfield -----	518	6.0	25 405	2.2	780	3.7	5 891	1.2	586	5.5	955	4.8
Garvin -----	510	8.8	4 775	6.8	1 009	4.6	5 487	3.7	358	11.7	548	8.3
Grady -----	593	6.4	17 246	2.0	1 102	3.4	15 541	2.3	534	6.9	1 093	7.9
Grant -----	242	9.3	11 737	1.7	411	7.2	2 699	3.8	502	5.7	1 015	3.9
Greer -----	113	18.7	2 285	5.6	267	10.1	702	9.4	263	9.8	507	7.4
Harmon -----	140	11.9	4 271	7.2	217	9.0	1 076	10.6	190	10.4	469	5.5
Harper -----	250	9.2	51 938	.6	322	6.4	13 941	1.0	181	10.9	291	4.2
Haskell -----	301	10.7	2 894	9.5	598	4.8	5 437	4.8	94	22.8	85	13.7
Hughes -----	247	11.5	2 207	6.9	616	4.2	2 041	8.4	176	12.5	475	11.8
Jackson -----	139	13.5	9 900	6.1	288	9.4	3 991	2.0	432	6.2	1 342	4.8
Jefferson -----	187	13.2	9 334	2.4	410	4.3	2 983	5.0	176	13.1	360	10.0
Johnston -----	214	12.8	4 990	3.9	454	5.5	7 869	1.8	83	22.5	122	22.4
Kay -----	318	10.5	12 038	2.0	507	7.1	2 457	2.8	573	5.7	997	5.8
Kingfisher -----	469	7.1	26 403	2.3	667	4.7	6 970	6.3	518	6.8	792	6.2
Kiowa -----	295	8.4	11 186	2.7	477	4.7	2 875	2.3	440	6.0	1 004	3.9
Latimer -----	165	13.8	1 870	6.8	413	5.6	1 935	8.7	37	35.1	(D)	(D)
Le Flore -----	702	6.2	11 926	3.3	1 207	3.4	30 426	.9	174	15.6	687	5.1
Lincoln -----	576	8.6	3 478	11.9	1 239	3.6	4 997	3.7	400	10.7	231	16.6
Logan -----	315	10.3	9 731	2.7	655	4.5	4 145	3.6	306	11.1	369	13.2
Love -----	182	13.8	3 885	6.2	447	5.3	1 862	5.3	205	12.9	512	6.6
McClain -----	273	10.0	7 088	2.5	607	4.8	5 020	8.9	287	10.9	526	9.2
McCurtain -----	536	7.2	17 694	1.5	1 092	3.8	43 707	1.0	153	16.9	240	2.3
McIntosh -----	284	12.8	2 067	11.9	648	4.9	2 597	6.3	84	16.4	153	18.1
Major -----	365	8.6	14 192	4.1	604	5.4	3 448	5.6	384	8.3	607	3.7
Marshall -----	128	16.4	1 891	8.6	277	6.9	1 013	6.4	113	19.1	281	11.5
Mayes -----	483	8.1	2 878	10.3	996	3.2	7 070	4.7	243	12.2	261	12.7
Murray -----	107	15.2	2 620	4.4	317	5.2	6 397	3.6	77	21.3	97	12.2
Muskogee -----	449	9.4	8 206	4.1	922	4.2	5 235	5.6	226	13.8	641	2.9
Noble -----	261	9.0	10 845	2.6	471	6.9	2 598	3.3	289	10.0	398	9.4
Nowata -----	244	11.4	9 316	3.2	541	4.6	4 146	2.0	139	15.6	142	15.7
Okfuskee -----	170	15.6	3 176	5.4	548	4.3	1 988	5.9	114	20.1	161	7.6
Oklahoma -----	209	15.8	908	32.8	612	5.7	1 750	11.6	238	11.8	486	17.6
Omulgee -----	281	12.1	4 172	7.6	715	4.8	2 955	5.4	146	18.1	211	12.7
Osage -----	436	8.0	34 618	.7	841	3.7	9 255	2.1	199	11.6	259	10.5
Ottawa -----	303	11.6	3 094	7.0	652	5.0	8 641	2.8	254	11.7	455	7.4
Pawnee -----	309	10.6	21 557	1.8	525	4.6	2 326	4.2	129	17.2	168	9.0
Payne -----	362	10.4	6 359	3.7	806	4.9	4 906	4.1	269	13.3	240	10.2
Pittsburg -----	446	9.7	3 855	11.3	1 139	3.6	5 916	4.5	109	21.7	215	17.2
Pontotoc -----	322	11.1	9 241	1.6	833	4.0	5 433	2.9	150	17.5	100	14.3
Pottawatomie -----	406	10.7	2 345	17.8	908	4.3	2 789	6.0	289	12.5	437	14.3
Pushmataha -----	220	14.4	1 949	14.5	501	5.3	2 275	10.2	54	32.6	17	25.9
Roger Mills -----	332	7.7	6 841	4.8	500	5.1	4 204	3.3	290	8.3	315	5.4
Rogers -----	497	8.6	5 134	5.7	925	4.4	4 182	8.7	185	16.7	333	14.5
Seminole -----	247	13.4	1 316	10.6	641	5.3	1 570	9.1	119	20.3	131	20.2
Sequoyah -----	262	11.3	1 688	19.2	633	5.2	2 160	6.0	167	15.6	184	9.9
Stephens -----	365	9.7	4 684	10.1	865	4.2	2 650	5.8	345	11.1	367	6.3
Texas -----	238	10.0	271 687	.1	330	9.0	119 958	.1	444	5.7	2 219	2.0
Tillman -----	176	12.1	6 108	8.3	336	6.5	2 100	2.8	444	3.7	1 418	4.1
Tulsa -----	243	12.4	907	14.1	516	5.6	1 413	9.6	146	16.3	283	5.3
Wagoner -----	256	11.7	2 719	3.9	606	4.2	1 949	5.1	215	11.8	649	3.5
Washington -----	275	11.2	8 039	4.1	474	6.6	1 652	6.7	95	18.7	156	14.0
Washita -----	500	6.4	22 297	2.1	681	5.0	4 181	2.8	620	5.3	1 462	7.1
Woods -----	320	7.4	22 715	1.0	483	4.1	8 979	1.8	332	7.0	502	4.1
Woodward -----	279	10.1	8 116	4.9	620	3.7	3 479	4.9	261	10.5	278	8.1

See footnotes at end of table.

C-16 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

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)
Oklahoma -----	34 703	1.8	140 995	1.1	22 332	1.8	57 080	1.3	62 807	1.6	146 709	1.0
Adair -----	509	6.9	877	8.4	132	19.9	149	15.8	942	2.0	3 088	3.7
Alfalfa -----	581	3.4	3 932	3.0	346	7.3	1 249	8.7	721	2.6	3 390	2.4
Atoka -----	404	8.7	742	13.4	242	12.4	478	11.1	885	3.3	923	5.5
Beaver -----	337	6.5	1 681	2.4	301	7.7	799	4.6	685	2.3	2 892	2.5
Beckham -----	421	7.7	2 105	4.0	196	12.0	460	6.5	641	4.3	1 937	4.5
Blaine -----	603	6.2	3 259	4.6	373	9.0	1 056	6.0	825	3.4	2 733	4.7
Bryan -----	766	6.2	2 038	7.0	489	8.7	960	8.1	1 286	2.1	2 014	4.8
Caddo -----	1 131	4.2	5 952	3.2	731	6.3	3 332	4.7	1 378	2.7	4 789	2.2
Canadian -----	715	5.6	4 429	4.1	544	6.8	1 404	20.0	1 062	1.8	3 328	2.9
Carter -----	396	8.8	921	5.9	291	11.5	420	9.2	924	3.1	1 176	7.3
Cherokee -----	249	14.0	923	7.5	117	20.1	(D)	(D)	917	2.6	1 475	5.0
Choctaw -----	474	7.6	1 316	13.9	196	15.1	266	8.8	762	4.2	1 029	6.1
Cimarron -----	256	6.3	2 600	3.9	238	6.2	1 218	6.0	422	2.4	4 192	2.2
Cleveland -----	383	9.1	800	8.2	177	13.2	205	11.9	814	2.9	842	5.9
Coal -----	248	9.5	515	6.2	178	11.7	234	26.0	519	2.5	875	6.5
Comanche -----	537	6.5	1 979	8.2	357	9.3	766	8.5	890	3.0	2 140	3.7
Cotton -----	420	5.1	2 486	4.5	245	9.5	965	12.9	531	2.5	1 832	3.6
Craig -----	477	7.7	1 486	7.9	254	12.4	593	13.4	977	2.5	1 820	6.3
Creek -----	274	12.7	371	17.4	203	15.3	214	25.8	1 044	2.4	885	6.9
Custer -----	637	4.1	4 335	2.3	320	7.7	1 326	3.6	828	2.2	3 388	3.2
Delaware -----	482	8.3	1 256	10.1	153	15.1	166	15.3	1 077	2.5	1 822	5.1
Dewey -----	414	5.8	2 040	5.3	230	10.4	469	10.5	636	3.6	1 958	3.8
Ellis -----	320	9.2	1 649	4.6	153	16.3	319	6.1	547	4.3	1 863	4.9
Garfield -----	899	3.3	5 506	2.7	591	5.4	1 998	7.5	1 113	1.7	3 922	2.3
Garvin -----	596	8.3	1 375	6.8	488	9.2	936	6.8	1 232	2.4	1 748	4.0
Grady -----	818	4.9	2 644	3.1	609	6.0	1 175	7.5	1 377	1.6	3 306	2.5
Grant -----	591	3.9	4 580	3.0	351	7.9	1 357	3.4	727	2.1	3 468	2.5
Greer -----	304	7.3	1 413	4.9	262	9.3	792	6.1	401	4.8	1 327	4.0
Harmon -----	200	8.5	1 070	5.3	163	12.5	874	8.0	312	4.0	1 498	2.7
Harper -----	251	7.9	1 778	3.5	132	13.6	642	5.5	432	3.0	1 777	4.1
Haskell -----	350	10.0	536	8.7	202	12.9	365	18.5	710	2.8	943	8.1
Hughes -----	363	8.1	1 196	13.2	227	10.9	674	13.0	720	2.9	1 098	6.5
Jackson -----	504	5.7	3 453	2.9	345	8.2	2 748	1.9	596	3.7	2 934	2.6
Jefferson -----	283	8.5	1 272	8.6	152	14.4	357	8.7	454	3.2	1 237	6.0
Johnston -----	256	10.9	417	14.3	156	17.1	202	8.9	515	3.5	961	12.3
Kay -----	736	4.5	3 803	5.2	538	7.6	1 556	8.3	940	2.2	3 239	4.1
Kingfisher -----	762	3.7	5 047	4.0	553	6.6	1 820	8.8	873	2.5	3 244	3.8
Kiowa -----	462	6.0	3 264	3.7	307	9.0	992	6.0	640	2.8	3 107	2.8
Latimer -----	185	14.4	376	27.4	174	15.7	(D)	(D)	539	1.9	782	7.0
Le Flore -----	405	10.0	834	8.6	283	12.2	517	7.9	1 411	2.3	2 082	3.5
Lincoln -----	706	6.2	1 259	6.7	454	9.1	427	14.1	1 483	2.4	1 370	7.9
Logan -----	532	6.6	2 208	9.6	421	8.6	926	14.8	827	2.5	1 676	4.2
Love -----	351	8.4	1 221	7.7	289	10.7	480	7.7	517	3.9	1 088	8.1
McClain -----	487	6.2	1 352	9.1	309	9.1	441	11.3	798	2.2	1 420	4.7
McCurtain -----	677	6.7	1 192	8.5	407	9.5	545	8.8	1 281	2.6	2 371	3.9
McIntosh -----	391	9.1	789	9.6	240	13.4	395	11.2	793	2.4	787	6.0
Major -----	640	5.1	2 938	2.7	392	8.3	1 124	4.1	791	3.3	2 418	3.4
Marshall -----	147	15.7	847	37.3	97	16.2	283	8.6	340	3.3	579	8.2
Mayes -----	612	6.0	1 495	6.0	381	9.6	508	9.2	1 131	2.0	1 382	4.6
Murray -----	126	13.8	333	14.5	168	11.1	216	15.0	396	2.1	611	6.3
Muskogee -----	597	7.3	1 689	11.1	418	9.6	729	4.4	1 214	2.0	1 819	5.8
Noble -----	543	5.4	2 541	3.7	369	8.7	992	4.6	678	2.9	2 058	5.1
Nowata -----	237	11.1	418	14.5	164	14.7	178	11.3	627	3.0	846	5.2
Oklfuskee -----	183	13.6	450	14.1	86	19.1	172	22.7	620	3.5	723	6.9
Oklahoma -----	315	9.7	568	19.1	255	12.9	404	17.5	736	3.8	986	10.1
Omulgee -----	243	13.1	721	9.4	219	13.4	304	10.1	878	2.4	859	6.1
Osage -----	404	9.5	1 333	7.0	273	11.1	810	5.8	1 007	2.3	2 127	5.0
Ottawa -----	467	7.7	1 685	7.3	254	10.3	739	10.9	849	2.5	1 435	5.5
Pawnee -----	278	11.2	868	8.2	206	15.1	277	9.5	613	2.0	882	5.2
Payne -----	555	7.9	1 135	7.5	382	10.2	443	13.9	1 025	2.6	1 339	4.9
Pittsburg -----	621	7.3	1 305	11.9	405	10.1	640	15.8	1 302	2.6	1 407	6.3
Pontotoc -----	461	9.0	732	9.6	279	13.8	284	10.5	945	2.5	1 102	4.7
Pottawatomie -----	441	9.5	1 118	27.1	211	13.7	223	6.4	1 029	2.9	1 186	5.4
Pushmataha -----	214	13.3	421	12.7	134	18.5	133	25.8	637	2.9	566	7.0
Roger Mills -----	359	7.3	1 386	4.9	153	12.5	276	5.8	606	4.3	1 836	3.8
Rogers -----	477	8.1	992	26.8	256	13.6	328	10.6	1 134	2.0	1 260	7.4
Seminole -----	317	11.4	387	18.9	100	22.0	135	24.9	764	3.7	614	7.8
Sequoyah -----	401	8.9	627	12.9	283	12.5	300	16.7	865	2.5	734	7.1
Stephens -----	589	6.5	1 353	13.3	361	10.0	510	7.3	1 019	2.3	1 358	4.4
Texas -----	368	6.1	6 132	1.3	355	6.5	3 195	3.1	682	2.1	8 698	1.0
Tillman -----	418	4.2	2 884	2.5	342	5.9	1 625	4.3	564	2.0	3 057	2.6
Tulsa -----	255	11.8	441	14.6	217	12.2	203	9.5	689	3.0	880	6.8
Wagoner -----	346	9.2	1 019	6.2	228	11.0	740	14.5	718	3.3	1 056	4.8
Washington -----	226	13.6	307	15.4	184	15.6	380	17.2	619	2.0	657	9.8
Washita -----	836	3.9	5 287	3.2	521	5.9	1 578	4.3	962	2.9	3 899	2.8
Woods -----	457	4.4	3 511	3.7	335	7.1	1 057	6.3	660	1.9	2 596	2.5
Woodward -----	427	6.3	1 800	9.6	185	11.2	593	6.7	703	2.6	1 960	4.5

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-17

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)
Oklahoma -----	37 258	1.7	28 232	1.1	20 070	1.9	144 750	.6	9 892	2.5	23 629	2.3
Adair -----	541	7.0	1 142	7.3	282	11.6	3 091	1.5	118	22.3	607	24.7
Alfalfa -----	628	3.5	475	3.7	324	7.6	1 790	1.3	138	14.8	569	4.4
Atoka -----	372	9.7	138	20.9	295	11.2	519	12.2	127	17.7	155	15.5
Beaver -----	479	5.3	599	3.6	300	7.8	2 389	2.1	92	15.3	270	4.3
Beckham -----	463	6.2	317	5.5	323	9.0	1 044	7.5	146	16.5	314	21.8
Blaine -----	569	6.6	462	5.3	307	9.0	2 001	4.0	125	19.0	194	14.9
Bryan -----	717	6.5	380	9.3	399	10.0	1 835	14.4	250	13.7	328	12.1
Caddo -----	962	5.2	1 190	3.7	604	7.4	4 454	1.4	271	12.9	769	5.9
Canadian -----	691	4.9	531	3.5	296	9.9	2 461	2.1	204	14.8	457	14.9
Carter -----	436	8.4	162	8.5	266	11.1	873	3.0	123	19.2	208	16.4
Cherokee -----	495	7.9	588	4.8	223	13.8	16 171	.4	75	25.9	291	7.5
Choctaw -----	400	8.9	189	10.9	259	11.0	721	8.0	131	18.5	200	20.0
Cimarron -----	298	5.8	448	3.6	198	7.9	3 461	1.7	48	8.2	167	.9
Cleveland -----	385	9.0	261	7.8	134	13.7	1 003	3.7	106	20.8	132	23.1
Coal -----	257	9.4	120	8.9	184	12.3	516	5.1	93	21.1	207	21.4
Comanche -----	578	6.6	376	5.1	301	10.6	1 629	4.9	112	19.0	336	42.2
Cotton -----	353	6.7	209	3.3	194	10.0	1 308	2.6	115	16.6	335	11.8
Craig -----	622	6.3	280	7.5	256	11.4	1 424	5.9	127	19.4	203	15.1
Creek -----	487	8.4	197	9.8	247	12.7	599	6.6	123	20.4	73	14.9
Custer -----	589	5.3	447	5.5	365	7.0	2 217	2.6	153	12.6	474	13.8
Delaware -----	682	5.6	743	3.7	285	10.3	1 896	2.7	241	13.1	330	11.5
Dewey -----	519	5.3	298	8.1	254	10.9	1 019	7.1	143	15.2	304	15.9
Ellis -----	379	7.6	524	2.8	193	11.2	1 308	2.6	84	22.3	191	10.8
Garfield -----	815	4.4	493	4.4	349	7.5	2 120	2.5	159	14.2	451	13.6
Garvin -----	707	7.4	368	6.9	443	10.6	1 688	7.1	129	23.8	144	17.2
Grady -----	953	4.3	1 210	1.8	404	8.1	6 925	1.1	264	12.9	541	8.1
Grant -----	504	5.7	402	7.6	310	7.6	1 844	4.2	101	12.2	410	5.7
Greer -----	327	7.2	216	5.7	201	11.5	761	6.9	102	19.3	368	16.0
Harmon -----	251	8.7	172	5.5	131	11.8	962	7.7	61	16.4	256	3.5
Harper -----	317	6.2	300	14.8	162	11.7	2 687	1.2	61	17.1	179	15.9
Haskell -----	308	9.7	122	8.9	217	14.2	605	8.7	77	25.4	60	29.7
Hughes -----	345	8.4	164	8.0	206	12.8	818	5.2	111	19.5	145	16.2
Jackson -----	468	6.3	454	3.3	295	9.4	2 852	2.1	197	14.0	717	10.7
Jefferson -----	284	8.0	190	9.7	189	13.2	1 405	2.0	49	19.8	244	4.0
Johnston -----	322	7.4	256	6.2	157	15.7	1 177	2.5	97	23.2	154	10.2
Kay -----	650	5.9	373	4.7	359	9.9	1 272	4.9	130	19.3	238	8.1
Kingfisher -----	638	6.1	481	8.4	292	12.2	1 869	5.4	161	17.8	431	30.6
Kiowa -----	484	5.4	315	6.8	341	7.7	1 320	2.9	102	11.4	496	12.7
Latimer -----	171	15.0	85	17.3	145	16.3	546	17.6	95	23.6	157	14.6
Le Flore -----	566	7.5	541	3.5	366	10.2	1 697	3.7	183	16.2	291	12.2
Lincoln -----	817	6.3	392	11.7	286	12.5	632	6.3	188	16.8	264	17.9
Logan -----	489	7.4	374	5.7	283	11.5	2 121	3.7	125	17.2	620	15.7
Love -----	297	9.7	143	8.7	191	13.2	1 163	17.6	116	18.9	412	48.6
McClain -----	539	5.6	477	22.4	230	11.4	2 218	13.2	126	16.9	269	18.3
McCurtain -----	599	6.8	640	3.8	415	9.1	1 409	6.9	165	15.7	415	7.0
McIntosh -----	327	9.2	204	15.0	191	15.3	450	8.9	101	25.5	122	25.2
Major -----	613	5.3	410	6.3	304	9.1	1 198	5.7	118	18.1	420	16.8
Marshall -----	211	11.7	115	8.7	105	18.4	512	4.2	82	23.7	133	26.7
Mayes -----	779	5.2	320	5.0	229	12.7	1 268	10.0	141	18.3	252	13.1
Murray -----	198	8.8	179	5.1	126	13.6	1 077	3.9	48	24.7	126	7.2
Muskogee -----	632	6.9	351	8.5	304	12.1	2 960	12.7	173	17.3	435	10.2
Noble -----	491	5.6	285	6.5	274	10.4	908	3.8	74	24.3	136	20.8
Nowata -----	319	9.4	222	7.2	172	14.9	608	5.7	53	25.2	129	18.3
Okfuskee -----	259	11.7	128	10.3	161	14.7	381	13.1	75	22.2	178	23.3
Oklahoma -----	521	6.5	244	7.6	200	14.6	655	7.8	114	19.0	214	24.8
Omulgee -----	394	9.9	152	14.9	229	12.7	577	6.4	115	21.3	111	17.9
Osage -----	553	7.2	382	4.4	288	9.9	3 434	.9	171	14.3	642	8.6
Ottawa -----	500	7.3	710	3.2	160	15.4	5 844	.9	69	23.6	95	13.1
Pawnee -----	294	10.4	161	10.3	179	13.9	521	9.3	107	18.5	256	8.9
Payne -----	640	5.9	455	5.3	244	13.3	1 519	7.6	129	21.0	438	15.8
Pittsburg -----	513	8.2	186	6.5	363	10.7	1 311	7.0	226	14.4	375	19.3
Pontotoc -----	422	9.4	371	14.2	259	12.4	1 163	4.6	145	18.6	239	20.1
Pottawatomie -----	581	7.0	271	7.8	262	12.4	671	7.0	128	22.1	317	32.1
Pushmataha -----	207	13.7	80	12.5	156	17.5	333	10.4	65	27.0	168	33.3
Roger Mills -----	459	6.3	369	5.6	266	8.4	1 166	9.0	119	12.5	234	20.2
Rogers -----	550	7.7	293	8.3	229	14.3	1 443	11.7	194	17.2	326	25.0
Seminole -----	363	10.1	162	13.8	179	16.3	611	12.0	117	21.0	107	23.2
Sequoyah -----	438	8.2	142	13.3	262	13.0	543	13.7	104	21.8	121	16.0
Stephens -----	539	8.0	275	8.8	292	11.1	886	4.0	114	18.9	177	21.3
Texas -----	487	4.7	1 444	1.1	328	7.7	11 832	.2	147	12.1	520	15.5
Tillman -----	372	6.6	493	3.4	311	5.2	2 442	2.4	188	9.3	949	9.4
Tulsa -----	425	7.5	223	7.8	168	15.0	1 715	3.1	160	16.7	322	18.7
Wagoner -----	413	8.0	192	4.7	233	13.0	1 377	7.2	112	20.1	258	9.1
Washington -----	288	12.0	120	13.0	174	16.2	640	4.4	91	21.7	161	15.1
Washita -----	707	5.0	438	4.0	472	6.9	2 216	4.6	206	11.6	639	10.9
Woods -----	494	4.3	304	5.3	277	7.4	1 731	1.8	131	16.4	369	6.3
Woodward -----	516	5.5	309	6.7	212	10.7	932	2.5	131	18.1	283	25.4

See footnotes at end of table.

C-18 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

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)
Oklahoma -----	53 464	1.6	158 445	1.2	18 775	2.0	62 841	1.5	28 942	1.7	195 857	1.0
Adair	778	3.5	3 721	4.3	241	14.9	2 007	5.8	382	8.3	2 533	12.2
Alfalfa -----	636	3.9	3 258	4.1	367	6.7	2 318	8.1	453	6.8	4 627	3.0
Atoka -----	697	5.3	1 195	9.0	180	15.1	256	15.5	413	9.1	1 474	8.9
Beaver -----	645	3.0	3 082	3.5	295	8.6	1 626	5.5	449	6.2	3 601	4.2
Beckham -----	588	5.2	1 726	4.2	279	10.7	904	7.9	352	8.3	1 760	7.6
Blaine -----	752	4.4	3 332	5.5	361	9.7	1 299	8.3	399	8.5	3 033	3.7
Bryan -----	1 121	3.4	2 540	7.2	398	10.7	622	10.5	575	7.7	2 835	7.5
Caddo -----	1 256	3.4	5 122	3.2	636	7.4	2 257	8.3	762	6.4	6 728	4.5
Canadian -----	947	3.1	3 930	3.9	436	7.8	1 533	7.8	520	6.7	4 048	2.8
Carter -----	741	5.2	1 288	7.5	188	15.2	346	16.8	316	10.6	1 660	9.7
Cherokee -----	735	4.9	2 239	10.5	112	20.9	354	8.8	357	10.7	2 887	4.0
Choctaw -----	604	5.8	1 107	5.9	182	15.6	379	15.1	376	9.2	1 750	9.3
Cimarron -----	375	4.1	3 407	6.1	156	9.6	1 208	5.9	272	6.0	3 717	2.7
Cleveland -----	690	4.8	1 132	7.6	126	20.0	200	22.5	211	14.5	972	14.5
Coal -----	419	5.3	735	8.2	170	15.0	209	13.6	243	8.7	1 303	7.2
Comanche -----	705	4.8	1 885	4.9	359	9.8	913	7.7	430	8.6	1 964	6.1
Cotton -----	435	4.9	1 812	3.8	265	8.9	1 628	9.3	247	9.4	2 158	4.9
Craig -----	850	4.0	2 192	4.6	197	13.8	393	9.9	485	8.2	3 330	6.2
Creek -----	880	3.8	1 020	9.4	158	17.9	149	25.3	289	11.7	1 011	12.6
Custer -----	728	3.6	3 341	4.7	347	7.7	1 855	3.7	415	6.5	4 396	4.0
Delaware -----	916	4.5	1 999	5.3	347	11.3	468	13.1	532	7.5	3 508	5.0
Dewey -----	557	4.7	1 866	5.8	321	9.4	800	10.2	300	8.1	2 606	7.7
Ellis -----	461	6.7	1 841	3.6	147	15.3	290	15.0	333	9.6	1 851	3.9
Garfield -----	1 008	2.6	4 208	2.8	493	6.4	1 900	4.5	513	5.7	4 813	3.5
Garvin -----	995	4.7	2 194	5.8	295	13.5	604	15.4	562	8.3	2 377	8.7
Grady -----	1 116	3.3	4 525	3.1	416	7.7	1 101	9.0	727	5.4	4 967	4.2
Grant -----	654	3.3	3 463	3.7	362	6.6	2 080	3.8	500	5.1	4 760	3.6
Greer -----	383	5.9	1 491	11.1	235	11.0	889	9.0	271	10.3	1 385	9.7
Harmon -----	291	5.5	1 106	7.5	157	9.0	764	3.6	215	10.3	1 358	6.8
Harper -----	409	3.9	1 926	6.6	149	11.3	827	11.0	282	7.9	2 792	3.7
Haskell -----	619	4.8	1 030	9.0	102	20.6	239	7.1	270	12.5	1 183	8.7
Hughes -----	577	5.1	1 216	7.8	215	13.0	277	11.9	313	9.2	1 915	8.6
Jackson -----	513	5.9	2 952	6.3	346	7.4	2 703	5.6	391	7.8	3 194	5.4
Jefferson -----	398	4.8	972	5.3	136	15.0	459	5.7	200	12.0	2 050	3.2
Johnston -----	418	6.7	1 027	10.7	138	19.3	225	7.8	269	11.5	1 833	10.9
Kay -----	843	3.6	3 048	4.3	403	7.1	1 686	5.6	568	6.5	4 313	6.6
Kingfisher -----	842	3.1	3 931	6.2	438	8.7	1 509	6.7	476	7.7	4 680	2.6
Kiowa -----	569	4.1	2 479	4.7	403	7.0	2 219	4.3	370	6.6	3 676	3.2
Latimer -----	403	6.8	513	10.1	79	23.4	101	23.5	140	17.1	633	13.5
Le Flore -----	1 201	3.6	2 255	4.0	278	12.2	355	15.1	586	7.2	3 595	7.4
Lincoln -----	1 216	3.9	1 743	8.7	295	12.9	372	20.5	506	8.5	1 764	11.0
Logan -----	709	3.9	1 974	8.2	216	11.5	439	13.9	368	9.3	2 145	8.5
Love -----	431	6.5	1 015	6.8	144	18.2	314	19.5	283	10.8	1 136	8.8
McClain -----	630	4.4	1 803	5.2	198	13.3	345	11.9	274	10.4	1 780	7.7
McCurtain -----	1 089	3.9	2 682	4.9	235	12.3	434	14.2	516	7.4	3 379	5.2
McIntosh -----	571	6.0	931	7.9	232	13.5	412	16.7	236	14.3	1 062	13.2
Major -----	699	4.5	2 595	6.0	367	9.2	1 225	9.2	392	8.6	3 618	5.6
Marshall -----	286	7.3	751	11.1	72	18.4	142	20.5	116	15.4	864	12.0
Mayes -----	935	3.9	1 613	7.0	249	13.6	299	12.2	529	7.9	1 971	8.9
Murray -----	299	5.9	680	8.0	66	20.8	148	17.4	122	15.5	1 090	6.5
Muskogee -----	1 025	3.5	2 235	6.6	246	14.2	669	12.6	433	9.2	2 110	14.0
Noble -----	608	3.7	1 982	4.4	332	9.5	770	5.2	365	8.6	2 303	5.0
Nowata -----	542	4.9	1 339	6.0	90	19.0	291	14.2	258	11.2	1 758	11.8
Oklfuskee -----	468	6.9	836	8.7	74	21.7	137	21.9	251	12.1	857	13.9
Oklahoma -----	711	4.0	1 142	10.5	159	16.8	192	19.6	310	11.5	1 063	17.2
Okmulgee -----	785	3.7	1 092	7.8	168	16.0	202	11.2	340	10.1	1 393	10.0
Osage -----	889	3.8	2 398	3.8	250	12.7	484	6.2	455	8.5	5 754	2.1
Ottawa -----	709	4.6	1 735	5.5	179	16.1	371	12.9	450	8.2	2 377	6.6
Pawnee -----	545	4.5	1 011	6.9	180	12.6	376	14.0	306	10.0	1 760	8.8
Payne -----	831	4.7	1 588	4.3	315	12.4	389	11.7	488	7.8	1 900	6.7
Pittsburg -----	1 017	4.4	1 695	7.1	206	15.3	454	17.3	472	9.2	1 916	11.1
Pontotoc -----	712	5.6	1 296	8.8	126	18.0	252	21.1	323	9.9	1 974	15.0
Pottawatomie -----	865	4.7	1 512	7.7	190	14.2	206	15.8	511	8.2	1 851	10.1
Pushmataha -----	516	5.8	672	10.8	106	20.5	153	17.8	242	12.3	949	17.2
Roger Mills -----	530	5.0	1 912	5.0	189	11.3	506	14.1	403	7.1	2 819	5.4
Rogers -----	951	3.9	1 988	22.4	277	13.6	331	12.5	485	8.3	2 614	16.6
Seminole -----	614	5.8	817	9.2	113	20.6	96	20.6	283	11.3	1 069	10.5
Sequoyah -----	712	4.5	1 090	10.4	173	15.6	270	21.9	304	11.3	1 263	14.0
Stephens -----	820	4.4	1 367	8.0	289	12.2	471	13.2	379	9.5	1 741	8.3
Texas -----	627	3.3	8 068	1.6	238	9.5	2 593	5.1	406	5.8	7 260	1.0
Tillman -----	506	3.4	2 650	3.0	367	5.1	3 257	14.5	356	5.1	3 546	4.4
Tulsa -----	603	4.5	1 292	10.9	105	19.9	179	36.3	259	11.4	1 112	16.6
Wagoner -----	674	3.7	1 513	6.4	164	14.0	521	7.4	248	11.1	1 176	9.0
Washington -----	532	5.1	869	10.0	66	21.9	147	25.6	240	12.4	1 159	11.6
Washita -----	851	3.6	3 583	3.4	552	6.1	2 745	7.2	494	5.7	4 634	3.8
Woods -----	593	2.9	2 725	2.6	339	6.7	1 891	3.4	387	6.1	4 013	3.6
Woodward -----	608	4.2	2 144	6.9	295	10.5	805	14.9	388	8.1	3 403	6.3

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-19

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)
Oklahoma -----	21 397	1.9	102 994	1.1	63 379	1.6	56 103	1.3	58 968	1.6	227 398	.7
Adair -----	204	16.3	585	16.9	979	2.1	802	4.3	868	3.3	7 226	2.4
Alfalfa -----	290	8.5	3 063	11.1	731	2.3	1 030	3.6	739	2.2	4 213	1.8
Atoka -----	245	13.2	546	9.9	936	3.0	554	5.6	853	3.8	1 492	6.3
Beaver -----	277	8.2	1 844	5.5	648	3.4	868	4.5	698	2.3	4 174	2.5
Beckham -----	301	10.1	998	6.2	699	3.2	655	6.7	670	3.7	1 718	4.0
Blaine -----	367	9.2	2 504	7.9	789	3.9	954	5.6	772	4.0	4 376	3.4
Bryan -----	329	11.3	1 092	12.4	1 301	2.1	922	5.9	1 222	2.7	2 469	6.2
Caddo -----	567	7.8	4 735	4.7	1 375	2.8	1 491	5.2	1 292	3.2	6 144	1.7
Canadian -----	486	7.2	2 891	6.7	972	3.1	1 270	4.5	1 038	2.2	4 947	4.5
Carter -----	321	10.6	715	12.5	917	3.4	709	8.8	817	4.4	1 950	4.7
Cherokee -----	210	15.4	588	8.5	966	2.0	560	7.3	803	3.8	11 035	.6
Choctaw -----	190	14.7	510	12.5	821	3.1	442	5.5	732	4.1	1 494	6.1
Cimarron -----	137	10.6	1 251	2.9	411	3.1	735	3.4	411	2.2	10 688	.6
Cleveland -----	227	15.0	419	15.3	853	1.5	714	8.5	704	4.4	1 121	6.9
Coal -----	137	16.3	184	14.7	513	2.8	363	7.0	445	4.3	1 046	9.0
Comanche -----	364	9.0	1 837	6.7	898	2.9	763	4.7	845	3.5	2 155	5.0
Cotton -----	283	8.4	2 051	4.1	520	2.9	637	9.0	504	3.4	2 088	2.3
Craig -----	289	10.5	958	5.2	992	2.3	1 041	5.7	927	3.1	3 301	3.8
Creek -----	275	12.3	360	16.4	1 074	1.9	772	8.9	922	3.5	1 125	7.8
Custer -----	398	7.1	3 093	4.1	775	3.0	1 032	5.3	814	2.3	4 338	2.7
Delaware -----	236	14.0	610	9.5	1 108	2.3	858	7.1	999	3.5	3 802	2.7
Dewey -----	288	9.5	1 598	6.3	642	3.3	655	4.3	643	3.2	2 904	3.2
Ellis -----	265	10.8	1 457	6.3	576	3.6	545	6.3	546	4.3	2 120	3.3
Garfield -----	486	6.4	3 404	4.1	1 111	1.4	1 562	2.6	1 060	2.4	4 553	2.2
Garvin -----	426	9.5	1 420	8.6	1 239	2.5	896	5.0	1 132	3.3	2 610	4.9
Grady -----	381	7.9	2 886	4.1	1 394	1.7	1 629	2.7	1 287	2.4	5 572	2.8
Grant -----	287	8.4	2 311	4.5	698	3.0	970	2.4	690	2.8	3 520	3.1
Greer -----	115	16.4	558	5.3	438	3.7	500	6.9	397	4.8	1 505	4.6
Harmon -----	102	13.5	692	3.5	306	4.5	324	6.3	299	5.9	1 176	4.1
Harper -----	254	9.0	1 782	4.2	410	4.2	565	7.0	415	3.6	3 043	2.9
Haskell -----	291	11.2	502	15.9	715	2.8	334	7.1	696	3.1	1 023	9.0
Hughes -----	196	13.8	383	15.9	733	3.0	493	10.0	667	3.8	1 359	6.5
Jackson -----	211	11.5	2 107	1.5	577	4.2	780	3.6	573	4.3	3 636	3.5
Jefferson -----	210	12.1	1 441	9.1	424	4.2	484	9.4	437	3.4	1 642	2.7
Johnston -----	109	22.1	474	12.6	563	1.9	436	7.2	478	4.6	1 984	3.5
Kay -----	483	7.2	3 647	7.2	851	3.5	1 103	5.8	898	2.4	3 377	6.5
Kingfisher -----	504	7.9	3 459	5.6	843	3.3	1 030	7.6	906	1.8	4 890	3.2
Kiowa -----	318	8.3	2 151	4.9	645	3.1	881	5.1	647	2.1	2 798	3.7
Latimer -----	72	22.8	216	6.7	525	2.7	342	13.7	446	4.5	808	8.3
Le Flore -----	295	11.9	816	6.0	1 442	2.3	883	4.0	1 237	3.3	4 835	2.2
Lincoln -----	515	8.8	664	9.4	1 551	2.1	747	4.8	1 381	3.1	1 843	5.3
Logan -----	330	9.9	1 492	12.7	828	2.6	793	8.5	824	2.6	3 347	2.8
Love -----	239	12.2	1 055	7.4	530	3.4	426	7.3	540	2.9	1 523	3.4
McClain -----	230	12.4	894	10.5	833	1.6	777	5.6	750	2.9	2 736	13.4
McCurtain -----	268	12.7	703	10.5	1 290	2.5	511	4.8	1 106	3.5	3 389	3.0
McIntosh -----	271	13.5	494	12.8	721	3.8	379	6.5	637	5.1	1 020	7.4
Major -----	353	9.1	1 747	5.6	764	3.8	888	5.1	752	4.0	3 015	3.4
Marshall -----	66	20.9	306	15.0	338	3.6	255	9.7	290	6.9	719	8.5
Mayes -----	323	10.3	871	8.4	1 162	2.2	755	4.3	1 064	2.8	2 411	3.7
Murray -----	105	16.2	837	6.4	395	2.2	399	7.6	375	3.2	1 920	6.8
Muskogee -----	334	12.1	1 497	4.7	1 186	2.3	962	12.3	1 069	3.2	4 367	2.4
Noble -----	247	9.6	1 730	6.3	673	2.9	697	5.5	635	3.9	1 927	3.7
Nowata -----	130	14.7	586	5.1	645	2.6	581	3.7	630	3.0	1 688	3.3
Okfuskee -----	207	13.8	400	12.6	635	3.4	414	5.9	562	5.1	1 052	8.5
Oklahoma -----	203	13.7	422	11.0	781	3.0	491	7.6	734	4.0	1 216	6.9
Omulgee -----	272	11.0	763	11.3	864	2.6	511	6.5	808	3.5	1 427	4.8
Osage -----	391	8.3	3 523	3.0	1 014	2.2	1 049	3.6	1 006	2.2	5 367	2.1
Ottawa -----	226	13.7	651	14.3	874	1.9	680	7.4	841	2.7	5 950	2.2
Pawnee -----	182	12.9	691	7.9	626	1.5	542	6.0	565	3.8	1 389	6.2
Payne -----	347	11.4	859	10.5	1 026	2.9	790	8.0	948	3.1	1 902	5.1
Pittsburg -----	261	12.5	422	12.0	1 332	2.4	740	9.6	1 092	4.0	2 413	6.4
Pontotoc -----	206	15.7	982	8.2	975	2.6	607	6.2	894	3.5	1 587	4.8
Pottawatomie -----	322	11.2	756	8.3	1 128	2.1	727	8.4	976	3.5	1 630	8.5
Pushmataha -----	81	24.9	122	21.1	613	3.5	270	5.6	551	4.7	630	6.0
Roger Mills -----	290	9.2	1 253	5.0	640	3.9	690	4.1	599	4.2	1 900	3.5
Rogers -----	317	10.3	867	7.2	1 217	1.9	1 039	8.6	1 061	3.1	2 202	6.5
Seminole -----	290	11.9	327	17.4	825	2.8	415	7.0	659	5.0	991	10.2
Sequoyah -----	246	11.7	334	6.5	864	2.7	444	6.0	770	3.6	994	6.0
Stephens -----	425	9.7	1 402	7.5	1 004	2.7	704	5.4	940	3.1	1 626	4.0
Texas -----	231	8.5	2 557	3.0	676	1.9	1 300	2.8	639	3.2	15 038	.9
Tillman -----	208	9.5	1 500	3.2	533	2.9	832	4.1	525	2.3	2 345	3.3
Tulsa -----	185	13.0	657	9.8	730	2.2	522	10.7	655	3.7	1 219	6.7
Wagoner -----	339	9.1	931	7.1	777	2.4	524	5.6	717	3.5	1 499	2.7
Washington -----	181	10.9	706	5.5	624	2.6	493	6.8	592	3.6	1 111	5.9
Washita -----	440	7.0	3 113	3.0	958	3.0	928	3.3	925	3.4	3 794	3.8
Woods -----	336	7.6	3 000	3.4	631	2.4	979	3.6	638	2.4	3 945	3.1
Woodward -----	374	7.1	1 743	4.6	706	2.7	659	4.7	689	2.8	2 003	2.7

See footnotes at end of table.

C-20 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

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)
Oklahoma -----	66 936	1.5	395 182	1.3	53 197	1.5	14 520 063	1.1	42 015	1.5	8 272 889	.8
Adair -----	1 006	1.5	9 933	10.6	841	1.5	103 160	1.7	585	1.6	32 773	1.6
Alfalfa -----	774	1.3	10 802	7.1	700	1.2	363 405	.6	648	1.2	278 200	.6
Atoka -----	982	2.5	1 662	29.9	773	2.6	110 100	3.1	597	2.9	36 749	2.7
Beaver -----	735	1.3	11 497	4.0	621	1.3	402 241	.9	498	1.3	200 366	.8
Beckham -----	732	2.5	4 193	14.8	624	3.0	228 716	2.2	466	3.1	121 257	1.7
Blaine -----	826	3.4	8 030	9.4	738	3.1	295 171	2.1	674	3.2	211 679	1.9
Bryan -----	1 360	1.5	5 069	15.1	1 063	1.5	178 157	1.5	805	1.5	73 693	1.4
Caddo -----	1 440	2.4	19 033	5.2	1 253	2.6	426 898	1.7	1 052	2.7	259 910	1.3
Canadian -----	1 072	1.7	10 313	8.8	912	1.4	318 561	.8	795	1.4	222 652	.8
Carter -----	993	2.5	350	(H)	675	2.7	109 948	3.4	396	3.2	27 226	2.9
Cherokee -----	976	1.9	23 627	3.1	755	2.1	91 410	2.8	503	2.5	28 886	2.7
Choctaw -----	833	3.0	8 853	65.7	690	2.8	124 561	3.0	532	3.0	43 320	2.5
Cimarron -----	445	1.1	20 745	2.3	359	1.1	387 701	.6	305	1.1	191 741	.5
Cleveland -----	867	1.2	318	(H)	599	1.2	81 949	1.7	407	1.4	33 378	1.5
Coal -----	536	1.9	975	47.0	420	1.7	75 561	1.9	334	1.8	26 680	1.5
Comanche -----	937	2.4	5 782	16.0	769	2.5	202 553	2.1	593	2.8	109 941	1.9
Cotton -----	540	2.3	3 207	11.5	482	2.3	222 581	1.4	425	2.4	147 782	1.2
Craig -----	1 049	1.4	5 923	9.8	846	1.4	171 205	1.4	707	1.5	89 404	1.2
Creek -----	1 123	1.3	-501	90.8	808	1.3	105 110	1.6	565	1.5	33 434	1.6
Custer -----	864	1.2	7 630	6.5	730	1.1	337 822	.7	651	1.1	244 264	.6
Delaware -----	1 144	1.8	7 187	8.6	929	1.8	119 593	2.1	725	2.0	53 816	1.9
Dewey -----	692	1.6	6 116	9.2	574	1.5	199 488	1.2	467	1.6	121 561	1.0
Ellis -----	598	3.0	8 428	4.9	489	2.9	194 709	1.9	377	2.9	109 541	1.4
Garfield -----	1 152	1.0	7 629	6.0	1 043	1.1	501 143	.6	958	1.1	378 510	.6
Garvin -----	1 308	1.6	4 361	14.5	965	1.5	177 761	1.5	666	1.6	70 635	1.3
Grady -----	1 431	1.2	7 831	7.9	1 153	1.2	272 607	1.0	889	1.3	146 960	.9
Grant -----	763	1.0	8 168	5.7	711	1.1	465 433	.6	689	1.0	372 491	.5
Greer -----	450	3.2	2 627	14.4	386	3.3	178 225	2.3	314	3.3	102 875	1.8
Harmon -----	332	1.4	2 968	13.5	291	1.4	156 484	.9	225	1.6	88 698	.8
Harper -----	441	2.5	3 902	9.2	357	2.4	206 919	1.5	304	2.4	124 059	1.2
Haskell -----	763	1.5	2 548	22.1	615	1.7	107 880	1.5	487	1.7	44 174	1.4
Hughes -----	772	2.3	1 070	35.9	615	2.5	101 384	2.7	454	2.9	35 478	2.2
Jackson -----	634	2.3	5 741	8.5	573	2.1	340 854	1.1	492	2.2	244 203	.8
Jefferson -----	468	2.6	4 239	9.1	370	2.9	109 685	1.7	284	3.0	46 354	1.4
Johnston -----	572	1.6	3 309	11.1	439	1.7	78 873	1.9	324	1.9	24 891	1.5
Kay -----	964	1.8	2 963	22.5	823	1.3	340 203	.8	745	1.3	271 379	.7
Kingfisher -----	921	1.6	9 719	9.7	811	1.3	358 004	.8	721	1.3	248 251	.7
Kiowa -----	692	1.0	6 448	6.8	635	1.0	357 670	.6	584	1.0	247 033	.5
Latimer -----	546	1.6	-297	(H)	419	1.4	52 544	1.9	326	1.6	18 746	1.9
Le Flore -----	1 466	2.1	3 290	29.8	1 141	2.0	163 242	2.2	838	2.2	70 805	1.7
Lincoln -----	1 656	1.4	-280	(H)	1 251	1.3	162 005	1.4	923	1.4	54 075	1.4
Logan -----	879	1.5	2 556	20.7	723	1.5	175 075	1.4	571	1.6	103 498	1.2
Love -----	556	2.3	2 623	20.8	417	2.4	88 293	2.4	312	2.7	30 663	1.9
McClain -----	851	1.2	3 944	13.3	641	1.3	111 895	1.2	476	1.4	49 118	1.0
McCurtain -----	1 315	2.4	8 475	6.3	1 005	2.4	137 712	2.5	749	2.6	58 434	2.0
McIntosh -----	805	1.8	380	(H)	661	1.6	101 768	1.5	519	1.7	41 001	1.5
Major -----	848	2.4	6 101	9.1	726	2.4	262 346	1.7	617	2.5	178 462	1.4
Marshall -----	349	2.5	1 109	42.5	263	2.7	48 900	3.6	188	3.1	18 638	2.5
Mayes -----	1 227	1.2	3 016	19.5	997	1.1	135 264	1.1	786	1.2	72 585	1.0
Murray -----	410	1.2	1 949	21.2	278	1.5	50 411	1.9	204	1.8	19 716	1.8
Muskogee -----	1 265	1.4	3 975	13.5	982	1.4	166 554	1.2	784	1.4	98 525	1.0
Noble -----	704	2.3	1 774	25.2	594	2.5	221 571	1.7	540	2.5	157 007	1.6
Nowata -----	694	1.2	3 613	12.1	533	1.2	96 288	1.3	454	1.2	49 060	1.4
Oktuske -----	677	2.4	831	55.8	505	2.4	88 141	2.8	377	2.7	27 472	2.5
Oklahoma -----	850	1.6	560	(H)	536	1.6	66 442	1.9	372	1.8	34 885	1.9
Omulgee -----	931	1.4	1 150	41.3	684	1.4	95 943	1.6	502	1.6	40 656	1.6
Osage -----	1 066	1.2	9 361	5.2	734	1.3	142 241	1.4	536	1.4	71 406	1.1
Ottawa -----	898	1.2	6 958	7.0	733	1.2	134 639	1.0	602	1.3	85 529	.9
Pawnee -----	630	1.4	1 596	26.7	449	1.4	83 375	1.7	340	1.6	39 501	1.5
Payne -----	1 116	1.4	1 873	22.5	833	1.4	134 183	1.6	668	1.5	66 569	1.4
Pittsburg -----	1 371	2.1	1 645	39.8	988	2.3	135 971	2.8	762	2.5	49 404	2.4
Pontotoc -----	1 037	1.5	2 779	19.9	762	1.5	106 454	1.7	576	1.6	31 999	1.6
Pottawatomie -----	1 184	1.4	106	(H)	896	1.3	132 056	1.5	620	1.5	48 848	1.4
Pushmataha -----	646	2.7	445	69.8	490	2.8	74 179	3.4	375	3.0	25 395	3.0
Roger Mills -----	677	3.0	3 240	13.0	531	3.2	158 813	2.6	407	3.3	71 040	1.9
Rogers -----	1 258	1.4	377	(H)	942	1.3	119 967	1.4	712	1.4	56 848	1.3
Seminole -----	872	2.1	754	78.8	664	2.2	94 713	2.8	452	2.6	26 354	3.0
Sequoyah -----	913	1.6	306	(H)	702	1.5	97 498	1.5	539	1.6	43 489	1.4
Stephens -----	1 093	1.6	2 298	19.8	858	1.5	163 009	1.4	597	1.6	61 463	1.3
Texas -----	705	1.0	40 224	1.2	571	1.0	621 820	.6	491	1.1	347 527	.5
Tillman -----	588	1.2	5 189	6.1	513	1.1	337 734	.6	461	1.1	227 295	.5
Tulsa -----	765	1.4	1 414	31.6	552	1.4	65 441	1.6	392	1.6	32 370	1.6
Wagoner -----	822	1.4	2 427	13.8	629	1.4	124 842	1.2	500	1.5	78 626	1.1
Washington -----	651	1.0	1 081	40.5	489	1.2	61 007	1.3	379	1.3	31 824	1.3
Washita -----	1 004	2.6	9 166	8.2	898	2.6	402 820	1.7	822	2.7	283 857	1.6
Woods -----	677	1.3	9 540	4.5	568	1.2	289 220	.7	520	1.3	209 505	.6
Woodward -----	747	1.2	4 939	8.3	602	1.2	211 962	.9	483	1.2	116 450	.7

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-21

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)
Oklahoma -----	2 581	1.1	512 487	.4	52 241	1.5	4 736 594	.9	44 115	1.6	1 728 273	1.3
Adair -----	30	4.7	1 164	5.4	891	1.5	51 732	1.3	727	1.6	23 904	1.6
Alfalfa -----	10	4.1	2 326	(L)	525	1.2	100 990	.4	313	1.6	13 134	1.2
Atoka -----	19	7.4	1 419	4.1	849	2.5	58 092	2.4	760	2.7	28 963	2.8
Beaver -----	111	2.2	28 377	1.4	513	1.3	87 766	.5	438	1.4	27 181	.8
Beckham -----	27	5.6	2 464	3.1	558	2.9	45 931	2.1	481	3.0	20 700	2.5
Blaine -----	18	5.5	3 262	1.6	638	3.0	83 769	1.6	534	3.3	21 907	2.5
Bryan -----	73	2.6	10 124	2.4	1 158	1.4	80 094	1.4	1 046	1.5	41 518	1.6
Caddo -----	294	2.1	48 636	.9	1 130	2.5	108 654	1.7	974	2.6	43 228	2.2
Canadian -----	52	3.4	3 864	3.3	782	1.4	95 583	.8	545	1.6	22 554	1.2
Carter -----	11	9.3	975	4.3	843	2.7	53 290	2.2	773	2.8	25 724	2.7
Cherokee -----	23	6.1	893	1.3	806	2.1	37 103	2.6	691	2.3	18 666	2.8
Choctaw -----	6	13.1	48	2.3	728	2.8	65 170	2.2	647	2.9	30 943	2.7
Cimarron -----	123	1.5	50 642	.5	270	1.2	118 998	.1	184	1.4	19 895	.4
Cleveland -----	32	5.0	299	3.5	627	1.2	24 952	1.5	527	1.3	12 258	1.8
Coal -----	7	10.0	(D)	(D)	462	1.7	43 915	1.3	411	1.8	21 451	1.6
Comanche -----	28	5.5	859	6.4	715	2.5	51 361	2.1	580	2.8	19 805	2.6
Cotton -----	5	14.5	669	17.7	420	2.4	41 182	1.4	375	2.6	14 228	2.1
Craig -----	11	8.0	247	10.9	877	1.4	95 580	.9	756	1.5	37 835	1.2
Creek -----	19	7.1	430	15.9	845	1.3	38 425	1.4	753	1.4	19 906	1.4
Custer -----	43	2.5	4 560	1.4	632	1.1	83 894	.5	450	1.3	21 262	1.0
Delaware -----	7	9.2	(D)	(D)	956	1.8	59 856	2.0	802	2.0	28 294	2.3
Dewey -----	13	4.3	1 724	1.2	555	1.5	63 333	.8	479	1.6	22 661	1.1
Ellis -----	49	3.7	20 377	.8	466	2.9	53 529	1.6	393	3.1	22 008	2.0
Garfield -----	17	5.9	790	6.6	835	1.1	98 547	.5	596	1.3	20 180	.9
Garvin -----	24	5.9	1 180	4.5	1 067	1.4	63 647	1.3	974	1.4	32 709	1.4
Grady -----	49	3.7	7 786	1.3	1 158	1.2	109 237	.7	924	1.4	37 527	1.2
Grant -----	2	—	(D)	(D)	457	1.1	54 544	.5	341	1.3	13 779	.8
Greer -----	35	4.0	5 770	1.2	318	3.1	26 700	2.0	294	3.2	(D)	(D)
Harmon -----	93	2.2	20 378	1.3	210	1.7	26 992	1.5	162	2.1	(D)	(D)
Harper -----	44	4.3	8 416	3.1	360	2.3	88 542	.7	271	2.6	20 713	1.4
Haskell -----	10	8.9	(D)	(D)	660	1.6	54 075	1.2	620	1.6	29 479	1.3
Hughes -----	44	4.6	4 605	2.7	643	2.4	45 497	2.2	595	2.6	23 487	2.5
Jackson -----	151	2.2	44 384	.6	348	2.3	41 847	.9	272	2.6	8 445	2.1
Jefferson -----	6	11.3	398	12.0	395	3.0	64 278	1.6	317	3.4	23 413	2.2
Johnston -----	18	6.5	1 767	4.3	481	1.6	48 213	1.0	433	1.7	27 463	1.0
Kay -----	16	6.0	1 677	7.5	592	1.3	53 047	.7	441	1.5	12 224	1.3
Kingfisher -----	27	3.4	4 693	1.9	683	1.3	86 678	.6	393	1.6	16 461	1.1
Kiowa -----	16	4.3	972	6.2	510	1.1	53 708	.7	413	1.3	15 862	1.1
Latimer -----	4	14.9	(D)	(D)	462	1.4	33 007	1.2	407	1.5	16 396	1.3
Le Flore -----	20	4.5	3 164	2.1	1 244	2.1	69 035	2.1	1 109	2.1	36 818	2.2
Lincoln -----	9	12.1	66	22.9	1 350	1.3	56 762	1.2	1 208	1.4	29 907	1.3
Logan -----	20	5.9	686	7.7	665	1.5	54 981	1.0	557	1.6	17 318	1.6
Love -----	26	4.3	3 638	1.4	485	2.3	39 826	1.9	437	2.4	18 663	2.3
McClain -----	19	5.6	283	1.6	647	1.3	46 339	1.0	534	1.4	18 135	1.3
McCurtain -----	23	6.3	1 812	2.3	1 083	2.4	69 432	2.6	986	2.5	41 214	2.8
McIntosh -----	6	10.6	476	20.4	675	1.7	43 420	1.3	598	1.8	24 028	1.4
Major -----	44	4.2	3 644	3.0	627	2.3	68 898	1.2	500	2.6	19 349	1.9
Marshall -----	17	7.1	1 216	3.2	283	2.6	20 063	2.2	267	2.7	10 927	2.4
Mayes -----	14	7.4	1 161	7.9	1 014	1.1	62 107	1.0	859	1.2	27 959	1.2
Murray -----	3	10.6	(D)	(D)	355	1.3	32 167	1.0	306	1.4	15 948	1.3
Muskogee -----	32	3.8	6 018	2.8	1 008	1.4	74 540	1.0	887	1.5	37 103	1.2
Noble -----	5	13.9	191	23.8	527	2.5	49 809	1.6	423	2.7	15 359	2.9
Nowata -----	2	11.5	(D)	(D)	573	1.2	54 599	.7	471	1.3	17 113	1.3
Okfuskee -----	16	8.1	1 086	4.0	574	2.4	36 931	2.4	504	2.5	18 643	2.6
Oklahoma -----	39	4.3	436	9.8	515	1.7	19 041	1.9	442	1.9	10 215	2.3
Okmulgee -----	9	9.6	120	2.3	732	1.4	44 863	1.3	657	1.5	19 935	1.8
Osage -----	8	9.6	(D)	(D)	844	1.3	149 564	.5	712	1.4	53 598	.6
Ottawa -----	18	6.3	56	4.2	695	1.3	40 424	1.3	600	1.4	20 693	1.5
Pawnee -----	7	13.0	18	15.0	497	1.4	40 661	1.1	388	1.6	14 683	1.4
Payne -----	32	5.1	492	7.5	838	1.5	50 872	1.4	710	1.6	19 437	1.7
Pittsburg -----	24	5.3	770	6.1	1 197	2.2	78 696	2.3	1 095	2.2	43 404	2.4
Pontotoc -----	16	6.4	2 128	1.2	846	1.4	71 498	1.0	749	1.5	27 998	1.4
Pottawatomie -----	37	4.4	2 706	4.6	939	1.3	43 204	1.2	835	1.4	23 232	1.3
Pushmataha -----	11	11.3	369	24.8	537	2.8	33 828	3.0	487	2.9	19 460	3.0
Roger Mills -----	29	5.0	2 910	1.4	580	3.1	62 775	1.9	504	3.3	27 674	2.4
Rogers -----	20	6.3	329	7.2	972	1.3	58 460	1.0	801	1.4	24 882	1.4
Seminole -----	10	9.6	466	9.6	726	2.1	30 303	2.7	656	2.2	17 009	2.9
Sequoyah -----	12	7.1	486	4.0	747	1.6	36 471	1.4	659	1.6	20 040	1.5
Stephens -----	12	9.0	282	6.1	923	1.4	62 057	1.3	794	1.5	29 395	1.4
Texas -----	257	1.2	160 604	.5	368	1.3	274 054	.1	253	1.6	15 178	1.0
Tillman -----	52	1.8	11 742	.6	359	1.3	34 163	1.0	308	1.4	12 227	1.2
Tulsa -----	47	3.4	1 337	2.3	464	1.6	18 302	2.0	383	1.7	9 936	2.0
Wagoner -----	16	7.6	1 255	2.0	621	1.4	35 314	1.3	556	1.5	16 743	1.6
Washington -----	9	8.5	67	14.3	454	1.2	32 764	1.1	371	1.4	10 176	1.6
Washita -----	32	4.5	5 531	1.7	765	2.4	88 734	1.3	545	2.9	20 962	2.4
Woods -----	20	4.7	2 523	3.0	494	1.2	93 143	.4	378	1.4	23 156	.9
Woodward -----	41	3.2	5 073	2.5	593	1.2	66 736	.6	494	1.3	24 675	.8

See footnotes at end of table.

C-22 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

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)
Oklahoma -----	2 297	1.2	90 312	.4	3 415	1.4	260 682	.7	1 577	1.5	103 732	1.4
Adair -----	109	2.4	5 800	1.2	68	3.8	8 416	1.9	22	6.8	613	9.3
Alfalfa -----	8	5.5	369	.2	30	4.7	8 313	1.1	31	5.5	2 836	7.1
Atoka -----	24	7.4	504	6.1	31	6.5	478	14.9	19	8.7	1 197	16.1
Beaver -----	17	6.4	899	2.2	55	3.6	4 800	3.4	5	14.8	459	20.9
Beckham -----	24	5.8	968	2.8	26	7.6	974	9.6	11	11.9	273	19.8
Blaine -----	16	7.5	433	4.1	41	5.7	925	11.0	21	7.4	1 514	6.8
Bryan -----	38	4.4	1 393	.5	43	5.1	1 067	10.4	27	6.1	1 134	16.7
Caddo -----	25	5.6	550	2.0	53	5.3	3 388	6.5	28	7.2	1 783	5.6
Canadian -----	29	3.4	2 077	1.1	55	3.3	7 148	2.3	42	4.4	4 798	1.3
Carter -----	26	7.7	74	12.5	61	5.3	1 162	9.2	19	8.9	1 358	18.3
Cherokee -----	76	3.9	2 360	3.4	48	5.3	685	7.6	18	8.3	337	23.9
Choctaw -----	31	6.9	387	3.3	28	7.1	611	9.5	5	16.3	72	24.7
Cimarron -----	10	7.8	27	13.1	14	5.0	467	2.0	8	8.3	558	9.4
Cleveland -----	22	4.9	1 067	.6	60	4.2	1 737	6.4	23	6.6	726	9.7
Coal -----	30	4.8	867	2.9	30	5.3	1 013	7.2	2	22.9	(D)	(D)
Comanche -----	53	3.6	2 944	2.0	44	5.5	1 863	2.6	35	6.0	2 342	8.9
Cotton -----	6	12.4	56	14.2	22	7.3	779	5.2	5	13.1	609	2.1
Craig -----	30	4.5	1 018	2.1	46	4.4	1 214	6.2	30	5.8	715	9.0
Creek -----	42	4.9	1 120	3.1	118	3.0	3 047	14.7	46	4.7	954	6.4
Custer -----	16	4.9	741	1.3	48	4.0	3 282	3.0	17	6.0	2 151	2.4
Delaware -----	90	3.0	4 000	2.1	81	3.6	46 281	.2	20	7.8	550	14.5
Dewey -----	12	7.5	369	.9	33	5.3	1 414	7.3	8	8.1	337	4.7
Ellis -----	35	5.0	1 111	1.0	24	7.6	585	7.0	14	11.0	1 475	18.6
Garfield -----	15	6.0	753	.4	42	3.9	4 991	1.5	45	3.4	7 182	2.4
Garvin -----	33	5.4	1 069	2.2	58	4.4	2 094	2.5	32	5.6	2 536	6.2
Grady -----	91	1.9	14 638	.2	92	3.3	5 356	1.8	62	3.8	3 213	4.3
Grant -----	11	5.3	443	4.6	37	4.5	1 496	5.1	25	4.3	5 358	2.1
Greer -----	3	26.3	(D)	(D)	7	13.3	190	23.5	4	17.4	3 263	12.2
Harmon -----	2	16.6	(D)	(D)	15	7.9	2 036	7.1	1	—	(D)	(D)
Harper -----	12	7.6	468	1.8	21	7.1	1 070	15.8	13	9.1	751	6.7
Haskell -----	17	8.8	113	14.2	20	7.6	200	13.7	16	8.2	1 188	11.0
Hughes -----	23	7.7	219	10.4	31	6.5	481	11.3	10	11.2	310	11.9
Jackson -----	9	11.0	86	7.9	20	7.2	760	15.2	8	10.3	339	9.2
Jefferson -----	15	8.4	57	14.6	18	9.0	418	23.8	5	13.0	800	29.8
Johnston -----	36	4.3	1 190	2.4	40	5.2	1 218	5.5	14	7.5	674	2.0
Kay -----	22	5.0	609	1.6	55	3.8	4 985	2.2	62	3.4	5 738	2.5
Kingfisher -----	29	3.1	2 414	.6	47	4.2	9 585	1.4	31	4.3	6 027	3.2
Kiowa -----	12	7.3	339	1.8	14	7.2	657	9.6	23	4.8	4 533	3.4
Latimer -----	7	12.5	12	12.6	25	6.2	233	9.7	10	9.4	976	2.6
Le Flore -----	49	5.2	451	5.0	68	3.8	1 413	5.4	23	6.8	498	7.3
Lincoln -----	63	3.1	2 810	1.4	124	3.0	3 672	4.7	55	4.3	743	6.2
Logan -----	24	4.5	770	3.4	39	4.6	1 674	5.9	27	5.8	2 653	3.0
Love -----	12	9.5	22	9.3	19	7.5	1 306	15.9	9	10.5	288	6.3
McClain -----	44	3.2	2 985	.6	43	4.5	1 530	4.1	18	7.3	509	10.0
McCurtain -----	36	6.4	137	10.4	61	4.1	50 841	1.2	14	8.4	595	2.7
McIntosh -----	33	4.8	966	3.4	40	4.9	994	11.7	12	7.7	199	8.1
Major -----	26	4.5	1 174	1.4	41	5.5	3 105	4.8	24	7.7	901	9.0
Marshall -----	4	17.9	4	17.9	13	11.4	423	16.1	10	11.1	(D)	(D)
Mayes -----	106	2.0	5 257	.8	89	3.0	3 164	5.5	19	7.1	224	9.9
Murray -----	27	4.6	1 748	1.5	19	7.2	429	6.6	11	9.2	358	8.2
Muskogee -----	45	3.8	2 087	1.9	83	3.8	1 140	6.4	35	5.4	1 633	4.6
Noble -----	14	6.9	452	1.1	44	5.5	2 149	8.7	36	5.8	3 099	7.1
Nowata -----	37	3.8	1 019	1.8	46	3.9	1 020	5.4	12	7.3	223	10.4
Okfuskee -----	26	6.5	133	8.9	46	5.3	1 441	9.8	16	8.3	(D)	(D)
Oklahoma -----	19	6.8	468	2.9	35	5.9	911	10.4	31	6.0	898	11.0
Omulgee -----	23	6.7	248	9.4	47	4.8	727	8.0	8	11.6	182	15.3
Osage -----	20	6.2	617	1.6	58	4.0	5 800	1.9	19	7.6	763	9.8
Ottawa -----	40	3.5	2 161	2.1	66	3.5	1 464	4.5	10	9.2	328	13.5
Pawnee -----	17	7.8	119	11.6	23	7.3	820	3.8	29	5.9	1 582	10.0
Payne -----	59	3.5	3 489	.8	98	3.3	2 936	5.2	46	4.7	2 265	6.7
Pittsburg -----	47	5.7	422	4.4	55	4.7	1 723	4.7	11	10.9	209	18.2
Pontotoc -----	43	4.6	1 822	1.9	77	3.5	4 054	3.1	26	6.3	1 202	8.1
Pottawatomie -----	36	4.9	1 201	2.2	59	4.3	1 446	8.8	32	5.7	983	9.4
Pushmataha -----	32	6.2	197	6.4	32	6.9	1 505	10.3	17	7.1	353	10.6
Roger Mills -----	37	4.4	1 890	.8	35	6.4	1 180	10.0	5	10.0	(D)	(D)
Rogers -----	56	3.7	2 102	1.8	62	4.1	1 229	6.7	16	8.0	198	12.6
Seminole -----	29	6.4	486	7.3	29	7.1	731	26.4	13	10.1	354	14.5
Sequoyah -----	26	5.9	213	4.9	34	5.9	667	12.0	16	6.5	697	9.0
Stephens -----	35	5.2	930	1.0	58	4.2	1 825	10.4	22	7.5	519	10.2
Texas -----	17	7.7	213	7.4	39	4.6	13 513	1.0	15	8.3	1 066	11.9
Tillman -----	7	10.5	33	15.5	13	7.3	888	12.6	23	6.6	2 124	7.3
Tulsa -----	12	9.0	109	8.3	34	5.9	1 128	13.0	27	6.4	512	9.4
Wagoner -----	35	4.6	1 168	2.7	44	4.9	335	7.4	9	9.7	264	3.9
Washington -----	15	8.6	133	13.6	47	4.5	1 586	2.7	14	8.3	311	9.6
Washita -----	12	7.9	539	1.2	24	6.2	2 115	2.0	11	8.6	1 413	4.7
Woods -----	15	8.1	70	16.3	27	5.1	1 649	4.3	20	5.8	1 420	3.6
Woodward -----	13	8.0	59	17.7	43	4.7	2 730	3.3	19	6.7	1 546	7.3

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-23

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	
Oklahoma -----	3 159	1.6	4 407 866	.4	529	.6	138 607 293	.1
Adair -----	85	3.0	1 347 043	.6	58	1.1	27 739 248	.1
Alfalfa -----	16	8.3	421	11.0	—	—	—	—
Atoka -----	40	6.3	859	8.1	2	20.6	(D)	(D)
Beaver -----	28	5.7	522	8.1	—	—	—	—
Beckham -----	20	8.8	197	11.0	—	—	—	—
Blaine -----	24	7.6	1 951	2.6	—	—	—	—
Bryan -----	73	4.0	8 334	15.4	—	—	—	—
Caddo -----	29	6.5	465	8.6	—	—	—	—
Canadian -----	35	5.7	884	9.1	2	24.8	(D)	(D)
Carter -----	54	5.9	1 072	7.3	2	21.7	(D)	(D)
Cherokee -----	74	4.6	(D)	(D)	21	2.1	3 930 352	(L)
Choctaw -----	28	7.8	454	8.5	6	6.7	1 122 005	(L)
Cimarron -----	13	7.0	339	7.1	—	—	—	—
Cleveland -----	49	4.8	895	6.9	2	23.6	(D)	(D)
Coal -----	31	6.1	929	8.8	—	—	—	—
Comanche -----	29	6.8	459	10.0	1	38.8	(D)	(D)
Cotton -----	18	8.8	171	11.6	—	—	—	—
Craig -----	39	5.3	1 062	16.1	1	—	(D)	(D)
Creek -----	110	3.2	(D)	(D)	8	12.2	342	21.6
Custer -----	15	7.8	314	10.7	—	—	—	—
Delaware -----	79	3.2	666 200	1.1	77	—	26 359 308	—
Dewey -----	39	4.6	864	5.1	—	—	—	—
Ellis -----	26	7.9	362	10.1	—	—	—	—
Garfield -----	51	4.1	1 215	6.0	—	—	—	—
Garvin -----	56	4.6	(D)	(D)	1	39.3	(D)	(D)
Grady -----	59	4.4	1 235	5.4	1	—	(D)	(D)
Grant -----	15	6.5	292	6.8	—	—	—	—
Greer -----	7	13.7	70	13.0	—	—	—	—
Harmon -----	3	20.6	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Harper -----	17	8.0	390	16.0	—	—	—	—
Haskell -----	45	5.2	1 019	7.7	10	—	3 074 810	—
Hughes -----	29	7.1	434	8.2	—	—	—	—
Jackson -----	10	10.2	223	20.2	—	—	—	—
Jefferson -----	17	8.2	521	17.0	—	—	—	—
Johnston -----	35	5.2	724 156	(L)	—	—	—	—
Kay -----	54	4.2	1 472	6.3	—	—	—	—
Kingfisher -----	22	6.8	638	14.3	—	—	—	—
Kiowa -----	11	7.6	251	11.1	—	—	—	—
Latimer -----	33	5.5	694	7.0	2	18.5	(D)	(D)
Le Flore -----	80	4.3	137 362	.2	117	1.0	28 852 735	.3
Lincoln -----	101	3.5	1 640	4.4	1	50.0	(D)	(D)
Logan -----	40	5.1	1 023	11.7	—	—	—	—
Love -----	28	7.5	409	8.5	2	27.9	(D)	(D)
McClain -----	29	6.2	451	7.1	1	37.4	(D)	(D)
McCurtain -----	75	3.5	466 038	1.9	161	.4	41 670 158	.1
McIntosh -----	40	5.4	740	6.6	—	—	—	—
Major -----	37	5.9	950	6.5	—	—	—	—
Marshall -----	18	8.3	273	9.9	—	—	—	—
Mayes -----	84	3.2	(D)	(D)	7	3.4	604 774	(L)
Murray -----	21	7.0	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Muskogee -----	77	4.1	1 228	5.2	2	19.3	(D)	(D)
Noble -----	22	7.7	370	11.6	—	—	—	—
Nowata -----	33	5.0	871	7.4	—	—	—	—
Okfuskee -----	36	5.8	4 710	37.4	1	33.9	(D)	(D)
Oklahoma -----	44	5.1	849	6.1	1	41.5	(D)	(D)
Okmulgee -----	57	4.5	1 307	5.3	1	35.9	(D)	(D)
Osage -----	53	4.4	1 333	5.8	1	39.6	(D)	(D)
Ottawa -----	41	4.8	(D)	(D)	11	3.0	4 334 225	(L)
Pawnee -----	40	5.4	772	8.8	—	—	—	—
Payne -----	43	5.1	1 735	4.5	6	15.6	(D)	(D)
Pittsburg -----	77	4.4	(D)	(D)	3	21.4	(D)	(D)
Pontotoc -----	58	4.5	853	6.4	—	—	—	—
Pottawatomie -----	62	4.3	991	5.9	—	—	—	—
Pushmataha -----	49	5.3	75 441	5.0	1	44.6	(D)	(D)
Roger Mills -----	27	7.5	877	13.0	2	25.0	(D)	(D)
Rogers -----	89	3.7	2 415	6.3	2	25.5	(D)	(D)
Seminole -----	53	5.0	763	6.6	3	18.1	(D)	(D)
Sequoyah -----	62	4.5	48 175	.2	3	16.6	(D)	(D)
Stephens -----	41	5.5	492	6.9	—	—	—	—
Texas -----	21	6.7	838	4.2	—	—	—	—
Tillman -----	17	7.6	353	12.4	3	20.6	215	20.6
Tulsa -----	47	5.3	1 136	8.6	1	35.8	(D)	(D)
Wagoner -----	29	6.4	976	9.3	—	—	—	—
Washington -----	36	5.1	702	5.6	1	34.2	(D)	(D)
Washita -----	15	8.8	190	10.9	1	41.9	(D)	(D)
Woods -----	25	5.7	692	6.0	3	14.3	390	18.2
Woodward -----	34	5.4	826	5.6	—	—	—	—

See footnotes at end of table.

C-24 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

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											
	Sorghum for grain or seed						Wheat for grain					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Oklahoma -----	2 076	1.1	281 244	.5	13 933 273	.5	16 716	1.5	5 197 545	.7	138 121 886	.7
Adair -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	16 716	6	136	7.8	4 990	9.4
Alfalfa -----	9	5.3	529	1.9	20 474	2.1	589	1.2	247 258	.6	7 071 142	.6
Atoka -----	2	21.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	3	14.4	157	17.0	3 170	16.3
Beaver -----	110	1.9	25 156	1.0	1 128 617	1.3	384	1.4	150 330	.9	3 552 377	.8
Beckham -----	23	6.0	1 833	4.8	52 725	7.3	311	3.4	78 110	1.8	1 914 101	1.6
Blaine -----	34	4.1	2 397	1.9	149 413	1.6	593	3.3	187 057	1.9	4 842 331	1.8
Bryan -----	25	4.7	1 585	3.8	49 511	5.2	37	3.8	5 162	2.9	130 298	1.8
Caddo -----	151	2.6	8 709	1.8	507 160	1.7	705	2.5	167 250	1.4	4 890 635	1.4
Canadian -----	23	4.0	1 749	2.0	89 828	2.1	605	1.4	184 089	.8	5 268 740	.7
Carter -----	3	15.5	370	12.6	7 280	14.4	22	6.7	3 803	4.5	94 425	3.6
Cherokee -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	17.2	87	17.8	2 050	18.5
Choctaw -----	3	13.3	395	7.1	(D)	(D)	8	5.6	1 839	.4	58 617	.2
Cimarron -----	194	1.3	72 664	.7	3 070 470	.6	247	1.2	99 084	.7	2 701 146	.7
Cleveland -----	5	7.3	572	1.0	(D)	(D)	70	3.0	9 052	2.7	253 305	2.6
Coal -----	18	7.3	669	7.5	24 943	13.8	8	8.4	1 243	4.4	46 230	3.5
Comanche -----	14	5.8	802	3.5	28 558	2.4	363	3.0	74 114	2.1	2 120 105	1.9
Cotton -----	5	8.5	655	4.2	18 076	2.9	364	2.4	127 747	1.1	3 809 100	1.0
Craig -----	111	2.4	10 594	1.9	626 987	2.0	133	2.4	16 655	1.6	539 487	1.5
Creek -----	3	9.4	207	2.7	(D)	(D)	24	4.8	2 436	2.9	59 987	2.9
Custer -----	46	2.2	3 987	2.3	244 483	2.2	558	1.2	209 695	.6	5 976 606	.6
Delaware -----	17	6.7	1 473	4.7	91 115	3.6	39	4.9	3 685	3.2	120 634	3.4
Dewey -----	19	5.8	737	4.8	24 305	4.5	384	1.6	104 214	.9	2 728 063	.9
Ellis -----	26	4.8	3 035	2.8	86 506	2.9	263	2.9	77 769	1.7	1 478 349	1.7
Garfield -----	14	3.7	587	2.5	23 256	2.0	877	1.1	354 258	.5	9 058 961	.5
Garvin -----	20	5.2	1 385	3.3	88 880	2.9	107	2.3	11 938	2.8	344 789	2.5
Grady -----	38	3.1	2 563	2.7	118 357	3.2	422	1.3	75 968	1.0	2 144 745	.9
Grant -----	44	3.0	3 012	2.2	155 429	2.3	664	1.0	350 994	.5	8 715 989	.5
Greer -----	15	8.2	704	5.4	34 538	4.4	256	3.3	78 837	1.9	2 055 224	1.7
Harmon -----	6	10.3	468	10.7	24 246	7.4	183	1.7	58 708	.9	1 193 368	.8
Harper -----	14	7.7	1 195	8.7	61 834	10.9	227	2.4	105 090	1.2	2 167 076	1.1
Haskell -----	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	12	5.3	1 345	3.7	38 962	.8
Hughes -----	10	10.3	277	8.9	9 353	9.8	13	6.5	1 168	8.3	33 675	13.1
Jackson -----	27	2.2	2 239	.8	161 166	.4	400	2.3	173 397	.9	4 302 963	.9
Jefferson -----	4	11.9	206	3.0	14 626	3.0	144	3.2	31 080	1.4	873 022	1.4
Johnston -----	7	5.2	415	1.8	18 981	2.3	20	6.3	1 350	1.7	29 303	2.5
Kay -----	109	2.0	8 569	1.0	440 452	1.0	634	1.4	238 993	.7	6 474 208	.8
Kingfisher -----	4	8.5	280	.8	8 392	1.3	615	1.3	213 410	.7	5 292 702	.7
Kiowa -----	19	3.8	1 227	3.4	55 135	2.7	532	1.0	204 519	.6	5 353 249	.6
Latimer -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	10.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Le Flore -----	9	—	1 429	—	59 478	—	25	4.0	4 273	3.3	163 640	1.9
Lincoln -----	9	6.3	227	4.3	12 050	4.3	122	2.8	7 072	2.8	155 424	2.5
Logan -----	11	7.5	843	8.1	39 735	8.4	340	1.8	78 162	1.2	1 960 594	1.1
Love -----	6	14.2	234	16.7	10 292	16.3	48	4.3	6 751	3.3	192 749	3.2
McClain -----	17	3.3	1 464	2.0	70 865	2.0	118	2.1	12 689	1.5	351 287	1.4
McCurtain -----	3	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	18	3.7	4 334	2.5	99 314	2.6
McIntosh -----	19	4.7	1 594	5.1	44 809	5.2	25	4.2	1 984	3.0	47 027	2.5
Major -----	16	6.3	872	4.1	38 483	2.4	507	2.6	151 571	1.4	3 654 858	1.3
Marshall -----	7	9.5	633	8.6	26 671	5.5	19	6.8	1 649	3.5	43 616	3.3
Mayes -----	48	2.7	3 495	1.3	222 643	1.1	82	2.0	9 796	1.3	330 544	1.1
Murray -----	7	7.8	849	9.4	38 023	12.0	16	4.8	2 225	2.5	74 180	2.2
Muskogee -----	25	4.7	2 796	4.0	103 585	2.8	92	2.6	13 320	1.4	319 657	1.3
Noble -----	23	3.9	1 585	1.5	89 413	1.3	417	2.7	133 165	1.5	3 284 297	1.6
Nowata -----	34	3.3	2 266	2.4	104 304	3.5	100	2.2	13 174	2.9	336 305	2.5
Okfuskee -----	7	13.6	121	13.3	4 728	27.0	21	7.6	1 486	5.2	36 239	4.9
Oklahoma -----	15	6.0	796	4.9	22 968	7.6	114	2.8	16 518	2.7	385 992	2.7
Omulgee -----	7	9.8	243	7.9	10 607	9.0	39	4.6	4 030	2.6	120 725	2.2
Osage -----	23	4.9	2 068	4.5	108 231	2.8	142	2.1	31 891	1.3	938 003	1.2
Ottawa -----	80	2.6	10 270	1.1	850 718	.9	135	2.0	22 491	.9	845 660	.9
Pawnee -----	11	6.3	593	1.5	31 701	1.3	136	2.3	23 134	2.0	589 629	2.0
Payne -----	22	6.0	1 632	6.2	84 195	6.2	214	2.1	27 013	1.6	606 883	1.7
Pittsburg -----	3	18.3	12	27.8	204	25.1	9	14.2	190	15.6	3 142	16.5
Pontotoc -----	8	9.1	390	12.3	18 187	7.8	12	6.8	595	5.8	14 633	5.9
Pottawatomie -----	20	5.4	1 023	7.4	42 719	9.2	71	3.2	6 703	3.0	150 681	3.6
Pushmataha -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Roger Mills -----	30	5.5	3 138	1.9	122 979	2.1	232	3.3	43 351	1.7	950 045	1.9
Rogers -----	18	5.6	1 035	7.8	53 713	10.3	91	2.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Seminole -----	3	12.8	(D)	(D)	2 578	5.9	11	8.4	1 401	4.0	20 169	4.1
Sequoyah -----	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	20	3.4	3 663	.5	90 612	.4
Stephens -----	6	8.2	553	3.6	25 647	3.0	201	2.3	31 190	1.7	782 674	1.6
Texas -----	251	1.3	66 166	.8	3 509 293	.8	437	1.1	218 266	.6	7 836 096	.5
Tillman -----	71	2.2	5 743	1.5	271 780	1.4	415	1.1	123 550	.6	3 372 084	.6
Tulsa -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	39	4.4	4 423	2.6	108 793	2.7
Wagoner -----	6	5.3	1 130	.6	59 596	.2	107	2.6	18 616	1.6	551 384	1.6
Washington -----	16	4.3	1 715	2.3	115 205	2.6	57	3.3	8 373	2.1	228 152	2.2
Washita -----	44	4.6	2 048	3.4	125 467	3.2	715	2.6	221 156	1.5	5 747 779	1.5
Woods -----	6	4.2	261	1.2	11 630	.1	428	1.3	190 949	.6	5 485 136	.7
Woodward -----	19	4.6	1 009	3.0	32 044	2.6	311	1.3	95 072	.7	2 161 107	.7

See footnotes at end of table.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-25

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested —Con.											
	Cotton						Soybeans for beans					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bales	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Oklahoma -----	1 726	1.3	296 484	.6	212 041	.5	1 196	1.2	193 302	.6	4 975 025	.6
Adair -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	36.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Alfalfa -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	16.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Atoka -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Beaver -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Beckham -----	112	3.2	19 813	1.7	10 910	1.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Blaine -----	6	-	223	-	121	-	1	-	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Bryan -----	1	-	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	27	3.6	4 562	3.6	118 028	2.9
Caddo -----	124	2.4	10 238	1.2	4 797	1.1	8	5.9	928	6.3	25 395	2.8
Canadian -----	17	5.1	1 191	4.5	752	5.0	27	4.2	1 585	3.2	42 339	2.9
Carter -----	3	15.5	85	21.9	45	20.7	3	-	780	-	22 600	-
Cherokee -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	39.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Choctaw -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	3 045	-	88 765	-
Cimarron -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	14.9	102	3.7	(D)	(D)
Cleveland -----	3	-	924	-	710	-	6	4.3	729	1.8	21 985	1.8
Coal -----	4	15.6	264	17.7	145	17.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Comanche -----	29	4.4	3 899	1.2	2 396	1.0	1	-	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Cotton -----	79	2.8	8 312	2.4	5 710	2.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Craig -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	102	2.6	10 957	1.8	204 922	1.9
Creek -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	7.3	1 292	11.6	31 055	12.8
Custer -----	52	2.3	5 537	1.4	5 077	1.5	4	11.0	(D)	(D)	3 726	16.9
Delaware -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	5.7	3 161	2.7	86 470	1.4
Dewey -----	5	11.0	355	14.6	214	10.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ellis -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Garfield -----	1	-	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	-	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Garvin -----	9	7.9	1 050	5.0	591	7.1	66	2.8	8 981	1.8	297 592	1.5
Grady -----	32	3.4	2 285	3.0	1 470	2.9	10	5.1	1 190	2.9	35 889	2.0
Grant -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	8.2	236	3.1	5 773	.6
Greer -----	84	2.8	12 082	1.9	8 390	1.2	2	24.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Harmon -----	107	2.0	22 224	1.0	22 018	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Harper -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Haskell -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	35 713	-
Hughes -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	11.0	166	21.1	1 823	20.6
Jackson -----	188	1.9	54 599	.6	53 318	.5	3	15.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Jefferson -----	5	-	389	-	329	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Johnston -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	14.0	125	9.1	2 678	15.4
Kay -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	5.3	502	8.0	11 760	6.4
Kingfisher -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	12.0	116	18.0	3 085	15.1
Kiowa -----	238	1.2	28 916	.6	16 727	.7	2	22.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Latimer -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	31.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Le Flore -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	27	4.1	13 141	1.4	310 882	1.6
Lincoln -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	36.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Logan -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Love -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
McClain -----	20	3.8	3 994	1.2	2 517	1.3	51	3.1	4 439	2.2	160 482	2.3
McCurtain -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	24	5.0	11 580	2.0	320 887	2.0
McIntosh -----	1	27.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	27	4.4	3 001	4.4	57 461	4.1
Major -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	19.3	238	25.2	4 899	26.4
Marshall -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mayes -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	78	2.4	7 170	1.4	174 335	1.6
Murray -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	9.0	937	11.4	27 355	10.2
Muskogee -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	83	2.4	20 655	.9	546 926	.8
Noble -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	31.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Nowata -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	48	3.3	3 318	4.0	78 725	4.5
Okfuskee -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	7.5	625	6.7	14 584	4.2
Oklahoma -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	12.2	245	9.9	8 619	6.7
Omulgee -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	35	5.0	3 025	3.0	71 005	2.8
Osage -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	43	4.4	3 960	4.6	119 186	4.5
Ottawa -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	107	2.3	19 487	.9	470 616	.7
Pawnee -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	21	5.8	1 514	2.7	31 712	3.9
Payne -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	15.2	41	28.9	1 295	27.7
Pittsburg -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	9.9	593	5.0	13 905	3.9
Pontotoc -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	11.0	228	7.3	8 430	5.9
Pottawatomie -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	5.8	740	3.0	22 877	2.2
Pushmataha -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Roger Mills -----	20	7.0	1 372	4.4	1 290	5.2	1	-	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Rogers -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	35	4.1	3 813	2.7	98 411	2.5
Seminole -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	21.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Sequoyah -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	33	3.5	7 931	1.2	186 401	1.2
Stephens -----	11	6.3	1 852	2.3	1 142	1.7	1	32.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Texas -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	4.6	730	1.3	28 554	1.5
Tillman -----	317	1.1	82 202	.5	50 877	.5	3	-	252	-	4 290	-
Tulsa -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	34	4.1	6 264	1.3	142 095	1.4
Wagoner -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	97	2.5	29 917	1.4	791 745	1.3
Washington -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	23	3.9	4 603	1.0	119 803	1.1
Washita -----	258	2.9	34 374	2.2	22 341	2.0	4	16.3	90	17.1	2 900	17.3
Woods -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	(D)	-	(D)	-
Woodward -----	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

See footnotes at end of table.

C-26 APPENDIX C

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

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.											
	Peanuts for nuts						Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Pounds	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	
Oklahoma -----	908	1.8	88 449	1.0	203 107 412	.8	32 299	1.6	2 112 710	1.3	3 992 843	1.2
Adair -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	572	1.6	32 267	1.6	68 726	1.6
Alfalfa -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	375	1.3	31 131	1.0	79 391	1.1
Atoka -----	32	6.5	2 275	5.4	3 676 183	4.7	560	2.9	33 575	2.8	58 575	3.1
Beaver -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	261	1.6	24 279	1.1	42 887	1.3
Beckham -----	8	11.3	529	10.9	1 454 600	8.9	331	3.3	22 211	2.4	41 080	2.3
Blaine -----	9	9.1	545	4.6	1 760 690	3.8	385	3.5	22 477	2.8	42 368	2.5
Bryan -----	98	2.6	12 684	1.8	20 534 664	1.6	700	1.6	42 765	1.8	80 649	1.9
Caddo -----	276	2.2	29 713	.9	86 570 890	.7	686	3.0	41 237	2.5	91 286	2.1
Canadian -----	6	7.2	417	5.4	1 325 806	4.5	541	1.5	33 830	1.3	77 929	1.1
Carter -----	10	9.6	810	6.1	1 425 972	7.7	340	3.4	18 885	3.4	29 988	3.0
Cherokee -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	471	2.6	27 097	2.9	46 893	2.9
Choctaw -----	1	44.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	504	3.1	36 060	2.9	65 672	2.8
Cimarron -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	79	1.8	8 837	.5	28 290	.3
Cleveland -----	2	15.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	332	1.5	20 742	2.1	35 887	2.2
Coal -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	315	1.9	24 359	1.5	40 704	1.6
Comanche -----	13	9.0	861	3.7	2 483 943	4.2	404	3.0	31 048	2.3	60 109	2.6
Cotton -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	230	2.8	13 320	3.0	25 038	2.5
Craig -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	635	1.5	52 950	1.5	77 077	1.5
Creek -----	3	22.0	44	26.2	81 000	25.9	507	1.6	28 282	1.8	44 071	2.2
Custer -----	13	3.9	1 040	1.2	4 061 857	1.5	403	1.3	23 593	.9	53 780	.8
Delaware -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	703	2.0	45 927	2.1	87 010	2.2
Dewey -----	3	11.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	300	1.8	17 443	1.6	30 726	1.6
Ellis -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	251	3.0	28 164	1.2	99 521	.6
Garfield -----	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	529	1.1	26 014	1.0	46 670	1.0
Garvin -----	8	6.8	932	3.8	2 518 389	2.8	569	1.7	40 234	1.4	107 201	1.4
Grady -----	30	4.2	2 434	3.6	5 440 536	3.0	749	1.3	60 725	1.0	154 245	.9
Grant -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	335	1.2	22 740	.9	53 436	.7
Greer -----	8	6.1	688	6.8	2 103 366	6.2	169	3.6	11 156	2.9	25 903	1.9
Harmon -----	16	5.3	1 176	4.0	2 819 212	3.8	112	2.3	6 942	1.9	13 416	3.1
Harper -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	204	2.7	19 230	1.7	34 477	1.5
Haskell -----	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	479	1.7	40 027	1.5	63 062	1.6
Hughes -----	58	4.2	6 161	2.7	12 120 987	2.1	419	2.9	26 889	2.4	46 460	2.4
Jackson -----	14	9.6	1 007	8.5	1 814 170	7.5	199	2.6	10 122	2.0	18 785	2.1
Jefferson -----	2	23.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	171	3.4	11 739	2.8	21 931	3.5
Johnston -----	24	6.3	2 034	3.8	4 197 859	4.0	294	2.0	19 698	1.7	34 513	2.1
Kay -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	410	1.4	22 330	1.0	45 657	1.2
Kingfisher -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	400	1.5	29 058	1.2	59 531	1.8
Kiowa -----	6	6.4	368	6.8	1 015 393	9.8	281	1.4	14 687	.9	34 504	.9
Latimer -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	315	1.7	18 557	2.0	29 428	2.0
Le Flore -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	808	2.2	49 919	2.3	83 454	2.2
Lincoln -----	3	13.3	170	13.0	318 000	12.9	849	1.4	45 726	1.4	82 512	1.5
Logan -----	2	25.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	436	1.7	26 485	1.7	46 005	1.7
Love -----	42	4.0	4 774	2.0	10 086 510	1.6	266	2.9	15 876	2.6	27 208	3.2
McClain -----	8	—	829	—	1 664 073	—	399	1.5	26 508	1.3	60 042	1.2
McCurtain -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	714	2.6	39 658	2.5	83 361	2.5
McIntosh -----	18	5.1	1 043	5.1	1 727 513	5.4	473	1.7	32 126	1.6	58 314	1.7
Major -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	370	2.6	22 220	2.1	43 436	2.0
Marshall -----	28	6.0	3 561	3.3	6 645 468	2.8	163	3.4	9 475	3.3	15 702	2.9
Mayes -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	727	1.2	53 084	1.2	88 970	1.1
Murray -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	170	1.9	15 017	1.7	26 093	1.7
Muskogee -----	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	714	1.5	59 245	1.2	106 705	1.2
Noble -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	393	2.7	26 821	2.5	48 890	2.7
Nowata -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	428	1.3	29 112	1.5	45 666	1.4
Okfuskee -----	13	7.3	1 396	3.2	1 973 934	4.8	352	2.7	22 266	2.6	32 035	2.9
Oklahoma -----	4	—	271	—	495 850	—	273	2.1	15 305	2.6	30 761	2.4
Omulgee -----	23	5.7	1 679	3.4	2 013 775	3.9	430	1.7	28 693	2.1	44 559	2.1
Osage -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	432	1.5	34 322	1.5	52 948	1.7
Ottawa -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	509	1.4	34 260	1.4	54 287	1.3
Pawnee -----	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	285	1.8	15 010	1.8	27 071	2.0
Payne -----	5	6.6	286	2.0	439 850	1.9	574	1.6	38 642	1.7	64 828	1.5
Pittsburg -----	32	6.8	1 920	6.2	2 932 660	7.0	739	2.5	46 531	2.4	74 248	2.6
Pontotoc -----	1	49.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	523	1.6	28 519	1.7	53 274	1.7
Pottawatomie -----	26	4.6	2 415	2.6	4 538 982	2.8	559	1.6	35 404	1.5	71 364	1.8
Pushmataha -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	367	3.1	25 188	3.0	42 017	3.3
Roger Mills -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	324	3.5	22 917	2.6	40 722	2.3
Rogers -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	618	1.4	38 450	1.5	61 939	1.5
Seminole -----	4	10.8	686	1.8	1 257 370	2.0	415	2.7	23 252	3.4	33 888	3.8
Sequoyah -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	510	1.7	30 463	1.9	47 719	2.1
Stephens -----	15	6.9	1 757	3.2	3 490 372	2.9	484	1.7	26 453	1.5	49 878	1.4
Texas -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	146	1.9	10 047	1.9	24 529	2.4
Tillman -----	21	2.3	1 531	1.3	3 992 284	1.3	210	1.6	14 193	1.2	33 777	1.2
Tulsa -----	1	39.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	283	1.9	17 691	2.7	26 778	2.5
Wagoner -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	405	1.7	29 406	1.9	51 606	2.1
Washington -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	303	1.5	15 409	1.6	27 724	1.7
Washita -----	17	3.8	1 156	2.1	3 572 274	2.4	506	2.7	29 975	2.4	62 624	1.8
Woods -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	291	1.5	18 533	1.1	34 026	1.1
Woodward -----	—	—	—	—	—	—	331	1.4	19 882	1.3	37 007	1.7

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

1992 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

APPENDIX C C-27

**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 -----	66 937	1.5	7 590	21.6	10.2	2.0
Land in farms ----- acres -----	32 143 030	1.0	713 912	19.6	2.2	.4
Average size of farm ----- acres -----	480.2	1.8	94.1	17.9	(X)	(X)
Farms by size:						
Less than 10 acres -----	2 832	1.6	778	44.6	21.5	7.7
10 to 49 acres -----	9 614	1.6	3 236	30.3	25.2	5.7
Less than 50 acres -----	12 446	1.6	4 014	26.3	24.4	4.9
50 acres or more -----	54 491	1.6	3 577	24.5	6.2	1.4
50 to 99 acres -----	9 250	1.7	1 964	40.9	17.5	6.0
100 to 179 acres -----	11 849	1.8	819	38.5	6.5	2.3
180 acres or more -----	33 392	1.6	794	35.1	2.3	.8
Harvested cropland ----- farms -----	42 015	1.5	3 039	23.6	6.7	1.5
acres -----	8 272 889	.8	90 546	23.0	1.1	.2
Farms by value of sales:						
Less than \$1,000 -----	7 721	1.6	3 655	28.7	32.1	6.2
\$1,000 to \$2,499 -----	8 181	1.7	1 843	31.6	18.4	4.7
Less than \$2,500 -----	15 902	1.6	5 497	24.9	25.7	4.7
\$2,500 or more -----	51 035	1.6	2 093	24.2	3.9	.9
\$2,500 to \$9,999 -----	21 397	1.8	1 664	27.6	7.2	1.8
\$10,000 or more -----	29 638	1.6	429	36.6	1.4	.5
Market value of agricultural products sold -----\$1,000 -----	3 562 646	.4	24 229	22.9	.7	.2
Farms by standard industrial classification:						
Crops (01) -----	15 298	1.4	1 977	31.9	11.4	3.2
Livestock (02) -----	51 639	1.5	5 614	22.1	9.8	2.0
Farms by type of organization:						
Individual or family -----	60 304	1.5	6 970	19.9	10.4	1.9
Partnership or corporation -----	6 181	1.4	604	58.7	8.9	4.7
Other -----	452	1.9	-	(X)	-	(X)
Farms by tenure of operator:						
Full owners -----	35 802	1.6	6 036	22.3	14.4	2.8
Part owners and tenants -----	31 135	1.4	1 347	32.8	4.1	1.3
Part owners -----	24 039	1.4	772	37.9	3.1	1.1
Tenants -----	7 096	1.5	576	52.4	7.5	3.6
Operators by place of residence:						
On farm operated -----	44 951	1.5	4 179	26.1	8.5	2.0
Not on farm operated -----	16 622	1.6	803	40.2	4.6	1.8
Not reported -----	5 364	1.5	2 608	28.3	32.7	6.3
Operators by principal occupation:						
Farming -----	33 279	1.5	1 191	35.9	3.5	1.2
Other -----	33 658	1.6	4 878	21.8	12.7	2.4
Operators by sex:						
Male -----	61 611	1.5	6 754	20.6	9.9	1.9
Female -----	5 326	1.6	837	50.9	13.6	5.8
Operators by race:						
White -----	63 781	1.5	5 469	22.8	7.9	1.7
Black and other races -----	3 156	1.6	601	49.1	16.0	6.7
Operators by years on present farm:						
4 years or less -----	8 672	1.5	2 389	30.4	21.6	5.2
5 years or more -----	46 219	1.5	2 213	32.3	4.6	1.4
Average years on present farm -----	19.5	2.2	8.7	31.0	(X)	(X)
Not reported -----	12 046	1.5	2 988	25.9	19.9	4.2
Average age of operator -----	55.0	2.1	49.8	21.1	(X)	(X)

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

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