

---

# Appendix C.

## Statistical Methodology

---

### THE SCREENING PHASE AND THE MAIL LIST MODEL

The 1997 Census of Agriculture featured a pre-census screening phase that surveyed selected records, by mail or telephone, for presence or absence of agricultural activity. Records selected for screening had a low probability of qualifying as farms. All records responding to the screener and reporting no agricultural activity were removed from the census mail list. Eliminating nonfarm records from the mail list reduced respondent burden and data collection costs.

The screening phase included nearly 500,000 records. Records were selected for screening using one of the following criteria:

- 1) Records on selected agriculture specialty lists that had no other list source,
- 2) Records identified by a mail list model as having a low probability of being a farm.

A mail list model predicted the probability that an addressee on the 1997 preliminary census mail list operated a farm. The model defined groups based on combinations of characteristics such as source(s) of the mail list record, expected value of agricultural production, and geographic location. Farm proportions were estimated for these groups by calculating the proportion of 1992 census respondent records that were farms which exhibited the characteristics defined by the group. This proportion, also called the in-scope rate, provided an estimate of the probability that an addressee in the group operated a farm.

Each address record on the 1997 preliminary census 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. Records with a farm probability of approximately 30 percent or less were selected for screening, along with records included on selected agriculture specialty lists as noted above.

Before screening, the preliminary census mail list consisted of 3,314,790 records. There were 478,298 records selected for screening. Of these, 125,570 records were determined to be nonfarms as a result of the screening phase and were removed. These records were removed from the final census mail list. The remaining 3,189,220 records received census report forms.

1997 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

### CENSUS SAMPLE DESIGN

All name and address records on the final census mail list were designated to receive a 1997 Census of Agriculture report form. Two different types of census report forms, sample and nonsample, were used to collect data. Sections 1 through 20 and 28 through 32 of the sample form were identical to sections on the nonsample census form. Sample form sections 21 through 27 contained additional questions on usage of fertilizers and chemicals, farm production expenditures, value of machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, farm-related income, and hired workers. There were 11 regional versions of the nonsample form and 13 regional versions of the sample form with listings of crops varying by region. These 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. Mail list records were selected into the sample with certainty if they (1) were expected to have large total value of agricultural products sold or large acreage, (2) were multi-unit operations (i.e., separate farms producing under one company organization), (3) were in a county with less than 100 farms in 1992, or (4) had other special characteristics. Farms with special characteristics were abnormal farms, such as institutional farms, experimental and research farms, and Indian reservations. Mail list records in counties containing 100 to 199 farms in 1992 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 2; records in counties containing 200 to 299 farms in 1992 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 4; and records in counties containing 300 or more farms in 1992 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 6. The remaining mail list records not chosen to receive the sample form received the nonsample census form. This differential sampling scheme was used to provide reliable data for the sample sections of the report form for all counties.

### EDITING DATA AND IMPUTATION FOR ITEM NONRESPONSE

The census of agriculture complex edit and imputation system is an automated computerized system that performed the following functions:

- Ensured reasonable relationships between/among data items, values for various sizes of farms, combinations of commodities, and economic interactions.
- Ensured necessary consistencies were present (there were more than 70 distinct consistency requirements).
- Ensured climatic, geographic, legal, and physical constraints were met.

The system performed these and similar functions for more than 900 data key codes for sample records and approximately 850 data key codes for nonsample records.

For the 1997 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 for that record 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 fixed 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 was 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 Classifications 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 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 the same 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. An edit run usually consisted of 10,000 or more records.

After the initial computer edit, all keyed reports not meeting the census farm definition were reviewed to ensure that the data had been keyed correctly. Edit referrals were generated for 17 percent of the reports included as farms; they were reviewed for keying accuracy and 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 re-edited.

## CENSUS ESTIMATION

The 1997 Census of Agriculture used two types of statistical estimation procedures to account for whole farm nonresponse and sample data collection. The procedures were necessary because some farm operators did not respond to the census despite numerous attempts to contact them, and estimates for certain data items were based on a sample of farm operators rather than a full enumeration.

### Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation

Whole farm nonresponse to the census occurred when a response was never received for a record. If the record was a large farm, as defined by value of production or acreage, or a unique farm operation, intensive telephone or personal followup was conducted during census processing to obtain a response. If these attempts failed, either the NASS survey database, the census historic database, or other more current sources were used to impute data for the record.

During mail list development, the State Statistical Offices (SSOs), in an effort to reduce respondent burden, identified records that participated in multiple NASS surveys and/or situations where there were special reporting relationships between an enumerator and a respondent. These records were referred to as tagged records. The SSOs had full responsibility for the data collection for these records, including imputation of data for the record if a response was not obtainable.

Whole farm nonresponse that occurred within the remaining universe of records was accounted for by a statistical weighting procedure. The weights of the responding farms were adjusted to account for farms that did not respond. The information needed for this process was obtained from the 1997 Nonresponse Survey. The SSOs conducted the nonresponse survey using computer-assisted telephone interviewing (Blaise-CATI) or personal enumeration when telephone contact was not possible. Alaska and Rhode

Island were not eligible for the survey because all nonrespondents were subject to extensive followup. In these cases, data were collected by telephone or other methods. The nonresponse survey collected information from a sample of census nonrespondents to determine farm status and estimate the proportion of farms in the nonresponse universe. The information was then used to estimate the number of nonresponding farm operations by State and county.

The 1997 Nonresponse Survey consisted of a stratified systematic sample of the nonresponse records within each State. The sample was selected near the end of the census follow-up operations. Five strata were defined to be homogeneous on probability of farm status and were based on screener status, total value produced, and list source(s) of the mail list record.

Based on survey results, estimates of the proportion of census nonrespondents operating farms were made for each stratum in the State. The estimates were applied to the total number of census nonrespondents in that stratum, providing a State estimate of the number of census nonrespondents that operated farms. The number of census nonrespondents that operated farms was then derived for each county by stratum. This estimation procedure assumed that the distribution of farms in a stratum by county was the same for census nonrespondents as for census respondents.

Within each stratum in a county, a noninteger nonresponse weight was calculated and assigned to each eligible respondent farm record. Census respondent farms that were designated as large farms or tagged records or as farms that exhibited "rare" commodities were ineligible to represent nonrespondent farms and were excluded from the nonresponse weighting procedure. These records were assigned nonresponse weights of 1.0.

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, divided by the number of eligible census respondent farms. Stratum controls were established to ensure that this weight never exceeded 2.0. For the published tabulations of the complete count items, the noninteger nonresponse weight was randomly rounded to an integer weight of either 1 or 2 for each record. For the sample count items, the noninteger nonresponse weight was used in the calculation of the final sample weight.

Table A quantifies the effect of the nonresponse estimation procedure on selected census data items. The percentages in this table are 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 this table do not reflect the effect of item nonresponse to individual census data items. The effect of this item nonresponse is discussed in the "Census Nonsampling Error" section.

## Sample Estimation

Sample data estimation determined the population totals that would have resulted from a complete census for the items in sections 21 through 27 of the sample form. The estimates were obtained from a weighting procedure that assigned 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.

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 were multiplied by 6.

The noninteger sample weight is calculated for each respondent sample farm by multiplying the noninteger nonrespondent weight by the sampling factor. For published tabulations of the sample count items, the noninteger sample weight was randomly rounded to an integer weight for each record. For certainty farms, the sampling factor equals 1 so the sample weight is just equal to the nonresponse weight. Sampling factor calculation for non-certainty farms is described below.

Within a county, the weighting procedure for non-certainty farms was performed in three steps using three variables. The first variable contained eight 1997 total value of agricultural production (TVP) groups. The second and third variables, Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code and farm acreage, contained two groups. The three sets of groups were:

TVP	SIC	Acres
\$1 to \$999	01, 08 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 classified the sample records into 32 mutually exclusive initial strata formed by the three variable groups. The total and sample farm counts were expanded to account for nonresponse. Each cell containing sample farm records was assigned an initial sample factor equal to the ratio of the total farm count to the sample farm count. This factor was approximately equal to the inverse of the probability of selecting a farm for the census sample.

The second step in the estimation procedure combined, when necessary, the 32 initial strata to increase the reliability of the weighting procedure. Any stratum that contained less than 10 sample farms or had a factor greater than twice the mail sample rate was collapsed with another stratum. The mail sample rate was either 2, 4, or 6,

depending on whether the county had a 1 in 2, 1 in 4, or 1 in 6 sample selection rate. The collapsing occurred within the 32 initial 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 final strata and used to calculate final sample factors.

The final step calculated the noninteger sample weight as the product of the final sampling factor and the noninteger nonresponse weight. As described previously, the noninteger sample weight for each record is randomly rounded to an integer weight which is used in published tabulations. For example, if the final weight for a farm was 7.2, then the record would be rounded to either 7 or 8.

## CENSUS SAMPLING ERROR

The sample for the 1997 Census of Agriculture was only one of a large number of possible samples of the same size that could have been selected using the same sample design. In this context, "sample" refers to the sample for both the nonresponse survey and the selection of farms to receive sample forms.

The standard error, or sampling error, of a survey estimate is a measure of the variation among the estimates from all possible samples. It is a measure of precision - that is, how well an estimate from a particular sample approximates the true population parameter. The percent relative standard error of an estimate is defined as the standard error of the estimate divided by the value of the estimate, then multiplied by 100. The true population parameter can be defined or conceptualized several different ways. One way is to think of the true population parameter as the average result of all possible samples (selected using a given sample design). A second way is to think of the true population parameter as the figure obtained from carrying out a complete enumeration of the population.

If all possible samples were selected, each of the samples surveyed under essentially the same conditions, and an estimate and its standard error 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 true population parameter.
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 true population parameter.

The following example illustrates the computations necessary to produce a confidence statement 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 0.1 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 true population parameter. 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. All farm operators were asked the complete count items. 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.

Only a sample of farm operators were asked the sample count items. These items appeared only in sections 21 through 27 of the sample 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, farm-related income, and hired workers.

Variability in the estimates of complete count items was due only to the nonresponse survey estimation procedure. With regard to the estimates of sample count items, variability was due to both the nonresponse survey estimation procedure and the census sample selection and estimation procedure. Therefore, variability in the sample count item estimates tends to be larger than the variability in the complete count item estimates. Percent relative standard error is a common measure of variability.

Table B provides the generalized reliability estimates of the estimated number of farms in a county that reported complete count and sample count items. The top half of the table shows the percent relative standard errors for estimated number of farms in a county that reported a complete count item, and the bottom half relates to sample count items. These reliability estimates are derived from regression equations. Separate regression equations were used to produce each section of table B. 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 the appropriate counties in the State. 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 1992 Census of Agriculture, variability in sample count

item estimates came only from nonresponse survey estimation procedures. The estimated relative standard error for a sample count item in these counties may be obtained using the first part of table B.

Use caution when referring to the "Sample Count Item" section of table B to make inferences on counties. Some counties may have been sampled at the rate of 1 in 2 or 1 in 4, but the reliability estimates shown were computed using only data from counties sampled at the rate of 1 in 6. Therefore, the reliability estimates shown would likely be overstated (or conservative) if the county was actually sampled at a higher rate.

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 standard error for percent change in State totals from 1992 to 1997. 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 1997 and the 1992 estimate for that characteristic to the 1992 estimate. This ratio is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percent change. The standard error of a percent change estimate 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 the (1) total number of farms, (2) number of large farms included with certainty, (3) size classifications of the farms sampled, (4) amount of nonresponse, (5) general agricultural characteristics, and (6) specific characteristic being measured.

The farm counts and related estimates displayed in tables A through F relate to unadjusted census totals. These totals are the same as the "Census total" displayed in the first column of table G (which will be discussed later in this appendix).

For most of the tables in this appendix, and also many of the tables throughout the publication, there is a footnote that reads "Data are based on a sample of farms." The table entries that this footnote relate to are estimates of totals. To illustrate, suppose that the entry "other farm-related income" is shown with this footnote and has some number of farms given. This number given would represent an estimated total number of farms with "other farm-related income," based on the farms that were in the sample. This number should not be interpreted as the number of farms in the sample that have "other farm-related income."

## CENSUS NONSAMPLING ERROR

The accuracy of the census counts is 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. Nonsampling errors arise from many sources, including respondent or enumerator error or incorrect data keying, editing, or imputing for missing data. These nonsampling errors are further discussed in this section. Nonsampling error due to mail list incompleteness and duplication as well as misclassification of records on the mail list is called coverage error. The section titled "Coverage Evaluation" discusses the evaluation studies conducted to measure the extent of this error in the census.

## Respondent and Enumerator Error

Incorrect or incomplete responses to the census report form or to the questions posed by an enumerator can introduce error into the census data. To reduce reporting error, detailed instructions for completing the report form were provided to each respondent. Questions were phrased as clearly as possible based on previous tests of the report form. In addition, each respondent's answers were checked for completeness and consistency by the complex edit and imputation system.

## Item Nonresponse

As information flowed from data collection to tabulation, various types of item nonresponses were identified on the census report forms. Nonresponse to particular questions on the census report form that logically should have been present created a type of nonsampling error in both complete count and sample count data. In this case, information from a similar farm was used to impute for these missing data items. The resulting data may have been biased if the characteristics of the nonreporting respondents were different from those of reporting respondents for those items.

## Processing Error

All phases of processing for each census report form were potential sources for the introduction of nonsampling error. An automated check-in recorded that the report had been returned and excluded from further followup mailings. Approximately one-third of the mail returns were reviewed to resolve questions dealing with multiple reports, respondent remarks, or no reported data. The remaining mail returns (about two-thirds) were batched and sent directly to data keying, along with some of the reviewed cases containing farm data. Keyed records were transmitted, formatted, and run through the complex edit and imputation system. About one-fifth of all forms edited were clerically reviewed for inconsistencies, omissions, or questionable values. While reviewing these forms, the edit review staff determined if the action taken by the computer edit and imputation system was correct. Edited records were tabulated to the county level. Each county was reviewed and, when necessary, individual records were corrected prior to publication.

Developing accurate processing methods is complicated by the complex structure of agriculture. Among the complexities are the many places to be included, the variety of arrangements under which farms are operated, the continuing changes in the relationship of operators to the farm operated, the expiration of leases and the initiation or renewal of leases, the problem of obtaining a complete list of agriculture operations, the difficulty of contacting and identifying some types of contractor/contractee relationships, the operator's absence from the farm during the data collection period, and the operator's opinion that part or all of the operation does not qualify and should not be included in the census. During data collection and processing of the census, all operations underwent a number of quality control checks to ensure as accurate an application as possible.

## COVERAGE EVALUATION

### Coverage Overview

The primary objectives of the census of agriculture are to accurately count U.S. farms, measure commodity production and sales, and measure demographic characteristics of farm operators. Since 1945, an evaluation of census coverage has been conducted for each census of agriculture to provide estimates of the completeness of census farm counts. These results help to identify problems and focus improvements for future censuses.

According to coverage evaluation results, the past five censuses of agriculture included an average of 92 percent of U.S. farms and 98 percent of agriculture production. Complete enumeration of agricultural operations satisfying the farm definition of \$1,000 or more in agricultural sales is complicated by the variety of arrangements under which farms are operated, the multiplicity of names used for an operation, the number of operations in which an operator participates, and the difficulty in classifying those operations just around the \$1,000 sales range. In 1997, extensive efforts were made to compile as complete and accurate a mail list as possible, while reducing the duplication and number of nonfarm operations on the list.

The 1997 coverage evaluation program was designed to measure four components of error in the census farm counts. These components include:

1. Undercount due to farms Not on the Mail List (NML)
2. Overcount due to farms Duplicated or enumerated more than once (DUP)
3. Undercount due to farms Incorrectly Classified as nonfarms (ICU)
4. Overcount due to nonfarms Incorrectly Classified as farms (ICO).

The first component, mail list undercount, is by far the largest component of coverage error. Duplication, though occurring far less frequently, can involve larger farms and have a larger impact on acreage and sales estimates. The

last two components involve the misclassification of either farms or nonfarms. Misclassification can arise from errors in either reporting or processing the data.

Table G - Coverage Estimates - illustrates the effect of coverage adjustments on census farm counts by demographic characteristics, land in farms, and total value of sales. The coverage total is defined as the net difference between undercounted and overcounted farms. The adjusted census total is the sum of the census total and the net coverage total. The relative standard error is shown for the final census coverage adjusted number. This number will be similar to the relative standard error for the census number, except when the coverage total is negative or close to zero. The coverage adjustment percentage shows the coverage total as a percentage of total census adjusted farms for that characteristic.

The 1997 Census of Agriculture is the first census to include all four components of coverage error in table G. Previous publications only included the coverage error component due to farms not on the mail list (NML). Because of this, caution should be taken when comparing coverage estimates from table G with previous years. In addition, the coverage total is a negative number for some characteristics. This means that the number of farms overcounted for this characteristic was greater than the number of farms undercounted.

### Area Frame Surveys to Measure Mail List Undercoverage

Names and addresses collected in the 1997 June Agricultural Survey and 1997 Fall Area Survey were used to estimate the undercount due to farms not on the census mail list (NML). These names were matched to the census mail list, and those that did not match were contacted by telephone or person. The enumerator verified whether the operation had reported in the census, and if not, a census of agriculture report form was completed.

The percentage of farms missed in the census varies considerably by State. In general, farms not on the mail list tended to be small in acreage, production, and sales of agricultural products. Farm operations could be missed for various reasons, including the possibility that the operation started after the mail list was developed, the operation may be so small as not to appear in any agriculture-related source lists, or the operation may have been falsely classified as a nonfarm prior to mailout.

### Classification Error Survey to Measure Three Types of Coverage Error

The remaining three types of coverage error were measured by the Classification Error Survey. This survey was used to estimate the number of farms counted more than once (DUP), the number of farms misclassified as nonfarms (ICU), and the number of nonfarms misclassified as farms (ICO). A sample of census of agriculture respondents was selected for reinterview to determine their farm/nonfarm status and collect information to identify

potential duplication. The farm classification from this interview was compared with the classification on the census of agriculture report form. Any differences between these two classifications were reconciled to determine the true farm status. Each operation was reviewed for duplication by matching the additional information received from the reinterview (landlords, tenants, other names, etc.) to the list of census respondents. Potential duplication was reviewed and discrepancies reconciled.

In general, the classification error rate is higher for small farms close to the \$1,000 agricultural sales requirement. This rate is also higher for farms with small acreage (less than 49 acres), higher for tenant farms than for full- or part-owner farms, and higher for farms where farming is not the operator's principal occupation.

### **Coverage Estimation**

The adjusted census total, T, is estimated as the census farm count, C, plus undercount and minus overcount adjustments. Undercount includes 1) farms not on the mail

list (NML) and 2) farms incorrectly classified as nonfarms (ICU). Overcount includes 3) nonfarms incorrectly classified as farms (ICO) and 4) farms duplicated in the census (DUP). Altogether, the adjusted census total is:

$$T = C + (NML + ICU) - (ICO + DUP).$$

In some States, estimates of misclassification of farms owned by operators having rare demographic characteristics were based on particularly small sample sizes. Where such small sample sizes occurred, a form of small area estimation was used in which data from similar States contributed to that State's estimates. In these cases, the coverage totals are weighted totals of the direct State estimate and the direct estimate from the region. Direct estimates were used to the largest extent possible, based on the amount of survey cases available for the particular item being estimated.

**Table A. Percent of State Totals Contributed by Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation: 1997**

Item	Percent of total	Item	Percent of total
Farms .....	9.0	Corn for grain or seed .....	2.0
Land in farms .....	5.1	Wheat for grain .....	2.1
Estimated market value of land and buildings <sup>1</sup> .....	5.1	Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Market value of agricultural products sold .....	1.5	Cattle and calves .....	7.1
Harvested cropland .....	3.0	Hogs and pigs .....	1.7
		Layers 20 weeks old and older .....	5.0

<sup>1</sup>Data are based on a sample of farms.

**Table B. Reliability Estimates for Number of Farms in a County Reporting a Complete Count Item or Sample Count Item: 1997**

Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>COMPLETE COUNT ITEM</b>		<b>SAMPLE COUNT ITEM</b>	
Number of farms reporting:		Number of farms reporting:	
25 .....	5.5	25 .....	42.7
50 .....	3.5	50 .....	29.6
75 .....	2.5	75 .....	23.7
100 .....	1.8	100 .....	20.1
150 .....	.7	150 .....	15.6
200 .....	.6	200 .....	12.9
300 .....	.5	300 .....	9.3
500 .....	.4	500 .....	4.9
750 .....	.3	750 .....	4.0
1,000 .....	.3	1,000 .....	3.4
1,500 .....	.2	1,500 .....	2.8
2,000 .....	.2	2,000 .....	2.4



**Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1997**

[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)
<b>FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS</b>			<b>FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES<sup>1</sup></b>		
Farms ..... number ..	45 142	.4	Total farm production expenses ..... farms ..	45 139	.4
Land in farms ..... acres ..	14 364 955	.3	..... \$1,000 ..	4 161 029	.2
Average size of farm ..... acres ..	318	.5	Average per farm ..... dollars ..	92 183	.5
<b>MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD</b>			<b>NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)<sup>1</sup></b>		
Total sales (see text) ..... farms ..	45 142	.4	All farms ..... number ..	45 139	.4
..... \$1,000 ..	5 479 692	.1	..... \$1,000 ..	1 007 988	.6
Average per farm ..... dollars ..	121 388	.5	Average per farm ..... dollars ..	22 331	.7
Farms by value of sales:			Farms with net gains <sup>2</sup> ..... number ..	23 043	1.0
Less than \$1,000 (see text) ..... farms ..	5 202	.7	..... \$1,000 ..	1 200 382	.4
..... \$1,000 ..	1 464	.9	Average net gain ..... dollars ..	52 093	1.1
\$1,000 to \$2,499 ..... farms ..	5 827	.7	Farms with net losses ..... number ..	22 096	1.1
..... \$1,000 ..	9 857	.7	..... \$1,000 ..	192 394	1.3
\$2,500 to \$4,999 ..... farms ..	6 901	.6	Average net loss ..... dollars ..	8 707	1.7
..... \$1,000 ..	24 768	.6	<b>GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME</b>		
\$5,000 to \$9,999 ..... farms ..	6 723	.6	Government payments ..... farms ..	9 477	.5
..... \$1,000 ..	47 550	.6	..... \$1,000 ..	143 873	.3
\$10,000 to \$19,999 ..... farms ..	4 906	.7	Other farm-related income <sup>1</sup> ..... farms ..	8 455	2.2
..... \$1,000 ..	67 785	.7	..... \$1,000 ..	72 452	2.5
\$20,000 to \$24,999 ..... farms ..	1 165	1.0	Customwork and other agricultural services ..... farms ..	2 469	4.3
..... \$1,000 ..	25 760	1.0	..... \$1,000 ..	32 229	4.2
\$25,000 to \$39,999 ..... farms ..	1 699	1.0	Gross cash rent or share payments ..... farms ..	1 738	5.2
..... \$1,000 ..	53 029	1.0	..... \$1,000 ..	21 177	4.4
\$40,000 to \$49,999 ..... farms ..	709	1.3	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products ..... farms ..	1 589	5.7
..... \$1,000 ..	31 312	1.3	..... \$1,000 ..	10 991	6.6
\$50,000 to \$99,999 ..... farms ..	1 978	1.1	Other farm-related income sources ..... farms ..	4 131	3.0
..... \$1,000 ..	141 691	1.1	..... \$1,000 ..	8 056	3.3
\$100,000 to \$249,999 ..... farms ..	3 466	.7	<b>COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS</b>		
..... \$1,000 ..	574 186	.6	Total ..... farms ..	1 704	.6
\$250,000 to \$499,999 ..... farms ..	3 366	—	..... \$1,000 ..	104 687	.3
..... \$1,000 ..	1 209 218	—			
\$500,000 or more ..... farms ..	3 200	—			
..... \$1,000 ..	3 293 072	—			
Sales by commodity or commodity group:					
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms ..	14 269	.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	2 188 026	.1			
Grains ..... farms ..	7 393	.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	1 593 750	.2			
Corn for grain ..... farms ..	783	.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	56 186	.3			
Wheat ..... farms ..	3 355	.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	117 570	.2			
Soybeans ..... farms ..	6 873	.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	672 058	.2			
Sorghum for grain ..... farms ..	844	.8			
..... \$1,000 ..	22 270	.4			
Barley ..... farms ..	—	—			
..... \$1,000 ..	—	—			
Oats ..... farms ..	80	2.4			
..... \$1,000 ..	1 155	1.1			
Other grains ..... farms ..	4 224	.4			
..... \$1,000 ..	724 511	.2			
Cotton and cottonseed ..... farms ..	1 729	.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	512 652	.1			
Tobacco ..... farms ..	—	—			
..... \$1,000 ..	—	—			
Hay, silage, and field seeds ..... farms ..	5 883	.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	24 306	.7			
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ..... farms ..	535	1.3			
..... \$1,000 ..	18 879	1.0			
Fruits, nuts, and berries ..... farms ..	550	1.3			
..... \$1,000 ..	9 659	1.7			
Nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms ..	401	1.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	27 167	1.1			
Other crops ..... farms ..	110	2.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	1 614	1.6			
Livestock, poultry, and their products ..... farms ..	33 181	.4			
..... \$1,000 ..	3 291 665	.1			
Poultry and poultry products ..... farms ..	5 305	.4			
..... \$1,000 ..	2 525 203	.1			
Dairy products ..... farms ..	794	.9			
..... \$1,000 ..	78 696	.6			
Cattle and calves ..... farms ..	29 903	.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	378 011	.4			
Hogs and pigs ..... farms ..	1 019	.9			
..... \$1,000 ..	217 867	.1			
Sheep, lambs, and wool ..... farms ..	310	1.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	369	3.0			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ..... farms ..	2 413	.7			
..... \$1,000 ..	91 518	.3			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ..... farms ..	1 084	1.0			
..... \$1,000 ..	5 107	1.3			

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1997—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)
<b>LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE</b>			<b>TENURE OF OPERATOR</b>		
Total cropland . . . . . farms..	37 205	.4	All operators . . . . . farms..	45 142	.4
Harvested cropland . . . . . farms..	10 062 289	.3	Full owners . . . . . acres..	14 364 955	.3
Farms by acres harvested:			Part owners . . . . . acres..	5 013 276	.4
1 to 9 acres . . . . . farms..	7 665 490	.2	Tenants . . . . . farms..	12 598	.4
10 to 19 acres . . . . . acres..	2 217	.8	acres..	6 464 481	.3
20 to 29 acres . . . . . farms..	10 781	.9	acres..	4 875	.6
30 to 49 acres . . . . . acres..	4 168	.6	acres..	2 887 198	.3
50 to 99 acres . . . . . acres..	54 151	.6	<b>OWNED AND RENTED LAND</b>		
100 to 199 acres . . . . . farms..	3 924	.6	Land owned . . . . . farms..	40 447	.4
200 to 499 acres . . . . . acres..	86 305	.6	Owned land in farms . . . . . acres..	8 220 560	.4
500 to 999 acres . . . . . farms..	5 324	.6	Land rented or leased from others . . . . . farms..	17 569	.4
1,000 acres or more . . . . . acres..	192 836	.6	acres..	6 971 829	.2
Cropland:			landlords..	40 094	.4
Pasture or grazing only . . . . . farms..	20 799	.5	Rented or leased land in farms . . . . . farms..	17 473	.4
Other cropland . . . . . acres..	2 008 011	.5	acres..	6 903 844	.2
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. . . . . farms..	4 459	.6	Land rented or leased to others . . . . . farms..	3 115	.7
Irrigated land . . . . . acres..	388 788	.7	acres..	827 434	.9
Acres irrigated:			<b>OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>		
1 to 9 acres . . . . . farms..	572	1.3	Operators by place of residence:		
10 to 49 acres . . . . . acres..	1 693	1.6	On farm operated . . . . .	32 326	.4
50 to 99 acres . . . . . farms..	673	1.3	Not on farm operated . . . . .	9 705	.6
100 to 199 acres . . . . . acres..	18 088	1.3	Not reported . . . . .	3 111	.5
200 to 499 acres . . . . . farms..	519	1.5	Operators by principal occupation:		
500 to 999 acres . . . . . acres..	36 371	1.5	Farming . . . . .	22 300	.4
1,000 acres or more . . . . . farms..	630	1.4	Other . . . . .	22 842	.5
Harvested cropland irrigated . . . . . farms..	88 381	1.4	Operators by days worked off farm:		
Pasture and other land irrigated . . . . . acres..	1 502	.8	Any . . . . .	24 906	.5
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs . . . . . farms..	500 341	.8	200 days or more . . . . .	17 855	.5
acres..	1 516	.2	Operators by sex:		
acres..	1 070 838	.2	Male . . . . . farms..	41 256	.4
acres..	2 001 505	—	acres..	13 648 552	.3
acres..	6 450	.5	Female . . . . . farms..	3 886	.7
acres..	3 705 976	1.7	acres..	716 403	.7
acres..	228	2.3	Average age of operator . . . . . years..	53.5	.6
acres..	11 241	2.3	<b>FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION</b>		
acres..	1 713	.8	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) . . . . . farms..	39 009	.4
acres..	169 105	1.2	acres..	9 091 236	.4
<b>VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS<sup>1</sup></b>			Partnership . . . . . farms..	3 891	.6
Estimated market value of land and buildings . . . . . farms..	45 139	.4	acres..	3 535 665	.3
Average per farm . . . . . \$1,000..	16 255 201	.8	Corporation:		
Average per acre . . . . . dollars..	360 114	.9	Family held . . . . . farms..	1 882	.8
Average per acre . . . . . dollars..	1 151	1.0	acres..	1 534 692	.4
<b>VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT<sup>1</sup></b>			More than 10 stockholders . . . . . farms..	46	3.1
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment . . . . . farms..	45 137	.4	10 or less stockholders . . . . . farms..	1 836	.8
Average per farm . . . . . \$1,000..	2 510 490	.7	Other than family held . . . . . farms..	143	2.4
Average per farm . . . . . dollars..	55 619	.8	acres..	73 058	2.0
<b>AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS<sup>1</sup></b>			More than 10 stockholders . . . . . farms..	21	3.4
Commercial fertilizer . . . . . farms..	25 006	1.0	10 or less stockholders . . . . . farms..	122	2.7
acres on which used..	5 602 211	.6	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. . . . . farms..	217	1.8
			acres..	130 304	1.2
			<b>HIRED FARM LABOR<sup>1</sup></b>		
			Hired workers by days worked:		
			150 days or more . . . . . farms..	6 547	1.8
			workers..	15 728	1.0
			Less than 150 days . . . . . farms..	12 198	1.6
			workers..	31 626	1.7
			<b>INJURIES AND DEATHS</b>		
			Farm-related injuries:		
			Operator and family members . . . . . farms..	349	1.4
			number..	396	1.5
			Hired workers . . . . . farms..	195	1.2
			number..	259	1.1
			Farm-related deaths:		
			Operator and family members . . . . . farms..	12	—
			number..	13	—
			Hired workers . . . . . farms..	9	—
			number..	9	—

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1997—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)
<b>FARMS BY SIZE</b>			<b>LIVESTOCK</b>		
1 to 9 acres .....	farms.. 1 686	.9	Cattle and calves inventory .....	farms.. 30 369	.4
10 to 49 acres .....	acres.. 7 253	1.0	number.. 1 770 248		.4
50 to 69 acres .....	farms.. 9 186	.6	Beef cows .....	farms.. 26 981	.5
70 to 99 acres .....	acres.. 269 785	.6	number.. 927 357		.5
100 to 139 acres .....	farms.. 3 228	.7	Milk cows .....	farms.. 1 193	.8
	acres.. 187 783	.6	number.. 49 012		.6
	farms.. 4 963	.6	Cattle and calves sold .....	farms.. 29 903	.5
	acres.. 407 365	.6	number.. 978 007		.4
	farms.. 4 698	.6	\$1,000.. 378 011		.4
	acres.. 544 358	.6	Hogs and pigs inventory .....	farms.. 1 247	.8
			number.. 858 741		.3
			Hogs and pigs sold .....	farms.. 1 019	.9
			number.. 2 762 914		.7
			\$1,000.. 217 867		.1
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory .....	farms.. 400	1.5
			number.. 8 284		1.9
140 to 179 acres .....	farms.. 3 561	.7	Sheep and lambs sold .....	farms.. 293	1.7
	acres.. 559 524	.7	number.. 5 836		2.3
180 to 219 acres .....	farms.. 2 652	.7			
	acres.. 524 345	.7	Horses and ponies inventory .....	farms.. 8 128	.5
220 to 259 acres .....	farms.. 1 936	.8	number.. 40 076		.7
	acres.. 460 218	.8	Horses and ponies sold .....	farms.. 1 509	.9
260 to 499 acres .....	farms.. 5 849	.7	number.. 10 052		.9
500 to 999 acres .....	acres.. 2 082 906	.6			
	farms.. 4 049	.6	<b>POULTRY</b>		
	acres.. 2 792 143	.6	Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory		
			(see text) .....	farms.. 1 835	.8
1,000 to 1,999 acres .....	farms.. 2 298	.3	number.. 20 213 603		.7
	acres.. 3 124 734	.3	Layers 20 weeks old and older .....	farms.. 1 643	.8
2,000 acres or more .....	farms.. 1 036	—	number.. 15 144 014		.6
	acres.. 3 404 541	—	Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold .....	farms.. 3 650	.2
			number.. 1 003 161 769		.1
<b>FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM</b>			<b>SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED</b>		
Oilseed and grain farming (1111) .....	farms.. 6 806	.5	Corn for grain or seed .....	farms.. 831	.6
	acres.. 5 895 658	.2	acres.. 184 079		.3
Vegetable and melon farming (1112) .....	farms.. 339	1.7	bushels.. 21 901 248		.3
	acres.. 32 370	1.9	Corn for silage or green chop .....	farms.. 36	3.2
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113) .....	farms.. 387	1.7	acres.. 3 442		.9
	acres.. 32 756	3.0	acres.. 41 671		.9
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114) .....	farms.. 320	1.7	tons, green.. 4 671		.7
	acres.. 23 337	1.9	farms.. 875		.4
Other crop farming (1119) .....	farms.. 3 985	.6	acres.. 130 948		.4
	acres.. 1 938 573	.3	bushels.. 8 988 578		.4
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111) .....	farms.. 24 329	.5	Wheat for grain .....	farms.. 3 361	.5
	acres.. 4 882 562	.5	acres.. 763 388		.2
Cattle feedlots (112112) .....	farms.. 4 703	1.2	bushels.. 35 361 702		.2
	acres.. 133 278	1.3	Rice .....	farms.. 4 207	.4
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212) .....	farms.. 637	1.0	acres.. 1 384 969		.2
	acres.. 206 951	1.0	cwt.. 78 882 488		.2
Hog and pig farming (1122) .....	farms.. 582	1.1	Cotton .....	farms.. 1 730	.5
	acres.. 93 814	.8	acres.. 962 272		.1
Poultry and egg production (1123) .....	farms.. 4 948	.4	bales.. 1 621 344		.1
	acres.. 907 860	.3	farms.. 6 889		.5
Sheep and goat farming (1124) .....	farms.. 184	2.3	acres.. 3 571 342		.2
	acres.. 14 681	3.6	bushels.. 103 074 994		.2
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129) .....	farms.. 1 922	.8	Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes .....	farms.. 39	4.9
	acres.. 203 115	1.0	acres.. 135		6.0
			cwt.. 7 358		7.2
			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) .....	farms.. 22 201	.5
			acres.. 1 232 771		.5
			tons, dry.. 2 396 515		.5
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) .....	farms.. 536	1.3
			acres.. 14 480		1.0
			Land in orchards .....	farms.. 646	1.3
			acres.. 14 334		1.5

<sup>1</sup>Data are based on a sample of farms.

<sup>2</sup>Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains.



**Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More: 1997—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)
<b>LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE</b>			<b>FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION</b>		
Total cropland . . . . . farms . . . . .	18 143	.5	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) . . . . . farms . . . . .	15 969	.5
Harvested cropland . . . . . acres . . . . .	8 726 871	.2	Partnership . . . . . farms . . . . .	6 406 695	.4
Cropland: . . . . . acres . . . . .	16 514	.5	Corporation: . . . . . acres . . . . .	3 335 585	.2
Pasture or grazing only . . . . . farms . . . . .	8 232	.5	Family held . . . . . farms . . . . .	1 655	.8
Total woodland . . . . . acres . . . . .	1 220 639	.6	More than 10 stockholders . . . . . acres . . . . .	1 482 587	.4
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured . . . . . farms . . . . .	10 112	.5	10 or less stockholders . . . . . farms . . . . .	39	2.8
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. . . . . farms . . . . .	1 315 198	.5	Other than family held . . . . . farms . . . . .	1 616	.8
Irrigated land . . . . . acres . . . . .	4 897	.5	More than 10 stockholders . . . . . acres . . . . .	99	2.3
Harvested cropland irrigated . . . . . farms . . . . .	992 972	.6	10 or less stockholders . . . . . farms . . . . .	61 143	1.7
Pasture and other land irrigated . . . . . acres . . . . .	10 091	.5	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. . . . . farms . . . . .	16	2.0
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs . . . . . farms . . . . .	361 758	.4	Less than 150 days . . . . . farms . . . . .	83	2.7
Reserve Programs . . . . . acres . . . . .	6 070	.5		113	1.9
	3 708 563	.5		110 789	1.0
	5 990	.4	<b>HIRED FARM LABOR<sup>1</sup></b>		
	3 700 213	.2	Hired workers by days worked:		
	150	1.8	150 days or more . . . . . farms . . . . .	5 802	1.8
	8 350	2.3	Less than 150 days . . . . . workers . . . . .	14 952	1.0
				8 232	1.7
				24 935	1.9
			<b>INJURIES AND DEATHS</b>		
			Farm-related injuries:		
			Operator and family members . . . . . farms . . . . .	191	1.6
			Hired workers . . . . . number . . . . .	225	1.6
			Farm-related deaths:		
			Operator and family members . . . . . farms . . . . .	8	—
			Hired workers . . . . . number . . . . .	(D)	(D)
				9	—
				(D)	(D)
			<b>FARMS BY SIZE</b>		
			1 to 9 acres . . . . .	481	1.3
			10 to 49 acres . . . . .	1 863	.7
			50 to 69 acres . . . . .	786	.9
			70 to 99 acres . . . . .	1 327	.8
			100 to 139 acres . . . . .	1 561	.7
			140 to 179 acres . . . . .	1 406	.8
			180 to 219 acres . . . . .	1 284	.9
			220 to 259 acres . . . . .	1 056	.9
			260 to 499 acres . . . . .	3 986	.7
			500 to 999 acres . . . . .	3 504	.6
			1,000 to 1,999 acres . . . . .	2 213	.3
			2,000 acres or more . . . . .	1 022	—
			<b>FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM</b>		
			Oilseed and grain farming (1111) . . . . .	5 478	.5
			Vegetable and melon farming (112) . . . . .	186	1.9
			Fruit and tree nut farming (113) . . . . .	128	2.3
			Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (114) . . . . .	206	2.1
			Other crop farming (119) . . . . .	1 540	.6
			Beef cattle ranching and farming (12111) . . . . .	6 495	.6
			Cattle feedlots (12112) . . . . .	286	1.6
			Dairy cattle and milk production (1212) . . . . .	622	1.0
			Hog and pig farming (122) . . . . .	366	1.0
			Poultry and egg production (123) . . . . .	4 800	.3
			Sheep and goat farming (124) . . . . .	22	6.5
			Animal aquaculture and other animal production (125, 1129) . . . . .	360	1.4
			<b>LIVESTOCK</b>		
			Cattle and calves inventory . . . . . farms . . . . .	11 751	.5
			Beef cows . . . . . number . . . . .	1 267 687	.4
			Milk cows . . . . . farms . . . . .	10 419	.5
			Hogs and pigs inventory . . . . . number . . . . .	639 714	.5
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory . . . . . farms . . . . .	846	.8
			Horses and ponies inventory . . . . . number . . . . .	47 976	.6
			Cattle and calves sold . . . . . farms . . . . .	11 928	.5
			Hogs and pigs sold . . . . . number . . . . .	769 732	.4
			Sheep and lambs sold . . . . . \$1,000 . . . . .	310 239	.4
			Horses and ponies sold . . . . . farms . . . . .	671	.8
			Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. . . . . number . . . . .	848 770	.3
			Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. . . . . farms . . . . .	621	.9
			Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. . . . . number . . . . .	2 755 122	.7
			Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. . . . . \$1,000 . . . . .	217 169	.1
			Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. . . . . farms . . . . .	108	2.1
			Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. . . . . number . . . . .	3 720	2.2
			Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. . . . . farms . . . . .	78	2.3
			Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. . . . . number . . . . .	2 609	3.2
			Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. . . . . farms . . . . .	2 819	.6
			Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. . . . . number . . . . .	15 266	.9
			Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. . . . . farms . . . . .	515	1.2
			Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. . . . . number . . . . .	7 704	1.0

See footnotes at end of table.

Table D. **Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More: 1997—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)
<b>POULTRY</b>			<b>SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED—Con.</b>		
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text) . . . . . farms..	1 010	.9	Wheat for grain . . . . . farms..	3 207	.5
Layers 20 weeks old and older . . . . . farms..	855	1.0	Wheat for grain . . . . . acres..	759 125	.2
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold . . . . . farms..	3 617	.2	Rice . . . . . farms..	35 236 523	.2
	1 003 061 425	.1	Rice . . . . . acres..	4 181	.4
			Rice . . . . . cwt..	1 384 490	.2
<b>SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED</b>			Cotton . . . . . farms..	78 857 005	.2
Corn for grain or seed . . . . . farms..	779	.6	Cotton . . . . . acres..	1 694	.5
Corn for grain or seed . . . . . acres..	183 466	.3	Cotton . . . . . bales..	961 559	.1
Corn for grain or seed . . . . . bushels..	21 869 775	.3	Soybeans for beans . . . . . farms..	1 620 412	.1
Corn for silage or green chop . . . . . farms..	33	2.8	Soybeans for beans . . . . . acres..	6 290	.5
Corn for silage or green chop . . . . . acres..	3 418	.8	Soybeans for beans . . . . . bushels..	3 546 704	.2
Sorghum for grain or seed . . . . . farms..	41 399	.7	Soybeans for beans . . . . . acres..	102 678 023	.2
Sorghum for grain or seed . . . . . acres..	832	.7	Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes . . . . . farms..	15	8.2
Sorghum for grain or seed . . . . . bushels..	129 860	.4	Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes . . . . . acres..	116	6.8
	8 927 489	.4	Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes . . . . . cwt..	(D)	(D)
			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) . . . . . farms..	9 823	.5
			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) . . . . . acres..	815 075	.5
			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) . . . . . tons, dry..	1 677 498	.5
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) . . . . . farms..	337	1.3
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) . . . . . acres..	14 022	.9
			Land in orchards . . . . . farms..	276	1.6
			Land in orchards . . . . . acres..	11 477	1.8

<sup>1</sup>Data are based on a sample of farms.

<sup>2</sup>Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains.

**Table E. Reliability Estimates of Percent Change in State Totals: 1992 to 1997**

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

Item	All farms		Farms with sales of \$10,000 or more	
	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate
Farms .....	2.7	.8	-3.0	.7
Land in farms .....	1.7	.5	.7	.4
Average size of farm .....	-1.2	.9	3.7	.8
Estimated market value of land and buildings <sup>1</sup> :				
Average per farm .....	27.5	1.7	33.3	1.8
Average per acre .....	30.8	1.8	29.2	1.8
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment <sup>1</sup> :				
Average per farm .....	24.7	1.6	27.1	1.7
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres .....	-2.4	1.3	-22.3	1.3
10 to 49 acres .....	10.7	1.2	-2.9	.9
50 to 179 acres .....	4.3	.7	-1.9	.7
180 to 499 acres .....	-2.6	.8	-3.1	.9
500 to 999 acres .....	-3.3	.8	-6.0	.7
1,000 to 1,999 acres .....	.5	.3	.1	.3
2,000 acres or more .....	9.1	-	8.5	-
Total cropland .....	-5	.8	-4.1	.7
Harvested cropland .....	-	.4	.1	.3
Irrigated land .....	-1.3	.6	-7	.6
Market value of agricultural products sold .....	31.7	.2	32.3	.2
Average per farm .....	28.2	1.0	36.4	1.0
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops .....	27.6	.2	27.8	.2
Livestock, poultry, and their products .....	34.6	.2	35.6	.2
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than \$2,500 .....	15.3	1.1	(X)	(X)
\$2,500 to \$4,999 .....	7.7	1.3	(X)	(X)
\$5,000 to \$9,999 .....	-1.8	1.1	(X)	(X)
\$10,000 to \$24,999 .....	-	1.1	-	1.1
\$25,000 to \$49,999 .....	-11.4	1.2	-11.4	1.2
\$50,000 to \$99,999 .....	-24.3	1.1	-24.3	1.1
\$100,000 to \$249,999 .....	-23.8	.6	-23.8	.6
\$250,000 to \$499,999 .....	.4	-	.4	-
\$500,000 or more .....	75.8	-	75.8	-
Total farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> .....	28.2	.6	28.9	.7
Average per farm .....	24.8	1.1	34.4	1.2
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) <sup>1</sup> .....	2.7	.9	-4.1	.8
Average per farm .....	29.5	1.0	29.7	.9
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming .....	-4.2	.7	-5.3	.6
Other .....	10.5	1.1	3.6	1.1
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any .....	9.5	1.0	-1	.9
200 days or more .....	10.3	1.1	4.9	1.1
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory .....	4.1	.9	1.3	.8
Beef cows .....	8.4	.8	9.3	.7
Milk cows .....	3.7	.9	3.3	.8
Cattle and calves sold .....	12.2	.9	13.4	.9
Hogs and pigs inventory .....	-29.3	.8	-26.1	.8
Hogs and pigs sold .....	-23.9	.6	-24.1	.6
Sheep and lambs inventory .....	4.8	.9	1.4	.8
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text) .....	19.6	.8	20.2	.8
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold .....	-33.8	.8	-32.2	.8
Wool .....	18.4	.6	19.8	.6
Sheep and lambs sold .....	-38.8	.8	-35.2	.8
Goats and kids .....	37.0	1.1	38.3	1.1
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text) .....	-4.8	2.1	-34.5	1.8
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold .....	-31.0	2.0	-41.7	2.0
Wool .....	-13.6	1.0	-9.3	1.1
Goats and kids .....	-8.6	.7	-8.9	.7
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold .....	-4	.3	-6	.3
Wool .....	16.3	.1	16.3	.1
Selected crops harvested:				
Sorghum for grain or seed .....	-62.7	.3	-62.0	.3
Wheat for grain .....	-62.0	.2	-61.9	.2
Rice .....	-61.5	.2	-61.5	.2
Cotton .....	-18.7	.5	-17.4	.5
Soybeans for beans .....	-6.3	.2	-6.1	.2
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) .....	.4	.2	.5	.2
Wheat for grain .....	-14.6	.5	-13.2	.5
Rice .....	1.6	.2	1.7	.2
Cotton .....	4.6	.2	4.7	.2
Soybeans for beans .....	-24.1	.5	-22.4	.5
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) .....	1.5	.2	1.6	.2
Wheat for grain .....	3.0	.1	3.0	.1
Rice .....	-9.4	.6	-7.9	.6
Cotton .....	12.9	.3	13.1	.3
Soybeans for beans .....	3.9	.2	4.1	.2
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) .....	3.1	.9	-1	.8
Wheat for grain .....	10.9	.9	9.9	.8
Rice .....	13.7	.9	10.2	.8

<sup>1</sup>Data are based on a sample of farms.

**Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997**

[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 <sup>1</sup>		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment <sup>1</sup>	
	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)
<b>Arkansas</b> .....	<b>45 142</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>14 364 955</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>360 114</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>2 510 490</b>	<b>.7</b>
Arkansas .....	518	.4	426 363	.3	823	.5	896 468	2.5	90 785	2.6
Ashley .....	299	.5	165 826	.7	555	.9	549 647	3.1	28 273	6.4
Baxter .....	492	.5	105 323	1.3	214	1.4	238 555	10.2	12 292	7.7
Benton .....	2 323	.4	296 543	.7	128	.8	300 261	3.8	79 497	2.8
Boone .....	1 259	.5	257 698	1.0	205	1.1	251 238	8.3	32 292	7.3
Bradley .....	249	.5	28 900	1.6	116	1.7	193 876	9.3	7 914	8.0
Calhoun .....	112	.6	17 622	2.9	157	2.9	144 774	5.8	3 210	11.0
Carroll .....	1 032	.4	242 482	.8	235	.9	283 170	4.8	33 593	5.1
Chicot .....	361	.4	287 962	.4	798	.6	703 977	3.8	56 143	5.7
Clark .....	376	.4	96 301	1.1	256	1.2	252 290	12.5	11 138	11.9
Clay .....	611	.5	323 578	.5	530	.7	676 471	3.2	65 044	2.2
Cleburne .....	710	.5	117 435	1.2	165	1.3	169 086	5.3	22 141	8.8
Cleveland .....	222	.3	32 824	2.3	148	2.3	224 016	9.0	7 947	8.2
Columbia .....	313	.3	57 683	1.3	184	1.4	217 418	7.0	8 593	8.8
Conway .....	729	.4	162 732	.8	223	.9	236 836	5.9	33 429	8.2
Craighead .....	754	.5	363 253	.4	482	.7	611 584	2.8	90 035	2.7
Crawford .....	806	.4	138 811	.8	172	.9	258 518	3.9	26 759	5.0
Crittenden .....	259	.6	319 824	.3	1 235	.7	1 239 075	2.5	56 064	4.7
Cross .....	382	.4	343 634	.3	900	.5	921 910	2.8	77 450	2.8
Dallas .....	121	.5	23 228	2.8	192	2.8	186 601	6.7	3 318	7.1
Desha .....	302	.5	275 954	.3	914	.5	797 799	2.2	53 312	1.5
Drew .....	342	.6	122 552	1.0	358	1.1	333 081	6.2	31 651	11.2
Faulkner .....	1 111	.4	211 467	.9	190	1.0	290 554	15.2	32 727	6.4
Franklin .....	783	.4	171 391	1.0	219	1.1	283 441	5.7	26 196	6.6
Fulton .....	737	.5	227 794	.8	309	1.0	237 542	6.8	13 809	7.5
Garland .....	360	.4	43 471	1.8	121	1.9	222 262	7.4	8 919	7.2
Grant .....	215	.5	32 519	2.2	151	2.2	216 775	7.1	6 838	8.3
Greene .....	733	.4	262 827	.6	359	.8	393 912	3.0	46 857	2.6
Hempstead .....	752	.4	189 435	1.0	252	1.1	270 114	5.0	28 570	4.8
Hot Spring .....	447	.4	75 305	1.3	168	1.3	190 402	6.3	11 067	7.0
Howard .....	656	.5	108 020	1.5	165	1.6	240 922	5.5	30 967	6.1
Independence .....	1 044	.5	283 126	.9	271	1.0	253 599	5.9	38 420	3.7
Izard .....	703	.5	187 863	1.0	267	1.1	196 946	5.9	18 027	8.6
Jackson .....	461	.6	335 099	.4	727	.7	629 413	2.7	48 748	3.9
Jefferson .....	362	.6	288 655	.5	797	.8	761 166	3.6	56 044	5.4
Johnson .....	606	.5	114 579	1.2	189	1.3	264 164	5.2	22 175	10.0
Lafayette .....	261	.6	97 701	1.3	374	1.4	357 221	4.3	14 631	6.1
Lawrence .....	661	.4	293 576	.5	444	.7	440 462	2.1	51 484	3.4
Lee .....	273	.8	279 643	.4	1 024	.8	855 854	2.1	47 722	3.3
Lincoln .....	292	.4	184 232	.5	631	.6	588 846	2.0	40 175	.9
Little River .....	381	.4	146 344	.8	384	.9	332 632	5.9	15 594	5.8
Logan .....	953	.4	199 294	.9	209	1.0	228 671	5.4	28 613	6.3
Lonoke .....	869	.4	390 705	.4	450	.5	584 568	3.8	83 934	5.8
Madison .....	1 203	.4	282 114	.8	235	.9	248 044	4.4	35 617	5.0
Marion .....	495	.5	139 553	.9	282	1.0	238 211	6.5	12 710	7.4
Miller .....	502	.5	154 096	.9	307	1.1	265 732	8.2	21 367	8.7
Mississippi .....	462	.4	489 158	.2	1 059	.4	1 286 648	1.3	108 806	1.1
Monroe .....	245	.4	235 812	.5	962	.6	878 759	2.2	42 120	3.0
Montgomery .....	417	.4	74 260	1.2	178	1.2	227 770	8.4	12 892	8.3
Nevada .....	372	.4	72 810	1.5	196	1.6	212 840	10.8	11 978	7.3
Newton .....	521	.5	108 680	1.1	209	1.2	214 196	15.0	9 906	12.4
Ouachita .....	177	.5	29 449	1.5	166	1.6	178 629	5.4	4 969	4.3
Perry .....	391	.5	72 711	1.6	186	1.6	286 046	8.5	13 103	8.2
Phillips .....	323	.6	361 185	.3	1 118	.7	1 034 072	1.6	52 230	2.6
Pike .....	406	.6	73 211	2.0	180	2.1	216 524	16.2	13 472	10.3
Poinsett .....	570	.4	401 266	.3	704	.5	786 212	1.9	96 134	5.7
Polk .....	850	.5	133 203	1.0	157	1.1	205 273	5.2	22 343	6.9
Pope .....	917	.5	152 100	1.0	166	1.1	229 228	4.6	30 377	6.3
Prairie .....	420	.4	301 851	.4	719	.6	780 481	5.0	62 670	7.0
Pulaski .....	421	.6	110 830	1.3	263	1.4	333 575	5.6	16 970	5.7
Randolph .....	694	.4	265 771	.8	383	.9	320 007	5.1	30 045	4.1
St. Francis .....	328	.7	289 882	.4	884	.8	898 934	2.4	42 789	1.8
Saline .....	329	.4	50 225	1.6	153	1.7	261 922	8.0	9 496	13.1
Scott .....	655	.4	115 733	1.4	177	1.5	206 366	5.6	20 248	7.0
Searcy .....	614	.5	188 275	1.1	307	1.1	215 024	8.7	16 057	13.6
Sebastian .....	724	.4	114 950	1.1	159	1.2	253 292	7.4	16 618	7.5
Sevier .....	588	.5	133 466	.7	227	.8	243 411	4.7	23 518	4.4
Sharp .....	618	.4	173 598	1.0	281	1.1	220 005	9.2	13 631	6.2
Stone .....	601	.4	142 453	.9	237	1.0	210 922	6.7	15 979	10.3
Union .....	281	.4	34 150	2.0	122	2.0	206 307	9.6	8 471	5.2
Van Buren .....	578	.5	132 417	1.2	229	1.3	234 175	8.5	19 648	10.2
Washington .....	2 476	.4	334 667	.7	135	.8	303 429	4.6	77 942	4.9
White .....	1 667	.4	394 294	.7	237	.8	288 596	8.7	62 547	6.8
Woodruff .....	239	.4	284 731	.3	1 191	.5	1 128 494	1.2	53 045	2.4
Yell .....	826	.5	188 480	.9	228	1.0	273 977	5.2	30 388	5.2

See footnotes at end of table.



**Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.**

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

Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm <sup>1</sup>		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup>			
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
							Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>Arkansas</b> . . . . .	<b>55 619</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>5 479 692</b>	<b>.1</b>	<b>121 388</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>45 139</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>4 161 029</b>	<b>.2</b>
Arkansas . . . . .	175 599	2.7	142 405	.2	274 913	.4	517	.5	83 931	.9
Ashley . . . . .	94 875	6.4	59 378	.3	198 590	.6	298	.7	39 012	1.7
Baxter . . . . .	24 983	7.8	21 046	.8	42 776	.9	492	.7	19 086	2.4
Benton . . . . .	34 222	2.9	337 522	.1	145 296	.5	2 323	.5	294 230	.4
Boone . . . . .	25 608	7.3	59 906	.3	47 583	.6	1 261	.7	54 450	2.0
Bradley . . . . .	31 783	8.0	14 410	.8	57 871	.9	249	1.1	11 034	2.9
Calhoun . . . . .	28 662	11.2	1 714	4.7	15 307	4.8	112	2.3	1 897	2.3
Carroll . . . . .	32 520	5.1	146 376	.2	141 837	.5	1 033	.6	129 050	.6
Chicot . . . . .	155 521	5.8	101 250	.2	280 472	.5	361	.7	68 408	1.4
Clark . . . . .	29 624	11.9	18 725	.7	49 801	.8	376	.7	14 795	3.6
Clay . . . . .	106 280	2.3	88 096	.4	144 183	.6	612	.7	55 123	1.7
Cleburne . . . . .	31 185	8.8	46 486	.5	65 474	.7	710	.7	37 378	2.4
Cleveland . . . . .	35 799	8.3	50 722	.2	228 476	.4	222	.9	42 048	.8
Columbia . . . . .	27 455	8.8	40 862	.3	130 548	.4	313	.6	35 525	.8
Conway . . . . .	45 856	8.3	83 395	.3	114 397	.5	729	.5	64 647	1.4
Craighead . . . . .	119 410	2.8	122 723	.3	162 763	.6	754	.7	76 440	1.3
Crawford . . . . .	33 241	5.0	60 016	.2	74 461	.5	805	.6	47 711	.8
Crittenden . . . . .	216 463	4.8	82 402	.3	318 153	.6	259	.7	62 915	.7
Cross . . . . .	203 282	2.9	102 850	.2	269 240	.5	382	.7	71 541	1.0
Dallas . . . . .	27 423	7.4	1 950	1.6	16 119	1.7	121	1.9	1 700	4.2
Desha . . . . .	176 531	1.7	100 873	.2	334 018	.5	302	.7	65 886	.9
Drew . . . . .	92 547	11.2	35 809	.6	104 704	.9	342	.9	22 023	2.8
Faulkner . . . . .	29 431	6.4	21 059	.8	18 955	.9	1 112	.6	17 079	4.0
Franklin . . . . .	33 499	6.6	99 719	.2	127 355	.5	782	.6	89 183	.4
Fulton . . . . .	18 737	7.5	15 186	1.1	20 605	1.2	737	.7	12 650	4.3
Garland . . . . .	24 776	7.2	25 478	.4	70 772	.6	360	.9	9 562	6.7
Grant . . . . .	31 805	8.4	4 704	1.4	21 881	1.5	215	1.5	5 048	3.0
Greene . . . . .	63 838	2.7	63 989	.5	87 297	.7	734	.7	37 713	2.3
Hempstead . . . . .	37 992	4.9	142 070	.2	188 922	.5	752	.6	119 885	.8
Hot Spring . . . . .	24 759	7.0	10 135	.9	22 673	1.0	447	.8	9 190	5.0
Howard . . . . .	47 206	6.1	128 526	.2	195 924	.5	656	.6	94 896	1.1
Independence . . . . .	36 801	3.8	72 510	.4	69 454	.6	1 044	.6	59 460	1.2
Izard . . . . .	25 643	8.6	27 980	.6	39 801	.8	703	.8	25 877	1.7
Jackson . . . . .	105 745	4.0	80 192	.4	173 952	.7	461	.8	54 739	1.6
Jefferson . . . . .	154 817	5.4	95 248	.2	263 117	.7	362	.9	68 025	.6
Johnson . . . . .	36 653	10.1	82 274	.2	135 766	.5	605	.7	73 446	1.4
Lafayette . . . . .	56 059	6.2	71 925	.3	275 575	.6	261	.9	60 327	1.3
Lawrence . . . . .	77 770	3.4	74 889	.4	113 296	.6	662	.6	50 435	1.3
Lee . . . . .	174 807	3.5	80 407	.3	294 530	.8	273	1.1	54 896	1.7
Lincoln . . . . .	137 587	1.3	109 772	.2	375 933	.4	292	.9	84 938	.4
Little River . . . . .	40 928	5.9	37 130	.4	97 454	.6	381	.6	31 021	2.3
Logan . . . . .	30 024	6.3	92 617	.2	97 184	.5	953	.6	77 038	1.1
Lonoke . . . . .	96 587	5.8	125 997	.2	144 990	.4	869	.6	84 866	1.8
Madison . . . . .	29 583	5.1	104 648	.2	86 989	.5	1 204	.5	82 357	1.2
Marion . . . . .	25 678	7.4	21 653	.4	43 743	.6	495	.7	18 402	2.7
Miller . . . . .	42 649	8.8	46 594	.4	92 816	.7	501	.7	39 019	2.0
Mississippi . . . . .	235 510	1.3	166 810	.1	361 061	.4	462	.6	113 721	.7
Monroe . . . . .	171 919	3.0	63 191	.3	257 924	.5	245	.8	41 646	.8
Montgomery . . . . .	30 990	8.4	43 159	.5	103 499	.6	416	.7	30 963	2.6
Nevada . . . . .	32 199	7.3	33 254	.3	89 393	.6	372	.7	27 063	.7
Newton . . . . .	18 976	12.4	9 929	.9	19 057	1.0	522	.8	7 936	4.0
Ouachita . . . . .	28 075	4.6	6 692	.4	37 807	.6	177	1.7	6 045	1.1
Perry . . . . .	33 511	8.3	36 785	.4	94 079	.6	391	.8	28 248	2.4
Phillips . . . . .	162 711	2.7	113 700	.2	352 013	.7	322	1.0	83 843	.9
Pike . . . . .	33 265	10.4	57 070	.3	140 568	.7	405	1.0	40 594	3.1
Poinsett . . . . .	168 362	5.7	139 716	.2	245 117	.5	571	.5	85 216	1.5
Polk . . . . .	26 317	6.9	99 264	.3	116 782	.6	849	.7	72 526	1.9
Pope . . . . .	33 127	6.4	110 368	.2	120 358	.5	917	.7	87 993	1.0
Prairie . . . . .	148 860	7.0	90 082	.3	214 481	.5	421	.6	51 767	1.9
Pulaski . . . . .	40 309	5.8	24 761	.6	58 816	.9	421	.9	18 977	2.1
Randolph . . . . .	43 355	4.2	44 112	.5	63 562	.6	693	.7	31 053	1.6
St. Francis . . . . .	130 852	2.0	68 925	.4	210 138	.8	327	1.0	51 152	1.2
Saline . . . . .	28 863	13.1	4 049	1.3	12 308	1.4	329	.9	3 273	5.3
Scott . . . . .	30 960	7.0	88 942	.3	135 790	.5	654	.6	69 017	1.2
Searcy . . . . .	26 151	13.6	10 248	1.5	16 690	1.6	614	.7	8 615	6.1
Sebastian . . . . .	22 984	7.6	36 854	.4	50 903	.6	723	.7	28 313	1.9
Sevier . . . . .	40 064	4.5	128 522	.1	218 576	.5	587	.7	103 145	.9
Sharp . . . . .	22 057	6.2	33 090	.5	53 544	.7	618	.7	27 681	1.7
Stone . . . . .	26 632	10.4	37 335	.6	62 122	.7	600	.7	26 860	3.5
Union . . . . .	30 255	5.2	49 711	.3	176 908	.5	280	.9	44 554	.6
Van Buren . . . . .	33 993	10.2	19 863	1.1	34 366	1.2	578	.7	15 450	7.4
Washington . . . . .	31 454	5.0	359 423	.1	145 163	.4	2 478	.5	307 482	.5
White . . . . .	37 520	6.8	62 828	.5	37 689	.7	1 667	.5	50 464	1.6
Woodruff . . . . .	221 021	2.5	74 080	.2	309 958	.4	240	.6	46 568	1.8
Yell . . . . .	36 789	5.3	113 307	.3	137 176	.5	826	.6	91 976	.7

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.**

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —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)
<b>Arkansas</b> .....	<b>14 619</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>467 737</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>29 654</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>1 654 949</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>12 192</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>110 955</b>	<b>.6</b>
Arkansas .....	30	29.3	117	42.0	65	22.8	323	13.1	409	3.4	6 391	1.3
Ashley .....	24	34.9	534	.7	168	7.0	3 050	15.1	126	13.1	1 942	4.8
Baxter .....	204	13.1	4 780	4.3	361	6.6	9 183	1.3	46	35.9	9	49.2
Benton .....	1 017	4.9	42 714	.8	1 845	2.4	192 976	.4	284	11.8	258	20.1
Boone .....	499	6.9	7 460	8.3	989	3.4	33 306	1.1	139	18.5	55	21.2
Bradley .....	67	17.3	1 079	13.6	164	9.0	5 640	3.3	67	17.4	71	11.1
Calhoun .....	26	13.9	298	4.3	73	7.5	849	2.2	20	21.9	7	44.1
Carroll .....	444	7.3	17 670	1.2	831	3.7	87 635	.6	112	19.2	90	39.7
Chicot .....	57	27.1	2 594	.9	112	11.0	8 458	.7	252	6.6	4 385	5.9
Clark .....	122	20.6	2 047	10.0	270	8.1	6 302	3.0	28	37.6	137	3.2
Clay .....	107	17.6	177	26.2	159	10.8	327	7.5	421	4.0	4 009	4.8
Cleburne .....	280	8.8	4 891	9.7	468	6.0	24 033	3.1	90	23.0	47	43.6
Cleveland .....	109	11.8	8 477	.6	161	7.2	26 640	.5	27	30.7	27	60.1
Columbia .....	124	17.3	4 398	1.2	238	8.6	22 200	.2	39	35.1	(D)	(D)
Conway .....	290	9.3	11 950	1.6	570	4.6	36 887	1.5	137	17.4	314	8.9
Craighead .....	103	19.4	205	24.8	200	13.5	527	19.3	561	5.2	5 183	2.3
Crawford .....	258	11.0	6 088	1.8	564	5.4	27 084	.4	133	16.7	908	1.7
Crittenden .....	12	56.5	7	68.3	29	32.2	21	51.3	217	5.0	4 302	1.1
Cross .....	25	39.3	343	9.1	63	22.1	210	10.8	321	4.7	5 518	1.1
Dallas .....	24	19.7	(D)	(D)	67	8.8	547	7.0	16	20.7	(D)	(D)
Desha .....	8	—	534	—	28	31.3	1 985	3.5	255	3.6	4 178	1.1
Drew .....	73	29.4	741	10.1	160	11.8	3 200	3.0	112	16.8	1 016	2.2
Faulkner .....	392	8.8	2 168	20.6	835	4.0	3 364	4.4	132	17.2	326	3.2
Franklin .....	320	9.3	9 222	1.7	556	5.6	65 073	.2	114	21.6	90	14.4
Fulton .....	213	13.4	2 398	11.4	655	3.2	3 361	11.0	120	21.1	40	25.4
Garland .....	91	18.2	2 036	6.5	241	8.6	2 190	18.1	29	43.3	128	12.3
Grant .....	71	9.0	860	5.6	161	4.2	2 131	3.3	46	14.6	15	20.6
Greene .....	126	21.1	609	26.3	282	10.1	1 023	8.2	419	5.8	2 922	3.5
Hempstead .....	364	7.9	20 341	1.2	606	3.6	72 134	.4	107	20.0	162	35.6
Hot Spring .....	128	16.5	1 252	19.8	377	4.3	3 363	3.6	69	24.6	45	17.3
Howard .....	361	9.1	20 169	.7	537	4.6	55 134	1.4	78	30.2	21	27.4
Independence .....	350	10.0	16 616	1.0	751	4.1	21 045	.6	284	10.8	844	10.2
Izard .....	282	10.9	2 451	9.2	545	5.1	16 111	1.8	102	23.4	71	34.6
Jackson .....	27	45.6	104	48.2	51	27.7	673	5.9	325	5.1	5 002	3.2
Jefferson .....	63	25.7	2 306	2.2	136	12.2	6 297	.6	193	7.5	3 884	2.3
Johnson .....	235	12.0	12 941	3.8	456	5.3	46 284	.9	148	19.0	72	8.0
Lafayette .....	164	8.5	9 704	.5	208	7.1	34 888	.1	71	18.0	646	8.5
Lawrence .....	136	16.3	1 157	9.5	328	6.9	4 733	2.6	375	5.1	3 045	2.2
Lee .....	14	56.2	237	5.7	56	28.8	496	12.0	240	5.3	5 020	3.3
Lincoln .....	87	11.1	12 342	.3	151	8.0	29 464	.4	140	4.8	1 994	1.6
Little River .....	160	12.4	4 797	3.3	278	6.0	14 328	1.5	74	23.3	542	7.7
Logan .....	312	9.1	8 756	.8	757	3.8	54 258	.9	109	19.1	141	22.2
Lonoke .....	141	18.2	2 689	8.8	357	8.1	6 752	2.4	407	6.2	4 891	3.2
Madison .....	502	7.6	8 952	2.8	949	3.3	55 982	.9	137	18.3	54	11.4
Marion .....	233	9.5	2 581	4.4	400	4.7	10 360	2.2	83	21.6	19	25.0
Miller .....	192	10.8	4 850	2.9	392	5.2	18 494	.6	115	17.7	875	10.4
Mississippi .....	37	31.6	276	53.7	44	28.6	64	18.3	441	1.3	7 157	1.8
Monroe .....	4	—	(D)	(D)	17	34.1	258	2.5	213	2.2	3 524	2.2
Montgomery .....	193	12.2	4 537	5.8	339	5.1	20 289	2.5	53	32.3	13	35.4
Nevada .....	154	13.0	2 968	2.9	305	5.4	18 471	.4	21	34.8	10	22.8
Newton .....	86	24.0	809	10.8	472	3.7	3 508	4.2	108	21.8	19	29.7
Ouachita .....	71	8.0	859	2.2	142	3.3	3 807	.6	10	22.7	11	30.8
Perry .....	145	12.3	3 611	8.6	271	6.7	16 585	.9	100	18.4	224	27.3
Phillips .....	15	42.4	75	12.7	37	17.2	117	10.9	270	5.2	5 632	2.0
Pike .....	168	14.9	9 342	5.8	355	4.2	22 314	4.3	40	32.9	16	26.3
Poinsett .....	50	40.7	118	30.9	85	29.3	770	20.9	441	6.4	6 305	2.2
Polk .....	425	7.8	12 583	2.6	695	4.1	46 795	2.5	99	23.6	38	37.8
Pope .....	377	8.7	19 541	1.7	737	3.8	48 598	1.0	134	18.0	167	6.0
Prairie .....	48	32.4	337	3.7	101	17.2	1 129	2.9	306	2.3	4 095	2.7
Pulaski .....	112	19.0	2 683	2.9	242	9.4	3 351	2.7	166	13.6	846	4.8
Randolph .....	190	13.6	2 048	3.6	495	4.8	6 664	1.8	200	10.9	1 269	2.0
St. Francis .....	17	55.4	131	13.4	37	38.3	687	6.7	270	5.8	4 036	2.5
Saline .....	130	14.5	279	21.5	255	7.1	516	14.7	24	44.1	34	12.3
Scott .....	268	10.4	13 382	2.5	545	4.4	42 693	1.0	42	36.1	10	22.7
Searcy .....	177	12.9	790	17.4	484	4.3	2 848	8.8	70	25.7	22	27.8
Sebastian .....	234	11.5	5 520	2.7	556	4.6	15 563	1.6	69	21.7	179	56.2
Sevier .....	317	7.0	19 793	.7	489	4.0	64 885	.8	83	23.4	51	19.9
Sharp .....	235	11.9	3 319	2.8	507	4.2	17 105	.7	148	16.5	59	17.6
Stone .....	156	12.3	2 460	4.9	498	4.0	17 587	3.6	119	18.9	130	10.5
Union .....	120	10.3	15 117	.7	226	5.2	22 025	.7	49	24.3	10	26.9
Van Buren .....	212	14.2	1 729	14.9	483	4.5	6 889	7.7	111	21.0	74	35.5
Washington .....	1 024	5.1	58 246	1.0	1 923	2.3	185 525	.5	242	15.1	158	14.4
White .....	413	9.5	3 874	14.5	993	4.2	12 656	3.2	330	9.3	1 755	4.4
Woodruff .....	5	—	29	—	34	32.7	145	10.6	189	4.1	4 259	3.4
Yell .....	369	8.9	16 284	1.0	637	4.6	53 786	1.3	115	21.5	230	24.2

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.**

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —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)
<b>Arkansas</b> .....	<b>25 076</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>213 542</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>16 089</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>237 031</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>43 057</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>181 212</b>	<b>.4</b>
Arkansas .....	430	3.3	14 073	1.3	360	4.7	9 864	1.6	476	2.9	7 833	3.0
Ashley .....	228	6.9	3 750	2.8	136	7.4	8 271	.7	280	3.7	2 477	3.1
Baxter .....	257	9.6	530	13.9	52	34.3	21	6.4	475	2.3	636	5.7
Benton .....	974	5.2	1 627	6.7	562	7.8	354	9.0	2 164	1.4	6 684	1.3
Boone .....	737	5.4	1 432	9.2	313	11.4	220	16.0	1 198	1.6	1 773	4.3
Bradley .....	157	9.6	193	11.1	87	16.5	132	10.8	248	1.1	392	3.6
Calhoun .....	81	5.9	106	11.6	25	16.7	22	31.8	110	2.6	97	9.5
Carroll .....	434	7.9	834	9.9	284	11.2	206	24.7	1 016	1.2	3 491	2.9
Chicot .....	211	10.5	4 292	4.3	200	8.2	9 242	2.3	347	2.6	4 622	2.7
Clark .....	211	12.0	586	16.7	107	22.3	404	27.1	364	2.0	733	7.5
Clay .....	487	3.0	8 840	3.9	404	4.6	6 585	3.3	561	3.1	4 887	2.1
Cleburne .....	331	9.7	476	11.2	163	15.5	83	20.8	633	2.8	860	5.1
Cleveland .....	107	11.6	178	29.7	92	13.2	56	20.6	205	3.9	654	6.7
Columbia .....	180	13.2	355	9.6	120	18.7	92	5.3	313	.6	667	6.1
Conway .....	413	6.4	1 258	5.4	194	13.4	773	7.3	727	.5	1 617	3.4
Craighead .....	638	4.0	10 587	2.2	510	4.7	12 690	1.8	715	2.4	6 402	2.0
Crawford .....	378	9.1	718	6.5	262	12.0	353	8.1	758	1.9	1 447	4.1
Crittenden .....	177	6.9	5 358	1.1	220	5.0	11 905	.8	244	3.6	3 807	1.1
Cross .....	307	4.3	8 235	2.0	292	5.3	8 356	2.3	375	1.9	5 513	1.9
Dallas .....	61	10.6	111	9.5	28	19.8	3	26.6	109	4.0	127	9.8
Desha .....	225	4.9	7 205	1.0	243	3.9	12 355	1.1	282	3.1	5 063	.9
Drew .....	210	12.2	1 953	5.1	164	14.8	3 108	1.8	314	5.3	1 539	2.9
Faulkner .....	678	5.7	1 620	6.5	202	13.4	437	5.4	1 070	1.5	1 089	4.8
Franklin .....	326	10.4	488	8.9	188	15.1	164	16.8	775	1.0	1 698	3.4
Fulton .....	507	5.8	1 438	9.7	149	18.6	45	17.7	712	1.8	804	8.2
Garland .....	112	14.9	197	17.3	74	22.9	40	22.9	319	3.6	433	6.2
Grant .....	131	5.6	234	8.0	61	11.1	25	37.0	205	2.4	259	6.0
Greene .....	526	4.8	5 545	3.5	392	6.6	4 902	3.7	693	1.8	3 607	3.5
Hempstead .....	326	9.5	678	14.8	259	12.0	402	23.2	717	2.1	2 915	5.6
Hot Spring .....	213	9.1	468	11.8	98	17.5	230	25.2	431	2.4	571	10.0
Howard .....	242	13.2	500	19.0	222	13.0	196	27.5	635	1.8	2 120	2.9
Independence .....	544	6.5	1 721	5.6	322	10.4	935	4.6	1 013	1.3	1 942	3.7
Izard .....	429	7.4	821	13.8	100	20.7	48	16.8	682	1.5	888	5.6
Jackson .....	338	6.0	6 922	2.2	327	6.2	7 266	2.6	449	1.7	4 749	2.0
Jefferson .....	206	9.8	6 010	1.0	202	10.6	11 019	.4	341	2.9	4 284	2.9
Johnson .....	262	10.5	485	14.7	108	17.6	173	5.0	597	1.5	1 608	5.5
Lafayette .....	154	8.3	946	5.1	145	9.1	1 875	6.8	257	1.5	1 351	3.4
Lawrence .....	543	3.7	6 515	2.4	419	5.7	5 818	2.2	661	.7	4 596	2.2
Lee .....	240	3.4	6 602	2.3	249	3.2	9 281	3.4	258	4.3	3 162	2.7
Lincoln .....	188	5.8	3 957	.6	156	7.1	6 927	1.3	280	2.5	3 525	1.6
Little River .....	173	12.1	783	12.4	111	19.2	555	7.0	371	1.8	1 112	7.3
Logan .....	410	7.7	829	10.4	292	10.0	326	7.8	904	1.7	1 826	2.1
Lonoke .....	585	4.7	10 812	4.0	488	6.2	10 025	4.1	814	2.2	6 455	2.2
Madison .....	633	6.1	1 273	11.9	271	12.0	219	30.6	1 164	1.2	2 613	3.2
Marion .....	321	7.5	676	8.4	104	17.2	67	32.0	464	3.0	573	8.5
Miller .....	279	8.7	1 215	5.4	158	12.8	1 243	8.4	485	1.7	1 405	2.5
Mississippi .....	394	3.8	13 233	1.4	401	2.1	23 678	1.3	462	.6	7 157	1.5
Monroe .....	201	4.0	5 896	1.2	188	4.0	6 533	1.1	229	2.0	3 844	2.7
Montgomery .....	172	14.6	289	24.7	110	20.2	51	19.1	397	2.5	797	6.6
Nevada .....	210	10.4	274	17.0	118	19.1	38	23.1	362	2.2	650	4.5
Newton .....	299	8.9	417	13.0	53	35.3	24	42.5	515	1.5	445	12.4
Ouachita .....	88	6.7	88	12.2	46	10.6	19	29.3	177	1.7	217	3.6
Perry .....	256	6.4	689	17.8	143	13.6	264	32.8	376	2.0	1 068	7.3
Phillips .....	244	7.4	9 588	2.0	280	5.0	16 460	1.3	315	2.2	5 968	2.2
Pike .....	126	20.1	390	26.3	98	17.5	33	18.2	382	4.5	900	5.9
Poinsett .....	432	6.7	11 499	2.5	404	6.3	12 553	1.5	499	3.9	7 163	2.1
Polk .....	316	11.1	484	15.0	291	11.8	143	18.6	809	2.3	1 595	4.2
Pope .....	443	7.2	676	7.9	280	10.2	274	9.3	886	1.6	1 916	3.7
Prairie .....	318	4.7	7 565	1.7	279	6.4	6 439	1.4	373	3.7	4 360	4.3
Pulaski .....	229	10.1	1 219	3.6	174	12.3	1 540	6.6	352	5.6	1 235	4.5
Randolph .....	545	4.6	3 995	4.2	220	11.4	1 824	4.1	686	1.0	2 282	2.2
St. Francis .....	230	8.0	5 346	3.5	227	7.3	8 206	1.4	318	2.5	3 404	1.3
Saline .....	144	13.5	324	16.2	61	24.3	84	16.8	307	3.8	303	12.9
Scott .....	212	13.7	338	18.1	136	17.3	88	26.1	651	.6	1 295	6.2
Searcy .....	372	6.9	549	13.0	128	17.4	66	29.3	601	1.5	827	12.0
Sebastian .....	270	11.2	433	19.2	144	16.7	143	33.7	691	2.1	769	9.3
Sevier .....	258	9.5	635	11.5	246	10.9	183	14.1	572	1.6	2 181	2.7
Sharp .....	357	7.9	837	18.4	142	16.5	126	29.4	575	2.4	761	7.5
Stone .....	324	8.5	527	14.6	161	15.6	87	19.3	599	.7	818	6.6
Union .....	141	10.1	121	11.0	95	12.7	38	19.5	280	.9	642	2.9
Van Buren .....	326	8.9	854	29.9	95	19.9	95	45.5	540	2.9	668	9.0
Washington .....	1 132	5.0	1 917	9.7	731	7.4	522	7.8	2 365	1.0	5 715	1.8
White .....	951	4.2	4 863	5.3	499	7.5	3 101	5.8	1 541	1.6	2 821	3.9
Woodruff .....	179	7.2	6 282	2.5	161	9.1	6 629	2.6	224	3.9	4 001	3.0
Yell .....	307	10.1	782	16.9	263	11.8	475	39.6	762	2.5	2 528	4.3

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.**

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —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)
<b>Arkansas</b> .....	<b>23 334</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>60 432</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>14 125</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>238 733</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>5 498</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>25 544</b>	<b>1.8</b>
Arkansas .....	389	5.7	2 310	6.0	345	6.0	8 740	1.5	88	17.1	883	2.2
Ashley .....	153	11.2	1 105	1.0	101	10.5	4 103	1.3	47	19.8	306	2.8
Baxter .....	185	13.3	144	4.7	118	19.2	526	6.6	93	25.3	132	35.9
Benton .....	1 334	3.8	3 193	1.2	565	7.1	10 415	1.6	261	11.3	1 160	3.0
Boone .....	593	6.9	679	6.8	302	10.9	712	12.0	140	17.7	235	15.7
Bradley .....	103	12.0	242	12.5	70	14.6	871	15.0	22	27.7	206	6.9
Calhoun .....	47	9.1	32	13.7	15	22.6	27	40.5	13	19.0	38	32.8
Carroll .....	651	5.1	1 453	3.4	235	11.3	2 853	1.0	118	16.0	478	4.0
Chicot .....	216	9.5	1 729	.7	196	7.6	7 495	1.9	88	17.3	569	2.4
Clark .....	182	14.7	233	11.2	97	23.4	721	26.4	19	60.3	12	10.1
Clay .....	354	6.9	942	3.4	256	9.0	6 022	9.6	89	17.3	341	6.5
Cleburne .....	298	8.3	349	5.7	144	15.5	518	11.2	43	32.9	121	36.8
Cleveland .....	144	8.4	406	2.6	64	18.3	924	2.0	40	22.8	153	21.4
Columbia .....	186	11.9	367	4.0	74	23.2	2 118	3.1	38	32.1	(D)	(D)
Conway .....	367	7.8	664	3.3	183	11.7	1 854	3.7	63	27.4	157	4.9
Craighead .....	555	4.9	1 487	2.4	391	5.9	8 008	2.4	138	13.7	1 625	18.1
Crawford .....	307	10.0	532	5.1	184	14.0	2 332	5.4	77	24.5	96	14.8
Crittenden .....	191	6.9	778	1.8	176	6.4	7 424	.8	60	11.7	406	1.5
Cross .....	263	7.4	2 087	1.9	222	8.6	6 806	4.4	84	18.2	568	2.2
Dallas .....	38	11.1	23	17.0	23	19.7	(D)	(D)	9	24.9	(D)	(D)
Desha .....	221	5.4	1 008	3.5	202	7.3	8 500	1.1	44	19.4	466	2.1
Drew .....	204	11.1	546	8.9	122	18.6	1 673	5.3	77	23.1	376	33.7
Faulkner .....	386	10.0	261	12.7	189	14.1	1 050	9.6	98	21.2	127	21.5
Franklin .....	324	9.0	536	2.4	263	11.1	1 073	3.8	65	24.0	141	13.1
Fulton .....	351	9.1	148	11.3	251	12.7	374	11.8	50	31.1	55	34.0
Garland .....	160	14.5	394	4.8	61	24.9	881	1.1	41	31.7	71	28.1
Grant .....	96	7.6	75	8.9	35	16.9	124	7.3	18	21.6	23	33.0
Greene .....	442	7.3	949	5.8	265	11.1	3 275	5.5	59	20.6	286	3.4
Hempstead .....	388	7.4	1 279	5.2	271	10.1	3 734	4.4	115	20.1	409	18.7
Hot Spring .....	203	10.6	164	8.9	100	19.6	197	5.8	52	27.3	157	33.1
Howard .....	383	8.1	1 164	5.1	237	11.8	2 713	3.3	117	19.5	366	5.5
Independence .....	415	8.2	678	2.6	317	10.2	3 553	4.0	93	21.5	229	15.6
Izard .....	270	10.8	284	9.5	197	13.9	595	6.6	61	23.8	98	19.7
Jackson .....	289	7.6	1 249	6.1	212	10.0	6 006	2.1	53	23.0	514	8.9
Jefferson .....	188	10.7	1 232	.6	201	10.6	8 157	1.2	69	20.2	868	.7
Johnson .....	253	12.2	776	3.5	146	17.4	2 401	2.2	42	26.6	93	12.2
Lafayette .....	171	9.5	427	1.1	103	13.9	1 466	.9	58	15.5	194	7.4
Lawrence .....	390	5.8	827	3.4	321	7.0	4 128	3.2	91	18.6	537	16.7
Lee .....	177	9.9	1 135	4.2	144	10.3	5 525	.6	64	24.0	467	5.4
Lincoln .....	205	6.2	1 027	.9	128	6.8	7 146	.9	33	14.8	282	4.0
Little River .....	230	8.3	388	13.0	121	14.6	1 269	9.2	61	24.1	265	35.6
Logan .....	417	7.8	722	5.7	200	12.8	897	10.6	84	18.7	298	19.0
Lonoke .....	515	6.1	3 176	4.6	357	7.7	9 830	1.9	95	20.4	700	9.1
Madison .....	650	5.9	800	6.3	273	11.0	774	6.9	105	21.5	207	12.5
Marion .....	261	9.7	224	8.7	131	15.1	232	13.1	59	24.8	130	10.5
Miller .....	274	7.6	366	3.4	182	12.6	1 386	6.5	40	27.8	85	7.0
Mississippi .....	301	5.7	1 096	1.5	335	5.6	14 335	1.0	130	7.8	1 558	4.5
Monroe .....	195	4.1	1 195	1.3	157	4.6	4 343	1.8	50	12.7	(D)	(D)
Montgomery .....	227	10.3	353	12.4	99	19.2	355	33.7	86	24.4	191	13.8
Nevada .....	159	13.3	253	2.0	168	12.8	547	7.5	36	35.6	94	25.6
Newton .....	197	13.9	143	15.7	105	20.6	135	7.1	60	23.1	25	27.8
Ouachita .....	73	7.2	72	5.4	31	12.6	120	5.2	26	16.5	37	28.8
Perry .....	166	13.0	261	6.0	38	13.9	538	.6	41	26.7	139	37.8
Phillips .....	244	6.8	929	3.7	207	8.9	8 562	.6	58	12.4	1 223	.1
Pike .....	190	9.8	472	12.3	114	20.0	1 432	34.1	35	22.1	94	10.2
Poinsett .....	332	7.4	1 688	2.8	361	6.8	8 701	3.5	105	.6	1 342	.3
Polk .....	509	6.0	737	5.7	259	12.5	1 383	8.1	99	21.9	180	6.2
Pope .....	450	7.4	1 157	4.1	206	12.4	3 615	1.9	96	17.9	372	31.4
Prairie .....	261	7.3	2 439	4.0	212	7.7	5 788	3.0	73	21.0	340	11.8
Pulaski .....	191	11.8	227	5.5	155	11.9	1 940	10.0	73	19.0	491	10.2
Randolph .....	326	9.2	413	3.0	197	12.5	2 109	6.5	104	18.0	281	5.6
St. Francis .....	204	9.0	1 241	1.3	157	9.1	5 574	1.8	41	19.6	444	3.0
Saline .....	87	21.4	39	22.1	46	33.9	(D)	(D)	17	36.7	(D)	(D)
Scott .....	356	8.4	627	12.4	163	14.4	1 551	12.4	72	25.9	173	18.7
Searcy .....	260	10.4	223	29.2	108	17.2	378	15.7	77	23.2	65	29.0
Sebastian .....	243	9.3	244	5.2	131	16.9	634	37.0	57	24.7	96	31.4
Sevier .....	330	7.9	989	6.6	235	10.3	2 636	9.4	96	15.3	268	12.0
Sharp .....	253	11.6	288	5.0	153	14.6	420	8.4	53	25.8	110	24.8
Stone .....	248	11.3	324	11.8	161	17.0	231	12.0	37	30.8	64	37.8
Union .....	171	6.9	524	2.4	74	15.4	1 319	1.3	37	25.6	56	22.4
Van Buren .....	274	10.0	248	11.9	117	19.9	495	16.3	96	22.5	163	13.4
Washington .....	1 336	4.5	2 569	2.7	614	7.7	11 646	1.8	309	11.9	878	10.0
White .....	748	5.5	960	3.5	372	9.3	3 165	4.6	159	16.9	220	23.9
Woodruff .....	166	6.5	1 036	3.2	160	8.8	5 702	.6	20	.1	500	(L)
Yell .....	418	7.7	1 091	2.1	200	13.0	1 391	8.8	81	17.9	301	7.7

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.**

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —Con.											
	Repair and maintenance				Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest			
	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)
<b>Arkansas</b> . . . . .	<b>36 149</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>202 827</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>10 847</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>84 552</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>20 737</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>192 005</b>	<b>.8</b>
Arkansas . . . . .	434	3.4	8 702	2.3	237	6.3	3 663	2.5	341	6.0	5 692	2.0
Ashley . . . . .	240	4.8	2 760	1.5	87	11.9	1 930	7.4	98	8.9	1 920	.3
Baxter . . . . .	341	7.2	935	12.0	76	22.1	58	23.0	179	13.7	664	8.6
Benton . . . . .	1 729	2.8	6 700	2.1	526	8.0	1 039	8.0	1 092	4.9	9 401	3.5
Boone . . . . .	1 031	3.0	1 656	6.2	215	14.6	240	19.1	466	8.3	2 466	9.3
Bradley . . . . .	188	6.0	485	8.3	42	28.0	125	11.0	109	12.7	570	8.7
Calhoun . . . . .	81	6.2	126	11.2	11	28.0	12	29.5	26	12.8	68	17.3
Carroll . . . . .	834	3.5	2 522	3.5	227	13.7	436	9.4	508	7.3	4 098	6.2
Chicot . . . . .	275	7.6	5 295	2.3	166	10.6	3 545	2.3	228	9.5	4 488	1.5
Clark . . . . .	281	7.8	728	13.9	52	33.1	115	27.5	155	16.4	816	9.7
Clay . . . . .	481	5.0	5 934	3.5	264	9.9	2 967	10.4	358	8.1	4 933	6.0
Cleburne . . . . .	552	4.3	1 105	9.6	138	18.4	141	23.7	276	10.0	1 199	11.5
Cleveland . . . . .	187	4.5	799	10.3	57	22.3	65	16.2	102	11.0	955	4.7
Columbia . . . . .	257	7.7	923	6.5	50	33.8	239	9.8	110	19.1	1 021	16.2
Conway . . . . .	580	4.3	2 182	5.8	152	17.1	320	9.6	312	8.9	2 211	8.4
Craighead . . . . .	609	4.6	7 012	3.2	351	8.7	2 963	5.3	433	5.8	5 794	3.2
Crawford . . . . .	600	5.0	1 574	4.4	134	18.6	281	14.7	240	12.1	1 585	6.3
Crittenden . . . . .	229	5.1	5 391	.4	136	8.3	3 232	8.2	135	7.4	4 109	1.6
Cross . . . . .	356	3.1	6 998	1.3	188	10.1	4 632	1.2	231	8.2	5 324	2.0
Dallas . . . . .	82	7.5	106	11.9	10	29.8	35	15.5	15	24.1	49	28.8
Desha . . . . .	259	3.3	5 964	1.7	190	6.0	3 245	6.0	191	6.0	3 875	1.4
Drew . . . . .	268	8.0	1 813	10.0	50	22.7	596	.8	148	17.9	1 337	5.2
Faulkner . . . . .	848	3.9	1 513	7.1	192	14.4	427	15.1	333	10.5	1 623	10.9
Franklin . . . . .	591	5.1	1 372	6.0	120	18.8	256	11.3	335	9.9	2 469	5.0
Fulton . . . . .	581	4.8	910	7.1	195	15.0	186	16.3	252	11.6	1 072	17.6
Garland . . . . .	278	6.5	465	11.7	29	41.6	44	25.0	71	19.7	395	12.1
Grant . . . . .	173	3.8	321	7.5	29	18.0	23	10.4	64	10.4	224	12.3
Greene . . . . .	619	3.6	3 738	4.0	257	11.1	1 979	13.7	394	7.8	3 372	5.7
Hempstead . . . . .	615	4.4	2 596	4.4	115	20.2	210	11.9	462	7.0	4 215	6.0
Hot Spring . . . . .	355	5.3	682	9.3	63	27.7	42	25.1	109	18.4	539	14.3
Howard . . . . .	543	4.7	2 474	5.8	101	18.8	329	7.8	328	9.7	2 893	8.7
Independence . . . . .	894	2.9	1 979	5.1	218	14.3	454	8.1	492	7.5	2 603	7.5
Izard . . . . .	560	4.5	946	8.8	143	17.5	171	20.3	324	9.8	1 653	10.1
Jackson . . . . .	379	5.6	4 663	2.0	236	7.3	3 805	6.6	291	8.1	3 614	1.4
Jefferson . . . . .	294	6.6	5 416	1.2	120	16.3	2 767	6.3	173	12.8	3 175	1.4
Johnson . . . . .	481	4.5	1 715	4.3	93	22.7	184	13.4	290	10.8	2 221	6.7
Lafayette . . . . .	236	3.3	1 283	5.2	73	19.5	880	14.8	139	10.7	1 477	6.7
Lawrence . . . . .	598	2.9	4 650	2.9	217	10.3	2 368	6.1	367	7.3	4 155	5.0
Lee . . . . .	213	8.5	4 346	2.8	169	9.9	3 869	4.0	171	8.3	2 956	2.0
Lincoln . . . . .	242	4.5	3 763	1.6	99	8.9	1 516	1.4	153	7.5	2 783	1.4
Little River . . . . .	283	5.4	1 494	8.8	84	23.1	401	11.8	183	10.0	1 799	12.1
Logan . . . . .	701	4.2	1 604	5.1	129	14.2	254	12.2	374	8.3	2 423	5.7
Lonoke . . . . .	654	5.1	7 004	1.9	298	9.2	3 450	4.2	445	6.9	4 968	4.8
Madison . . . . .	994	2.8	2 103	9.1	203	13.8	319	15.0	532	7.1	3 265	7.7
Marion . . . . .	426	3.9	685	9.4	110	18.7	142	14.5	225	9.8	1 095	11.4
Miller . . . . .	410	4.9	1 340	3.8	100	17.5	684	13.0	219	10.0	1 904	6.7
Mississippi . . . . .	412	2.8	10 546	1.0	290	5.9	4 312	1.5	374	4.3	7 453	2.8
Monroe . . . . .	219	4.0	3 057	1.4	125	7.2	1 674	1.9	176	6.5	2 950	2.1
Montgomery . . . . .	347	5.3	718	8.5	47	31.1	49	31.4	179	14.1	980	16.5
Nevada . . . . .	354	3.3	834	10.4	62	26.9	94	32.4	138	14.2	811	11.5
Newton . . . . .	403	5.6	480	15.1	99	19.6	251	10.1	215	12.9	841	16.1
Ouachita . . . . .	141	3.8	259	5.5	7	32.3	6	31.0	45	10.4	156	7.8
Perry . . . . .	311	4.4	865	9.0	83	17.3	134	13.2	174	12.3	1 177	13.1
Phillips . . . . .	281	5.1	6 997	1.7	203	8.2	6 135	1.5	214	7.3	4 354	2.0
Pike . . . . .	312	5.8	1 220	16.3	66	28.5	81	31.6	194	14.0	1 183	9.1
Poinsett . . . . .	429	6.9	7 246	1.9	270	9.3	4 506	3.9	372	7.1	6 194	2.5
Polk . . . . .	690	4.3	1 646	7.6	133	15.7	228	10.6	445	8.1	2 423	8.9
Pope . . . . .	813	3.0	2 550	5.0	174	15.2	283	17.8	436	8.0	2 969	6.2
Prairie . . . . .	366	3.5	4 650	3.6	162	11.2	2 027	3.7	237	6.8	3 311	3.1
Pulaski . . . . .	338	5.6	1 605	5.7	113	19.6	440	5.5	128	12.1	785	9.1
Randolph . . . . .	587	4.2	2 702	2.7	175	12.1	1 073	2.3	319	9.6	2 560	6.7
St. Francis . . . . .	266	6.3	4 186	4.2	162	9.1	3 306	4.1	213	8.3	3 931	7.0
Saline . . . . .	284	5.1	419	7.4	21	46.8	11	77.1	40	34.0	130	36.8
Scott . . . . .	560	4.1	1 404	5.7	140	18.7	134	17.4	311	9.9	3 022	3.9
Searcy . . . . .	476	5.1	702	9.0	121	18.2	91	17.9	214	11.3	662	13.1
Sebastian . . . . .	480	6.4	922	12.0	90	23.2	105	22.8	180	13.4	983	8.4
Sevier . . . . .	447	5.1	1 934	6.6	135	15.5	302	8.6	352	6.8	3 208	13.1
Sharp . . . . .	519	4.1	761	9.1	124	17.9	217	21.5	262	10.7	1 384	11.8
Stone . . . . .	494	3.7	987	14.1	71	24.8	85	37.1	324	8.5	1 468	14.8
Union . . . . .	223	5.5	604	4.9	13	25.8	22	23.1	132	10.3	786	5.8
Van Buren . . . . .	486	3.8	1 030	9.4	85	24.1	132	21.8	262	11.8	1 189	14.6
Washington . . . . .	1 942	2.6	6 348	3.3	518	9.3	806	11.9	1 104	4.9	7 416	4.8
White . . . . .	1 264	3.1	3 998	3.3	345	10.8	1 001	5.5	704	6.3	3 868	6.8
Woodruff . . . . .	198	6.8	4 612	4.5	104	9.9	2 194	2.0	144	7.7	3 025	3.1
Yell . . . . .	645	4.5	2 772	6.4	157	17.9	216	19.2	370	7.6	3 320	6.5

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.**

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —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)
<b>Arkansas</b> .....	<b>9 818</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>127 308</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>42 825</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>48 485</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>38 686</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>315 718</b>	<b>.3</b>
Arkansas .....	253	7.9	5 872	1.5	437	4.4	1 311	8.2	460	2.5	8 158	1.4
Ashley .....	72	16.3	2 808	5.8	268	3.7	380	8.2	248	6.2	3 674	2.1
Baxter .....	45	27.5	210	17.0	475	2.4	299	5.5	427	4.5	959	4.6
Benton .....	486	8.2	970	6.3	2 251	1.1	2 530	2.2	2 069	1.8	14 209	1.4
Boone .....	188	15.5	275	19.7	1 224	1.4	928	7.1	1 023	2.8	3 014	5.7
Bradley .....	14	27.2	40	9.5	241	2.2	187	7.3	208	6.7	800	7.8
Calhoun .....	24	11.8	27	8.1	110	2.6	80	6.2	95	4.7	108	10.7
Carroll .....	194	15.1	441	9.7	1 017	.9	1 344	3.7	873	2.6	5 500	1.4
Chicot .....	168	12.1	4 513	4.4	287	5.2	914	5.3	328	2.5	6 266	2.4
Clark .....	60	29.8	249	15.8	369	1.6	340	8.5	312	5.4	1 371	2.5
Clay .....	154	14.1	2 924	6.1	541	3.6	875	3.6	542	3.1	5 361	5.3
Cleburne .....	67	28.0	122	17.7	706	.9	443	4.6	542	4.4	2 992	1.9
Cleveland .....	26	29.6	31	19.9	220	1.0	200	7.9	183	5.7	2 484	.7
Columbia .....	69	28.2	85	22.0	303	2.7	262	6.8	292	4.7	1 694	2.2
Conway .....	146	17.7	391	18.3	661	3.1	585	5.1	660	2.8	3 484	2.9
Craighead .....	282	10.0	4 585	7.5	664	3.7	1 273	4.0	731	1.7	8 099	4.6
Crawford .....	119	18.3	449	6.8	796	1.2	560	3.8	648	4.1	3 702	2.0
Crittenden .....	152	6.8	10 089	.4	204	5.5	680	2.5	233	5.0	5 404	.7
Cross .....	144	10.7	8 256	.4	344	3.1	865	2.5	358	3.2	7 829	.8
Dallas .....	14	22.2	13	22.4	117	2.6	117	15.4	94	6.0	210	4.9
Desha .....	127	8.7	3 813	.9	260	4.0	767	.9	290	1.4	6 929	1.0
Drew .....	86	20.5	1 226	1.4	312	4.3	411	13.9	298	6.0	2 486	6.5
Faulkner .....	146	17.0	618	22.8	1 076	1.5	873	8.5	946	3.1	1 582	7.0
Franklin .....	167	16.3	316	10.2	754	2.1	691	7.4	678	3.5	5 593	1.2
Fulton .....	81	21.6	338	18.2	728	1.1	470	6.2	635	3.7	1 010	6.2
Garland .....	52	29.2	297	21.7	350	2.0	291	7.4	300	5.3	1 701	7.4
Grant .....	40	14.8	40	14.1	214	1.5	174	5.1	175	3.5	521	4.3
Greene .....	134	19.5	621	8.1	661	3.3	907	3.7	651	2.6	3 979	3.2
Hempstead .....	207	13.5	575	22.9	709	2.6	891	5.4	650	3.6	9 343	1.2
Hot Spring .....	81	20.3	100	19.9	431	2.5	330	6.5	352	5.8	1 051	5.4
Howard .....	146	18.5	299	10.8	642	1.9	767	4.9	569	4.7	5 750	1.7
Independence .....	225	13.7	1 043	28.9	1 016	1.4	688	4.6	849	3.4	5 131	2.1
Izard .....	139	17.8	198	16.3	673	1.9	440	5.4	591	3.9	1 103	5.3
Jackson .....	199	11.3	4 469	4.6	365	5.3	661	2.4	423	2.9	5 041	2.4
Jefferson .....	122	16.1	4 875	.9	321	4.6	757	6.2	318	5.5	6 978	1.1
Johnson .....	196	12.3	661	5.8	580	2.3	525	6.1	523	3.8	3 306	2.6
Lafayette .....	76	16.8	1 001	25.8	243	4.1	459	4.5	239	4.7	3 729	2.3
Lawrence .....	201	12.7	2 309	12.2	596	2.7	767	4.2	588	3.1	4 829	2.7
Lee .....	155	10.8	6 417	2.7	239	4.3	561	5.8	253	4.0	4 822	2.4
Lincoln .....	91	8.0	2 267	1.6	267	2.3	518	7.2	266	3.1	7 429	.6
Little River .....	85	22.0	581	5.9	375	1.4	383	8.4	289	5.5	2 324	4.2
Logan .....	219	11.8	598	5.4	904	1.8	723	4.6	777	3.0	3 384	3.7
Lonoke .....	241	11.8	4 403	2.1	793	2.4	1 073	4.5	730	3.1	8 638	2.4
Madison .....	103	20.4	259	48.8	1 198	.7	986	3.8	1 052	2.3	4 553	2.9
Marion .....	57	24.5	241	22.4	485	1.5	390	6.1	437	3.8	986	5.3
Miller .....	145	15.0	2 024	16.0	477	2.2	513	7.5	401	4.5	2 637	2.6
Mississippi .....	232	6.9	8 722	.6	397	3.4	1 184	4.3	437	1.9	12 950	.6
Monroe .....	114	8.9	2 759	2.9	221	3.1	418	2.8	229	2.1	4 453	1.3
Montgomery .....	66	25.5	104	18.7	405	2.6	345	5.9	368	4.1	1 891	6.1
Nevada .....	88	21.3	110	16.1	347	3.9	333	6.9	311	5.9	1 577	2.7
Newton .....	60	28.7	55	25.4	495	2.7	243	7.7	366	6.8	541	11.8
Ouachita .....	36	13.4	34	20.6	168	2.4	129	9.5	159	2.8	230	4.5
Perry .....	89	18.3	441	26.1	379	2.1	302	13.3	332	4.1	1 950	4.6
Phillips .....	190	9.1	10 168	1.3	290	3.9	705	2.6	314	2.4	6 929	1.7
Pike .....	55	31.4	112	43.0	405	1.0	395	15.2	358	3.9	2 612	5.1
Poinsett .....	213	9.7	5 724	4.0	486	4.5	1 064	2.7	483	4.3	10 342	1.1
Polk .....	116	21.9	261	18.8	849	.7	751	6.7	772	2.7	3 278	2.7
Pope .....	175	15.6	273	10.4	878	1.6	757	6.3	776	3.3	4 844	3.5
Prairie .....	119	10.2	2 642	9.9	402	2.3	891	5.0	367	3.0	5 752	3.4
Pulaski .....	80	20.1	370	3.6	386	3.9	418	8.7	364	4.9	1 827	2.1
Randolph .....	168	14.9	777	6.3	676	1.4	544	7.6	615	3.5	2 533	2.4
St. Francis .....	179	8.5	4 789	3.1	305	2.9	788	9.6	286	4.6	5 106	.9
Saline .....	76	22.5	140	19.2	306	3.9	261	10.7	298	4.4	4 722	6.6
Scott .....	68	26.0	103	28.0	645	1.3	474	5.5	576	3.8	3 722	2.1
Searcy .....	87	20.3	134	22.1	587	2.1	406	6.4	523	3.9	853	7.4
Sebastian .....	143	15.4	555	15.8	668	2.8	607	8.2	594	4.6	1 560	3.8
Sevier .....	101	16.0	502	24.1	572	1.9	629	4.3	516	3.6	4 948	2.1
Sharp .....	74	23.0	238	6.3	604	1.5	443	12.6	483	5.1	1 613	4.6
Stone .....	78	25.3	249	41.7	587	1.3	384	5.3	505	3.6	1 459	8.2
Union .....	45	25.3	34	31.3	268	2.8	286	7.3	243	4.4	2 972	.9
Van Buren .....	78	26.5	192	43.2	560	2.0	389	7.2	488	3.8	1 305	16.6
Washington .....	353	11.3	1 352	8.7	2 421	.9	2 635	8.2	2 102	2.0	21 751	.9
White .....	276	10.9	1 463	7.6	1 599	1.3	1 135	3.5	1 302	2.8	5 584	2.7
Woodruff .....	82	12.7	2 735	1.4	206	5.4	579	2.8	215	5.9	4 838	1.6
Yell .....	179	16.1	351	17.7	809	1.3	801	4.4	698	3.3	7 648	1.9

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.**

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

Geographic area	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) <sup>1</sup>				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)
<b>Arkansas</b> .....	<b>45 139</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>1 007 988</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>37 205</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>10 062 289</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>30 125</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>7 665 490</b>	<b>.2</b>
Arkansas .....	517	.5	51 886	2.2	474	.5	375 526	.3	444	.6	359 150	.3
Ashley .....	298	.7	16 580	2.1	239	.9	138 220	.5	212	1.1	129 963	.5
Baxter .....	492	.7	457	63.0	358	.9	39 589	1.6	234	1.4	9 354	1.9
Benton .....	2 323	.5	26 947	3.8	1 883	.5	168 089	.8	1 471	.6	80 624	1.0
Boone .....	1 261	.7	2 214	30.9	995	.6	116 341	1.1	709	.9	28 314	1.3
Bradley .....	249	1.1	2 176	10.4	209	.9	14 642	1.7	171	1.3	6 463	2.3
Calhoun .....	112	2.3	-179	31.6	105	.9	10 354	3.0	88	1.6	3 525	3.1
Carroll .....	1 033	.6	9 225	9.2	844	.6	105 428	1.1	676	.7	36 542	1.0
Chicot .....	361	.7	27 078	3.0	312	.7	253 709	.4	285	.8	233 740	.4
Clark .....	376	.7	1 399	30.2	306	.7	50 509	1.3	233	1.1	25 623	1.5
Clay .....	612	.7	27 259	3.7	557	.6	296 145	.5	515	.7	276 775	.5
Cleburne .....	710	.7	4 173	13.2	598	.7	54 952	1.4	477	.9	21 679	1.6
Cleveland .....	222	.9	5 611	3.2	172	.9	13 609	2.3	128	1.4	6 448	4.2
Columbia .....	313	.6	3 470	6.3	253	.7	26 114	1.6	202	1.1	10 391	2.1
Conway .....	729	.5	12 679	5.3	606	.6	96 363	.8	517	.8	59 490	.8
Craighead .....	754	.7	39 923	2.2	696	.6	335 232	.4	647	.7	317 946	.4
Crawford .....	805	.6	8 308	4.4	641	.7	78 007	.9	484	.9	45 174	1.0
Crittenden .....	259	.7	16 241	2.7	247	.7	304 202	.3	246	.7	292 366	.3
Cross .....	382	.7	26 341	2.4	347	.6	317 066	.3	327	.7	304 728	.2
Dallas .....	121	1.9	264	22.9	95	1.5	9 109	2.9	76	2.1	3 864	3.7
Desha .....	302	.7	30 599	1.4	282	.6	257 230	.3	268	.7	243 155	.3
Drew .....	342	.9	8 121	8.1	289	.9	93 855	.8	247	1.1	75 745	.7
Faulkner .....	1 112	.6	3 244	34.0	922	.6	120 064	.9	700	.8	54 329	.9
Franklin .....	782	.6	6 017	7.8	647	.6	86 214	1.0	522	.8	39 080	1.3
Fulton .....	737	.7	-205	(H)	584	.8	92 098	1.1	375	1.1	20 326	1.6
Garland .....	360	.9	15 484	3.1	257	1.0	20 524	2.5	170	1.5	6 923	2.6
Grant .....	215	1.5	-538	20.9	177	1.1	15 818	3.3	140	1.5	7 488	2.4
Greene .....	734	.7	21 337	4.0	636	.6	229 540	.6	548	.7	205 163	.6
Hempstead .....	752	.6	16 435	4.2	577	.7	89 581	1.4	464	.9	34 821	1.3
Hot Spring .....	447	.8	-277	(H)	356	.7	37 106	1.7	257	1.1	15 300	2.3
Howard .....	656	.6	18 104	3.2	486	.7	53 534	1.6	387	.9	20 853	1.7
Independence .....	1 044	.6	7 111	8.9	820	.7	154 375	1.0	617	.9	87 707	1.2
Izard .....	703	.8	-186	(H)	546	.7	80 112	1.3	363	1.1	16 996	1.8
Jackson .....	461	.8	17 908	4.9	429	.7	294 515	.5	401	.8	276 269	.4
Jefferson .....	362	.9	23 579	3.7	308	1.0	258 344	.4	265	1.2	238 625	.4
Johnson .....	605	.7	6 571	7.9	513	.7	65 605	1.3	426	.9	31 757	1.4
Lafayette .....	261	.9	8 111	3.1	203	1.0	66 707	1.3	183	1.1	46 935	.8
Lawrence .....	662	.6	20 048	5.7	587	.6	238 241	.5	515	.7	210 211	.5
Lee .....	273	1.1	22 990	3.0	256	.9	262 839	.4	243	1.0	254 023	.4
Lincoln .....	292	.9	23 091	1.3	233	.9	155 781	.4	205	1.1	142 609	.4
Little River .....	381	.6	5 708	9.6	308	.8	83 228	.8	249	1.1	50 864	.8
Logan .....	953	.6	9 397	6.2	787	.6	106 932	.9	642	.7	50 958	1.3
Lonoke .....	869	.6	35 872	3.1	762	.5	327 025	.3	651	.7	280 525	.4
Madison .....	1 204	.5	14 389	5.4	991	.5	124 770	1.0	788	.7	44 836	1.1
Marion .....	495	.7	1 927	18.2	387	.8	53 429	1.3	270	1.2	11 888	1.3
Miller .....	501	.7	5 847	7.6	400	.9	105 300	1.1	322	1.1	64 018	1.3
Mississippi .....	462	.6	49 252	1.8	451	.4	480 157	.2	443	.4	464 026	.2
Monroe .....	245	.8	21 102	2.2	226	.7	211 137	.4	214	.8	203 267	.4
Montgomery .....	416	.7	6 503	7.0	326	.8	36 043	1.5	262	1.0	13 828	1.8
Nevada .....	372	.7	2 514	10.7	312	.8	36 642	1.6	265	1.0	14 963	1.3
Newton .....	522	.8	2 940	12.2	400	.9	37 316	1.5	287	1.3	10 150	1.8
Ouachita .....	177	1.7	734	17.1	140	1.2	13 164	.5	122	1.5	4 989	1.8
Perry .....	391	.8	6 829	7.0	330	.8	45 380	1.6	279	1.0	24 712	1.6
Phillips .....	322	1.0	27 695	2.4	312	.7	345 592	.3	300	.8	339 395	.3
Pike .....	405	1.0	12 387	5.5	305	.9	32 985	1.7	245	1.2	13 527	1.8
Poinsett .....	571	.5	39 442	1.9	531	.5	374 979	.3	523	.5	363 805	.3
Polk .....	849	.7	15 882	4.3	641	.7	61 327	1.3	471	.9	21 572	1.4
Pope .....	917	.7	15 604	3.8	730	.7	85 429	1.1	580	.8	43 018	1.5
Prairie .....	421	.6	34 191	2.3	382	.6	257 472	.4	357	.7	239 175	.4
Pulaski .....	421	.9	6 330	7.6	350	.9	77 266	1.1	263	1.3	59 934	1.0
Randolph .....	693	.7	9 727	5.0	572	.7	163 067	.8	445	.9	113 107	.7
St. Francis .....	327	1.0	15 953	2.9	303	.8	244 322	.5	273	1.0	229 409	.5
Saline .....	329	.9	512	58.8	281	.9	26 451	2.0	200	1.3	11 856	2.3
Scott .....	654	.6	13 215	4.3	522	.6	56 275	1.3	415	.9	22 434	1.3
Searcy .....	614	.7	1 362	41.4	486	.7	69 024	1.5	368	1.0	18 321	1.6
Sebastian .....	723	.7	7 197	8.2	536	.7	64 021	1.5	388	1.0	26 857	1.6
Sevier .....	587	.7	20 911	2.7	456	.7	63 217	1.0	364	.9	27 274	.7
Sharp .....	618	.7	3 027	24.1	489	.7	68 959	1.3	324	1.1	18 587	2.0
Stone .....	600	.7	2 877	13.9	478	.6	56 052	1.2	386	.8	17 345	1.3
Union .....	280	.9	3 694	4.1	202	1.0	13 667	2.7	147	1.5	4 907	3.6
Van Buren .....	578	.7	830	83.3	497	.7	61 675	1.3	410	.9	25 300	1.6
Washington .....	2 478	.5	36 675	4.6	1 975	.5	174 878	.7	1 538	.6	76 914	.9
White .....	1 667	.5	7 773	11.6	1 410	.5	267 983	.7	1 110	.6	169 223	.7
Woodruff .....	240	.6	25 034	1.2	226	.6	255 216	.3	211	.8	245 807	.4
Yell .....	826	.6	15 059	3.9	676	.6	106 620	1.0	575	.7	58 225	1.2

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.**

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

Geographic area	Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry							
	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
					Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>Arkansas</b> .....	<b>6 593</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>3 717 217</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>30 369</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>1 770 248</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>26 981</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>927 357</b>	<b>.5</b>
Arkansas .....	403	.6	308 540	.3	73	2.8	3 102	3.2	67	2.9	1 872	3.3
Ashley .....	114	1.5	90 966	.4	120	1.8	4 954	3.0	105	2.1	(D)	(D)
Baxter .....	6	13.4	62	20.3	396	.8	20 785	1.4	342	1.0	9 465	1.8
Benton .....	39	4.8	683	14.0	1 830	.5	105 787	.6	1 590	.6	55 312	.7
Boone .....	22	7.1	179	6.6	1 072	.6	62 465	.9	925	.7	31 259	1.0
Bradley .....	43	3.0	1 242	1.9	161	1.3	5 359	1.7	148	1.5	3 234	1.8
Calhoun .....	6	13.7	76	23.3	81	1.8	4 196	4.2	71	2.1	(D)	(D)
Carroll .....	10	8.7	148	15.9	887	.5	73 745	.8	775	.6	33 190	1.0
Chicot .....	192	1.1	116 473	.6	70	2.7	7 206	2.6	64	2.9	(D)	(D)
Clark .....	15	6.0	1 954	1.2	277	.9	17 228	1.5	244	1.1	8 860	1.9
Clay .....	297	1.0	176 079	.5	181	1.7	7 466	2.5	162	1.9	(D)	(D)
Cleburne .....	18	6.9	274	14.0	536	.8	25 431	1.2	477	.9	13 585	1.6
Cleveland .....	4	13.0	27	16.3	159	1.0	8 334	3.6	149	1.1	(D)	(D)
Columbia .....	11	5.1	213	1.3	233	.9	15 717	1.3	211	1.0	(D)	(D)
Conway .....	40	3.5	6 744	1.5	595	.6	33 992	.9	504	.8	15 652	1.0
Craighead .....	444	.8	221 658	.5	179	1.8	5 308	2.8	156	2.1	(D)	(D)
Crawford .....	53	3.3	4 006	3.2	617	.7	30 438	.9	545	.8	15 991	1.0
Crittenden .....	130	1.3	95 840	.5	21	6.4	1 224	8.4	20	6.3	975	8.9
Cross .....	256	.9	223 337	.3	70	3.1	5 399	1.9	56	3.5	2 267	2.9
Dallas .....	3	9.2	4	13.8	91	1.6	3 206	2.7	77	2.0	(D)	(D)
Desha .....	222	1.0	159 403	.3	30	5.0	2 648	3.6	24	5.9	1 096	4.5
Drew .....	116	1.9	49 007	.6	188	1.4	9 936	2.9	163	1.6	5 024	3.0
Faulkner .....	28	4.4	3 268	1.5	881	.6	45 053	.9	762	.7	21 665	1.0
Franklin .....	20	6.7	310	8.2	645	.6	43 613	1.1	557	.8	21 014	1.2
Fulton .....	7	8.7	120	9.8	638	.7	40 355	.9	542	.8	17 088	1.0
Garland .....	11	7.1	80	21.6	267	.9	9 496	2.3	232	1.1	5 491	3.6
Grant .....	3	21.4	7	22.9	161	1.3	9 114	2.4	138	1.6	(D)	(D)
Greene .....	258	1.1	116 388	.6	294	1.2	8 660	2.0	260	1.4	4 606	2.4
Hempstead .....	13	6.3	859	7.3	599	.6	52 673	1.0	541	.7	30 289	1.1
Hot Spring .....	15	6.7	1 101	8.4	366	.7	17 830	1.6	332	.8	9 491	1.6
Howard .....	34	2.3	1 644	2.3	481	.7	35 693	1.3	450	.7	21 432	1.4
Independence .....	59	3.1	15 398	2.0	850	.6	46 926	1.1	770	.7	26 468	1.2
Izard .....	11	9.3	264	10.2	592	.7	29 427	1.2	538	.8	15 578	1.1
Jackson .....	277	1.1	154 802	.5	113	2.2	4 174	2.4	102	2.4	2 355	2.7
Jefferson .....	161	1.4	146 774	.3	108	2.6	5 667	3.6	99	2.9	2 711	3.9
Johnson .....	24	5.4	1 611	1.5	461	.8	27 668	1.0	422	.9	14 837	1.2
Lafayette .....	23	4.7	10 345	2.4	192	1.0	28 994	1.0	172	1.2	(D)	(D)
Lawrence .....	274	1.0	112 479	.6	331	1.0	16 529	1.7	306	1.1	9 114	1.8
Lee .....	147	1.5	102 209	.4	47	4.4	1 931	5.2	42	4.7	(D)	(D)
Lincoln .....	104	1.6	98 176	.5	124	1.9	9 809	1.6	114	2.0	4 724	2.0
Little River .....	22	5.4	925	6.9	302	.8	29 323	.8	274	1.0	(D)	(D)
Logan .....	24	5.1	1 112	4.8	795	.6	48 670	.9	716	.7	26 803	1.1
Lonoke .....	312	.9	209 562	.3	353	1.2	15 661	1.6	303	1.3	7 776	2.0
Madison .....	14	5.9	422	12.5	1 038	.5	63 561	.8	940	.6	35 891	.8
Marion .....	4	13.3	25	14.8	432	.7	28 251	1.0	370	.9	15 238	1.2
Miller .....	21	4.2	8 352	1.0	377	.9	30 298	1.1	330	1.1	13 878	1.3
Mississippi .....	229	.8	162 589	.3	30	4.9	2 070	4.5	26	5.3	(D)	(D)
Monroe .....	173	1.0	128 099	.5	12	6.8	719	3.8	10	6.5	382	3.2
Montgomery .....	12	5.7	216	6.9	332	.7	19 998	1.7	306	.8	11 449	1.6
Nevada .....	5	14.2	117	18.4	290	.9	18 175	1.2	274	1.0	11 287	1.2
Newton .....	11	9.0	132	17.4	449	.8	19 261	1.3	406	.9	11 124	1.2
Ouachita .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	124	1.5	5 538	1.5	108	1.8	(D)	(D)
Perry .....	32	4.5	5 333	2.9	310	.9	14 518	1.8	288	1.0	(D)	(D)
Phillips .....	156	1.3	131 053	.3	38	4.3	3 092	2.6	37	4.4	1 999	2.3
Pike .....	13	4.0	679	1.4	304	.9	20 812	1.8	275	1.0	11 492	2.0
Poinsett .....	443	.6	274 028	.3	47	4.4	1 635	6.5	44	4.7	1 047	6.3
Polk .....	16	4.9	680	1.8	664	.7	37 701	1.2	597	.8	20 395	1.3
Pope .....	34	4.5	1 945	4.8	731	.6	36 381	.9	653	.7	19 312	1.0
Prairie .....	268	.8	178 631	.4	99	2.3	5 487	4.1	81	2.7	2 891	4.5
Pulaski .....	69	3.0	20 462	1.5	219	1.6	10 782	2.2	191	1.8	5 706	2.2
Randolph .....	95	1.7	47 333	.7	541	.7	35 477	1.1	507	.8	18 581	1.2
St. Francis .....	171	1.4	102 577	.7	63	3.5	2 743	4.3	56	3.8	(D)	(D)
Saline .....	15	7.7	438	5.4	248	1.0	10 374	2.1	214	1.2	5 812	1.9
Scott .....	1	25.6	(D)	(D)	528	.6	27 874	1.2	469	.7	15 172	1.4
Searcy .....	10	6.2	262	.8	546	.6	34 449	1.1	486	.7	18 669	1.2
Sebastian .....	13	7.7	209	13.7	566	.7	28 805	1.4	492	.8	15 214	1.5
Sevier .....	35	2.8	1 315	3.1	465	.7	37 485	.8	437	.7	22 288	.8
Sharp .....	13	8.3	904	3.7	524	.7	26 960	1.0	474	.8	14 533	1.2
Stone .....	21	4.6	334	10.0	498	.6	30 773	.9	452	.7	16 203	1.1
Union .....	3	13.3	(D)	(D)	187	1.1	6 607	2.0	156	1.4	(D)	(D)
Van Buren .....	18	7.2	429	9.7	486	.7	25 430	1.2	410	.9	11 908	1.7
Washington .....	63	3.4	874	2.9	1 981	.5	109 526	.6	1 764	.5	58 129	.7
White .....	164	1.8	51 073	1.1	1 097	.7	56 133	1.1	967	.7	30 982	1.1
Woodruff .....	169	1.0	159 122	.4	23	5.7	1 201	2.8	22	5.8	967	2.5
Yell .....	30	3.5	5 191	4.0	653	.6	36 940	1.0	592	.7	21 837	1.1

See footnotes at end of table.



**Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—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)
<b>Arkansas</b> . . . . .	<b>1 193</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>49 012</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>1 247</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>858 741</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>8 284</b>	<b>1.9</b>
Arkansas . . . . .	—	—	—	—	8	12.2	215	14.4	1	43.9	(D)	(D)
Ashley . . . . .	2	22.9	(D)	(D)	12	8.9	276	14.2	3	12.1	4	15.5
Baxter . . . . .	9	10.3	265	13.5	12	8.5	588	21.3	—	—	—	—
Benton . . . . .	83	2.3	4 401	1.7	71	3.2	66 502	.1	40	4.5	596	7.8
Boone . . . . .	44	3.9	1 155	4.5	17	7.0	4 732	2.4	9	10.7	245	9.5
Bradley . . . . .	4	14.6	39	14.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Calhoun . . . . .	2	22.5	(D)	(D)	10	6.8	116	17.7	—	—	—	—
Carroll . . . . .	55	2.8	2 917	2.3	27	4.7	1 716	2.1	15	5.9	536	5.2
Chicot . . . . .	2	18.3	(D)	(D)	2	18.3	(D)	(D)	1	42.3	(D)	(D)
Clark . . . . .	9	6.4	497	3.0	19	5.0	6 008	7.8	2	22.5	(D)	(D)
Clay . . . . .	2	22.5	(D)	(D)	11	8.5	286	5.5	2	21.3	(D)	(D)
Cleburne . . . . .	25	5.0	1 065	2.9	15	7.4	(D)	(D)	7	11.6	285	4.5
Cleveland . . . . .	2	17.3	(D)	(D)	3	16.4	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Columbia . . . . .	2	12.2	(D)	(D)	14	6.2	795	1.6	2	14.7	(D)	(D)
Conway . . . . .	41	3.0	3 312	1.2	28	3.3	57 449	.5	8	8.8	350	2.4
Craighead . . . . .	2	22.9	(D)	(D)	9	9.2	1 190	1.6	7	11.5	107	10.4
Crawford . . . . .	22	5.6	810	.9	22	5.9	246	8.2	16	6.7	381	12.2
Crittenden . . . . .	—	—	—	—	2	15.0	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Cross . . . . .	—	—	—	—	4	16.3	80	23.1	—	—	—	—
Dallas . . . . .	3	13.4	(D)	(D)	4	14.9	157	18.5	1	28.7	(D)	(D)
Deshia . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Drew . . . . .	6	11.8	67	19.5	13	7.7	394	10.5	2	20.3	(D)	(D)
Faulkner . . . . .	44	3.4	2 348	2.8	34	4.6	264	7.0	11	8.5	136	12.3
Franklin . . . . .	29	4.1	1 525	2.1	5	9.0	(D)	(D)	5	13.4	134	15.3
Fulton . . . . .	32	4.1	2 393	3.6	24	5.8	731	11.0	7	12.2	45	18.4
Garland . . . . .	9	8.3	265	5.7	6	10.1	(D)	(D)	4	8.6	25	8.2
Grant . . . . .	4	16.1	(D)	(D)	7	10.5	113	21.3	—	—	—	—
Greene . . . . .	9	10.5	262	6.7	9	8.5	470	18.2	8	10.2	114	13.8
Hempstead . . . . .	14	7.3	464	7.9	20	4.9	45 055	.9	4	16.1	22	21.7
Hot Spring . . . . .	11	9.3	203	12.2	13	7.1	63	8.9	8	9.6	58	14.1
Howard . . . . .	6	9.2	33	12.1	49	2.2	78 348	1.0	1	—	(D)	(D)
Independence . . . . .	18	5.4	214	8.4	32	4.9	1 974	3.7	6	13.7	41	15.3
Izard . . . . .	17	6.6	791	5.1	12	6.7	(D)	(D)	10	8.1	179	8.1
Jackson . . . . .	—	—	—	—	10	10.5	287	24.5	1	24.7	(D)	(D)
Jefferson . . . . .	—	—	—	—	6	17.2	250	21.8	3	20.5	36	23.9
Johnson . . . . .	11	8.2	130	7.4	15	6.1	13 756	1.5	4	17.4	(D)	(D)
Lafayette . . . . .	4	13.3	(D)	(D)	6	10.9	423	7.1	1	—	(D)	(D)
Lawrence . . . . .	6	13.7	38	13.3	8	9.7	152	19.9	—	—	—	—
Lee . . . . .	1	—	(D)	(D)	8	13.8	708	30.0	—	—	—	—
Lincoln . . . . .	6	11.8	305	2.8	7	9.3	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Little River . . . . .	4	11.0	(D)	(D)	19	5.4	16 192	4.8	1	—	(D)	(D)
Logan . . . . .	41	3.8	1 868	3.1	20	5.5	23 564	.9	10	7.4	650	3.0
Lonoke . . . . .	18	5.2	1 426	3.0	11	7.2	177	6.5	9	8.8	46	9.1
Madison . . . . .	53	3.0	2 360	2.6	46	3.6	49 200	.5	18	6.1	277	8.6
Marion . . . . .	17	5.1	732	3.4	10	9.2	457	6.0	7	10.1	99	16.6
Miller . . . . .	14	7.8	356	2.7	8	8.9	315	2.3	1	27.0	(D)	(D)
Mississippi . . . . .	1	—	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Monroe . . . . .	—	—	—	—	7	11.4	991	5.6	—	—	—	—
Montgomery . . . . .	12	5.7	324	6.0	20	5.5	18 744	5.5	3	17.3	31	15.8
Nevada . . . . .	6	11.2	77	12.6	10	9.6	157	17.7	4	15.4	49	23.3
Newton . . . . .	15	7.4	195	11.6	23	5.6	7 922	7.2	7	9.9	285	11.2
Ouachita . . . . .	1	24.9	(D)	(D)	11	7.7	221	9.5	1	37.8	(D)	(D)
Perry . . . . .	2	19.5	(D)	(D)	15	5.6	10 908	.2	8	10.8	441	16.5
Phillips . . . . .	—	—	—	—	9	12.5	433	14.7	—	—	—	—
Pike . . . . .	7	9.8	86	4.9	29	3.1	36 136	1.2	2	16.0	(D)	(D)
Poinsett . . . . .	—	—	—	—	2	24.1	(D)	(D)	1	40.5	(D)	(D)
Polk . . . . .	33	5.0	758	6.1	45	3.4	47 764	.7	15	7.6	277	9.0
Pope . . . . .	25	5.6	473	8.1	55	2.7	74 302	.8	4	9.5	135	9.1
Prairie . . . . .	5	6.5	540	3.5	4	13.4	(D)	(D)	2	26.0	(D)	(D)
Pulaski . . . . .	6	13.7	19	22.6	14	8.7	385	13.8	3	20.8	20	22.7
Randolph . . . . .	11	7.9	75	12.1	25	5.7	1 086	5.7	4	15.3	126	16.6
St. Francis . . . . .	1	35.9	(D)	(D)	11	10.1	144	17.6	—	—	—	—
Saline . . . . .	7	10.7	244	12.6	7	11.4	72	14.8	2	17.0	(D)	(D)
Scott . . . . .	17	6.8	368	9.8	14	6.9	(D)	(D)	7	9.5	289	12.1
Searcy . . . . .	37	3.9	1 824	3.5	23	5.0	3 453	1.5	1	32.6	(D)	(D)
Sebastian . . . . .	26	4.7	707	2.7	9	8.4	(D)	(D)	24	5.1	276	7.3
Sevier . . . . .	11	7.6	318	2.1	60	1.8	96 727	.9	1	—	(D)	(D)
Sharp . . . . .	17	6.8	200	12.9	18	7.4	672	8.8	3	19.2	42	23.8
Stone . . . . .	27	4.2	484	5.1	13	7.3	196	10.5	1	18.6	(D)	(D)
Union . . . . .	5	10.3	(D)	(D)	10	8.4	219	8.7	6	11.9	99	16.5
Van Buren . . . . .	56	3.1	3 673	2.3	10	8.4	9 569	3.4	5	15.0	119	18.7
Washington . . . . .	101	2.1	4 503	1.4	51	3.3	80 787	(L)	36	4.7	751	5.2
White . . . . .	62	3.1	2 238	3.0	25	5.6	1 686	7.5	14	8.1	220	10.3
Woodruff . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yell . . . . .	19	6.5	702	6.6	38	2.9	54 312	.9	11	8.3	99	14.7

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.**

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

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry—Con.							
	Layers 20 weeks old and older inventory				Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>Arkansas</b> .....	<b>1 643</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>15 144 014</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>3 650</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>1 003 161 769</b>	<b>.1</b>
Arkansas .....	6	10.0	165	12.3	—	—	—	—
Ashley .....	10	9.5	220	10.4	—	—	—	—
Baxter .....	21	6.4	423	7.6	8	5.4	994 102	3.3
Benton .....	133	2.3	1 373 775	2.0	329	.4	113 132 954	.1
Boone .....	44	4.5	180 945	5.7	57	.9	18 540 549	.1
Bradley .....	11	6.2	154 045	6.7	14	2.1	4 164 416	.5
Calhoun .....	3	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Carroll .....	48	3.8	1 170 281	1.0	148	.8	38 420 082	.2
Chicot .....	7	11.4	114	14.1	—	—	—	—
Clark .....	17	5.9	182 047	4.6	7	3.5	3 185 000	.6
Clay .....	8	9.7	177	12.4	1	30.2	(D)	(D)
Cleburne .....	16	8.0	80 581	7.9	118	1.4	20 112 955	.6
Cleveland .....	16	4.8	317 797	2.3	45	—	20 022 762	—
Columbia .....	15	3.6	300 766	(L)	41	1.5	15 533 916	.3
Conway .....	11	8.6	(D)	(D)	133	1.1	27 073 568	.4
Craighead .....	4	14.1	44	14.2	—	—	—	—
Crawford .....	29	5.0	148 182	4.0	63	.8	15 173 915	.2
Crittenden .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cross .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Dallas .....	—	—	—	—	2	15.7	(D)	(D)
Desha .....	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)
Drew .....	10	8.0	133 967	4.2	5	—	1 528 000	—
Faulkner .....	40	4.5	(D)	(D)	4	14.5	(D)	(D)
Franklin .....	15	8.2	75 189	14.5	57	1.1	16 474 427	.2
Fulton .....	19	7.0	404	9.2	3	14.0	(D)	(D)
Garland .....	25	4.2	212 168	4.7	2	12.9	(D)	(D)
Grant .....	14	7.5	(D)	(D)	3	6.2	(D)	(D)
Greene .....	9	9.2	220	15.7	—	—	—	—
Hempstead .....	20	4.2	749 803	1.0	152	1.0	49 315 878	.2
Hot Spring .....	31	4.2	349 158	2.7	2	—	(D)	(D)
Howard .....	34	4.0	505 897	3.4	228	1.0	43 241 100	.4
Independence .....	36	4.5	218 626	5.3	48	2.4	15 240 264	.6
Izard .....	24	5.4	(D)	(D)	36	3.0	11 213 317	.7
Jackson .....	3	15.7	55	16.0	—	—	—	—
Jefferson .....	11	10.6	(D)	(D)	7	—	3 508 400	—
Johnson .....	30	4.8	202 579	5.9	66	1.2	20 772 440	.2
Lafayette .....	12	8.6	121 624	6.2	79	1.4	26 514 053	.3
Lawrence .....	14	7.4	87 320	5.9	14	3.5	3 486 966	1.1
Lee .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Lincoln .....	7	10.9	123 915	10.7	33	1.4	21 063 624	.1
Little River .....	8	10.2	28 955	16.1	39	1.7	10 431 881	.6
Logan .....	28	5.8	39 505	17.7	110	.8	31 964 306	.2
Lonoke .....	22	5.2	124 577	(L)	3	—	1 740 000	—
Madison .....	76	2.9	520 680	2.8	143	.7	36 491 930	.3
Marion .....	31	4.9	(D)	(D)	4	—	1 352 000	—
Miller .....	12	8.8	134 734	6.2	49	—	13 432 182	—
Mississippi .....	3	18.2	18	23.4	—	—	—	—
Monroe .....	2	13.3	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Montgomery .....	50	3.1	612 800	3.0	54	1.7	11 755 346	.6
Nevada .....	18	5.4	325 630	4.7	50	1.3	13 789 403	.2
Newton .....	21	6.5	40 365	10.6	2	—	(D)	(D)
Ouachita .....	6	8.8	44 077	8.6	9	—	2 571 875	—
Perry .....	13	9.2	498	11.7	62	1.5	13 671 320	.5
Phillips .....	1	40.5	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Pike .....	32	3.7	468 481	3.3	63	1.1	12 572 854	.4
Poinsett .....	1	40.5	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Polk .....	47	3.7	337 875	3.8	194	1.1	36 655 144	.4
Pope .....	38	4.1	271 873	3.8	134	.9	32 308 410	.3
Prairie .....	3	18.9	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Pulaski .....	13	7.9	(D)	(D)	3	—	1 951 200	—
Randolph .....	16	7.3	(D)	(D)	10	2.6	4 173 217	.8
St. Francis .....	1	42.5	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Saline .....	19	6.7	620	10.1	1	48.4	(D)	(D)
Scott .....	57	3.4	448 284	3.5	109	1.2	33 148 480	.3
Searcy .....	23	5.6	516	7.9	2	—	(D)	(D)
Sebastian .....	25	5.5	60 690	7.0	42	1.2	10 838 611	.2
Sevier .....	16	5.2	144 793	5.7	174	.6	45 398 924	.2
Sharp .....	45	3.9	401 945	5.1	28	1.7	11 374 000	.3
Stone .....	7	12.3	361	13.8	113	1.5	18 458 035	.7
Union .....	15	6.9	66 563	8.2	55	1.2	17 252 981	.3
Van Buren .....	21	6.6	483	8.3	36	3.5	4 344 290	2.2
Washington .....	124	2.3	3 111 318	.8	302	.5	102 347 152	.1
White .....	53	3.1	567 894	(L)	11	4.8	3 403 550	.8
Woodruff .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yell .....	41	3.8	397 827	4.9	142	1.0	39 441 894	.3

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—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)	
<b>Arkansas</b> .....	<b>875</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>130 948</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>8 988 578</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>3 361</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>763 388</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>35 361 702</b>	<b>.2</b>	
Arkansas .....	15	2.2	2 668	.2	177 396	.2	326	.7	86 794	.5	4 836 985	.5	
Ashley .....	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	21	4.3	4 579	5.5	171 544	5.8	
Baxter .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Benton .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	15	5.2	965	3.8	41 320	3.5	
Boone .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	29.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Bradley .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Calhoun .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Carroll .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Chicot .....	14	3.0	3 298	.4	256 889	.5	50	2.2	9 616	.7	418 333	.7	
Clark .....	3	7.9	(D)	(D)	15 140	1.6	7	6.9	925	2.2	24 989	2.8	
Clay .....	87	2.3	9 272	2.6	630 094	2.2	193	1.5	26 608	1.2	1 174 629	1.1	
Cleburne .....	1	23.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	2	26.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Cleveland .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Columbia .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Conway .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Craighead .....	45	3.4	3 373	3.6	220 318	3.0	24	3.7	7 190	1.7	269 314	1.3	
Crawford .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	14 021	1.9	627 025	1.9	
Crittenden .....	30	3.0	6 190	.8	506 742	.7	19	4.6	3 853	1.5	148 638	2.1	
Cross .....	29	1.5	4 401	1.2	307 611	1.7	106	1.5	32 821	.5	1 448 411	.4	
Dallas .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	141	1.4	36 796	.5	1 683 901	.5	
Desha .....	23	4.2	2 803	1.2	202 860	1.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Drew .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	78	2.0	18 378	.9	829 886	.9	
Faulkner .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	20	3.0	3 973	2.3	149 713	3.2	
Franklin .....	1	18.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	13	4.5	2 495	2.2	109 780	2.2	
Fulton .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	17.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Garland .....	1	37.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Grant .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Greene .....	71	2.7	6 673	2.5	406 471	2.4	1	33.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Hempstead .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	133	1.8	11 239	1.6	455 432	1.7	
Hot Spring .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Howard .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	11.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Independence .....	42	3.7	4 202	3.0	248 595	3.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Izard .....	2	18.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	55	3.2	8 837	2.6	379 356	2.7	
Jackson .....	43	3.6	5 216	2.8	228 755	1.4	4	12.1	130	14.5	4 650	15.6	
Jefferson .....	8	6.2	1 103	5.2	81 740	4.2	160	1.5	38 346	.9	1 651 228	.8	
Johnson .....	6	5.4	433	.7	23 437	.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Lafayette .....	13	3.9	2 410	2.9	126 666	2.3	82	2.0	21 790	1.0	966 472	1.1	
Lawrence .....	75	2.2	10 235	1.9	511 832	1.9	9	7.1	673	6.4	29 638	5.3	
Lee .....	23	3.1	4 590	.9	382 054	.8	17	2.4	7 177	.7	295 624	.5	
Lincoln .....	12	5.2	1 614	1.6	124 953	1.0	135	1.5	20 423	1.0	976 961	.9	
Little River .....	7	3.3	1 138	1.2	76 067	1.1	140	1.6	47 442	.5	2 339 176	.3	
Logan .....	4	10.9	150	16.5	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Lonoke .....	13	3.9	2 200	.5	155 628	.3	14	4.5	7 967	.8	330 269	.6	
Madison .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	15	5.2	1 799	3.6	73 375	4.0	
Marion .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	191	1.1	39 040	.7	1 896 041	.5	
Miller .....	13	2.1	4 572	.3	341 086	.1	3	12.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Mississippi .....	40	2.7	5 871	1.8	414 930	1.9	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Monroe .....	20	4.1	3 995	1.8	313 534	1.3	21	4.5	7 429	4.5	270 236	4.6	
Montgomery .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	150	1.1	46 132	.3	1 822 509	.2	
Nevada .....	1	21.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	127	1.3	31 892	.7	1 461 311	.6	
Newton .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Ouachita .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Perry .....	2	13.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Phillips .....	63	2.2	16 565	.7	1 367 486	.6	4	12.0	379	13.0	17 176	14.4	
Pike .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	161	1.5	51 814	.6	2 410 632	.7	
Poinsett .....	26	4.0	3 069	2.0	234 617	1.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Polk .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Pope .....	4	7.1	548	1.8	(D)	(D)	109	1.6	18 711	.8	868 753	.5	
Prairie .....	21	4.6	2 258	2.4	164 624	2.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Pulaski .....	8	6.1	2 120	5.6	113 930	5.5	11	4.4	2 670	1.6	111 936	1.8	
Randolph .....	13	6.5	1 688	5.3	107 571	3.9	171	1.2	27 718	.6	1 469 144	.6	
St. Francis .....	21	2.4	3 142	1.0	246 083	1.3	43	3.3	11 816	1.6	536 073	1.4	
Saline .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	50	1.9	8 560	1.4	426 317	1.5	
Scott .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	136	1.6	39 331	.6	1 757 190	.6	
Searcy .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Sebastian .....	1	20.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Sevier .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	4.7	1 743	7.1	75 319	8.3	
Sharp .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Stone .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Union .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Van Buren .....	1	29.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Washington .....	1	19.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	4	4.9	127	6.1	5 977	5.2	
White .....	25	4.4	4 637	1.6	290 781	2.2	76	2.4	11 267	1.6	459 375	1.6	
Woodruff .....	36	2.3	8 626	1.3	571 984	1.2	107	1.4	34 266	.6	1 677 217	.5	
Yell .....	6	6.2	405	3.0	26 401	1.9	16	5.9	3 410	3.8	151 067	4.0	

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.**

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Rice					Cotton						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Hundredweight	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bales	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>Arkansas</b> .....	<b>4 207</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>1 384 969</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>78 882 488</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>1 730</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>962 272</b>	<b>.1</b>	<b>1 621 344</b>	<b>.1</b>
Arkansas .....	367	.7	122 744	.3	7 631 555	.2	7	—	2 080	—	3 841	—
Ashley .....	51	2.1	19 170	.6	986 505	.5	70	1.8	53 649	.5	103 883	.4
Baxter .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Benton .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boone .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bradley .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Calhoun .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Carroll .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Chicot .....	112	1.6	36 870	1.1	1 923 228	1.0	93	1.5	45 871	.4	84 045	.3
Clark .....	5	4.9	1 179	.7	47 450	.9	—	—	—	—	—	—
Clay .....	213	1.2	69 785	.6	3 930 110	.5	61	2.5	28 331	1.3	42 771	1.0
Cleburne .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Columbia .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Conway .....	3	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Craighead .....	277	1.1	82 248	.7	4 813 017	.6	196	1.4	107 622	.5	169 748	.4
Crawford .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Crittenden .....	77	1.9	23 885	1.6	1 273 880	1.4	80	1.5	45 862	.2	77 786	.2
Cross .....	230	.9	99 281	.3	5 587 589	.3	10	2.7	4 431	.9	7 608	.8
Dallas .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Deshia .....	140	1.1	43 888	.6	2 491 088	.6	157	1.1	78 278	.2	150 340	.2
Drew .....	57	2.2	15 008	1.4	860 804	1.3	47	2.5	22 714	.7	42 384	.7
Faulkner .....	8	3.0	2 047	.6	115 915	.4	—	—	—	—	—	—
Franklin .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Fulton .....	2	10.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Garland .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Grant .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Greene .....	203	1.3	56 341	.8	3 166 213	.8	69	2.3	22 429	1.1	30 466	1.1
Hempstead .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Hot Spring .....	2	11.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Howard .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Independence .....	33	3.6	7 208	1.7	416 823	1.7	—	—	—	—	—	—
Izard .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jackson .....	257	1.2	84 704	.6	4 614 882	.6	7	7.5	1 151	2.7	1 674	2.8
Jefferson .....	99	1.2	51 084	.3	2 879 208	.4	97	1.7	56 256	.9	92 460	.7
Johnson .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lafayette .....	13	7.5	3 127	7.6	161 450	7.6	10	3.6	3 651	.3	5 501	.2
Lawrence .....	258	1.0	72 906	.6	4 218 095	.6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lee .....	109	1.7	34 224	.7	1 946 777	.8	54	2.0	30 111	.6	54 194	.5
Lincoln .....	72	1.2	31 191	.7	1 801 543	.6	65	1.8	33 712	.4	64 306	.4
Little River .....	2	24.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Logan .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	48.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lonoke .....	240	.9	75 139	.4	4 435 258	.4	65	1.3	25 085	.5	53 813	.5
Madison .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Marion .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Miller .....	11	4.5	5 797	1.4	281 252	1.6	7	—	2 095	—	2 302	—
Mississippi .....	51	1.2	17 885	.5	978 783	.5	304	.7	212 843	.2	317 865	.2
Monroe .....	135	1.2	48 481	.5	2 619 534	.5	48	2.4	17 572	1.0	31 415	.8
Montgomery .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nevada .....	1	21.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Newton .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ouachita .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Perry .....	3	16.6	1 532	3.9	59 740	7.7	—	—	—	—	—	—
Phillips .....	69	1.7	17 857	1.1	988 022	.9	102	1.6	78 278	.3	142 695	.3
Pike .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Poinsett .....	375	.7	127 171	.4	7 407 750	.4	114	1.5	63 117	.5	97 724	.4
Polk .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pope .....	4	5.0	263	1.9	14 752	1.7	—	—	—	—	—	—
Prairie .....	252	.9	74 182	.4	4 540 249	.3	4	12.6	1 768	2.9	(D)	(D)
Pulaski .....	26	3.9	4 462	2.0	247 003	1.8	4	—	1 319	—	2 237	—
Randolph .....	84	1.7	25 907	.7	1 470 033	.7	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
St. Francis .....	133	1.6	42 322	.7	2 402 248	.7	39	1.5	16 042	.8	27 936	.6
Saline .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Scott .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Searcy .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sebastian .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sevier .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sharp .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Stone .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Union .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Van Buren .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Washington .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
White .....	93	2.1	25 340	1.1	1 350 037	1.1	1	22.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Woodruff .....	134	1.1	58 677	.5	3 064 242	.6	13	5.3	6 764	.9	9 777	.9
Yell .....	3	8.5	717	5.0	40 894	5.4	1	25.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.**

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Soybeans for beans					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)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>Arkansas</b> .....	<b>6 889</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>3 571 342</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>103 074 994</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>22 201</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>1 232 771</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>2 396 515</b>	<b>.5</b>
Arkansas .....	392	.6	210 429	.3	7 734 272	.3	49	3.6	2 276	5.4	5 323	4.6
Ashley .....	107	1.6	51 491	1.1	1 403 888	.8	88	2.5	3 202	5.3	5 038	4.6
Baxter .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	227	1.4	8 983	1.9	14 721	2.3
Benton .....	13	5.7	918	6.6	29 449	7.4	1 421	.6	74 670	.9	163 040	1.0
Boone .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	690	.9	27 648	1.3	43 836	1.5
Bradley .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	128	1.7	5 168	2.9	10 656	2.6
Calhoun .....	1	34.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	76	2.0	3 216	3.2	8 157	5.0
Carroll .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	658	.7	36 028	1.0	68 868	1.1
Chicot .....	236	1.0	139 548	.6	4 268 200	.5	45	3.9	2 831	4.9	6 792	3.9
Clark .....	28	4.1	10 012	3.1	230 773	2.7	207	1.3	12 405	1.9	25 728	2.3
Clay .....	392	.9	132 982	.6	3 791 972	.6	136	2.2	5 603	3.3	7 563	3.9
Cleburne .....	1	23.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	463	1.0	21 663	1.6	39 885	2.2
Cleveland .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	123	1.4	6 375	4.2	13 977	3.3
Columbia .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	191	1.1	10 119	2.2	24 335	1.9
Conway .....	28	3.6	21 204	1.0	465 377	1.0	489	.8	33 053	1.2	70 222	1.4
Craighead .....	410	.9	111 719	.6	3 168 500	.6	133	2.3	4 259	3.3	6 726	3.2
Crawford .....	39	3.0	17 595	1.1	438 857	1.3	421	1.0	24 122	1.5	47 638	1.5
Crittenden .....	219	.9	202 631	.4	5 512 708	.4	13	8.2	1 329	19.0	2 318	16.4
Cross .....	276	.9	183 842	.3	5 640 908	.3	29	5.2	2 424	5.6	4 263	9.0
Dallas .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	72	2.2	3 839	3.7	8 821	3.3
Desha .....	225	1.0	111 363	.5	3 267 686	.4	16	7.1	1 112	4.5	2 213	5.1
Drew .....	73	2.1	28 404	1.2	754 115	1.0	127	1.9	6 580	3.5	12 815	3.8
Faulkner .....	27	3.6	11 280	1.6	303 623	1.3	664	.8	40 284	1.1	75 559	1.2
Franklin .....	9	7.5	2 298	8.1	47 225	9.1	500	.9	35 859	1.3	58 769	1.2
Fulton .....	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	361	1.2	18 012	1.7	29 000	1.6
Garland .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	154	1.7	6 876	2.6	12 648	3.3
Grant .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	131	1.7	7 554	2.4	16 016	2.4
Greene .....	346	1.0	99 706	.8	2 520 310	.7	197	1.7	7 404	3.5	13 737	4.3
Hempstead .....	12	6.3	3 492	6.6	83 234	8.6	447	.9	30 675	1.1	72 620	1.5
Hot Spring .....	5	6.3	2 467	5.6	55 015	4.2	239	1.1	11 244	2.3	23 513	4.3
Howard .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	379	.9	20 651	1.7	48 355	1.4
Independence .....	91	2.5	35 021	2.2	784 719	2.3	547	.9	32 268	1.5	61 910	1.8
Izard .....	1	32.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	349	1.1	16 682	1.8	27 074	1.8
Jackson .....	317	1.0	165 337	.5	4 033 616	.4	68	3.2	2 915	4.0	4 087	4.2
Jefferson .....	186	1.4	116 618	.5	3 206 990	.4	58	4.1	3 234	6.8	7 024	8.9
Johnson .....	14	7.0	5 522	3.7	149 919	2.1	395	.9	24 867	1.6	44 035	1.9
Lafayette .....	34	3.2	18 042	1.0	528 586	.8	151	1.4	10 741	1.1	27 176	1.4
Lawrence .....	303	.9	106 706	.6	2 884 287	.6	228	1.5	13 335	2.2	23 209	2.2
Lee .....	215	1.2	168 717	.5	5 258 525	.5	28	5.4	1 614	4.4	3 622	5.2
Lincoln .....	108	1.5	65 548	.7	1 788 501	.7	80	2.7	4 944	2.8	9 597	3.2
Little River .....	35	3.3	22 025	1.4	523 121	1.2	220	1.2	15 486	1.4	41 923	1.9
Logan .....	28	4.2	7 816	4.5	190 249	4.6	623	.8	41 289	1.3	65 810	1.2
Lonoke .....	308	.9	144 828	.4	4 497 433	.3	303	1.3	20 489	2.0	43 301	1.9
Madison .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	775	.7	44 133	1.1	92 925	1.3
Marion .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	264	1.2	11 820	1.3	21 484	1.4
Miller .....	47	3.1	25 428	2.4	620 336	2.4	274	1.3	15 753	1.8	34 738	1.7
Mississippi .....	330	.7	209 904	.4	6 396 422	.3	25	5.6	1 840	6.6	4 239	6.3
Monroe .....	196	.9	116 944	.5	3 036 011	.4	10	6.0	712	4.6	2 126	1.9
Montgomery .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	259	1.0	13 772	1.8	26 407	2.1
Nevada .....	3	15.2	629	14.2	(D)	(D)	250	1.1	14 097	1.3	27 802	1.6
Newton .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	276	1.3	10 106	1.8	17 096	2.3
Ouachita .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	114	1.6	4 834	1.9	9 814	2.1
Perry .....	23	4.6	7 809	3.2	193 130	2.9	246	1.2	13 700	1.7	25 979	1.7
Phillips .....	271	1.0	206 334	.4	5 874 595	.4	29	5.1	1 797	3.4	2 752	5.2
Pike .....	6	8.9	1 100	3.2	27 800	3.8	240	1.2	11 720	2.1	28 242	2.1
Poinsett .....	411	.7	162 986	.4	4 975 492	.3	42	4.7	1 622	5.5	2 717	6.1
Polk .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	462	1.0	21 919	1.5	41 682	1.5
Pope .....	19	5.4	11 207	4.7	222 477	6.0	553	.9	30 540	1.2	52 407	1.2
Prairie .....	280	.8	149 523	.4	4 958 704	.4	86	2.4	5 461	3.7	10 315	3.9
Pulaski .....	67	2.8	33 217	1.4	886 290	1.3	166	2.0	9 632	2.6	18 644	3.0
Randolph .....	102	1.7	46 705	1.1	1 330 856	1.0	359	1.1	23 084	1.8	37 851	1.7
St. Francis .....	233	1.2	159 145	.5	4 452 162	.5	26	6.1	1 528	5.4	6 981	3.6
Saline .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	176	1.5	11 215	2.5	18 975	2.4
Scott .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	409	.9	22 277	1.3	40 845	1.4
Searcy .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	359	1.0	18 333	1.6	26 684	2.5
Sebastian .....	15	4.9	4 206	4.1	99 376	4.0	365	1.1	21 737	1.9	37 553	2.0
Savoy .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	356	.9	27 493	.9	54 106	1.1
Sharp .....	2	22.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	308	1.2	17 534	2.1	28 231	2.3
Stone .....	3	10.8	638	6.1	18 776	5.2	370	.8	16 462	1.4	27 971	1.5
Union .....	1	31.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	141	1.6	4 963	3.9	13 519	4.4
Van Buren .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	398	.9	25 664	1.6	46 181	1.8
Washington .....	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1 477	.6	75 516	.9	164 427	1.0
White .....	175	1.7	81 087	1.1	2 063 890	1.1	895	.8	49 173	1.1	106 177	1.4
Woodruff .....	191	.9	141 907	.4	3 980 764	.3	12	6.3	419	8.5	630	5.9
Yell .....	30	4.2	13 682	2.2	329 368	2.2	555	.8	40 587	1.3	65 095	1.1

<sup>1</sup>Data are based on a sample of farms.

**Table G. Coverage Estimates: 1997**

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

Item	Census total	Coverage total <sup>1</sup>	Adjusted census		Coverage adjustment (percent)
			Total	Relative standard error (percent)	
Farms ..... number..	45 142	4 343	49 485	2.0	8.8
Land in farms ..... acres..	14 364 955	488 707	14 853 662	1.9	3.3
Average size of farm ..... acres..	318	113	300	(X)	(X)
<b>Farms by size of farm:</b>					
Less than 10 acres .....	1 686	272	1 958	4.1	13.9
10 to 49 acres .....	9 186	1 781	10 967	4.6	16.2
50 to 179 acres .....	16 450	2 211	18 661	3.6	11.8
180 acres or more .....	17 820	79	17 899	1.6	4
<b>Farms by value of sales:</b>					
Less than \$2,500 .....	11 029	1 892	12 921	3.9	14.6
\$2,500 to \$9,999 .....	13 624	1 068	14 692	3.7	7.3
\$10,000 or more .....	20 489	1 383	21 872	2.1	6.3
Market value of agricultural products sold ..... \$1,000..	5 479 692	44 729	5 524 420	1.5	8
<b>Farms by type of organization:</b>					
Individual or family .....	39 009	4 314	43 323	2.3	10.0
Partnership, corporation, or other .....	6 133	29	6 162	2.1	5
<b>Farms by tenure of operator:</b>					
Full owners .....	27 669	3 419	31 088	2.7	11.0
Part owners .....	12 598	589	13 187	2.6	4.5
Tenants .....	4 875	335	5 210	4.3	6.4
<b>Operators by place of residence:</b>					
On farm operated .....	32 326	3 648	35 974	2.5	10.1
Not on farm operated .....	9 705	529	10 234	2.5	5.2
Not reported .....	3 111	166	3 277	7.1	5.1
<b>Operators by principal occupation:</b>					
Farming .....	22 300	978	23 278	2.3	4.2
Other .....	22 842	3 365	26 207	2.9	12.8
<b>Operators by sex:</b>					
Male .....	41 256	3 263	44 519	2.0	7.3
Female.....	3 886	1 080	4 966	7.5	21.7
<b>Operators by race:</b>					
White .....	44 208	4 104	48 312	2.1	8.5
Black and other races .....	934	239	1 173	1.0	20.4
<b>Operators by years on present farm:</b>					
4 years or less .....	6 425	240	6 665	1.7	3.6
5 years or more .....	30 996	1 862	32 858	1.6	5.7
Not reported .....	7 721	2 241	9 962	7.0	22.5

<sup>1</sup> See text in Appendix C regarding coverage estimates.