

---

# 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 .....	10.6	Corn for grain or seed .....	5.4
Land in farms .....	6.6	Wheat for grain .....	5.7
Estimated market value of land and buildings <sup>1</sup> .....	6.4	Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Market value of agricultural products sold .....	4.2	Cattle and calves .....	7.8
Harvested cropland .....	5.7	Hogs and pigs .....	2.7
		Layers 20 weeks old and older .....	.2

<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 .....	5.8	25 .....	42.1
50 .....	3.8	50 .....	29.1
75 .....	2.9	75 .....	23.3
100 .....	2.3	100 .....	19.7
150 .....	1.4	150 .....	15.4
200 .....	.6	200 .....	12.6
300 .....	.5	300 .....	9.1
500 .....	.4	500 .....	4.6
750 .....	.3	750 .....	3.8
1,000 .....	.3	1,000 .....	3.3
1,500 .....	.2	1,500 .....	2.7
2,000 .....	(X)	2,000 .....	(X)



**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 ..	57 916	.4	Total farm production expenses ..... farms ..	57 922	.4
Land in farms ..... acres ..	15 111 022	.3	Average per farm ..... dollars ..	4 011 772	.4
Average size of farm ..... acres ..	261	.6	Livestock and poultry purchased ..... farms ..	14 780	1.6
<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 ..	57 916	.4	All farms ..... number ..	57 922	.4
Average per farm ..... \$1,000 ..	5 229 977	.2	Average per farm ..... \$1,000 ..	1 163 605	.9
Average per farm ..... dollars ..	90 303	.5	Average per farm ..... dollars ..	20 089	1.0
Farms by value of sales:			Farms with net gains <sup>2</sup> ..... number ..	31 555	.8
Less than \$1,000 (see text) ..... farms ..	7 545	.7	Average net gain ..... \$1,000 ..	1 396 731	.7
\$1,000 to \$2,499 ..... farms ..	1 285	.9	Average net gain ..... dollars ..	44 263	1.1
\$2,500 to \$4,999 ..... farms ..	5 477	.7	Farms with net losses ..... number ..	26 367	1.0
\$5,000 to \$9,999 ..... farms ..	9 169	.7	Average net loss ..... \$1,000 ..	233 126	1.4
\$10,000 to \$19,999 ..... farms ..	20 426	.7	Average net loss ..... dollars ..	8 842	1.7
\$20,000 to \$24,999 ..... farms ..	6 579	.7	<b>GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME</b>		
\$25,000 to \$39,999 ..... farms ..	47 283	.7	Government payments ..... farms ..	30 295	.5
\$40,000 to \$49,999 ..... farms ..	6 658	.6	Other farm-related income <sup>1</sup> ..... farms ..	188 508	.3
\$50,000 to \$99,999 ..... farms ..	95 482	.7	Customwork and other agricultural services ..... farms ..	16 093	1.6
\$100,000 to \$249,999 ..... farms ..	2 099	.9	Gross cash rent or share payments ..... farms ..	92 792	3.2
\$250,000 to \$499,999 ..... farms ..	46 832	.9	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products ..... farms ..	5 282	2.8
\$500,000 or more ..... farms ..	4 101	.8	Other farm-related income sources ..... farms ..	33 706	5.3
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			Government payments ..... \$1,000 ..	6 458	2.8
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms ..	40 750	.5	Government payments ..... dollars ..	43 618	5.1
Grains ..... farms ..	3 246 617	.3	<b>COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS</b>		
Corn for grain ..... farms ..	33 540	.5	Total ..... farms ..	3 356	.6
Wheat ..... farms ..	2 982 707	.3	Total ..... \$1,000 ..	149 820	.4
Soybeans ..... farms ..	27 392	.5			
Sorghum for grain ..... farms ..	1 515 617	.3			
Barley ..... farms ..	10 563	.5			
Oats ..... farms ..	91 903	.3			
Other grains ..... farms ..	28 024	.5			
Cotton and cottonseed ..... farms ..	1 344 904	.3			
Tobacco ..... farms ..	112	2.4			
Hay, silage, and field seeds ..... farms ..	2 090	1.9			
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ..... farms ..	48	3.9			
Fruits, nuts, and berries ..... farms ..	150	4.0			
Nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms ..	643	1.2			
Other crops ..... farms ..	1 185	2.0			
Livestock, poultry, and their products ..... farms ..	558	1.0			
Poultry and poultry products ..... farms ..	26 858	.6			
Dairy products ..... farms ..	—	—			
Cattle and calves ..... farms ..	—	—			
Hogs and pigs ..... farms ..	2 011	.7			
Sheep, lambs, and wool ..... farms ..	28 408	1.1			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ..... farms ..	9 580	.5			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ..... farms ..	46 774	.6			
	—	—			
	—	—			
	1 125	.9			
	43 622	.6			
	536	1.4			
	11 885	1.9			
	1 195	1.0			
	110 877	.6			
	299	1.5			
	22 343	.5			
	28 449	.4			
	1 983 359	.2			
	1 379	.8			
	515 456	.1			
	2 749	.7			
	255 784	.5			
	21 585	.5			
	331 134	.3			
	6 623	.5			
	843 002	.2			
	1 896	.8			
	3 812	2.1			
	3 181	.7			
	34 172	.8			

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..	53 256	.4	All operators . . . . . farms..	57 916	.4
Harvested cropland . . . . . farms..	12 848 950	.3	Full owners . . . . . acres..	15 111 022	.3
Farms by acres harvested:	47 613	.5	Part owners . . . . . acres..	3 624 043	.5
1 to 9 acres . . . . . farms..	11 716 704	.3	Tenants . . . . . farms..	19 019	.5
10 to 19 acres . . . . . acres..	5 935	.7	acres..	9 981 173	.3
20 to 29 acres . . . . . farms..	28 565	.7	acres..	5 057	.6
30 to 49 acres . . . . . acres..	5 314	.7	acres..	1 505 806	.5
50 to 99 acres . . . . . acres..	71 493	.7	<b>OWNED AND RENTED LAND</b>		
100 to 199 acres . . . . . farms..	3 721	.7	Land owned . . . . . farms..	53 116	.4
200 to 499 acres . . . . . acres..	87 043	.7	Owned land in farms . . . . . acres..	8 200 611	.4
500 to 999 acres . . . . . farms..	5 127	.7	Land rented or leased from others . . . . . farms..	52 859	.4
1,000 acres or more . . . . . acres..	193 216	.7	acres..	7 219 208	.4
50 to 99 acres . . . . . farms..	7 040	.7	Land rented or leased to others . . . . . farms..	24 282	.5
100 to 199 acres . . . . . acres..	494 959	.7	acres..	7 944 726	.3
200 to 499 acres . . . . . farms..	6 053	.7	Rented or leased land in farms . . . . . landlords..	90 095	.4
500 to 999 acres . . . . . acres..	849 739	.7	acres..	24 076	.5
1,000 acres or more . . . . . farms..	7 196	.7	acres..	7 891 814	.3
acres..	2 306 945	.7	Land rented or leased to others . . . . . farms..	10 097	.6
500 to 999 acres . . . . . farms..	4 350	.5	acres..	1 034 315	.8
1,000 acres or more . . . . . acres..	3 024 716	.5	<b>OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>		
acres..	2 877	—	Operators by place of residence:		
4 660 028	—	—	On farm operated . . . . .	44 066	.5
Cropland:			Not on farm operated . . . . .	9 670	.6
Pasture or grazing only . . . . . farms..	18 876	.5	Not reported . . . . .	4 180	.6
acres..	621 266	.5	Operators by principal occupation:		
Other cropland . . . . . farms..	12 737	.5	Farming . . . . .	26 993	.5
acres..	510 980	.6	Other . . . . .	30 923	.5
Total woodland . . . . . farms..	28 861	.5	Operators by days worked off farm:		
acres..	1 283 246	.5	Any . . . . .	33 959	.5
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured . . . . . farms..	10 219	.5	200 days or more . . . . .	24 216	.5
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. . . . . farms..	364 067	.6	Operators by sex:		
Irrigated land . . . . . farms..	39 772	.5	Male . . . . . farms..	54 695	.4
acres..	614 759	.5	acres..	14 711 758	.3
acres..	1 753	.7	Female . . . . . farms..	3 221	.8
acres..	250 050	.5	acres..	399 264	.9
Acres irrigated:			Average age of operator . . . . . years..	52.8	.6
1 to 9 acres . . . . . farms..	737	1.2	<b>FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION</b>		
10 to 49 acres . . . . . acres..	1 840	1.6	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) . . . . . farms..	49 293	.5
50 to 99 acres . . . . . farms..	250	1.8	acres..	10 821 789	.4
100 to 199 acres . . . . . acres..	6 145	2.0	Partnership . . . . . farms..	5 235	.6
200 to 499 acres . . . . . farms..	142	2.2	acres..	2 187 125	.4
500 to 999 acres . . . . . acres..	10 170	2.3	Corporation:		
1,000 acres or more . . . . . farms..	232	1.4	Family held . . . . . farms..	2 797	.7
acres..	32 108	1.5	acres..	1 946 569	.3
acres..	259	1.1	More than 10 stockholders . . . . . farms..	59	2.9
acres..	79 331	1.1	10 or less stockholders . . . . . farms..	2 738	.7
acres..	100	.8	Other than family held . . . . . farms..	221	1.9
acres..	65 142	.7	acres..	67 093	1.8
acres..	33	—	farms..	24	4.7
acres..	55 314	—	10 or less stockholders . . . . . farms..	197	2.0
Harvested cropland irrigated . . . . . farms..	1 719	.7	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. . . . . farms..	370	1.6
acres..	248 383	.5	acres..	88 446	1.3
Pasture and other land irrigated . . . . . farms..	59	3.9	<b>HIRED FARM LABOR<sup>1</sup></b>		
acres..	1 667	4.0	Hired workers by days worked:		
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs . . . . . farms..	7 722	.6	150 days or more . . . . . farms..	6 214	2.1
acres..	364 177	.8	workers..	14 476	1.6
<b>VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS<sup>1</sup></b>			Less than 150 days . . . . . farms..	15 273	1.5
Estimated market value of land and buildings . . . . . farms..	57 922	.4	workers..	48 667	1.9
\$1,000 . . . . .	30 852 897	.6	<b>INJURIES AND DEATHS</b>		
Average per farm . . . . . dollars..	532 663	.8	Farm-related injuries:		
Average per acre . . . . . dollars..	2 064	.8	Operator and family members . . . . . farms..	586	1.3
<b>VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT<sup>1</sup></b>			number..	657	1.3
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment . . . . . farms..	57 921	.4	Hired workers . . . . . farms..	214	1.4
\$1,000 . . . . .	3 709 854	.8	number..	534	.9
Average per farm . . . . . dollars..	64 050	.9	Farm-related deaths:		
<b>AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS<sup>1</sup></b>			Operator and family members . . . . . farms..	26	—
Commercial fertilizer . . . . . farms..	41 241	.7	number..	26	—
acres on which used..	9 088 706	.6	Hired workers . . . . . farms..	6	—
			number..	6	—

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.. 4 183	.7	Cattle and calves inventory .....	farms.. 23 025	.5
10 to 49 acres .....	acres.. 19 450	.8	number.. 976 701		.4
50 to 69 acres .....	farms.. 13 987	.6	Beef cows .....	farms.. 15 164	.5
70 to 99 acres .....	acres.. 384 068	.6	number.. 277 797		.5
100 to 139 acres .....	farms.. 4 397	.7	Milk cows .....	farms.. 3 216	.7
	acres.. 257 236	.6	number.. 131 630		.5
	farms.. 6 293	.6	Cattle and calves sold .....	farms.. 21 585	.5
	acres.. 517 708	.6	number.. 667 846		.4
	farms.. 5 458	.7	\$1,000.. 331 134		.3
	acres.. 634 918	.7	Hogs and pigs inventory .....	farms.. 6 442	.5
			number.. 3 972 060		.2
			Hogs and pigs sold .....	farms.. 6 623	.5
			number.. 7 584 642		.2
			\$1,000.. 843 002		.2
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory .....	farms.. 1 927	.8
			number.. 54 227		1.3
140 to 179 acres .....	farms.. 3 765	.7	Sheep and lambs sold .....	farms.. 1 814	.8
180 to 219 acres .....	acres.. 591 660	.7	number.. 45 792		2.0
220 to 259 acres .....	farms.. 2 587	.8	Horses and ponies inventory .....	farms.. 9 176	.6
260 to 499 acres .....	acres.. 511 884	.8	number.. 58 628		.7
500 to 999 acres .....	farms.. 1 975	.9	Horses and ponies sold .....	farms.. 2 342	.8
	acres.. 470 232	.9	number.. 10 117		1.2
	farms.. 2 356 769	.7	<b>POULTRY</b>		
	acres.. 5 268	.6	Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory		
	acres.. 3 645 156	.5	(see text) .....	farms.. 1 846	.8
			number.. 22 731 425		.2
1,000 to 1,999 acres .....	farms.. 2 753	.2	Layers 20 weeks old and older .....	farms.. 1 785	.8
2,000 acres or more .....	acres.. 3 704 157	.1	number.. 20 613 402		.2
	farms.. 713	—	Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold .....	farms.. 204	2.2
	acres.. 2 017 784	—	number.. 10 391 178		2.1
<b>FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM</b>			<b>SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED</b>		
Oilseed and grain farming (1111) .....	farms.. 30 336	.5	Corn for grain or seed .....	farms.. 30 642	.5
Vegetable and melon farming (1112) .....	acres.. 11 624 417	.3	acres.. 5 473 792		.3
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113) .....	farms.. 492	1.4	bushels.. 652 547 322		.3
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114) .....	acres.. 71 454	.9	Corn for silage or green chop .....	farms.. 3 365	.7
Other crop farming (1119) .....	farms.. 630 568	.6	acres.. 102 464		.5
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111) .....	acres.. 8 831	.6	tons, green.. 1 639 160		.5
Cattle feedlots (112112) .....	farms.. 876 174	.8	Wheat for grain .....	farms.. 10 658	.5
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212) .....	acres.. 1 986	.8	acres.. 545 027		.4
Hog and pig farming (1122) .....	farms.. 247 705	.9	bushels.. 29 209 090		.4
Poultry and egg production (1123) .....	acres.. 1 921	.8	Oats for grain .....	farms.. 1 739	.9
Sheep and goat farming (1124) .....	farms.. 446 447	.7	acres.. 23 551		1.1
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129) .....	acres.. 3 432	.6	Tobacco .....	bushels.. 1 445 213	1.0
	farms.. 874 007	.4	farms.. 2 017		.7
	acres.. 673	.9	acres.. 8 507		1.0
	acres.. 92 485	.5	pounds.. 17 275 291		1.1
	acres.. 663	1.3	Soybeans for beans .....	farms.. 28 056	.5
	acres.. 23 831	2.4	acres.. 5 003 186		.3
			bushels.. 210 645 005		.3
			Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes .....	farms.. 115	2.6
			acres.. 4 041		.4
			cwt.. 1 010 898		.4
			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass		
			silage, green chop, etc. (see text) .....	farms.. 22 923	.5
			acres.. 674 789		.5
			tons, dry.. 1 756 825		.5
			Alfalfa hay .....	farms.. 14 384	.5
			acres.. 331 998		.5
			tons, dry.. 1 025 634		.5
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) .....	farms.. 1 125	.9
			acres.. 30 139		.7
			Land in orchards .....	farms.. 571	1.3
			acres.. 5 835		2.1

<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**

[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 ..	32 605	.5	Total farm production expenses ..... farms ..	32 560	.5
Land in farms ..... acres ..	13 537 803	.3	..... \$1,000 ..	3 863 199	.4
Average size of farm ..... acres ..	415	.6	Average per farm ..... dollars ..	118 649	.6
<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 ..	32 605	.5	All farms ..... number ..	32 560	.5
Average per farm ..... \$1,000 ..	5 151 814	.2	..... \$1,000 ..	1 233 823	.8
..... dollars ..	158 007	.6	Average per farm ..... dollars ..	37 894	1.0
Farms by value of sales:			Farms with net gains <sup>2</sup> ..... number ..	25 499	.8
\$10,000 to \$19,999 ..... farms ..	6 658	.6	..... \$1,000 ..	1 385 788	.7
..... \$1,000 ..	95 482	.6	Average net gain ..... dollars ..	54 347	1.0
\$20,000 to \$24,999 ..... farms ..	2 099	.9	Farms with net losses ..... number ..	7 061	2.4
..... \$1,000 ..	46 832	.9	..... \$1,000 ..	151 965	1.8
\$25,000 to \$39,999 ..... farms ..	4 101	.8	Average net loss ..... dollars ..	21 522	3.0
..... \$1,000 ..	130 184	.8	<b>GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME</b>		
\$40,000 to \$49,999 ..... farms ..	1 956	1.0	Government payments ..... farms ..	21 586	.5
..... \$1,000 ..	87 355	1.0	..... \$1,000 ..	167 617	.3
\$50,000 to \$99,999 ..... farms ..	5 728	.8	Other farm-related income <sup>1</sup> ..... farms ..	10 580	1.8
..... \$1,000 ..	410 171	.8	..... \$1,000 ..	67 249	3.6
\$100,000 to \$249,999 ..... farms ..	6 772	.7	..... farms ..	4 305	3.1
..... \$1,000 ..	1 084 271	.7	..... \$1,000 ..	31 449	5.5
\$250,000 to \$499,999 ..... farms ..	3 307	—	Gross cash rent or share payments ..... farms ..	2 763	4.1
..... \$1,000 ..	1 154 721	—	..... \$1,000 ..	23 356	6.8
\$500,000 or more ..... farms ..	1 984	—	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products ..... farms ..	602	9.0
..... \$1,000 ..	2 142 798	—	..... \$1,000 ..	4 664	12.4
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			Other farm-related income sources ..... farms ..	5 494	2.5
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms ..	29 116	.5	..... \$1,000 ..	7 779	4.7
..... \$1,000 ..	3 204 366	.3	<b>COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS</b>		
Grains ..... farms ..	26 894	.5	Total ..... farms ..	3 159	.6
..... \$1,000 ..	2 955 888	.3	..... \$1,000 ..	149 609	.4
Corn for grain ..... farms ..	23 471	.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	1 503 044	.3			
Wheat ..... farms ..	9 643	.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	90 465	.3			
Soybeans ..... farms ..	24 319	.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	1 332 254	.3			
Sorghum for grain ..... farms ..	104	2.3			
..... \$1,000 ..	2 073	1.9			
Barley ..... farms ..	45	4.1			
..... \$1,000 ..	146	4.2			
Oats ..... farms ..	531	1.3			
..... \$1,000 ..	1 105	2.1			
Other grains ..... farms ..	534	1.0			
..... \$1,000 ..	26 801	.6			
Cotton and cottonseed ..... farms ..	—	—			
..... \$1,000 ..	—	—			
Tobacco ..... farms ..	1 167	.8			
..... \$1,000 ..	25 310	1.1			
Hay, silage, and field seeds ..... farms ..	5 159	.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	37 459	.7			
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ..... farms ..	757	1.1			
..... \$1,000 ..	42 698	.6			
Fruits, nuts, and berries ..... farms ..	272	1.8			
..... \$1,000 ..	11 298	2.0			
Nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms ..	739	1.2			
..... \$1,000 ..	109 480	.6			
Other crops ..... farms ..	244	1.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	22 233	.5			
Livestock, poultry, and their products ..... farms ..	16 472	.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	1 947 449	.2			
Poultry and poultry products ..... farms ..	895	.9			
..... \$1,000 ..	515 124	.1			
Dairy products ..... farms ..	2 584	.7			
..... \$1,000 ..	255 352	.5			
Cattle and calves ..... farms ..	12 272	.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	303 477	.3			
Hogs and pigs ..... farms ..	5 610	.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	840 510	.2			
Sheep, lambs, and wool ..... farms ..	850	1.1			
..... \$1,000 ..	2 565	3.1			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ..... farms ..	1 302	1.0			
..... \$1,000 ..	30 421	.9			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ..... farms ..	1 373	.9			
..... \$1,000 ..	10 807	1.1			

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>LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE</b>			<b>FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION</b>		
Total cropland . . . . . farms . . . . .	31 544	.5	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) . . . . . farms . . . . .	26 050	.5
Harvested cropland . . . . . acres . . . . .	12 049 099	.3	Partnership . . . . . farms . . . . .	9 404 219	.4
Cropland: . . . . . acres . . . . .	30 984	.5	Corporation: . . . . . acres . . . . .	3 780	.7
Pasture or grazing only . . . . . farms . . . . .	11 366 961	.3	Family held . . . . . farms . . . . .	2 086 852	.4
Total woodland . . . . . acres . . . . .	9 654	.6	More than 10 stockholders . . . . . acres . . . . .	2 439	.7
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured . . . . . farms . . . . .	405 894	.7	10 or less stockholders . . . . . farms . . . . .	1 911 139	.3
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. . . . . farms . . . . .	16 038	.5	Other than family held . . . . . acres . . . . .	53	3.1
Irrigated land . . . . . acres . . . . .	822 500	.6	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. . . . . farms . . . . .	2 386	.7
Harvested cropland irrigated . . . . . farms . . . . .	4 937	.6	More than 10 stockholders . . . . . acres . . . . .	169	2.0
Pasture and other land irrigated . . . . . farms . . . . .	231 376	.7	10 or less stockholders . . . . . farms . . . . .	62 891	1.9
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs . . . . . farms . . . . .	21 756	.5	Less than 150 days . . . . . farms . . . . .	20	4.6
Reserve Programs . . . . . acres . . . . .	434 828	.5	150 days or more . . . . . farms . . . . .	149	2.1
Estimated market value of land and buildings . . . . . farms . . . . .	1 426	.7	Less than 150 days . . . . . workers . . . . .	167	2.3
Average per farm . . . . . \$1,000 . . . . .	247 837	.7	150 days or more . . . . . workers . . . . .	72 102	1.4
Average per acre . . . . . dollars . . . . .	1 415	.5			
	246 393	.5	<b>HIRED FARM LABOR<sup>1</sup></b>		
	31	4.8	Hired workers by days worked: . . . . . farms . . . . .	5 213	2.1
	1 444	4.3	150 days or more . . . . . workers . . . . .	13 402	1.6
			Less than 150 days . . . . . farms . . . . .	11 499	1.6
			Less than 150 days . . . . . workers . . . . .	40 364	2.1
			<b>INJURIES AND DEATHS</b>		
			Farm-related injuries: . . . . . farms . . . . .	406	1.5
			Operator and family members . . . . . number . . . . .	457	1.5
			Hired workers . . . . . farms . . . . .	194	1.4
			Hired workers . . . . . number . . . . .	511	.8
			Farm-related deaths: . . . . . farms . . . . .	18	—
			Operator and family members . . . . . number . . . . .	(D)	(D)
			Hired workers . . . . . farms . . . . .	4	—
			Hired workers . . . . . number . . . . .	(D)	(D)
			<b>FARMS BY SIZE</b>		
			1 to 9 acres . . . . .	1 008	1.1
			10 to 49 acres . . . . .	2 519	.8
			50 to 69 acres . . . . .	1 468	.9
			70 to 99 acres . . . . .	3 074	.8
			100 to 139 acres . . . . .	3 412	.8
			140 to 179 acres . . . . .	2 704	.9
			180 to 219 acres . . . . .	2 032	.9
			220 to 259 acres . . . . .	1 694	1.0
			260 to 499 acres . . . . .	6 062	.7
			500 to 999 acres . . . . .	5 182	.6
			1,000 to 1,999 acres . . . . .	2 738	.2
			2,000 acres or more . . . . .	712	—
			<b>FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM</b>		
			Oilseed and grain farming (1111) . . . . .	21 680	.5
			Vegetable and melon farming (1112) . . . . .	249	1.8
			Fruit and tree nut farming (1113) . . . . .	124	2.7
			Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114) . . . . .	604	1.3
			Other crop farming (1119) . . . . .	1 693	.8
			Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111) . . . . .	1 813	.8
			Cattle feedlots (112112) . . . . .	757	1.2
			Dairy cattle and milk production (11212) . . . . .	1 832	.8
			Hog and pig farming (1122) . . . . .	2 868	.6
			Poultry and egg production (1123) . . . . .	521	.9
			Sheep and goat farming (1124) . . . . .	59	3.9
			Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129) . . . . .	405	1.6
			<b>LIVESTOCK</b>		
			Cattle and calves inventory . . . . . farms . . . . .	12 402	.6
			Beef cows . . . . . number . . . . .	803 565	.4
			Milk cows . . . . . farms . . . . .	7 207	.6
			Hogs and pigs inventory . . . . . number . . . . .	193 482	.6
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory . . . . . farms . . . . .	2 733	.7
			Sheep and lambs sold . . . . . number . . . . .	130 124	.5
			Cattle and calves sold . . . . . farms . . . . .	12 272	.5
			Hogs and pigs sold . . . . . number . . . . .	590 195	.4
			Sheep and lambs sold . . . . . \$1,000 . . . . .	303 477	.3
			Horses and ponies inventory . . . . . farms . . . . .	5 382	.5
			Horses and ponies sold . . . . . number . . . . .	3 946 202	.2
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory . . . . . farms . . . . .	5 610	.5
			Sheep and lambs sold . . . . . number . . . . .	7 555 519	.2
			Horses and ponies inventory . . . . . \$1,000 . . . . .	840 510	.2
			Horses and ponies sold . . . . . farms . . . . .	862	1.1
			Horses and ponies sold . . . . . number . . . . .	32 039	2.0
			Average age of operator . . . . . years . . . . .	809	1.1
				29 667	3.1
				3 483	.7
				26 399	1.0
				1 001	1.1
				6 971	1.5

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) .....	811	1.1	Oats for grain .....	1 436	.9
Layers 20 weeks old and older .....	22 703 080	.2	..... farms..	21 099	1.1
..... farms..	781	1.1	..... bushels..	1 321 298	1.1
..... farms..	20 588 629	.2	Tobacco .....	1 167	.8
..... number..			..... farms..	7 287	1.1
..... number..			..... acres..	15 188 332	1.2
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold .....	129	2.6	Soybeans for beans .....	24 329	.5
..... farms..	10 382 586	2.1	..... farms..	4 933 262	.3
..... number..			..... acres..	208 333 338	.3
			..... bushels..	77	3.0
			Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes .....	4 012	.4
			..... farms..	1 006 706	.3
			..... acres..		
			..... cwt..		
<b>SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED</b>			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass		
Corn for grain or seed .....	26 009	.5	silage, green chop, etc. (see text) .....	12 385	.6
..... farms..	5 401 784	.3	..... farms..	483 373	.5
..... acres..	645 996 189	.3	..... acres..	1 355 148	.5
..... bushels..	3 048	.7	Alfalfa hay .....	8 849	.6
Corn for silage or green chop .....	98 919	.5	..... farms..	260 786	.6
..... farms..	1 593 950	.6	..... acres..	849 142	.6
..... acres..	9 679	.5	..... tons, dry..	757	1.1
..... tons, green..	532 868	.4	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) .....	29 282	.7
..... farms..	28 703 750	.4	..... farms..	193	2.1
..... acres..			Land in orchards .....	4 430	2.5
..... bushels..			..... farms..		
			..... acres..		

<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 .....	-7.7	1.1	-11.1	1.3
Land in farms .....	-3.3	.9	-4.0	.9
Average size of farm .....	4.8	1.6	8.1	1.9
Estimated market value of land and buildings <sup>1</sup> :				
Average per farm .....	53.9	2.6	57.5	3.0
Average per acre .....	48.0	2.4	47.2	2.4
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment <sup>1</sup> :				
Average per farm .....	15.5	2.1	20.8	2.5
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres .....	-18.6	1.2	-27.1	1.6
10 to 49 acres .....	-1.7	1.3	3.4	1.9
50 to 179 acres .....	-6.4	.8	-11.0	1.0
180 to 499 acres .....	-14.1	1.1	-16.8	1.1
500 to 999 acres .....	-12.2	1.1	-12.7	1.0
1,000 to 1,999 acres .....	2.5	.2	2.4	.2
2,000 acres or more .....	37.1	-	36.9	-
Total cropland .....	-8.4	1.1	-10.6	1.3
Harvested cropland .....	-3.9	.9	-3.9	.9
Irrigated land .....	-12.2	1.1	-10.2	1.3
Average per farm .....	-1.0	.9	-3	.9
Market value of agricultural products sold .....	12.9	.8	13.5	.8
Average per farm .....	22.4	1.7	27.7	2.1
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops .....	20.3	.9	21.2	.9
Livestock, poultry, and their products .....	2.5	.6	2.8	.5
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than \$2,500 .....	16.4	1.3	(X)	(X)
\$2,500 to \$4,999 .....	-16.6	1.2	(X)	(X)
\$5,000 to \$9,999 .....	-18.3	1.2	(X)	(X)
\$10,000 to \$24,999 .....	-17.7	1.2	-17.7	1.2
\$25,000 to \$49,999 .....	-17.0	1.3	-17.0	1.3
\$50,000 to \$99,999 .....	-14.4	1.7	-14.4	1.7
\$100,000 to \$249,999 .....	-11.6	1.2	-11.6	1.2
\$250,000 to \$499,999 .....	7.1	-	7.1	-
\$500,000 or more .....	51.9	-	51.9	-
Total farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> .....	10.1	.9	10.4	.9
Average per farm .....	19.3	1.8	24.2	2.1
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) <sup>1</sup> .....	-7.7	1.2	-11.1	1.3
Average per farm .....	21.0	1.6	21.8	1.6
Average per farm .....	31.1	2.4	37.0	2.7
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming .....	-14.4	1.0	-14.7	1.1
Other .....	-1.0	1.3	-3.7	1.8
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any .....	-4.1	1.3	-6.7	1.7
200 days or more .....	-4.0	1.3	-5.8	1.8
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory .....	-11.4	1.1	-15.3	1.2
number .....	-12.3	.9	-14.1	.9
Beef cows .....	-9.6	1.1	-13.4	1.3
number .....	-5.5	1.2	-7.8	1.3
Milk cows .....	-18.7	1.3	-20.5	1.3
number .....	-8.9	1.0	-9.1	1.0
Cattle and calves sold .....	-10.9	1.1	-15.1	1.2
number .....	-12.6	.7	-14.6	.7
Hogs and pigs inventory .....	-46.3	.7	-44.5	.8
number .....	-14.0	.5	-13.2	.5
Hogs and pigs sold .....	-47.3	.7	-44.8	.8
number .....	-13.4	.6	-12.7	.6
Sheep and lambs inventory .....	-24.5	1.1	-31.5	1.3
number .....	-25.1	1.5	-28.1	1.9
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text) .....	-21.4	1.1	-22.6	1.4
number .....	2.1	.3	2.2	.3
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold .....	8.5	3.5	-	3.7
number .....	-50.7	1.1	-50.7	1.1
Selected crops harvested:				
Corn for grain or seed .....	-17.2	1.1	-13.3	1.3
acres .....	-6.1	.8	-5.4	.8
bushels .....	-19.0	.6	-18.6	.6
Corn for silage or green chop .....	-16.7	1.2	-18.0	1.2
acres .....	-7.6	1.0	-8.1	1.0
tons, green .....	-15.7	.9	-15.9	.9
Wheat for grain .....	-17.6	1.1	-14.3	1.2
acres .....	.5	.9	2.3	.9
bushels .....	16.6	1.0	18.2	1.0
Oats for grain .....	-40.1	.9	-40.5	1.0
acres .....	-43.3	.9	-43.6	.9
bushels .....	-44.5	.8	-44.8	.9
Soybeans for beans .....	-16.4	1.1	-10.7	1.3
acres .....	5.8	.9	7.2	1.0
bushels .....	8.0	.9	9.1	.9
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) .....	-5.7	1.1	-10.7	1.3
acres .....	-1.7	1.2	-5.9	1.2
tons, dry .....	2.6	1.2	-3.6	1.2
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) .....	-13.6	1.4	-10.5	1.7
acres .....	-11.0	1.1	-10.3	1.1

<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>Indiana</b> .....	<b>57 916</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>15 111 022</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>532 663</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>3 709 854</b>	<b>.8</b>
Adams .....	1 093	.6	208 653	.9	191	1.1	386 965	4.8	60 678	5.0
Allen .....	1 440	.7	276 385	.9	192	1.1	487 172	5.5	72 163	5.3
Bartholomew .....	577	.3	166 612	.6	289	.7	673 626	6.0	45 681	3.6
Benton .....	433	.5	256 820	.6	593	.7	1 377 939	3.7	65 444	7.2
Blackford .....	303	.5	85 958	1.1	284	1.2	475 311	4.4	18 174	6.2
Boone .....	611	.5	228 328	.7	374	.8	912 026	2.2	50 623	4.6
Brown .....	173	.4	21 707	2.6	125	2.7	286 938	5.9	4 320	6.1
Carroll .....	563	.3	218 170	.4	388	.5	892 164	2.7	52 946	2.8
Cass .....	700	.5	205 380	.8	293	.9	608 898	6.1	43 635	4.2
Clark .....	647	.4	108 773	.9	168	1.0	378 203	7.9	21 392	8.5
Clay .....	520	.4	159 441	.9	307	1.0	489 489	4.9	34 248	6.6
Clinton .....	585	.4	236 320	.6	404	.7	877 712	4.3	66 330	5.2
Crawford .....	410	.5	61 320	1.3	150	1.4	219 120	9.8	8 469	8.3
Daviess .....	1 101	.6	217 131	.8	197	1.0	361 590	3.0	64 546	5.0
Dearborn .....	679	.4	81 383	1.1	120	1.2	315 397	8.9	16 807	11.1
Decatur .....	654	.5	198 614	.7	304	.9	686 923	3.2	53 798	6.2
De Kalb .....	785	.4	162 936	.8	208	.9	354 733	5.1	33 977	8.6
Delaware .....	635	.4	173 443	.7	273	.8	585 061	3.1	40 985	4.3
Dubois .....	812	.3	191 053	.6	235	.7	393 152	4.0	49 468	4.0
Elkhart .....	1 335	.4	182 771	.7	137	.9	376 179	4.4	63 882	4.9
Fayette .....	420	.7	106 737	1.4	254	1.6	454 627	6.6	22 357	9.0
Floyd .....	310	.4	28 708	2.2	93	2.3	345 271	10.4	9 407	22.6
Fountain .....	550	.5	204 554	.9	372	1.0	756 142	5.2	54 646	8.2
Franklin .....	776	.4	138 635	.9	179	1.0	350 732	7.1	36 811	9.0
Fulton .....	622	.5	170 645	.8	274	.9	414 617	4.2	42 306	5.1
Gibson .....	579	.3	232 839	.5	402	.6	744 849	3.9	59 664	5.6
Grant .....	575	.3	192 292	.6	334	.7	766 578	3.2	56 591	6.6
Greene .....	878	.4	205 628	.8	234	.9	326 884	4.9	41 230	7.8
Hamilton .....	591	.5	140 813	.8	238	.9	788 291	5.2	36 434	4.7
Hancock .....	549	.5	163 704	.7	298	.8	820 486	2.8	48 254	5.1
Harrison .....	1 108	.4	161 378	.8	146	.9	247 454	4.9	41 209	5.4
Hendricks .....	631	.5	167 228	.7	265	.8	756 625	6.3	42 201	6.4
Henry .....	770	.5	177 601	.9	231	1.0	434 342	5.0	36 392	3.6
Howard .....	486	.4	147 750	.7	304	.8	773 005	3.8	39 164	5.3
Huntington .....	651	.5	184 137	.8	283	.9	516 640	4.2	52 236	5.8
Jackson .....	809	.5	201 006	.9	248	1.1	442 245	5.6	52 408	5.7
Jasper .....	618	.4	282 915	.6	458	.7	812 357	3.7	58 650	5.3
Jay .....	839	.5	179 794	.8	214	1.0	388 377	4.1	38 505	4.2
Jefferson .....	796	.5	126 379	.9	159	1.1	232 524	4.3	27 830	6.2
Jennings .....	605	.5	130 373	1.1	215	1.2	322 546	7.3	38 771	10.2
Johnson .....	526	.5	135 563	1.0	258	1.2	723 711	4.6	34 806	7.6
Knox .....	584	.4	280 628	.6	481	.7	945 362	4.9	65 687	3.4
Kosciusko .....	1 130	.4	246 907	.6	219	.7	401 682	4.0	55 967	3.6
Lagrange .....	1 392	.5	189 932	.8	136	.9	331 512	4.1	50 585	4.6
Lake .....	442	.4	148 872	.8	337	.9	936 590	8.7	28 693	7.5
La Porte .....	749	.5	247 756	.7	331	.9	735 780	3.7	67 913	3.7
Lawrence .....	875	.4	170 811	1.2	195	1.2	257 659	10.5	34 686	14.2
Madison .....	738	.4	223 751	.7	303	.8	744 224	3.6	60 811	6.0
Marion .....	225	.5	29 034	1.9	129	2.0	679 205	8.9	9 337	5.1
Marshall .....	865	.5	201 637	.9	233	1.0	439 129	4.3	44 428	5.6
Martin .....	335	.5	70 105	1.4	209	1.5	316 036	13.3	13 526	9.4
Miami .....	678	.3	197 198	.6	291	.7	551 451	3.8	44 019	3.5
Monroe .....	473	.4	62 149	1.5	131	1.6	295 504	10.5	13 017	8.2
Montgomery .....	681	.4	273 258	.6	401	.7	781 847	4.3	60 348	6.7
Morgan .....	601	.5	133 958	1.0	223	1.1	556 216	6.7	32 549	8.2
Newton .....	381	.5	207 315	.7	544	.8	1 055 528	4.4	48 106	8.1
Noble .....	942	.4	181 963	1.0	193	1.1	354 512	3.5	42 051	6.5
Ohio .....	252	.6	29 880	1.4	119	1.5	235 744	6.0	5 386	7.4
Orange .....	531	.6	123 343	1.3	232	1.4	262 223	6.4	22 644	8.1
Owen .....	569	.5	107 265	1.2	189	1.3	325 083	12.8	19 482	9.5
Parke .....	471	.5	188 816	.9	401	1.0	691 386	5.7	34 431	8.2
Perry .....	484	.4	84 251	1.2	174	1.3	230 083	7.8	17 005	13.1
Pike .....	288	.5	84 237	1.4	292	1.5	377 386	11.9	17 070	11.5
Porter .....	476	.4	134 505	.8	283	.9	651 204	4.6	34 046	7.8
Posey .....	437	.5	195 305	.7	447	.9	739 931	3.4	60 880	4.9
Pulaski .....	531	.5	236 332	.7	445	.8	727 287	3.3	51 212	8.4
Putnam .....	794	.5	195 377	.8	246	.9	518 222	5.2	37 884	4.6
Randolph .....	851	.4	223 817	.7	263	.8	485 559	5.2	56 884	5.2
Ripley .....	821	.5	159 460	.9	194	1.0	347 165	6.2	39 412	5.7
Rush .....	663	.8	227 874	.8	344	1.1	835 721	3.0	56 050	5.2
St. Joseph .....	666	.4	154 142	.7	231	.8	537 115	7.2	45 757	6.2
Scott .....	348	.7	57 372	1.5	165	1.7	298 828	8.7	12 282	8.2
Shelby .....	641	.4	200 661	.7	313	.8	794 434	2.9	59 227	6.7
Spencer .....	638	.5	172 687	.8	271	.9	411 276	4.1	44 156	3.8
Starke .....	410	.5	135 643	.8	331	.9	522 279	6.8	31 980	9.8
Steuben .....	581	.5	123 953	1.0	213	1.1	380 311	5.2	24 097	4.8
Sullivan .....	473	.5	176 895	.8	374	.9	603 165	3.9	42 625	6.8
Switzerland .....	541	.6	67 881	1.4	125	1.5	238 061	6.6	13 692	8.4
Tippecanoe .....	665	.4	241 539	.7	363	.8	955 334	4.0	49 451	4.5
Tipton .....	415	.4	158 440	.7	382	.8	1 093 274	4.3	48 037	5.2
Union .....	268	.5	82 500	1.3	308	1.4	562 855	4.6	21 272	7.4
Vanderburgh .....	271	.4	72 112	1.1	266	1.2	661 549	9.1	21 601	12.4
Vermillion .....	249	.3	118 065	.8	474	.9	728 321	13.8	27 302	14.0
Vigo .....	455	.5	114 889	1.2	253	1.3	532 292	5.0	30 290	9.7

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	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)
Wabash.....	762	.5	188 230	.8	247	.9	545 956	5.6	67 972	9.1
Warren.....	378	.5	184 653	.7	489	.9	936 710	4.0	41 121	4.6
Warrick.....	356	.4	98 549	1.2	277	1.2	494 724	6.5	25 306	7.5
Washington.....	914	.4	181 298	.9	198	1.0	269 647	5.0	37 918	6.5
Wayne.....	814	.5	172 860	.9	212	1.0	411 831	4.2	43 798	5.5
Wells.....	660	.3	195 901	.6	297	.7	651 072	4.8	58 331	6.8
White.....	620	.5	272 072	.5	439	.7	957 254	3.8	63 220	4.2
Whitley.....	787	.5	165 067	.8	210	1.0	393 792	5.3	38 876	6.8
	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>			
							Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>Indiana.....</b>	<b>64 050</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>5 229 977</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>90 303</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>57 922</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>4 011 772</b>	<b>.4</b>
Adams.....	55 515	5.1	95 237	.6	87 134	.9	1 093	.7	82 215	1.9
Allen.....	50 148	5.4	89 877	.8	62 414	1.0	1 439	.8	60 745	1.9
Bartholomew.....	79 308	3.7	46 702	.6	80 939	.7	576	.7	34 427	3.1
Benton.....	150 793	7.3	79 373	.5	183 310	.7	434	.8	51 356	3.4
Blackford.....	59 979	6.3	25 295	.9	83 481	1.0	303	1.0	19 207	3.0
Boone.....	82 988	4.7	81 519	.5	133 419	.7	610	.7	60 028	1.6
Brown.....	24 547	6.4	2 203	1.9	12 733	2.0	176	1.8	2 002	4.8
Carroll.....	93 876	2.8	116 937	.3	207 704	.4	564	.5	83 763	1.0
Cass.....	62 425	4.3	77 559	.5	110 799	.7	699	.7	56 196	2.0
Clark.....	33 012	8.5	21 878	1.0	33 815	1.1	648	.6	16 770	5.2
Clay.....	65 862	6.6	42 549	.8	81 824	.9	520	.8	32 276	3.0
Clinton.....	113 385	5.2	106 004	.4	181 203	.6	585	.6	75 387	2.5
Crawford.....	20 655	8.3	3 502	2.9	8 541	2.9	410	.8	3 975	7.4
Daviess.....	58 678	5.0	117 889	.5	107 075	.7	1 101	.7	107 796	1.3
Dearborn.....	24 752	11.2	8 965	2.2	13 203	2.3	679	.7	6 642	9.7
Decatur.....	82 386	6.2	82 874	.5	126 719	.7	653	.7	63 221	2.3
De Kalb.....	43 283	8.6	38 669	.8	49 261	.9	785	.7	28 864	3.0
Delaware.....	64 544	4.3	52 625	.6	82 874	.7	635	.6	39 876	2.3
Dubois.....	60 997	4.0	144 151	.3	177 526	.4	811	.6	137 339	.9
Elkhart.....	47 851	4.9	124 038	.5	92 912	.7	1 335	.6	96 862	1.8
Fayette.....	53 230	9.0	26 419	1.4	62 903	1.6	420	1.0	20 781	3.9
Floyd.....	30 247	22.6	3 716	3.0	11 986	3.0	311	.8	2 852	9.6
Fountain.....	99 357	8.3	49 371	.8	89 765	1.0	550	.7	40 388	2.9
Franklin.....	47 376	9.0	31 237	1.0	40 253	1.1	777	.7	23 593	3.9
Fulton.....	68 016	5.2	55 452	.7	89 151	.8	622	.7	40 923	3.4
Gibson.....	103 047	5.6	69 056	.4	119 268	.6	579	.6	50 020	2.1
Grant.....	98 419	6.7	62 549	.5	108 781	.6	575	.6	43 229	2.9
Greene.....	46 959	7.9	77 483	.4	88 249	.5	878	.6	67 192	1.3
Hamilton.....	61 752	4.7	59 491	.5	100 662	.7	590	.7	42 544	2.8
Hancock.....	88 055	5.1	55 797	.6	101 634	.8	548	.8	39 294	1.9
Harrison.....	37 158	5.5	46 049	.5	41 561	.7	1 109	.6	41 536	1.9
Hendricks.....	67 092	6.5	49 154	.6	77 899	.8	629	.6	37 945	2.7
Henry.....	47 323	3.7	52 177	.8	67 763	1.0	769	.7	38 875	3.4
Howard.....	80 585	5.3	62 587	.6	128 779	.7	486	.7	39 899	2.3
Huntington.....	80 239	5.8	69 752	.6	107 146	.7	651	.7	46 742	1.8
Jackson.....	64 622	5.7	92 711	.5	114 599	.7	811	.6	93 578	1.1
Jasper.....	94 749	5.4	111 015	.4	179 636	.6	619	.6	76 403	1.6
Jay.....	45 894	4.2	83 241	.5	99 215	.7	839	.6	74 367	1.8
Jefferson.....	34 963	6.3	23 445	1.2	29 453	1.3	796	.7	18 014	4.0
Jennings.....	63 873	10.2	45 214	.7	74 734	.9	607	.7	40 577	4.4
Johnson.....	66 297	7.7	46 342	.7	88 103	.8	525	.7	34 050	3.3
Knox.....	112 477	3.5	101 195	.4	173 280	.5	584	.6	75 737	1.6
Kosciusko.....	49 573	3.6	146 062	.3	129 259	.5	1 129	.5	123 303	.9
Lagrange.....	36 366	4.6	103 278	.5	74 194	.7	1 391	.6	83 668	1.5
Lake.....	64 917	7.5	47 827	.7	108 206	.8	442	.6	34 712	5.9
La Porte.....	90 551	3.8	95 814	.5	127 922	.7	750	.7	71 666	1.4
Lawrence.....	39 641	14.2	22 317	1.0	25 506	1.1	875	.6	20 308	5.5
Madison.....	82 399	6.1	77 512	.6	105 030	.7	738	.6	55 411	2.1
Marion.....	41 681	5.2	32 681	.5	145 247	.8	224	1.0	17 298	3.4
Marshall.....	51 362	5.7	62 187	.8	71 892	.9	865	.7	44 444	2.7
Martin.....	40 375	9.4	23 997	1.0	71 632	1.1	335	.8	21 446	6.0
Miami.....	64 925	3.5	74 763	.5	110 270	.6	678	.6	58 182	2.6
Monroe.....	27 404	8.2	8 406	1.8	17 771	1.8	475	.7	7 550	10.9
Montgomery.....	88 486	6.8	85 081	.5	124 935	.6	682	.6	62 899	2.8
Morgan.....	54 159	8.2	34 315	.9	57 096	1.1	601	.8	24 078	5.1
Newton.....	125 932	8.1	84 301	.5	221 262	.7	382	.7	56 869	2.4
Noble.....	44 688	6.5	58 841	.8	62 464	.9	941	.6	40 698	2.5
Ohio.....	21 371	7.5	3 764	2.2	14 935	2.3	252	1.0	3 217	10.8
Orange.....	42 644	8.2	22 143	1.2	41 700	1.3	531	.7	18 636	6.0

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	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)		
Owen .....	34 238	9.5	16 417	1.2	28 853	1.3	569	.6	13 727	8.1		
Parke .....	73 101	8.3	43 384	.8	92 110	.9	471	.7	35 997	5.3		
Perry .....	35 133	13.1	13 184	1.4	27 240	1.4	484	.7	11 323	8.4		
Pike .....	59 271	11.5	20 050	1.2	69 620	1.3	288	.7	17 205	8.6		
Porter .....	71 227	7.8	42 227	.8	88 712	.9	478	.8	28 314	3.4		
Posey .....	139 313	5.0	59 770	.6	136 774	.8	437	.8	42 529	2.1		
Pulaski .....	96 445	8.5	98 057	.4	184 665	.7	531	.7	73 362	1.8		
Putnam .....	47 773	4.7	48 773	.7	61 427	.9	793	.7	38 645	2.6		
Randolph .....	66 923	5.3	67 766	.6	79 631	.8	850	.6	51 795	2.2		
Ripley .....	48 005	5.8	56 909	.6	69 317	.8	821	.7	50 662	2.1		
Rush .....	84 539	5.3	85 928	.7	129 605	1.0	663	.8	60 643	2.1		
St. Joseph .....	68 498	6.2	55 178	.6	82 849	.7	668	.6	40 479	2.8		
Scott .....	35 091	8.3	9 183	1.5	26 388	1.6	350	1.0	8 399	8.9		
Shelby .....	92 397	6.7	66 936	.6	104 425	.7	641	.7	46 281	3.1		
Spencer .....	69 319	3.8	51 896	.7	81 341	.8	637	.7	41 617	1.7		
Starke .....	77 999	9.9	33 138	.7	80 825	.9	410	.8	23 611	3.7		
Steuben .....	41 475	4.8	25 641	1.2	44 133	1.3	581	.7	20 288	5.6		
Sullivan .....	90 116	6.9	43 806	.7	92 614	.9	473	.8	33 063	2.7		
Switzerland .....	25 308	8.4	13 331	1.7	24 641	1.8	541	.8	9 260	7.3		
Tippecanoe .....	74 251	4.5	79 502	.5	119 552	.7	666	.7	60 210	3.0		
Tipton .....	115 473	5.3	65 838	.5	158 646	.7	416	.7	44 779	2.2		
Union .....	79 670	7.4	25 709	1.1	95 929	1.2	267	1.1	17 617	3.3		
Vanderburgh .....	80 005	12.4	20 875	1.0	77 030	1.1	270	1.0	16 303	8.2		
Vermillion .....	109 646	14.0	30 490	.7	122 449	.7	249	.7	24 988	7.6		
Vigo .....	66 718	9.7	26 017	1.1	57 180	1.2	454	.8	20 484	4.4		
Wabash .....	89 320	9.1	97 747	.5	128 276	.7	761	.7	74 384	1.6		
Warren .....	108 499	4.7	57 996	.5	153 429	.7	379	.8	41 617	2.4		
Warrick .....	71 083	7.5	23 671	1.2	66 491	1.3	356	.8	20 020	5.8		
Washington .....	41 440	6.6	40 119	.7	43 894	.8	915	.6	35 631	2.2		
Wayne .....	53 872	5.5	51 021	.8	62 680	.9	813	.6	39 326	3.0		
Wells .....	88 380	6.8	74 294	.5	112 567	.6	660	.6	51 711	2.3		
White .....	101 804	4.3	118 603	.4	191 296	.6	621	.7	88 137	1.7		
Whitley .....	49 398	6.9	51 930	.7	65 985	.9	787	.7	37 495	3.6		
Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —Con.												
Geographic area	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>Indiana</b> .....	<b>14 780</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>282 253</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>25 765</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>818 113</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>38 483</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>254 268</b>	<b>.7</b>
Adams .....	497	8.1	8 800	9.9	627	5.3	30 284	3.7	765	3.7	3 341	6.3
Allen .....	289	11.6	6 239	5.3	463	8.9	8 781	11.7	1 035	2.8	4 829	6.7
Bartholomew .....	150	13.6	918	2.8	244	9.8	2 458	10.6	432	4.6	3 083	6.4
Benton .....	49	37.2	738	16.5	84	27.0	916	12.4	404	3.0	4 513	3.9
Blackford .....	58	16.7	1 142	11.6	109	13.4	2 525	7.0	200	3.4	1 428	6.1
Boone .....	192	11.8	2 430	8.1	287	8.7	6 614	2.2	420	4.7	4 223	3.1
Brown .....	34	15.3	110	5.8	82	8.5	308	3.7	72	8.0	92	18.8
Carroll .....	184	11.7	6 717	2.7	255	9.3	20 512	2.3	428	4.0	4 299	3.0
Cass .....	192	12.9	3 527	3.9	364	8.5	8 709	8.1	489	4.1	3 748	4.2
Clark .....	135	18.1	755	8.4	324	9.3	1 266	3.9	335	7.2	1 326	7.7
Clay .....	160	13.6	1 972	7.3	254	9.3	6 578	3.4	385	4.5	2 371	5.8
Clinton .....	140	16.0	3 781	4.2	224	11.8	17 575	1.3	483	3.5	4 731	4.4
Crawford .....	86	22.6	238	28.9	215	9.2	588	18.6	147	14.7	97	14.7
Daviess .....	467	6.9	10 054	3.4	683	5.0	50 466	2.0	695	4.7	3 172	6.6
Dearborn .....	118	20.5	468	46.5	378	8.9	834	32.5	271	10.2	284	17.0
Decatur .....	262	9.7	5 006	3.7	316	8.6	11 975	4.4	519	3.5	3 719	5.2
De Kalb .....	153	15.7	1 901	15.2	268	11.2	4 680	7.4	425	4.4	2 127	5.6
Delaware .....	122	17.3	1 486	35.1	188	13.0	2 987	10.2	428	5.2	3 562	6.4
Dubois .....	341	7.3	14 686	3.2	540	5.1	81 418	1.1	516	5.1	2 651	5.0
Elkhart .....	664	6.1	11 021	8.7	920	3.8	34 576	3.6	849	3.9	2 902	5.6
Fayette .....	98	20.4	1 429	13.7	225	10.8	2 366	13.4	271	7.4	1 323	8.3
Floyd .....	41	33.5	266	59.9	148	14.3	236	18.8	150	14.0	119	12.8
Fountain .....	115	19.1	738	18.5	195	13.2	2 610	20.4	405	5.1	3 731	5.6
Franklin .....	243	11.9	1 454	20.5	419	7.9	4 097	10.8	513	4.6	1 537	7.4
Fulton .....	204	13.3	2 638	11.7	262	10.9	5 028	4.0	519	3.8	2 979	4.8
Gibson .....	139	15.5	1 954	11.5	210	11.6	4 850	5.2	457	4.1	4 458	2.8
Grant .....	70	22.0	1 314	2.2	161	14.9	2 846	3.6	402	4.2	3 859	4.3
Greene .....	170	15.5	5 168	5.2	470	6.9	31 905	.6	412	6.6	2 026	9.2
Hamilton .....	114	20.5	943	30.6	283	10.8	2 931	11.1	377	4.9	3 967	4.4
Hancock .....	154	14.4	997	9.5	228	8.8	3 686	2.5	405	4.3	3 349	5.0
Harrison .....	282	11.0	5 044	3.0	536	6.3	17 215	3.4	514	6.1	1 295	10.2
Hendricks .....	127	19.2	957	12.6	277	11.0	2 915	4.9	447	5.1	3 265	5.2
Henry .....	192	15.1	2 070	6.8	322	10.2	2 349	19.1	562	3.9	3 341	3.2
Howard .....	93	19.1	2 409	15.3	222	10.1	6 910	6.7	419	3.2	2 817	4.6

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)
Huntington	124	17.2	3 657	2.3	239	11.1	5 275	9.8	453	5.2	3 393	3.8
Jackson	229	11.9	6 281	9.4	459	5.9	23 004	2.1	521	4.0	3 493	7.9
Jasper	119	16.8	6 903	3.5	157	13.7	11 954	4.2	523	2.8	5 009	4.4
Jay	237	10.0	8 059	4.0	297	8.6	32 382	1.8	563	4.2	2 891	4.6
Jefferson	121	19.5	417	29.0	389	8.1	1 289	8.1	493	4.5	1 427	4.7
Jennings	164	15.2	5 129	4.2	337	7.9	12 010	1.5	309	7.5	1 788	13.6
Johnson	129	19.1	1 154	9.5	209	11.8	2 262	5.6	368	6.1	2 367	4.9
Knox	145	14.3	7 547	2.9	232	11.1	8 997	3.0	468	4.4	6 101	3.3
Kosciusko	335	9.4	10 466	2.7	555	6.8	47 207	1.7	677	3.9	3 899	4.5
Lagrange	808	4.8	13 261	4.8	1 024	3.1	23 338	4.1	983	3.5	2 490	6.1
Lake	79	24.4	1 070	39.6	178	14.4	2 094	17.7	298	6.6	3 007	6.7
La Porte	136	17.1	2 981	4.9	262	11.1	8 454	2.7	548	4.3	4 566	2.3
Lawrence	257	12.3	3 283	4.9	533	6.1	2 550	7.4	329	8.4	1 202	13.0
Madison	134	17.0	2 140	8.1	221	11.7	1 986	3.4	581	3.9	7 188	2.7
Marion	35	31.8	170	20.6	80	15.8	1 068	7.3	143	8.6	1 354	4.7
Marshall	171	15.2	1 515	9.2	278	11.4	4 929	8.2	613	3.1	3 033	3.4
Martin	118	19.2	1 761	17.1	204	10.6	10 369	4.2	197	6.3	726	12.8
Miami	209	12.2	4 893	23.6	346	8.2	10 346	6.0	540	3.5	3 526	5.3
Monroe	169	13.2	660	35.9	291	8.3	965	27.8	220	9.6	435	23.1
Montgomery	179	13.3	3 981	12.8	297	9.5	9 757	10.8	489	4.6	5 141	4.3
Morgan	160	14.9	1 162	13.3	315	8.7	1 783	4.7	382	6.1	2 152	8.4
Newton	70	22.7	4 537	3.4	116	16.2	12 261	2.7	335	3.4	3 612	4.6
Noble	272	11.7	2 885	11.6	400	8.0	6 112	7.0	626	3.8	2 903	7.7
Ohio	30	32.6	323	68.7	123	11.9	5 214	17.5	152	8.4	176	7.5
Orange	111	19.7	1 772	34.1	228	10.7	5 134	3.6	211	9.5	977	10.8
Owen	154	15.9	1 499	9.2	314	9.1	1 752	8.0	253	9.1	1 043	16.0
Parke	121	16.9	2 084	19.1	212	10.7	2 289	8.3	333	4.2	2 838	5.7
Perry	132	15.9	1 086	6.0	304	7.6	2 945	7.5	280	7.2	460	29.9
Pike	72	29.5	606	13.9	100	25.1	4 192	6.2	208	10.7	1 227	15.8
Porter	68	23.5	551	9.9	109	17.9	1 616	20.5	359	4.8	2 461	5.3
Posey	80	19.7	1 267	9.6	143	13.7	3 876	2.7	347	3.6	4 494	3.0
Pulaski	110	16.9	4 325	1.4	186	12.9	15 851	5.1	407	4.1	4 323	5.9
Putnam	238	12.8	1 917	11.6	413	8.2	4 555	3.9	444	5.9	3 534	9.4
Randolph	167	13.0	2 360	8.2	284	10.3	8 415	9.1	630	3.5	4 054	5.7
Ripley	239	11.5	10 624	2.6	433	6.5	11 049	2.7	547	4.5	2 513	5.6
Rush	229	9.9	5 080	9.1	344	7.1	8 208	4.5	518	4.1	4 461	4.4
St. Joseph	99	24.5	630	2.4	198	15.1	4 397	8.2	490	3.9	2 843	5.1
Scott	73	23.8	87	35.1	163	14.0	191	27.3	191	8.9	761	11.7
Shelby	127	16.3	1 383	6.5	231	11.3	3 048	6.9	480	4.1	4 115	3.3
Spencer	204	11.9	3 480	5.7	268	10.2	10 242	4.8	420	6.3	2 564	4.3
Starke	44	31.1	240	20.4	101	20.1	497	29.4	237	9.1	1 881	4.5
Steuben	56	25.5	1 041	11.0	179	14.8	2 329	25.2	299	5.4	1 437	8.7
Sullivan	48	27.8	1 031	38.0	165	15.1	2 009	9.6	345	5.4	3 196	4.6
Switzerland	52	27.8	201	53.5	199	14.1	909	13.7	326	6.2	404	7.9
Tippecanoe	185	14.1	1 934	15.1	263	11.4	7 331	5.9	503	4.9	4 058	5.8
Tipton	76	16.7	1 318	10.4	113	14.5	4 797	1.0	352	3.6	3 069	5.4
Union	62	15.9	578	12.2	113	11.5	2 812	16.2	213	4.8	1 259	5.8
Vanderburgh	32	32.2	278	13.5	78	21.0	894	42.9	197	6.2	1 550	9.5
Vermillion	66	27.5	1 014	4.7	78	24.8	2 679	2.9	211	5.6	2 516	24.9
Vigo	87	19.5	571	9.0	173	12.0	1 043	10.1	291	7.1	2 288	9.4
Wabash	217	10.6	11 053	6.1	277	9.1	19 785	2.8	508	4.5	3 511	5.3
Warren	67	24.1	1 030	3.8	162	12.7	8 968	5.6	272	5.8	2 765	4.3
Warrick	29	38.3	487	30.2	156	12.4	1 297	24.6	232	7.6	1 681	6.8
Washington	190	15.3	2 626	7.5	506	6.1	11 019	1.9	420	7.1	1 482	4.4
Wayne	194	14.4	1 628	15.6	369	9.6	5 815	6.0	498	5.1	2 650	4.9
Wells	99	18.6	2 923	1.9	180	13.9	8 748	4.2	552	3.6	3 700	4.4
White	145	14.7	8 535	2.3	200	12.4	18 581	1.2	511	3.4	5 149	5.6
Whitley	142	16.4	3 411	15.1	198	12.8	6 239	9.0	436	4.9	2 560	9.7

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>Indiana</b>	<b>41 337</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>451 832</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>36 541</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>291 799</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>53 806</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>192 729</b>	<b>.6</b>
Adams	772	4.2	5 420	6.2	779	3.7	3 782	6.3	1 049	1.2	3 055	3.7
Allen	1 040	2.9	6 372	5.0	953	4.0	4 253	8.7	1 363	1.4	3 352	4.9
Bartholomew	451	4.4	5 715	3.5	407	5.0	3 418	5.1	509	2.7	2 299	5.2
Benton	397	2.9	8 195	5.2	393	4.1	6 736	5.0	425	2.0	2 677	3.7
Blackford	190	4.5	2 148	7.4	191	6.0	1 738	6.4	278	3.8	960	3.7
Boone	413	5.0	7 391	3.3	416	5.0	5 236	3.3	569	2.3	2 819	2.2
Brown	94	7.2	153	10.1	68	9.3	83	21.6	169	2.1	143	7.8
Carroll	440	4.8	8 905	3.6	430	4.6	5 516	4.5	525	2.8	3 534	3.5
Cass	518	4.5	6 744	3.9	498	3.9	4 619	4.9	637	2.6	2 702	2.5

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.											
	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)
Clark	388	5.9	2 218	6.8	324	7.7	1 405	10.3	606	2.3	953	10.1
Clay	405	5.0	4 688	6.5	350	6.2	2 456	8.3	484	2.7	1 849	5.0
Clinton	486	3.5	8 185	3.0	444	5.1	5 003	5.2	553	2.2	3 448	4.7
Crawford	205	9.9	351	11.0	89	21.4	213	58.8	350	4.7	271	9.4
Daviess	827	3.7	7 720	5.4	684	4.8	3 925	5.3	1 034	1.6	2 982	3.2
Dearborn	428	6.6	708	15.8	229	11.7	325	31.0	657	1.8	476	9.8
Decatur	533	3.2	7 466	4.5	516	3.6	4 953	6.2	633	1.3	3 550	4.9
De Kalb	439	4.5	3 102	7.4	422	5.4	2 353	7.5	685	2.6	1 453	6.2
Delaware	414	5.9	5 275	3.7	391	6.4	3 943	4.1	552	3.1	2 059	2.7
Dubois	577	4.2	5 658	5.3	486	5.3	2 857	4.4	774	1.7	3 540	2.8
Elkhart	887	3.5	5 508	4.7	900	4.1	3 038	5.8	1 254	1.6	3 887	4.9
Fayette	289	6.7	2 698	11.4	241	8.8	1 677	9.7	392	3.3	1 314	8.3
Floyd	177	10.7	212	16.4	110	13.3	136	19.0	311	.8	198	11.7
Fountain	421	4.9	7 188	5.5	395	5.5	4 705	5.9	508	2.6	2 175	3.9
Franklin	601	4.0	2 881	8.4	530	4.8	1 661	8.8	745	1.3	1 391	6.3
Fulton	511	4.3	5 953	5.0	496	4.7	3 526	6.2	607	1.6	2 295	4.2
Gibson	440	3.8	9 269	3.6	449	4.6	5 751	4.3	553	2.1	2 957	4.2
Grant	434	5.1	5 899	3.9	392	6.1	4 344	4.2	541	2.9	2 352	3.5
Greene	536	5.5	4 258	6.8	420	7.1	2 352	7.3	832	2.0	2 737	3.5
Hamilton	370	5.0	4 755	5.4	377	5.1	3 230	7.2	502	3.0	2 033	3.8
Hancock	401	4.5	5 057	3.8	408	5.1	3 841	4.1	477	3.5	2 176	3.3
Harrison	713	4.5	2 672	9.3	484	6.4	1 794	13.6	1 022	1.7	1 436	4.5
Hendricks	476	5.1	5 487	5.4	417	5.8	3 723	5.5	610	1.8	1 909	4.4
Henry	534	4.9	6 193	5.1	477	6.4	3 443	6.4	696	2.5	2 450	4.8
Howard	399	4.5	5 412	6.6	404	3.8	2 973	4.9	466	1.9	1 825	3.2
Huntington	481	5.0	5 672	5.5	440	5.4	4 182	5.9	604	2.5	2 424	3.0
Jackson	597	3.8	5 524	5.7	485	5.3	3 696	6.3	760	1.6	4 092	3.8
Jasper	511	2.6	10 010	4.6	499	3.5	6 195	4.4	576	2.4	3 649	3.5
Jay	580	4.0	4 572	5.5	611	4.1	3 075	4.6	792	2.1	2 156	3.6
Jefferson	627	3.4	2 629	6.5	476	5.3	1 440	7.6	741	2.2	1 165	4.6
Jennings	371	7.3	3 235	10.7	255	10.6	1 617	13.9	520	3.6	1 617	11.0
Johnson	416	4.6	3 929	4.5	363	7.3	2 898	5.6	510	2.1	1 755	5.0
Knox	474	3.1	11 611	3.2	424	5.4	6 512	5.9	543	2.6	3 666	3.2
Kosciusko	695	4.4	6 555	5.7	610	5.9	4 354	6.1	1 016	2.1	3 829	4.0
Lagrange	1 028	3.5	4 656	4.3	907	3.9	2 929	6.3	1 321	1.3	3 359	3.2
Lake	319	6.7	3 819	7.5	310	7.0	2 909	8.2	432	1.4	2 400	8.0
La Porte	572	3.8	8 594	5.2	544	4.1	6 477	4.2	696	2.6	4 320	4.6
Lawrence	517	5.2	2 494	8.9	297	9.3	1 014	11.1	811	2.3	1 394	7.7
Madison	573	4.1	8 044	4.8	516	4.6	4 999	4.6	708	1.9	2 643	3.1
Marion	132	8.3	773	14.1	121	9.3	519	7.6	185	6.8	589	11.5
Marshall	684	3.7	6 571	4.3	630	3.9	3 989	5.5	804	1.9	2 519	5.6
Martin	207	9.7	1 487	25.4	153	14.1	797	9.3	299	3.6	660	7.6
Miami	555	3.3	6 967	5.1	527	3.3	4 112	5.3	652	1.6	2 824	4.8
Monroe	307	6.8	916	27.7	164	10.8	333	16.3	455	2.3	491	12.0
Montgomery	554	3.9	8 213	4.5	452	5.5	5 745	4.8	648	1.6	2 960	6.4
Morgan	405	6.7	3 367	8.7	369	6.8	2 682	8.1	544	3.4	1 347	5.9
Newton	330	3.7	6 824	8.7	325	4.7	5 171	4.8	353	3.5	2 232	5.6
Noble	679	2.9	4 807	6.7	602	4.2	3 048	6.8	844	2.1	2 203	5.9
Ohio	202	5.8	284	19.8	157	8.5	149	8.4	219	5.1	166	10.0
Orange	298	8.0	1 778	9.5	173	10.7	999	9.1	464	3.4	686	5.5
Owen	356	6.2	1 771	11.3	225	12.4	1 089	17.8	521	2.7	956	13.6
Parke	330	5.0	5 904	6.7	277	6.2	3 019	5.6	458	2.1	1 847	6.8
Perry	354	5.8	1 358	22.2	256	7.7	384	27.8	460	2.3	655	10.5
Pike	216	9.5	3 084	18.8	197	12.1	1 268	14.2	268	5.1	744	7.9
Porter	345	6.2	4 252	5.8	325	6.5	2 716	6.6	433	3.0	2 106	6.8
Posey	357	4.2	8 352	4.1	324	5.0	4 842	2.6	420	1.9	2 274	2.7
Pulaski	437	3.7	8 002	5.4	406	4.6	5 308	4.2	494	2.6	3 284	3.9
Putnam	491	5.4	5 432	4.2	449	6.9	3 108	6.8	756	1.9	1 913	4.3
Randolph	655	3.4	6 960	4.1	617	3.8	5 393	6.4	772	2.3	3 072	4.6
Ripley	635	4.4	4 120	6.4	540	3.9	2 202	7.1	793	1.8	2 601	3.8
Rush	549	3.8	8 129	3.8	507	4.6	4 920	5.8	640	1.7	3 367	3.7
St. Joseph	472	4.3	5 394	6.0	439	5.2	3 669	6.6	625	1.7	2 631	6.0
Scott	239	7.2	1 480	15.1	175	11.2	1 072	14.8	326	3.9	460	8.1
Shelby	470	5.3	6 908	8.3	453	4.9	4 607	6.2	572	3.0	2 967	4.4
Spencer	461	5.1	5 435	4.8	397	6.0	3 003	3.9	622	1.6	1 938	3.4
Starke	241	8.1	4 038	3.4	199	5.9	2 338	6.8	345	6.1	1 815	6.6
Steuben	296	7.0	2 095	6.9	272	7.7	2 271	12.6	489	4.1	1 283	7.5
Sullivan	359	5.5	6 964	5.2	310	6.5	4 400	4.1	447	3.2	1 616	5.1
Switzerland	393	4.4	775	10.5	291	7.5	465	9.7	495	3.8	663	8.3
Tippecanoe	534	4.1	7 848	4.9	518	4.0	5 423	7.6	636	1.7	2 973	3.5
Tipton	333	5.0	5 759	5.3	358	3.7	4 395	5.3	396	2.5	2 333	5.2
Union	211	5.1	2 482	4.9	215	4.8	1 339	6.1	248	3.1	1 242	5.9
Vanderburgh	222	4.8	2 708	11.6	196	7.0	1 743	8.5	257	2.7	1 022	10.2
Vermillion	222	5.3	3 379	12.6	190	7.2	4 210	6.4	249	-.7	1 161	12.8
Vigo	282	7.1	3 331	7.8	252	8.5	2 158	12.4	414	2.2	1 371	7.6
Wabash	515	4.3	5 299	3.0	452	5.5	3 578	5.0	679	2.4	2 928	2.1
Warren	276	6.0	4 996	4.5	267	6.6	3 818	5.5	361	2.9	2 105	3.7
Warrick	262	5.6	4 462	11.0	214	9.1	1 815	10.1	338	3.2	1 389	9.4
Washington	515	6.5	3 213	5.7	323	7.9	1 644	5.5	825	2.1	1 567	6.3
Wayne	523	5.3	4 763	6.2	447	6.7	3 114	10.1	707	3.1	2 212	6.1
Wells	513	4.1	6 490	4.1	512	4.9	3 929	5.6	595	3.0	2 647	3.8
White	495	4.7	9 241	5.3	490	4.6	6 691	5.7	583	2.9	3 403	4.0
Whitley	458	5.6	4 217	7.1	468	6.0	3 021	6.3	717	3.0	1 784	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	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>Indiana</b> .....	<b>39 997</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>56 716</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>16 964</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>248 070</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>3 726</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>17 334</b>	<b>3.0</b>
Adams .....	707	5.0	1 128	5.3	307	10.2	3 625	7.3	47	26.8	126	14.8
Allen .....	931	4.0	864	7.5	332	10.8	3 582	18.0	50	29.8	319	2.9
Bartholomew .....	399	4.5	485	5.5	195	10.9	1 874	1.7	30	35.9	108	10.8
Benton .....	358	6.4	422	7.5	195	11.4	1 749	3.7	47	33.7	265	57.0
Blackford .....	184	6.6	255	4.1	76	12.9	997	3.8	9	32.4	57	43.7
Boone .....	509	3.8	713	4.3	192	11.1	3 744	5.7	49	23.5	256	11.0
Brown .....	103	7.0	46	10.3	34	16.0	138	10.6	23	19.5	23	22.0
Carroll .....	469	4.2	1 026	3.1	226	9.9	4 756	1.7	53	26.2	809	4.8
Cass .....	561	4.2	722	4.4	268	10.3	3 330	4.8	71	24.6	529	25.1
Clark .....	425	7.0	248	8.0	174	13.6	991	9.7	47	33.6	101	24.0
Clay .....	405	5.2	375	5.3	143	13.0	1 650	10.2	59	21.5	107	15.1
Clinton .....	433	5.5	816	5.7	277	9.7	3 883	3.0	40	37.3	185	18.4
Crawford .....	212	10.5	68	14.8	76	18.1	159	30.8	24	41.6	6	43.6
Daviess .....	567	6.3	1 058	5.1	249	10.3	3 055	3.2	89	19.7	572	9.0
Dearborn .....	467	6.3	152	11.1	149	17.9	156	32.5	20	56.9	(D)	(D)
Decatur .....	518	4.2	930	6.2	198	11.5	4 741	5.9	60	25.3	226	23.7
De Kalb .....	424	6.0	440	8.0	164	15.7	1 552	5.1	39	41.7	162	12.3
Delaware .....	462	4.6	590	7.0	172	12.9	2 204	7.2	47	30.6	236	21.3
Dubois .....	651	3.2	1 598	3.1	266	8.7	6 128	3.9	25	—	104	—
Elkhart .....	940	4.0	1 815	4.6	412	8.0	4 218	7.6	103	21.1	243	18.4
Fayette .....	328	5.3	320	9.7	111	17.2	767	14.3	17	43.5	31	25.1
Floyd .....	165	13.6	73	16.6	50	32.4	153	8.0	45	33.8	57	54.8
Fountain .....	422	4.5	442	7.2	128	15.9	1 154	3.6	40	36.4	218	22.4
Franklin .....	517	4.9	558	10.6	189	14.8	840	3.6	15	47.9	19	41.0
Fulton .....	465	4.5	651	4.7	215	12.5	1 272	1.6	22	26.4	32	20.7
Gibson .....	454	4.2	706	8.7	231	10.1	2 821	6.5	65	18.7	207	13.4
Grant .....	387	6.9	615	7.1	156	14.0	1 593	1.5	15	50.9	28	9.5
Greene .....	578	5.4	843	7.1	242	11.6	3 788	2.0	70	27.2	61	35.6
Hamilton .....	431	5.9	547	4.6	170	15.6	6 782	2.4	63	27.8	624	13.8
Hancock .....	429	5.3	557	7.2	146	12.0	2 000	6.2	38	27.2	95	41.2
Harrison .....	682	4.9	525	7.6	334	10.6	1 495	8.3	38	29.2	62	11.9
Hendricks .....	440	6.7	419	5.6	187	14.2	1 538	2.2	38	31.7	153	28.3
Henry .....	498	6.1	441	8.1	244	11.9	2 327	15.1	86	23.4	215	25.9
Howard .....	369	4.8	446	5.3	142	14.2	1 822	1.5	20	35.0	188	2.1
Huntington .....	498	4.7	648	3.0	190	12.2	3 298	11.1	23	44.0	143	7.9
Jackson .....	570	5.0	2 348	3.1	229	11.5	11 719	1.8	36	34.3	689	2.0
Jasper .....	442	5.4	1 021	4.2	235	10.4	4 246	1.8	60	27.3	182	35.3
Jay .....	599	5.1	901	4.3	284	10.4	1 827	2.0	47	28.6	210	10.1
Jefferson .....	563	5.2	353	11.5	325	9.0	1 213	7.1	67	24.5	87	19.1
Jennings .....	326	9.5	575	3.1	146	17.3	2 824	5.7	33	38.4	231	6.4
Johnson .....	343	7.4	429	5.9	123	15.0	3 364	1.2	47	31.8	523	3.6
Knox .....	447	5.6	750	3.7	201	9.6	5 784	3.3	58	26.6	686	25.5
Kosciusko .....	735	4.2	1 561	3.0	347	10.4	10 844	5.4	80	23.9	273	21.2
Lagrange .....	846	4.3	1 451	3.1	330	9.7	9 902	1.2	55	27.7	483	62.9
Lake .....	270	9.8	466	9.0	178	13.9	3 044	20.0	44	36.1	302	14.5
La Porte .....	542	4.8	1 301	6.6	206	10.2	5 100	4.8	38	26.4	209	14.4
Lawrence .....	467	6.7	296	6.9	218	12.5	927	15.0	8	70.9	68	12.5
Madison .....	604	4.0	613	5.2	195	13.1	4 928	6.6	45	31.3	199	12.5
Marion .....	168	6.3	291	5.0	85	16.3	6 700	4.5	4	—	(D)	(D)
Marshall .....	572	4.8	698	6.8	237	12.5	2 892	27.5	46	34.1	123	28.6
Martin .....	210	10.3	263	12.1	79	23.2	464	7.8	26	43.7	62	39.0
Miami .....	519	4.7	757	5.8	233	11.4	3 497	4.6	30	34.3	133	17.0
Monroe .....	307	7.4	181	18.2	73	22.7	553	9.8	28	43.9	58	57.0
Montgomery .....	505	4.8	827	6.2	202	13.0	2 618	10.5	45	32.5	264	15.3
Morgan .....	409	6.1	353	6.9	178	15.0	1 882	5.0	74	25.6	152	17.0
Newton .....	296	6.4	807	11.9	142	13.1	3 543	1.6	42	27.4	71	6.2
Noble .....	593	5.2	733	5.2	219	12.7	2 375	9.5	62	27.4	72	21.7
Ohio .....	163	7.6	80	11.0	80	15.0	269	22.0	21	30.7	64	12.1
Orange .....	247	10.6	296	6.3	136	15.4	1 441	11.6	28	43.2	125	15.2
Owen .....	307	6.5	169	7.4	133	17.5	684	29.1	37	46.0	65	65.7
Parke .....	323	5.2	501	9.6	167	13.0	1 719	10.0	51	29.4	177	23.2
Perry .....	340	6.5	216	7.2	119	17.9	420	28.7	25	40.8	42	25.0
Pike .....	185	11.6	180	14.6	88	22.2	1 019	27.9	5	—	37	—
Porter .....	300	5.8	461	6.7	107	15.0	1 421	16.1	31	32.4	147	19.0
Posey .....	346	4.6	544	3.5	161	11.9	2 589	1.2	34	30.0	154	22.8
Pulaski .....	441	4.2	1 013	4.4	231	9.9	5 540	3.1	37	34.7	71	29.2
Putnam .....	579	5.4	609	5.4	230	12.6	1 490	5.2	69	26.4	186	7.9
Randolph .....	660	3.9	708	5.8	293	9.2	2 487	5.3	39	29.9	87	14.6
Ripley .....	603	4.7	835	4.3	274	11.0	2 197	3.3	61	24.2	178	9.5
Rush .....	561	3.7	793	4.3	242	10.6	3 057	11.6	30	25.6	49	22.2
St. Joseph .....	467	6.1	798	5.4	120	17.8	3 819	10.7	78	26.3	245	32.7
Scott .....	205	8.9	119	11.0	105	12.9	386	6.5	32	29.6	25	11.9
Shelby .....	479	4.1	764	8.5	215	11.0	3 467	3.4	19	38.0	131	12.4
Spencer .....	451	5.1	512	5.0	222	10.2	2 099	3.3	34	25.2	190	27.6
Starke .....	216	11.2	338	9.1	165	13.3	1 802	2.7	36	35.8	75	22.1
Steuben .....	306	8.5	360	6.8	116	15.8	1 011	11.6	24	47.0	53	61.5
Sullivan .....	320	7.4	550	30.2	147	14.3	1 517	4.7	60	27.5	423	29.9
Switzerland .....	345	7.0	229	9.4	195	10.5	846	7.8	60	24.7	202	32.1
Tippecanoe .....	482	5.9	892	7.0	207	12.6	3 795	4.8	50	31.6	456	6.8

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)
Tipton .....	309	5.6	544	6.7	132	13.4	4 455	.6	17	—	701	—
Union .....	222	4.8	333	5.3	93	13.0	632	12.2	7	40.3	9	18.2
Vanderburgh .....	188	5.7	261	12.3	103	16.0	1 234	18.5	14	40.9	39	7.5
Vermillion .....	210	8.1	208	13.2	72	22.6	1 271	1.0	12	69.1	21	9.7
Vigo .....	308	6.4	298	5.9	94	16.2	1 319	7.0	19	30.1	97	2.6
Wabash .....	547	4.5	1 065	3.1	246	10.1	5 406	6.7	64	25.7	448	5.0
Warren .....	299	5.5	571	4.1	120	14.0	3 055	3.4	14	45.0	294	1.5
Warrick .....	233	6.1	302	11.8	86	19.1	819	15.4	26	38.0	63	23.9
Washington .....	608	5.0	581	5.0	247	12.5	1 699	8.1	52	28.6	130	28.4
Wayne .....	605	4.9	699	5.6	230	11.7	1 564	8.6	24	38.4	75	24.1
Wells .....	484	5.0	729	7.5	173	13.3	2 197	9.5	49	28.6	109	20.7
White .....	460	5.9	1 123	1.9	167	10.9	5 123	.9	43	32.5	250	44.1
Whitley .....	477	6.9	518	6.8	143	16.7	1 791	5.0	22	47.2	74	22.5
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>Indiana .....</b>	<b>47 778</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>257 352</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>19 743</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>58 005</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>27 599</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>272 608</b>	<b>1.0</b>
Adams .....	966	2.7	4 249	5.8	470	7.8	904	14.4	560	7.0	4 559	7.4
Allen .....	1 132	2.9	5 462	5.9	465	8.4	858	8.1	512	7.7	3 792	7.9
Bartholomew .....	460	4.2	2 619	4.7	179	13.2	408	6.6	276	7.7	2 988	13.8
Benton .....	383	2.5	3 837	5.0	220	11.7	1 360	9.3	324	6.9	3 877	7.4
Blackford .....	251	5.3	1 200	5.6	109	10.8	546	6.3	166	7.9	1 728	5.8
Boone .....	512	3.8	3 810	3.1	247	9.5	1 160	6.4	318	6.7	4 359	5.4
Brown .....	145	4.3	214	7.9	32	16.1	36	23.9	51	12.2	168	14.6
Carroll .....	486	3.7	5 237	6.1	198	11.4	1 015	9.9	337	6.9	5 044	6.1
Cass .....	598	3.8	3 558	4.6	281	10.2	976	8.1	374	7.8	3 809	7.1
Clark .....	527	4.5	1 474	8.7	179	16.0	225	26.1	241	11.2	1 658	10.2
Clay .....	426	4.6	2 160	6.7	161	12.3	426	24.0	238	8.9	2 361	13.4
Clinton .....	522	3.3	4 069	4.4	227	10.3	770	9.5	341	7.5	5 475	8.2
Crawford .....	305	6.9	548	13.6	80	23.0	48	26.3	120	16.8	316	20.4
Daviess .....	887	3.4	4 620	3.7	374	9.4	710	8.5	522	6.9	5 096	7.0
Dearborn .....	514	5.0	766	9.2	155	16.7	(D)	(D)	145	17.5	501	23.1
Decatur .....	556	3.0	3 384	5.0	234	11.0	1 037	7.4	416	6.6	3 843	6.9
De Kalb .....	589	4.2	1 838	5.7	218	14.4	622	18.4	306	10.2	2 261	9.0
Delaware .....	478	4.8	2 733	6.1	226	11.5	677	10.7	285	8.8	3 077	7.7
Dubois .....	677	3.6	3 892	4.7	308	9.1	881	9.4	384	6.9	3 916	5.1
Elkhart .....	1 095	3.1	5 713	4.2	545	7.7	1 098	9.1	813	5.0	6 249	5.2
Fayette .....	327	5.6	1 512	11.7	140	17.9	362	17.4	291	6.6	2 486	10.9
Floyd .....	248	8.2	353	15.6	48	34.4	23	32.3	43	32.6	91	44.2
Fountain .....	446	4.1	2 782	8.2	200	13.6	470	14.8	264	9.7	3 396	13.3
Franklin .....	657	3.4	2 431	12.5	230	11.9	248	18.1	332	9.0	1 927	13.1
Fulton .....	563	3.2	3 010	7.8	238	12.3	1 384	26.8	343	8.0	3 880	10.1
Gibson .....	489	3.7	3 551	4.8	184	12.6	603	9.4	299	8.0	4 194	4.8
Grant .....	480	4.2	2 700	4.6	182	12.8	819	15.6	293	8.8	4 525	6.8
Greene .....	719	3.9	2 615	6.5	264	11.1	586	10.3	344	9.7	2 557	10.8
Hamilton .....	433	5.1	2 978	11.7	213	13.1	642	23.2	258	11.2	3 037	10.9
Hancock .....	455	3.9	2 886	4.2	170	11.1	670	14.0	287	8.3	3 368	5.6
Harrison .....	909	3.1	2 138	6.5	276	12.1	316	17.3	366	8.6	1 756	10.3
Hendricks .....	536	3.6	2 493	5.4	236	12.8	675	19.6	244	10.5	3 238	9.0
Henry .....	559	4.7	2 664	5.4	332	9.5	884	9.2	291	9.9	2 785	8.9
Howard .....	395	3.7	2 866	4.6	211	11.3	846	7.7	272	8.1	2 892	8.0
Huntington .....	543	3.7	3 021	6.4	237	11.1	889	14.5	358	7.3	3 906	5.7
Jackson .....	735	2.7	6 150	3.2	307	10.2	658	12.3	407	7.0	2 911	9.1
Jasper .....	530	3.2	4 677	4.4	257	9.6	1 025	10.0	372	6.9	4 855	4.3
Jay .....	748	2.9	3 108	6.4	274	10.1	655	13.9	487	5.9	4 827	5.6
Jefferson .....	665	3.4	1 539	7.0	204	13.7	308	17.6	296	10.7	1 792	10.2
Jennings .....	520	3.9	2 443	9.0	113	19.6	148	20.7	263	10.6	2 218	9.6
Johnson .....	445	4.8	2 276	6.5	188	14.5	776	12.8	288	8.8	3 690	9.2
Knox .....	520	3.2	4 970	4.0	158	15.1	1 172	7.3	357	7.5	5 062	5.1
Kosciusko .....	921	3.5	7 310	4.3	522	7.3	1 807	6.8	558	6.5	6 133	4.7
Lagrange .....	1 088	3.0	4 482	4.8	489	8.1	787	7.4	802	5.0	5 034	5.2
Lake .....	367	5.0	2 486	9.5	134	18.0	614	21.3	200	12.5	1 893	15.0
La Porte .....	598	4.2	5 295	3.7	263	9.8	1 232	6.8	329	8.2	4 739	6.7
Lawrence .....	655	4.7	1 479	8.8	225	13.1	283	20.7	278	11.1	1 603	16.8
Madison .....	644	3.3	3 844	5.8	239	11.2	985	22.8	372	8.2	3 982	6.3
Marion .....	165	6.5	1 622	3.9	39	27.7	(D)	(D)	78	17.4	588	10.7
Marshall .....	704	3.6	3 213	7.7	342	9.1	1 603	4.5	456	7.6	3 354	7.8
Martin .....	253	7.4	925	11.2	87	24.0	144	17.4	132	17.0	1 328	18.0
Miami .....	590	3.0	3 839	5.6	270	10.3	739	13.2	371	6.2	4 341	6.8
Monroe .....	332	6.9	695	14.0	131	18.4	123	29.7	114	16.1	672	18.0
Montgomery .....	578	3.6	4 168	5.1	236	11.7	905	17.6	391	7.2	4 783	6.3

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.											
	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)
Morgan	459	5.1	1 889	9.9	205	13.3	465	8.3	289	9.4	1 687	11.9
Newton	321	4.0	3 024	3.3	140	14.3	603	2.9	235	9.3	3 063	11.6
Noble	769	2.9	2 847	5.2	343	9.8	1 046	15.5	443	7.7	3 382	12.6
Ohio	204	5.9	330	10.1	63	18.6	51	13.1	94	15.0	379	14.8
Orange	416	5.3	1 145	6.9	135	15.8	236	15.2	177	14.1	1 009	13.8
Owen	458	3.9	1 274	12.4	194	15.1	212	21.7	229	12.3	993	14.4
Parke	397	4.7	2 560	10.0	175	13.7	546	17.6	236	9.2	4 187	10.5
Perry	430	3.6	831	10.5	164	13.5	173	29.6	187	12.3	931	14.2
Pike	212	10.5	1 025	15.2	85	26.2	308	41.6	155	14.3	884	15.9
Porter	362	5.1	2 491	7.9	119	15.2	417	4.6	208	8.9	1 921	6.8
Posey	365	3.8	3 064	4.5	181	12.2	432	8.0	227	9.5	2 767	6.7
Pulaski	434	4.2	4 572	4.3	203	11.6	865	8.9	351	6.0	4 318	6.0
Putnam	698	3.2	2 740	7.2	231	12.6	613	29.8	316	9.6	3 259	8.1
Randolph	719	3.1	3 209	4.4	367	7.7	902	8.3	502	5.4	4 537	7.7
Ripley	702	3.4	2 709	5.7	210	13.3	533	13.7	332	9.5	2 230	8.9
Rush	608	2.9	3 832	4.7	275	8.9	949	15.0	422	6.3	5 251	8.3
St. Joseph	566	3.6	2 994	5.6	219	14.6	567	19.5	308	9.7	3 297	6.4
Scott	297	6.1	723	11.0	107	15.0	153	17.6	132	15.2	864	14.5
Shelby	531	3.1	3 818	7.1	214	11.6	604	13.5	306	7.1	3 956	7.3
Spencer	569	3.1	2 674	4.9	233	10.6	555	15.0	303	9.0	2 313	5.8
Starke	351	5.8	2 000	7.6	156	14.5	791	13.1	205	11.9	2 002	11.2
Steuben	460	5.1	1 964	16.6	182	14.0	477	19.4	220	11.5	1 494	12.0
Sullivan	383	5.7	2 495	5.6	177	13.1	451	15.3	227	10.0	2 819	10.2
Switzerland	470	4.3	1 019	9.8	128	17.3	137	13.9	235	11.8	1 085	15.4
Tippecanoe	547	3.0	4 021	5.7	233	11.5	1 048	7.9	355	8.1	5 676	11.2
Tipton	331	5.8	3 227	4.2	174	12.3	854	10.3	193	10.7	2 922	5.1
Union	237	3.9	1 540	7.0	86	13.7	240	14.4	145	8.6	1 473	8.0
Vanderburgh	237	4.8	1 216	10.3	62	22.6	111	10.1	106	14.4	1 324	14.0
Vermillion	193	9.8	1 876	11.2	106	16.0	486	26.8	104	18.6	1 224	12.5
Vigo	382	3.8	1 808	6.6	79	18.5	239	16.8	221	9.4	1 662	10.4
Wabash	590	3.8	4 138	5.9	288	9.5	802	7.9	396	7.1	4 442	6.2
Warren	335	4.5	2 605	5.7	134	15.0	381	11.7	255	7.5	2 936	6.8
Warrick	307	5.1	1 629	12.4	127	16.9	296	16.2	171	10.5	1 349	19.6
Washington	774	3.2	2 818	6.5	282	11.3	626	21.8	422	7.9	2 673	6.9
Wayne	647	4.7	2 930	6.1	352	10.1	823	14.8	317	10.1	3 461	7.8
Wells	525	4.7	3 254	5.1	237	10.8	855	12.9	374	8.0	3 816	9.3
White	523	4.7	4 584	3.9	285	9.3	1 051	10.1	349	8.9	5 277	3.1
Whitley	643	4.6	2 772	6.7	245	10.7	791	13.4	287	10.6	2 823	7.4

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>Indiana</b>	<b>16 729</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>358 739</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>55 473</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>138 472</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>52 467</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>313 484</b>	<b>.6</b>
Adams	290	11.5	6 109	9.9	1 064	1.4	2 071	3.7	1 011	2.2	4 761	5.7
Allen	296	10.9	3 876	7.6	1 396	1.2	3 118	4.2	1 281	2.1	5 048	4.4
Bartholomew	206	9.2	4 690	11.5	545	2.1	1 250	4.4	535	2.6	2 116	4.2
Benton	218	11.7	9 419	8.8	401	3.6	1 472	7.2	426	2.0	5 181	5.0
Blackford	94	12.1	2 109	6.6	303	1.0	756	7.2	268	3.9	1 619	3.3
Boone	227	8.5	11 039	3.7	576	2.0	2 094	5.0	564	2.3	4 140	4.1
Brown	7	32.9	33	25.5	176	1.8	230	6.0	158	3.1	228	6.6
Carroll	204	9.1	8 432	3.5	555	1.1	1 901	4.1	555	1.5	6 060	2.9
Cass	227	9.8	7 034	4.3	659	2.0	1 768	5.0	655	2.4	4 420	3.6
Clark	103	16.7	1 471	16.0	633	1.7	1 307	8.1	603	2.8	1 371	6.6
Clay	147	13.4	2 033	19.7	492	2.5	1 181	5.2	460	3.5	2 068	5.0
Clinton	244	7.5	10 045	7.6	544	2.7	2 124	8.3	563	2.0	5 299	3.7
Crawford	23	40.6	40	24.3	389	3.1	572	8.2	346	5.1	461	11.8
Daviess	210	10.7	4 296	6.0	1 069	1.3	2 445	8.1	1 024	2.2	7 625	7.1
Dearborn	103	21.9	320	18.8	656	1.9	945	9.5	597	3.7	599	7.1
Decatur	238	10.5	6 158	10.0	611	2.4	1 610	5.9	614	2.1	4 621	6.4
De Kalb	157	15.7	2 371	19.2	769	1.5	1 539	6.6	635	3.2	2 464	12.8
Delaware	216	9.9	6 443	4.5	613	1.3	1 522	5.1	532	3.9	3 083	3.4
Dubois	279	8.5	2 731	7.2	780	1.8	2 024	3.3	757	2.1	5 255	3.1
Elkhart	414	8.1	4 430	7.5	1 269	1.3	3 175	3.8	1 266	1.6	8 988	3.3
Fayette	109	20.0	1 558	24.2	399	2.8	1 088	12.0	376	3.4	1 849	9.9
Floyd	31	40.8	144	32.2	311	.8	473	7.8	258	6.8	318	10.3
Fountain	160	13.4	5 444	7.1	525	2.1	1 498	7.5	504	2.6	3 838	6.9
Franklin	193	14.3	1 634	20.7	738	1.9	1 129	8.9	684	2.7	1 788	5.9
Fulton	274	8.3	3 994	7.6	579	2.6	1 574	5.6	576	2.7	2 706	7.4
Gibson	197	9.4	3 042	6.5	546	2.4	1 607	6.9	544	2.3	4 051	4.4
Grant	271	8.2	7 207	9.3	549	2.0	1 839	8.8	495	3.4	3 291	5.0
Greene	152	13.5	1 306	11.9	819	2.0	1 939	6.1	771	2.9	5 051	3.0
Hamilton	217	12.5	4 559	5.9	543	3.2	1 741	9.7	546	2.4	3 775	5.8

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)
Hancock	189	9.4	6 282	4.9	524	1.8	1 566	8.4	493	3.1	2 765	8.4
Harrison	171	14.1	1 530	11.5	1 069	1.5	1 586	4.4	962	2.6	2 672	3.3
Hendricks	231	11.9	6 506	4.3	617	1.3	1 708	10.0	588	2.8	2 958	3.5
Henry	265	9.5	5 215	9.6	724	2.4	1 701	7.9	671	3.3	2 797	9.6
Howard	188	11.3	4 674	4.6	464	2.1	1 274	5.3	425	3.1	2 547	3.3
Huntington	212	9.9	5 612	8.3	622	1.3	1 426	6.3	600	2.8	3 196	3.3
Jackson	207	11.4	2 857	14.7	785	1.1	1 378	5.7	729	2.8	18 778	1.3
Jasper	304	8.1	8 440	6.7	581	2.4	1 771	10.8	572	1.9	6 466	4.8
Jay	208	11.0	3 588	9.0	809	1.4	1 912	5.8	745	3.2	4 204	6.1
Jefferson	134	16.3	1 398	21.8	767	1.7	1 280	5.3	696	2.9	1 676	7.8
Jennings	127	17.7	2 540	15.3	590	1.7	928	8.0	555	2.7	3 274	5.5
Johnson	202	10.9	4 435	8.9	485	3.5	1 096	6.4	469	3.5	3 097	5.4
Knox	220	9.8	5 968	9.3	551	2.7	1 870	5.1	555	2.2	5 041	2.5
Kosciusko	317	9.8	5 363	8.9	1 127	.5	3 521	5.2	1 029	2.2	10 180	1.4
Lagrange	310	9.8	3 140	8.8	1 368	.9	3 183	3.8	1 279	1.7	5 172	3.6
Lake	191	13.0	5 530	10.5	416	3.0	1 685	10.6	409	2.3	3 391	7.6
La Porte	301	7.8	9 164	4.2	705	2.1	2 428	4.3	692	2.6	6 808	3.2
Lawrence	86	23.5	937	6.6	854	1.3	1 351	6.1	794	2.6	1 428	7.0
Madison	286	8.5	7 522	6.4	700	2.1	2 113	5.5	690	2.2	4 225	3.7
Marion	60	18.0	823	9.8	219	2.3	465	11.2	203	3.3	2 071	9.6
Marshall	332	10.0	4 096	7.1	830	1.6	2 061	5.6	829	1.5	3 847	4.4
Martin	40	31.5	734	27.4	325	3.0	704	9.5	286	5.6	1 023	17.7
Miami	277	7.3	6 632	7.1	628	2.3	1 648	5.3	640	2.0	3 927	3.7
Monroe	56	27.8	179	21.5	454	2.6	607	10.0	383	5.3	683	8.5
Montgomery	261	8.3	7 030	9.2	629	2.7	1 954	6.7	655	1.6	4 553	4.3
Morgan	135	12.5	2 059	8.6	584	2.0	1 076	11.7	547	2.6	2 021	7.3
Newton	169	11.7	3 997	6.2	331	4.6	1 876	27.3	356	2.7	5 246	3.2
Noble	229	12.8	2 696	12.5	912	1.4	2 189	4.8	813	2.6	3 400	5.7
Ohio	34	29.8	110	7.3	246	1.5	255	6.2	208	5.4	366	5.4
Orange	52	25.6	903	5.1	525	1.2	785	6.2	429	4.5	1 350	3.9
Owen	33	31.4	118	5.4	569	.6	1 007	9.2	449	4.3	1 096	11.5
Parke	198	10.6	4 440	10.0	449	2.5	1 502	10.8	399	4.3	2 385	10.2
Perry	91	19.6	277	25.6	483	.7	663	8.7	471	1.7	883	8.5
Pike	142	15.3	1 074	12.1	256	5.3	519	23.5	223	7.5	1 039	24.7
Porter	166	10.3	4 057	10.1	465	1.6	1 135	6.3	402	3.9	2 562	6.5
Posey	168	10.9	3 059	11.0	401	3.3	1 380	9.0	421	2.2	3 435	4.1
Pulaski	211	8.7	7 310	4.9	511	1.9	1 534	5.8	492	2.3	7 043	3.2
Putnam	202	12.1	4 613	8.3	763	1.8	1 696	7.0	708	2.9	2 980	6.1
Randolph	307	8.2	3 789	5.3	809	1.7	2 186	5.4	754	2.7	3 634	5.6
Ripley	207	11.4	3 721	8.3	798	1.4	1 487	5.6	752	2.5	3 663	7.0
Rush	235	10.1	6 427	5.8	651	1.4	2 241	5.1	641	1.7	3 878	5.7
St. Joseph	305	8.4	4 443	6.9	620	3.0	2 070	5.8	631	1.7	2 683	3.9
Scott	73	15.9	1 006	17.8	340	2.7	511	8.4	303	5.1	560	5.6
Shelby	227	9.9	5 906	6.8	626	1.4	1 651	6.0	592	2.5	2 954	3.7
Spencer	182	11.9	2 574	7.7	618	1.8	1 289	4.1	619	1.4	2 749	5.9
Starke	119	14.5	2 883	8.5	352	5.2	1 050	12.5	389	3.1	1 861	11.0
Steuben	141	11.8	1 746	11.0	549	2.4	1 209	8.0	519	3.2	1 517	8.2
Sullivan	124	16.1	1 972	9.5	473	.8	1 402	5.2	403	4.4	2 218	3.3
Switzerland	79	22.1	487	16.4	523	2.3	569	5.6	462	4.4	1 270	10.3
Tippecanoe	257	8.4	7 573	10.6	641	1.8	2 053	7.6	618	2.4	5 128	4.9
Tipton	207	9.8	6 117	4.9	388	3.0	1 640	6.7	376	3.5	2 647	3.9
Union	112	11.1	1 621	11.5	243	3.4	712	5.3	249	2.9	1 343	6.8
Vanderburgh	100	16.2	1 973	15.1	252	3.4	596	14.5	237	4.5	1 354	11.8
Vermillion	95	20.2	2 397	15.3	246	.7	775	16.4	249	.7	1 772	8.7
Vigo	85	18.4	1 670	13.5	424	2.5	837	8.2	389	3.5	1 791	8.5
Wabash	200	10.4	5 356	9.8	730	1.8	1 805	5.9	655	2.8	4 769	3.6
Warren	132	12.6	3 518	7.8	350	2.8	1 094	5.5	365	2.5	3 480	3.9
Warrick	100	16.0	2 028	16.2	348	1.5	857	12.1	336	3.3	1 546	6.6
Washington	126	15.8	1 349	8.6	908	.9	1 684	5.0	848	2.2	2 720	4.3
Wayne	166	12.6	3 705	10.6	781	1.9	2 268	4.3	732	3.0	3 618	5.5
Wells	226	10.1	7 361	7.1	645	1.7	1 503	4.8	611	2.8	3 450	4.4
White	250	8.6	9 823	5.9	561	3.6	2 095	7.8	565	2.5	7 209	2.8
Whitley	162	12.1	2 421	10.5	750	1.9	2 061	6.5	701	3.4	3 011	11.1
	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>Indiana</b>	<b>57 922</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>1 163 605</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>53 256</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>12 848 950</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>47 613</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>11 716 704</b>	<b>.3</b>
Adams	1 093	.7	13 609	15.8	992	.7	191 192	.9	909	.7	179 996	1.0
Allen	1 439	.8	29 796	4.6	1 342	.7	246 668	.9	1 192	.8	230 054	.9
Bartholomew	576	.7	11 811	5.4	542	.4	146 039	.7	506	.5	138 189	.7
Benton	434	.8	25 926	6.0	416	.6	247 562	.6	409	.6	241 562	.6

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)
Blackford.....	303	1.0	4 897	7.6	279	.7	76 593	1.1	227	1.0	69 696	1.2
Boone.....	610	.7	19 920	5.6	556	.6	212 137	.7	515	.7	206 132	.7
Brown.....	176	1.8	114	61.1	165	.6	10 381	2.2	141	1.1	6 668	2.7
Carroll.....	564	.5	32 003	2.6	497	.5	198 014	.5	474	.5	186 176	.5
Cass.....	699	.7	20 304	4.1	627	.6	179 249	.7	570	.7	170 009	.7
Clark.....	648	.6	2 835	17.6	593	.5	75 586	.9	499	.7	58 120	1.1
Clay.....	520	.8	9 343	11.0	482	.6	134 623	.9	440	.7	126 260	1.0
Clinton.....	585	.6	26 282	4.9	543	.6	222 586	.6	514	.6	217 580	.6
Crawford.....	410	.8	-740	48.8	382	.6	29 601	1.4	295	1.0	12 726	1.8
Daviess.....	1 101	.7	9 511	9.3	1 008	.6	188 972	.8	899	.7	168 261	.8
Dearborn.....	679	.7	-419	82.1	635	.5	44 856	1.4	578	.6	29 435	1.9
Decatur.....	653	.7	19 293	6.2	593	.6	170 873	.8	558	.7	159 475	.8
De Kalb.....	785	.7	8 479	11.3	733	.5	135 205	.8	511	.8	104 717	1.0
Delaware.....	635	.6	13 114	5.5	586	.6	159 571	.7	526	.7	152 438	.7
Dubois.....	811	.6	6 308	11.9	728	.4	138 274	.7	656	.5	118 376	.7
Elkhart.....	1 335	.6	24 287	6.7	1 185	.5	160 160	.8	1 049	.6	143 324	.9
Fayette.....	420	1.0	4 814	19.4	377	.9	85 029	1.6	348	1.1	75 806	1.7
Floyd.....	311	.8	-422	59.2	286	.5	18 472	2.8	244	.8	12 750	4.1
Fountain.....	550	.7	13 711	9.9	501	.7	177 202	.9	468	.7	162 606	1.0
Franklin.....	777	.7	5 776	15.6	728	.5	91 558	1.0	677	.6	74 811	1.1
Fulton.....	622	.7	14 873	6.4	570	.6	151 322	.8	523	.7	140 458	.9
Gibson.....	579	.6	16 327	7.6	541	.5	211 810	.5	506	.6	198 806	.5
Grant.....	575	.6	18 750	4.9	541	.5	178 082	.6	486	.6	172 544	.6
Greene.....	878	.6	7 646	14.2	805	.5	146 620	.9	737	.6	120 576	.9
Hamilton.....	590	.7	16 946	8.4	539	.6	126 509	.8	487	.7	120 531	.8
Hancock.....	548	.8	15 977	6.3	505	.6	155 422	.7	482	.7	152 356	.7
Harrison.....	1 109	.6	3 522	17.3	1 030	.5	109 853	.9	857	.6	75 449	1.1
Hendricks.....	629	.6	11 211	8.8	581	.6	150 491	.7	537	.7	140 890	.7
Henry.....	769	.7	11 947	8.5	702	.6	161 322	.9	644	.7	151 430	1.0
Howard.....	486	.7	18 296	5.0	453	.5	137 933	.7	436	.6	135 655	.7
Huntington.....	651	.7	23 613	4.0	600	.6	168 886	.8	542	.7	160 643	.8
Jackson.....	811	.6	1 538	59.5	741	.6	157 403	1.0	663	.7	139 436	1.1
Jasper.....	619	.6	29 956	3.6	570	.5	257 576	.6	549	.6	248 730	.6
Jay.....	839	.6	7 898	15.6	792	.6	157 345	.9	659	.7	140 899	.9
Jefferson.....	796	.7	3 813	18.8	765	.5	80 534	.9	705	.6	61 469	1.0
Jennings.....	607	.7	4 883	19.7	552	.6	91 446	1.3	458	.9	79 439	1.4
Johnson.....	525	.7	11 490	7.7	465	.7	121 046	1.0	425	.8	114 775	1.0
Knox.....	584	.6	26 057	3.8	528	.6	255 766	.6	511	.6	243 509	.6
Kosciusko.....	1 129	.5	20 968	5.0	1 011	.4	210 148	.7	846	.6	188 205	.7
Lagrange.....	1 391	.6	18 174	7.0	1 267	.6	156 233	.8	1 107	.6	127 875	.9
Lake.....	442	.6	13 510	11.5	414	.6	138 929	.8	377	.7	132 551	.8
La Porte.....	750	.7	27 337	3.9	694	.6	226 816	.7	651	.7	212 940	.7
Lawrence.....	875	.6	2 694	39.3	779	.6	100 355	1.2	661	.7	64 725	1.2
Madison.....	738	.6	21 865	5.5	693	.5	208 843	.7	654	.5	202 098	.8
Marion.....	224	1.0	15 113	3.2	194	1.0	24 102	2.0	168	1.3	21 822	2.2
Marshall.....	865	.7	15 396	6.0	794	.6	176 837	.8	716	.7	160 601	.9
Martin.....	335	.8	3 131	26.8	302	.8	46 451	1.6	262	1.1	35 897	1.8
Miami.....	678	.6	16 994	6.7	639	.4	175 108	.6	588	.5	165 003	.6
Monroe.....	475	.7	696	80.0	425	.6	36 214	1.9	362	.8	22 807	2.3
Montgomery.....	682	.6	23 708	5.8	611	.6	243 976	.6	574	.7	232 300	.6
Morgan.....	601	.8	7 345	16.5	545	.7	110 972	1.0	481	.8	101 157	1.1
Newton.....	382	.7	28 858	6.3	353	.7	192 801	.7	340	.7	184 854	.7
Noble.....	941	.6	17 616	5.4	883	.5	147 016	1.0	729	.7	126 941	1.1
Ohio.....	252	1.0	806	58.7	241	.7	15 949	1.5	229	.8	9 358	1.6
Orange.....	531	.7	3 649	17.3	491	.7	77 911	1.3	410	.9	54 994	1.4
Owen.....	569	.6	2 708	33.9	506	.7	70 022	1.3	430	.9	52 250	1.5
Parke.....	471	.7	9 184	12.7	427	.7	146 125	.9	390	.8	136 104	.9
Perry.....	484	.7	2 041	31.4	443	.6	44 187	1.6	388	.8	28 278	2.1
Pike.....	288	.7	2 662	23.6	266	.7	70 123	1.5	227	1.1	63 185	1.7
Porter.....	478	.8	14 020	6.7	442	.5	122 766	.8	407	.6	117 591	.9
Posey.....	437	.8	14 991	6.2	409	.6	180 104	.7	386	.7	175 881	.7
Pulaski.....	531	.7	25 080	4.1	500	.6	216 338	.7	482	.7	207 706	.7
Putnam.....	793	.7	9 022	10.2	701	.6	152 919	.9	616	.7	136 146	.9
Randolph.....	850	.6	14 778	8.0	799	.5	202 017	.7	707	.6	187 956	.8
Ripley.....	821	.7	4 386	23.3	769	.6	123 794	1.0	705	.6	106 398	1.1
Rush.....	663	.8	23 465	5.0	621	.8	207 225	.9	594	.9	198 032	.9
St. Joseph.....	668	.6	15 461	9.0	615	.5	139 661	.8	563	.6	131 004	.8
Scott.....	350	1.0	1 161	34.8	307	.9	41 364	1.5	255	1.2	33 879	1.7
Shelby.....	641	.7	20 418	6.7	601	.5	185 603	.7	560	.6	180 102	.7
Spencer.....	637	.7	7 875	7.2	599	.5	142 200	.8	542	.7	124 768	.9
Starke.....	410	.8	8 384	7.7	386	.7	116 495	.8	320	1.0	103 811	.9
Steuben.....	581	.7	5 226	19.3	535	.6	99 218	1.0	366	1.0	71 944	1.2
Sullivan.....	473	.8	10 858	6.7	438	.6	154 407	.8	397	.8	146 668	.8
Switzerland.....	541	.8	3 392	13.2	516	.7	33 929	1.7	496	.7	20 701	2.1
Tippecanoe.....	666	.7	19 845	7.1	612	.5	220 806	.7	582	.6	213 122	.7
Tipton.....	416	.7	20 444	6.3	388	.6	147 636	.7	376	.6	146 096	.7
Union.....	267	1.1	6 515	8.2	251	.7	68 968	1.3	236	.8	63 111	1.3
Vanderburgh.....	270	1.0	4 446	9.8	259	.6	66 532	1.2	243	.8	64 540	1.2
Vermillion.....	249	.7	7 055	17.2	234	.5	101 027	.8	225	.6	95 431	.8
Vigo.....	454	.8	6 070	13.6	408	.7	99 012	1.2	374	.9	93 732	1.3

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	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)
Wabash.....	761	.7	23 280	4.1	683	.6	163 227	.8	584	.8	150 107	.8
Warren.....	379	.8	16 331	7.2	335	.8	162 247	.7	315	.9	153 224	.8
Warrick.....	356	.8	3 687	21.4	323	.7	80 901	1.3	283	.8	73 939	1.3
Washington.....	915	.6	1 392	47.9	838	.5	125 278	1.0	689	.6	90 019	1.2
Wayne.....	813	.6	13 599	8.0	743	.6	142 427	.9	616	.7	123 991	1.0
Wells.....	660	.6	22 817	6.6	612	.4	182 069	.7	575	.5	175 631	.7
White.....	621	.7	28 145	3.7	578	.6	253 021	.6	543	.7	244 828	.6
Whitley.....	787	.7	11 712	8.7	720	.6	138 872	.9	574	.8	119 639	.9
	Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry							
	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
					Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>Indiana.....</b>	<b>1 753</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>250 050</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>23 025</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>976 701</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>15 164</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>277 797</b>	<b>.5</b>
Adams.....	15	8.5	190	24.6	425	1.4	15 212	1.5	46	4.5	373	4.8
Allen.....	39	5.4	1 167	6.1	362	1.7	19 838	1.5	87	3.4	1 648	2.4
Bartholomew.....	30	3.5	5 953	1.1	220	1.4	6 736	1.8	165	1.7	2 114	2.0
Benton.....	2	—	(D)	(D)	81	3.0	3 865	3.2	56	3.7	1 341	4.2
Blackford.....	—	—	—	—	54	3.6	1 769	6.0	34	4.5	(D)	(D)
Boone.....	5	11.8	(D)	(D)	186	1.9	6 292	2.7	152	2.2	2 303	2.8
Brown.....	4	14.7	8	19.5	72	2.5	2 087	2.8	60	2.9	(D)	(D)
Carroll.....	8	9.4	507	4.7	151	1.7	6 084	1.7	91	2.4	1 596	2.6
Cass.....	21	5.6	1 596	2.3	260	1.6	12 323	2.0	180	2.1	3 934	3.2
Clark.....	19	6.8	257	2.4	342	1.1	14 056	1.3	286	1.3	6 794	1.5
Clay.....	1	—	(D)	(D)	200	1.7	7 421	2.2	149	2.1	2 711	3.0
Clinton.....	7	11.9	185	12.9	105	2.6	2 484	4.3	72	3.4	(D)	(D)
Crawford.....	3	22.0	6	21.4	267	1.2	8 926	2.0	226	1.4	4 418	2.4
Daviess.....	19	5.6	1 628	1.7	571	1.1	20 298	1.5	266	1.8	4 803	3.2
Dearborn.....	21	6.5	84	15.5	426	.9	11 046	2.0	362	1.1	4 864	1.9
Decatur.....	4	17.0	4	17.0	281	1.4	16 193	1.6	164	2.1	3 750	2.3
De Kalb.....	14	7.5	560	3.2	163	1.9	8 782	1.8	68	3.3	749	4.2
Delaware.....	13	6.4	288	6.3	145	2.2	4 857	3.5	93	2.9	1 591	5.2
Dubois.....	15	6.9	491	7.1	467	.9	26 807	1.2	376	1.0	9 535	1.6
Elkhart.....	135	2.1	23 524	1.3	757	.8	42 719	1.0	153	2.3	1 932	3.0
Fayette.....	3	14.8	(D)	(D)	226	1.7	9 201	2.6	194	1.9	3 647	2.7
Floyd.....	7	9.4	12	12.6	164	1.3	3 332	1.8	144	1.5	1 632	2.0
Fountain.....	4	17.6	484	18.0	235	1.6	9 075	2.6	196	1.8	4 303	2.6
Franklin.....	20	6.3	222	13.3	452	.9	16 193	1.4	341	1.2	5 207	1.8
Fulton.....	37	3.4	9 913	2.5	241	1.6	10 394	2.0	133	2.4	2 302	3.4
Gibson.....	23	4.9	2 416	1.6	151	1.9	6 620	2.1	108	2.4	1 870	2.9
Grant.....	6	12.0	24	13.8	134	2.1	4 728	1.9	86	2.8	1 131	3.0
Greene.....	5	8.3	596	1.8	546	.8	21 561	1.2	466	1.0	10 091	1.4
Hamilton.....	13	8.2	717	2.0	154	2.0	4 267	2.4	100	2.6	1 480	3.0
Hancock.....	16	7.3	515	8.0	139	2.3	3 437	2.9	103	2.7	1 341	3.4
Harrison.....	17	6.9	64	11.3	678	.8	24 294	1.5	578	.9	10 520	1.4
Hendricks.....	7	10.2	28	11.8	219	1.7	7 176	3.0	163	2.0	2 918	4.0
Henry.....	8	10.1	1 052	9.2	325	1.4	11 078	1.9	234	1.7	3 243	2.0
Howard.....	4	16.2	58	17.9	137	2.1	5 000	2.4	79	2.9	792	4.1
Huntington.....	7	11.2	20	15.1	154	2.0	7 070	1.7	101	2.6	1 417	2.8
Jackson.....	11	8.7	518	5.8	398	1.2	18 996	1.5	282	1.6	4 802	2.6
Jasper.....	57	3.0	16 523	1.8	132	2.3	10 734	1.2	100	2.7	2 230	3.1
Jay.....	7	9.7	202	10.7	225	1.8	8 873	2.0	101	3.0	1 136	5.2
Jefferson.....	25	5.9	335	3.7	413	1.1	14 068	1.7	364	1.3	6 546	2.0
Jennings.....	8	10.0	671	10.6	317	1.3	9 529	1.9	256	1.5	3 931	2.1
Johnson.....	8	8.6	1 241	3.6	188	1.8	8 884	2.5	120	2.5	2 092	5.7
Knox.....	70	2.4	13 687	1.4	184	1.7	10 379	1.6	136	2.1	3 652	2.4
Kosciusko.....	46	2.9	12 476	1.8	397	1.1	26 429	1.0	185	1.9	3 216	3.0
Lagrange.....	71	3.0	23 478	1.8	925	.8	39 275	1.0	91	2.8	1 205	4.2
Lake.....	38	4.1	6 211	2.3	88	2.9	3 204	2.8	49	4.3	714	5.4
La Porte.....	111	2.2	27 090	1.4	234	1.8	24 980	1.1	120	2.8	1 675	3.8
Lawrence.....	14	7.4	2 968	11.4	582	.8	27 336	2.0	498	.9	13 425	2.0
Madison.....	10	5.2	936	.1	213	1.7	6 485	1.7	154	2.0	2 299	2.0
Marion.....	41	3.7	263	3.1	42	4.2	965	6.3	24	5.7	297	6.3
Marshall.....	25	5.5	4 662	4.6	313	1.5	15 452	1.7	148	2.4	2 350	4.0
Martin.....	—	—	—	—	218	1.4	8 017	2.3	178	1.7	3 502	2.6
Miami.....	16	5.7	1 867	7.7	243	1.3	14 578	2.0	139	1.9	2 074	2.9
Monroe.....	13	6.9	91	22.4	275	1.2	10 717	2.3	232	1.4	5 329	2.2
Montgomery.....	12	8.2	870	5.7	247	1.6	8 701	2.0	187	1.9	3 813	2.2
Morgan.....	5	11.9	35	9.4	279	1.5	9 063	2.2	220	1.8	3 724	2.3
Newton.....	24	4.9	7 324	1.2	90	2.7	3 660	3.6	79	3.0	(D)	(D)
Noble.....	26	5.1	4 244	2.2	335	1.3	16 262	1.7	144	2.2	2 236	3.1
Ohio.....	20	6.6	390	4.8	150	1.7	3 327	2.6	133	1.9	1 712	2.8
Orange.....	3	13.9	(D)	(D)	311	1.3	12 965	2.4	257	1.5	5 644	2.5

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	Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry							
	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
					Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Owen .....	7	10.7	93	3.0	309	1.2	10 917	2.0	264	1.4	5 040	2.1
Parke .....	17	7.4	803	8.7	221	1.6	9 518	2.1	176	1.8	3 637	2.7
Perry .....	11	7.9	187	11.0	347	.9	12 521	1.6	314	1.1	5 868	1.9
Pike .....	2	17.2	(D)	(D)	107	2.5	3 509	3.4	87	2.9	1 597	3.7
Porter .....	39	3.9	6 827	3.3	124	2.1	4 416	2.2	84	2.7	1 347	3.7
Posey .....	19	2.5	3 445	.1	99	2.4	4 040	2.8	63	3.2	1 112	3.7
Pulaski .....	53	3.1	10 999	1.7	138	2.2	6 106	3.0	88	3.0	1 293	4.1
Putnam .....	6	12.5	50	18.5	379	1.2	12 155	1.5	300	1.4	5 256	1.7
Randolph .....	8	10.5	90	6.1	230	1.6	7 862	2.6	151	2.1	1 850	2.9
Ripley .....	21	5.5	80	5.8	410	1.2	15 012	1.8	331	1.4	5 548	2.3
Rush .....	2	26.8	(D)	(D)	232	1.8	14 194	1.4	127	2.5	3 211	2.1
St. Joseph .....	61	3.0	12 941	1.6	170	1.9	6 440	2.6	78	3.1	724	4.3
Scott .....	8	9.3	70	13.1	177	1.8	4 675	2.4	147	2.1	(D)	(D)
Shelby .....	12	7.8	1 672	.1	205	1.7	6 283	2.3	130	2.4	1 978	2.8
Spencer .....	6	13.7	142	18.5	316	1.3	14 051	1.9	259	1.5	6 343	1.7
Starke .....	51	2.9	10 795	2.2	63	3.7	1 702	4.0	39	4.8	(D)	(D)
Steuben .....	17	7.1	1 225	5.3	166	1.9	9 257	2.5	72	3.2	1 110	4.8
Sullivan .....	29	4.7	5 575	3.1	153	2.1	5 386	2.8	128	2.3	2 467	3.1
Switzerland .....	35	5.8	140	8.1	287	1.4	7 809	2.4	247	1.6	3 903	3.0
Tippecanoe .....	32	4.3	3 689	1.5	202	1.7	7 761	1.6	155	2.0	3 626	2.1
Tipton .....	3	17.0	(D)	(D)	69	3.2	2 004	3.6	35	4.8	(D)	(D)
Union .....	5	12.3	40	12.1	124	2.0	4 259	2.6	90	2.6	1 581	3.4
Vanderburgh .....	10	10.4	(D)	(D)	57	3.4	1 808	4.3	36	4.6	364	6.6
Vermillion .....	3	12.7	(D)	(D)	102	2.0	4 442	2.8	85	2.4	(D)	(D)
Vigo .....	15	7.3	357	2.1	138	2.4	3 050	3.6	116	2.6	1 307	3.6
Wabash .....	15	7.1	782	7.1	195	1.9	22 465	1.1	80	3.3	1 138	4.3
Warren .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	127	2.4	5 000	2.8	112	2.6	(D)	(D)
Warrick .....	11	8.7	27	10.5	144	1.9	4 630	2.4	117	2.2	1 596	2.8
Washington .....	6	9.7	7	8.3	565	.8	30 138	1.3	456	1.0	11 227	1.7
Wayne .....	10	8.6	314	10.4	374	1.2	16 425	1.6	245	1.6	4 606	2.4
Wells .....	3	17.2	4	17.2	111	2.2	8 287	1.4	37	4.2	420	4.9
White .....	14	5.7	2 333	2.5	173	2.0	6 965	2.1	129	2.4	2 518	2.9
Whitley .....	8	10.2	718	.4	222	1.8	9 534	2.0	77	3.5	1 109	3.4
Livestock and poultry—Con.												
Geographic area	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>Indiana .....</b>	<b>3 216</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>131 630</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>6 442</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>3 972 060</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>1 927</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>54 227</b>	<b>1.3</b>
Adams .....	261	1.9	5 968	1.8	281	1.8	105 431	1.4	27	6.0	1 143	15.0
Allen .....	135	2.8	3 919	2.4	127	2.7	49 783	2.0	46	4.9	897	8.3
Bartholomew .....	15	5.3	1 125	4.4	45	3.1	24 052	1.5	29	4.7	609	8.5
Benton .....	5	10.5	250	8.6	18	4.9	6 982	2.9	11	9.3	866	15.3
Blackford .....	2	24.0	(D)	(D)	27	5.3	33 458	1.4	12	9.0	217	9.1
Boone .....	14	9.4	316	13.5	93	2.5	69 682	.7	23	5.6	608	8.8
Brown .....	6	8.2	(D)	(D)	8	10.3	203	15.8	7	9.1	189	11.1
Carroll .....	17	6.1	538	6.5	163	1.4	255 176	.4	29	4.6	751	6.3
Cass .....	17	6.6	1 122	2.3	113	2.3	72 036	.8	42	4.6	1 502	7.4
Clark .....	16	5.9	732	5.2	26	4.9	3 506	3.4	11	7.8	330	9.3
Clay .....	9	9.1	690	1.7	52	3.5	18 415	1.7	11	9.2	278	11.7
Clinton .....	1	33.7	(D)	(D)	119	1.9	181 579	.5	31	5.2	860	8.5
Crawford .....	16	7.2	272	8.1	13	9.0	948	11.5	3	17.2	(D)	(D)
Daviess .....	209	2.2	3 110	2.2	303	1.6	154 715	1.2	39	5.0	776	9.0
Dearborn .....	13	7.2	490	4.3	29	5.2	1 868	8.0	16	6.9	394	9.6
Decatur .....	22	6.2	1 126	4.9	145	2.0	147 844	.7	21	5.9	591	6.3
De Kalb .....	31	4.7	2 727	2.0	47	4.0	18 355	2.5	24	5.9	584	8.4
Delaware .....	11	7.9	569	5.4	63	3.1	24 502	1.3	26	6.1	506	7.1
Dubois .....	33	3.8	2 753	2.1	177	1.6	110 646	.9	20	6.6	791	18.8
Elkhart .....	348	1.3	18 297	1.1	184	2.0	73 951	1.2	50	4.1	889	5.1
Fayette .....	14	9.5	631	11.3	65	3.8	24 878	2.7	17	8.9	460	15.0
Floyd .....	5	11.1	55	13.5	14	5.6	1 864	3.1	4	11.6	(D)	(D)
Fountain .....	9	10.9	172	17.5	46	4.3	25 918	1.5	11	8.6	258	12.6
Franklin .....	30	4.2	1 831	2.9	101	2.4	38 620	2.4	32	4.7	667	5.6
Fulton .....	34	4.6	1 606	3.2	74	2.8	33 912	1.0	26	5.8	570	10.5
Gibson .....	21	5.0	963	3.7	61	2.8	38 267	.7	7	11.1	197	13.8
Grant .....	8	8.4	982	2.6	65	2.6	27 858	1.3	19	6.7	390	8.0
Greene .....	24	5.1	871	4.2	56	3.4	96 385	.3	18	6.2	1 820	7.0
Hamilton .....	5	11.8	294	7.5	58	3.4	24 010	1.7	38	5.0	900	7.2
Hancock .....	9	9.8	114	18.5	61	3.1	54 942	1.1	45	4.3	1 521	6.9
Harrison .....	35	4.4	1 560	3.9	46	3.9	5 953	3.6	10	8.9	395	14.4
Hendricks .....	19	5.7	559	5.5	50	4.0	25 011	1.9	33	5.1	845	8.0
Henry .....	19	6.5	984	4.1	65	3.4	18 097	2.9	36	5.2	1 076	10.2
Howard .....	16	7.8	611	8.6	96	2.2	73 259	1.0	8	11.3	251	14.0

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	Livestock and poultry—Con.											
	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Huntington	16	4.1	1 049	3.5	83	2.7	36 854	1.8	36	4.7	652	5.6
Jackson	34	4.3	2 717	2.3	67	3.3	34 410	1.9	10	9.6	896	4.6
Jasper	5	9.7	199	.2	80	2.6	93 813	.5	9	9.1	201	12.1
Jay	61	3.7	2 082	2.7	126	2.3	53 052	1.5	36	5.0	670	8.5
Jefferson	26	5.6	826	6.1	21	6.8	3 699	8.3	14	7.9	248	11.9
Jennings	10	8.3	387	6.2	50	4.0	11 430	4.3	7	13.2	270	22.8
Johnson	11	6.6	1 134	2.8	41	4.4	14 037	2.0	11	10.2	580	31.9
Knox	7	10.0	234	11.4	84	2.5	44 215	.8	7	11.7	111	15.5
Kosciusko	74	3.0	3 482	2.4	129	2.0	102 998	.7	56	3.5	1 951	10.1
Lagrange	528	1.2	11 396	1.3	259	1.8	69 338	1.5	63	3.9	1 243	7.6
Lake	16	6.4	826	4.4	26	5.0	9 435	1.1	11	9.5	208	13.3
La Porte	47	4.0	5 365	1.8	57	3.6	27 110	1.5	27	5.7	780	4.2
Lawrence	16	7.1	741	8.0	32	5.1	4 218	8.4	18	6.9	190	9.8
Madison	6	10.6	104	10.3	63	3.0	26 111	1.3	33	4.5	785	5.6
Marion	3	20.4	90	23.4	8	9.1	764	4.7	9	11.1	312	12.6
Marshall	81	3.3	4 589	2.6	89	3.2	15 124	3.2	44	4.4	1 708	7.1
Martin	16	7.7	166	9.5	43	4.4	24 716	3.0	5	10.7	75	20.4
Miami	38	3.3	2 547	2.3	107	1.9	99 543	.8	24	5.5	808	8.4
Monroe	11	9.1	354	10.1	16	6.3	279	10.7	15	6.9	308	7.7
Montgomery	6	10.2	51	12.5	69	3.0	91 444	.5	38	5.1	1 240	10.1
Morgan	13	8.3	256	5.3	50	4.1	10 515	2.5	32	5.4	927	7.2
Newton	1	38.9	(D)	(D)	19	3.8	22 013	1	14	8.1	293	9.1
Noble	104	2.7	4 716	2.2	75	3.0	43 481	1.5	40	4.5	1 243	6.1
Ohio	5	14.2	135	18.6	6	12.3	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Orange	23	6.3	713	7.9	45	4.4	16 330	2.9	8	11.5	262	13.7
Owen	16	7.5	410	10.5	34	4.6	12 934	1.6	21	6.0	551	5.7
Parke	32	5.5	1 228	5.1	50	3.9	25 025	2.4	17	6.8	183	8.3
Perry	11	8.4	769	4.7	51	3.6	28 890	1.8	9	9.9	90	11.4
Pike	4	14.8	200	14.6	18	7.2	5 986	4.8	4	14.4	70	16.4
Porter	16	5.2	950	2.8	51	3.3	14 134	2.6	21	6.0	558	9.8
Posey	16	6.5	1 036	5.4	31	4.5	12 359	2.3	6	10.9	101	15.2
Pulaski	17	7.1	1 406	4.0	75	2.9	54 160	1.2	13	9.2	486	9.7
Putnam	12	8.2	333	7.4	93	2.6	40 026	1.5	53	3.9	1 163	5.0
Randolph	24	5.1	845	5.1	97	2.6	50 936	1.2	31	5.4	1 039	8.4
Ripley	19	6.7	970	4.3	94	2.8	33 316	2.5	25	5.9	875	9.5
Rush	32	5.6	1 525	3.8	158	2.0	109 134	.9	23	6.8	634	10.7
St. Joseph	43	3.8	2 222	3.4	64	3.3	27 430	1.7	17	8.1	293	9.8
Scott	2	14.8	(D)	(D)	16	7.4	1 253	18.6	11	9.4	217	11.1
Shelby	18	7.0	781	7.3	49	3.1	63 453	.7	25	5.6	677	8.0
Spencer	22	6.4	1 183	7.0	75	3.0	48 437	1.4	10	10.1	219	10.0
Starke	1	34.4	(D)	(D)	32	5.2	2 268	3.4	7	11.2	70	14.8
Steuben	48	3.4	2 618	2.6	31	5.1	6 859	6.1	7	10.1	187	12.7
Sullivan	11	8.2	362	7.7	35	4.9	13 898	3.1	12	9.6	272	18.1
Switzerland	22	6.9	622	7.9	23	5.9	(D)	(D)	7	11.7	96	11.5
Tippecanoe	6	12.8	239	6.9	70	2.7	90 874	.5	39	3.8	1 941	8.0
Tipton	3	19.3	(D)	(D)	57	3.0	56 821	.8	14	8.5	445	7.3
Union	10	8.3	508	6.9	53	3.0	28 912	2.4	7	9.7	180	11.1
Vanderburgh	8	7.3	478	7.3	12	6.4	3 804	7.7	6	11.8	81	16.4
Vermillion	1	—	(D)	(D)	15	6.5	24 205	.8	9	8.5	352	8.5
Vigo	6	12.7	149	20.7	34	4.9	15 563	1.6	7	11.6	126	10.6
Wabash	39	4.3	2 079	3.5	119	2.3	127 954	.8	29	5.3	1 650	12.5
Warren	2	19.7	(D)	(D)	16	7.4	(D)	(D)	9	9.6	163	13.3
Warrick	9	7.2	586	5.9	32	5.0	11 829	4.9	7	9.9	95	4.4
Washington	52	3.5	2 410	2.4	73	3.0	17 299	2.1	15	7.7	510	11.7
Wayne	53	3.7	2 764	2.9	90	2.7	36 397	1.7	41	4.4	1 015	5.1
Wells	22	4.8	1 703	2.6	80	2.5	65 972	1.1	14	7.1	172	9.0
White	9	9.0	606	3.6	102	2.1	110 596	.5	24	6.4	519	7.9
Whitley	43	4.3	2 197	3.4	96	2.7	59 829	1.3	38	5.0	934	5.9

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)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
<b>Indiana</b>	<b>1 785</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>20 613 402</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>10 391 178</b>	<b>2.1</b>			
Adams	81	3.3	942 178	4.3	14	8.8	357 530	11.0			
Allen	50	4.9	19 780	19.0	7	11.0	380	13.5			
Bartholomew	11	8.0	204	8.0	1	24.5	(D)	(D)			
Benton	4	16.9	127	31.8	—	—	—	—			
Blackford	6	11.4	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—			
Boone	17	6.9	680	10.9	—	—	—	—			
Brown	8	10.1	234	14.4	1	29.5	(D)	(D)			
Carroll	16	6.6	636	8.1	—	—	—	—			
Cass	12	9.5	381	16.7	3	20.8	(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	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)
Clark	15	6.8	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)
Clay	14	7.0	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)
Clinton	15	7.4	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Crawford	18	6.7	350	9.1	—	—	—	—
Daviess	59	4.4	1 061	4.5	2	27.3	(D)	(D)
Dearborn	18	6.8	783	10.3	—	—	—	—
Decatur	9	10.5	214	14.3	—	—	—	—
De Kalb	16	7.1	382	8.5	3	13.2	150	20.4
Delaware	22	6.8	686	9.6	—	—	—	—
Dubois	37	3.1	2 841	9.6	2	—	(D)	(D)
Elkhart	88	3.2	77 185	5.2	45	4.3	3 005 354	4.5
Fayette	5	16.7	190	24.9	—	—	—	—
Floyd	5	12.2	75	14.5	1	17.3	(D)	(D)
Fountain	8	10.8	118	12.2	—	—	—	—
Franklin	26	5.5	906	8.6	2	21.6	(D)	(D)
Fulton	14	8.4	(D)	(D)	3	20.8	(D)	(D)
Gibson	10	8.6	167	10.4	—	—	—	—
Grant	9	9.5	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Greene	29	5.2	671	8.8	2	14.7	(D)	(D)
Hamilton	15	7.9	393	11.4	2	26.4	(D)	(D)
Hancock	13	9.5	261	11.5	—	—	—	—
Harrison	36	4.4	(D)	(D)	10	6.3	1 952 978	2.4
Hendricks	17	6.8	257	7.9	—	—	—	—
Henry	17	7.8	404	11.4	1	31.8	(D)	(D)
Howard	13	8.6	5 357	22.1	1	28.6	(D)	(D)
Huntington	13	6.1	65 334	(L)	—	—	—	—
Jackson	22	6.3	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Jasper	7	12.4	(D)	(D)	1	34.3	(D)	(D)
Jay	42	3.6	1 779	966	1	33.2	(L)	(D)
Jefferson	20	6.9	276	7.0	—	—	—	—
Jennings	13	8.6	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Johnson	15	7.7	218	11.8	—	—	—	—
Knox	9	10.0	141	17.4	—	—	—	—
Kosciusko	30	4.6	2 461	526	5	14.1	(L)	(D)
Lagrange	207	2.0	258 050	1.2	32	5.7	1 870 836	7.0
Lake	15	8.3	999	18.6	—	—	—	—
La Porte	26	6.5	782	11.0	4	16.8	(D)	(D)
Lawrence	22	6.0	318	6.8	—	—	—	—
Madison	21	6.0	479	7.5	2	26.3	(D)	(D)
Marion	2	26.7	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Marshall	25	6.1	(D)	(D)	8	11.0	(D)	(D)
Martin	12	8.3	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Miami	25	4.9	529	5.7	5	11.7	260	14.2
Monroe	12	8.1	226	12.8	—	—	—	—
Montgomery	19	8.4	456	14.9	—	—	—	—
Morgan	10	11.2	181	12.3	1	35.7	(D)	(D)
Newton	3	17.1	(D)	(D)	1	38.8	(D)	(D)
Noble	32	5.5	997	8.8	3	21.1	(D)	(D)
Ohio	4	16.1	102	23.8	1	37.0	(D)	(D)
Orange	15	7.4	(D)	(D)	1	36.0	(D)	(D)
Owen	22	6.7	563	7.4	—	—	—	—
Parke	17	8.8	444	12.2	1	37.7	(D)	(D)
Perry	17	7.0	460	7.1	—	—	—	—
Pike	3	16.8	66	21.2	—	—	—	—
Porter	19	5.1	288	6.3	2	13.5	(D)	(D)
Posey	7	9.5	153	11.4	—	—	—	—
Pulaski	10	9.0	(D)	(D)	1	27.9	(D)	(D)
Putnam	26	5.9	504	7.1	—	—	—	—
Randolph	12	7.8	(D)	(D)	1	30.2	(D)	(D)
Ripley	27	5.8	1 014	9.1	—	—	—	—
Rush	10	12.0	355	17.3	2	26.8	(D)	(D)
St. Joseph	26	5.5	(D)	(D)	6	10.3	852	11.0
Scott	17	8.0	343	9.9	—	—	—	—
Shelby	5	11.9	179	17.3	—	—	—	—
Spencer	4	13.3	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Starke	12	9.2	892	13.8	2	28.4	(D)	(D)
Steuben	11	8.8	262	15.0	1	29.7	(D)	(D)
Sullivan	6	13.1	99	14.7	—	—	—	—
Switzerland	20	6.8	462	9.3	2	21.0	(D)	(D)
Tippecanoe	17	6.6	(D)	(D)	2	14.7	(D)	(D)
Tipton	4	14.5	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Union	4	15.1	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Vanderburgh	3	18.1	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Vermillion	5	11.2	70	12.4	—	—	—	—
Vigo	12	9.3	450	15.4	—	—	—	—
Wabash	13	9.0	(D)	(D)	2	24.7	(D)	(D)
Warren	1	34.3	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Warrick	7	12.0	103	14.0	2	21.6	(D)	(D)
Washington	30	5.1	69 439	4.6	5	6.4	2 023 254	(L)
Wayne	16	8.4	471	10.2	2	25.6	(D)	(D)
Wells	20	5.5	170 689	2.2	2	22.5	(D)	(D)
White	14	7.1	(D)	(D)	2	25.3	(D)	(D)
Whitley	14	8.0	(D)	(D)	2	25.7	(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											
	Corn for grain or seed					Corn for silage or green chop						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	Farms		Acres		Quantity		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, green	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
<b>Indiana</b> .....	<b>30 642</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>5 473 792</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>652 547 322</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>3 365</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>102 464</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>1 639 160</b>	<b>.5</b>
Adams .....	696	.9	70 784	1.0	9 626 844	1.0	121	2.6	3 135	2.1	47 680	2.0
Allen .....	845	1.0	85 866	1.0	11 597 698	1.0	73	3.8	1 874	3.9	28 224	3.3
Bartholomew .....	367	.8	67 794	.8	7 684 825	.8	24	4.4	786	3.5	12 363	3.5
Benton .....	382	.7	120 732	.6	15 810 028	.6	8	8.0	203	7.6	3 285	7.3
Blackford .....	159	1.5	28 065	1.2	3 450 962	1.2	4	14.6	84	20.4	1 000	16.5
Boone .....	379	1.0	98 481	.8	11 738 962	.8	14	7.7	642	9.0	15 390	6.6
Brown .....	37	4.2	1 840	5.0	184 079	4.5	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Carroll .....	376	.7	103 130	.5	14 569 784	.4	27	3.3	974	6.0	15 598	10.2
Cass .....	419	1.0	84 862	.8	11 328 965	.7	25	5.2	909	3.6	17 416	2.9
Clark .....	176	1.7	16 708	1.5	1 527 244	1.4	19	4.4	677	4.8	11 161	3.9
Clay .....	332	1.0	64 916	1.0	7 078 022	1.0	26	4.9	923	2.9	14 391	2.3
Clinton .....	423	.8	108 819	.6	13 735 695	.6	8	12.2	71	14.6	981	14.2
Crawford .....	31	5.0	713	5.0	52 805	4.9	8	10.7	244	9.7	4 690	21.4
Daviess .....	639	1.0	89 873	.9	8 742 059	.9	177	2.3	2 987	2.2	43 805	1.9
Dearborn .....	150	1.9	7 361	3.5	638 892	3.6	20	5.9	623	6.6	7 710	5.8
Decatur .....	441	.9	83 777	.8	10 437 791	.8	49	3.8	2 231	2.2	37 572	2.5
De Kalb .....	324	1.2	36 636	1.2	4 327 664	1.2	37	4.1	1 971	2.5	29 599	2.4
Delaware .....	356	1.0	63 858	.7	7 273 557	.7	15	6.4	563	5.1	7 919	4.7
Dubois .....	440	.8	59 549	.8	5 451 897	.8	56	2.9	2 896	1.9	42 627	2.0
Elkhart .....	695	.8	64 955	1.0	8 539 274	1.0	319	1.4	10 826	1.4	192 227	1.4
Fayette .....	235	1.5	38 122	1.8	3 917 276	1.8	17	8.3	554	5.5	7 072	4.6
Floyd .....	58	2.5	3 264	7.9	280 902	11.2	3	16.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Fountain .....	363	1.0	79 676	1.0	8 655 044	.9	22	6.2	401	10.1	5 908	9.5
Franklin .....	387	1.0	35 220	1.3	3 511 824	1.4	60	3.1	1 876	2.3	23 769	2.2
Fulton .....	396	.9	70 435	.9	8 901 341	.9	44	4.0	1 584	4.4	23 854	4.4
Gibson .....	385	.8	95 804	.6	10 528 687	.6	25	4.0	814	5.2	12 552	4.6
Grant .....	337	.9	71 940	.7	9 648 372	.7	7	8.6	750	2.7	13 140	2.7
Greene .....	292	1.2	51 262	1.2	4 787 550	1.2	39	3.9	1 062	5.2	12 687	7.0
Hamilton .....	300	1.2	57 296	.9	7 205 479	.9	8	7.3	257	5.9	5 666	6.1
Hancock .....	347	1.0	71 651	.8	8 934 774	.7	17	6.4	329	6.0	5 230	6.2
Harrison .....	249	1.5	18 929	1.8	1 221 649	1.8	39	4.0	1 434	4.4	13 731	4.4
Hendricks .....	307	1.2	66 663	.8	8 034 070	.9	9	8.2	242	12.0	3 865	9.8
Henry .....	441	1.0	70 172	1.0	8 580 044	1.0	27	5.2	882	3.9	11 087	4.1
Howard .....	347	.8	64 341	.8	9 159 882	.8	20	6.1	842	4.2	15 358	3.5
Huntington .....	394	.9	64 040	.9	8 383 839	.9	27	4.7	683	4.8	10 956	7.1
Jackson .....	439	1.0	59 118	1.3	5 987 878	1.4	42	3.8	1 890	2.4	29 824	1.6
Jasper .....	465	.8	138 246	.7	17 532 560	.7	26	4.1	1 007	2.0	19 292	1.9
Jay .....	441	1.0	55 697	1.0	6 464 525	1.0	40	3.7	1 350	2.7	22 892	2.3
Jefferson .....	194	1.8	11 714	2.1	1 029 827	1.9	20	6.2	769	4.1	8 530	5.1
Jennings .....	234	1.5	32 757	1.6	3 385 159	1.7	23	5.4	761	7.6	10 830	7.8
Johnson .....	286	1.2	59 275	1.1	7 051 574	1.2	27	4.8	965	2.9	18 575	2.1
Knox .....	421	.8	109 195	.6	11 954 848	.6	19	5.0	578	2.6	10 665	1.9
Kosciusko .....	584	.8	93 186	.7	12 224 215	.7	76	2.9	3 019	2.3	52 684	2.6
Lagrange .....	817	.8	61 262	1.1	7 350 203	1.0	484	1.2	5 230	1.3	84 709	1.2
Lake .....	249	1.1	68 344	.9	8 926 139	.8	18	5.8	429	5.6	7 812	6.1
La Porte .....	454	1.0	113 242	.7	15 190 619	.7	64	3.5	3 176	2.1	59 964	1.9
Lawrence .....	210	1.6	18 610	2.2	1 729 070	1.8	37	4.4	1 056	5.8	14 125	7.0
Madison .....	471	.8	95 169	.8	12 384 287	.7	13	7.3	478	5.9	6 285	3.7
Marion .....	64	2.9	9 248	2.5	1 095 409	2.7	8	9.9	164	17.6	2 230	21.0
Marshall .....	540	.9	84 829	1.0	10 473 157	1.0	86	3.2	3 092	3.1	48 174	3.1
Martin .....	120	2.2	16 105	2.2	1 328 087	2.1	12	9.5	322	8.2	5 276	9.5
Miami .....	442	.7	73 862	.7	9 579 147	.7	41	3.0	2 655	4.3	49 363	5.5
Monroe .....	93	2.4	6 047	3.8	588 191	3.9	19	6.6	370	9.0	5 746	8.5
Montgomery .....	449	.8	115 932	.7	12 580 944	.6	23	5.9	336	6.9	4 974	7.1
Morgan .....	275	1.3	50 799	1.2	6 149 122	1.2	8	3.9	186	1.2	2 970	.9
Newton .....	305	.9	106 200	.7	13 665 526	.7	17	6.7	539	9.6	7 382	10.7
Noble .....	519	.9	58 456	1.2	7 102 292	1.2	92	2.9	2 198	2.7	34 896	2.8
Ohio .....	28	5.3	2 066	2.6	170 353	2.7	5	13.6	113	21.2	1 578	17.3
Orange .....	148	2.0	22 017	1.8	1 828 735	1.8	17	7.2	686	5.9	11 155	5.6
Owen .....	192	1.6	20 534	1.9	2 310 391	1.8	19	5.7	587	6.1	7 602	6.3
Parke .....	271	1.2	66 914	1.0	7 285 614	1.0	26	6.0	654	6.5	11 047	7.0
Perry .....	137	1.9	8 232	2.9	735 609	3.1	11	8.5	423	8.8	5 471	8.9
Pike .....	152	1.7	29 996	1.9	2 547 963	1.7	9	9.6	226	10.6	4 088	12.1
Porter .....	288	.9	60 976	.9	8 186 659	.9	20	5.9	541	9.5	6 887	4.3
Posey .....	311	1.0	81 561	.8	8 707 068	.8	20	5.5	709	4.0	9 448	4.8
Pulaski .....	412	.8	106 040	.7	13 303 268	.7	26	5.7	1 074	4.1	21 106	4.2
Putnam .....	324	1.2	63 661	1.0	7 076 555	1.0	23	5.3	539	3.8	8 211	3.3
Randolph .....	530	.8	78 429	.8	8 769 232	.9	28	4.5	885	4.9	13 595	5.9
Ripley .....	431	1.1	48 345	1.2	4 630 138	1.3	38	4.5	1 499	5.8	27 250	6.1
Rush .....	516	1.0	95 585	.9	12 282 075	.9	42	4.2	1 783	2.1	27 635	2.2
St. Joseph .....	370	1.0	69 251	.8	8 685 397	.8	43	3.6	1 402	3.4	23 303	3.5
Scott .....	94	2.5	9 693	2.3	816 533	2.2	9	8.6	206	7.8	3 502	9.1
Shelby .....	420	.9	92 051	.7	11 069 155	.7	21	6.5	646	5.8	8 899	6.4
Spencer .....	319	1.2	55 715	1.0	5 134 350	.9	20	6.5	739	5.1	13 217	5.0
Starke .....	233	1.4	59 664	1.0	7 059 966	1.0	11	7.9	183	9.3	3 342	11.4
Steuben .....	252	1.4	32 152	1.3	3 704 294	1.3	37	4.2	1 477	3.4	24 019	3.7
Sullivan .....	299	1.1	69 759	.9	7 114 423	.9	13	6.7	377	5.8	4 319	4.0
Switzerland .....	71	3.6	4 304	4.2	396 013	3.9	15	7.7	470	6.4	5 178	5.9
Tippecanoe .....	393	.9	104 188	.7	11 677 362	.7	12	8.3	696	8.8	10 274	9.0

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												
	Corn for grain or seed					Corn for silage or green chop							
	Farms		Acres		Quantity			Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, green	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Tipton .....	316	.9	70 977	.7	9 957 250	.7	4	12.3	120	19.9	2 350	18.8	
Union .....	183	1.2	33 895	1.3	4 465 355	1.4	13	6.8	326	6.2	5 950	7.2	
Vanderburgh .....	162	1.3	31 645	1.3	3 319 954	1.3	8	6.9	191	6.3	3 390	4.5	
Vermillion .....	185	.9	47 354	.9	5 058 426	.9	13	5.9	286	6.6	3 923	4.7	
Vigo .....	236	1.4	43 440	1.5	4 432 944	1.4	7	10.9	221	18.1	4 026	22.8	
Wabash .....	407	1.1	69 202	.9	8 999 887	.9	51	3.7	1 761	2.7	30 274	3.0	
Warren .....	243	1.2	75 814	.7	8 234 505	.8	13	8.6	506	14.1	7 370	15.1	
Warrick .....	191	1.3	33 671	1.5	3 491 964	1.5	15	7.2	499	6.8	6 300	7.9	
Washington .....	269	1.4	34 083	1.5	2 991 977	1.5	47	3.4	2 435	1.8	34 213	2.0	
Wayne .....	406	1.1	55 693	1.1	6 822 792	1.1	54	3.6	1 853	3.3	31 894	3.5	
Wells .....	433	.8	75 280	.7	10 086 371	.7	23	4.5	931	3.2	13 747	3.0	
White .....	458	.8	118 282	.6	15 653 945	.6	20	4.3	606	3.6	9 500	3.2	
Whitley .....	385	1.1	48 496	1.0	6 220 240	.9	41	4.1	1 516	4.4	21 193	4.3	
Selected crops harvested—Con.													
Geographic area	Wheat for grain					Oats 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>Indiana .....</b>	<b>10 658</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>545 027</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>29 209 090</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>1 739</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>23 551</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1 445 213</b>	<b>1.0</b>
Adams .....	285	1.6	11 593	1.7	697 543	1.5	134	2.7	1 390	3.5	86 789	3.5	
Allen .....	528	1.3	29 837	1.2	1 730 562	1.2	162	2.6	2 157	2.5	135 995	2.5	
Bartholomew .....	141	1.6	7 670	1.2	389 617	1.1	5	8.8	140	2.6	6 956	2.4	
Benton .....	31	4.1	2 055	2.7	121 581	2.1	18	5.7	323	4.3	18 662	4.4	
Blackford .....	54	3.3	3 207	1.7	164 802	1.7	5	11.1	63	10.7	4 350	9.5	
Boone .....	97	2.3	4 109	2.1	255 032	2.1	9	10.8	116	12.9	5 438	12.0	
Brown .....	4	13.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Carroll .....	128	1.6	4 185	1.6	271 548	1.7	18	4.8	231	2.7	12 421	2.3	
Cass .....	142	2.1	5 110	1.7	296 410	1.7	12	7.7	304	3.5	17 539	4.2	
Clark .....	102	2.4	5 898	1.7	244 767	1.5	6	12.5	44	11.2	1 800	12.6	
Clay .....	97	2.5	4 529	1.8	209 535	1.6	4	14.6	28	18.4	1 364	17.0	
Clinton .....	128	2.1	4 732	2.1	297 499	2.1	10	8.8	138	6.6	8 612	7.6	
Crawford .....	2	18.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	5	12.3	82	13.6	2 470	9.9	
Daviess .....	138	2.2	11 650	1.3	582 711	1.3	8	11.5	66	8.1	3 840	7.1	
Dearborn .....	62	3.2	1 135	3.8	44 602	3.9	7	11.0	71	13.3	3 364	13.7	
Decatur .....	206	1.6	9 023	1.6	497 771	1.5	16	7.5	196	7.6	10 505	6.9	
De Kalb .....	218	1.6	11 254	1.6	601 969	1.7	30	5.5	361	6.1	18 351	6.7	
Delaware .....	103	2.4	4 404	3.1	236 433	3.3	23	5.5	348	3.7	21 339	4.2	
Dubois .....	202	1.4	9 845	1.3	418 040	1.2	7	7.2	104	4.6	1 942	8.2	
Elkhart .....	162	2.0	3 861	2.8	195 209	2.7	83	3.2	826	3.4	50 194	3.5	
Fayette .....	125	2.6	4 237	2.5	229 285	2.4	7	12.6	111	12.4	6 560	10.8	
Floyd .....	29	3.8	454	7.1	18 815	7.7	1	20.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Fountain .....	76	3.1	3 205	3.1	176 712	3.1	15	7.7	325	7.3	23 468	7.7	
Franklin .....	190	1.6	4 382	2.5	205 680	2.5	24	5.1	206	6.3	11 117	6.1	
Fulton .....	95	2.4	2 727	2.6	138 209	2.6	9	8.5	115	4.7	9 762	2.1	
Gibson .....	254	1.1	30 044	.7	1 648 691	.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Grant .....	104	2.2	4 218	2.2	236 283	2.2	11	7.9	227	10.8	17 005	12.8	
Greene .....	67	3.0	3 272	2.8	151 052	3.0	5	14.1	96	18.4	6 160	21.2	
Hamilton .....	108	2.4	3 759	3.3	229 494	3.8	6	10.1	83	4.2	3 120	7.6	
Hancock .....	109	2.2	4 535	1.8	265 542	1.6	22	6.1	248	6.5	14 995	7.7	
Harrison .....	117	2.3	5 831	2.0	247 832	1.8	13	7.5	145	8.6	4 708	8.9	
Hendricks .....	100	2.4	5 086	1.5	283 757	1.5	8	10.1	155	9.5	8 410	10.1	
Henry .....	87	2.9	3 091	2.6	175 749	2.6	20	7.1	239	7.5	15 599	8.5	
Howard .....	95	2.1	2 835	2.3	180 442	2.3	15	6.7	261	4.7	19 253	4.9	
Huntington .....	213	1.6	8 692	1.9	470 345	1.9	32	4.3	585	3.8	30 927	4.7	
Jackson .....	178	2.0	7 351	2.1	326 469	2.1	6	12.6	43	12.6	2 553	10.5	
Jasper .....	58	3.1	1 901	4.3	89 844	4.1	12	2.9	213	.8	14 142	.5	
Jay .....	172	1.8	7 218	1.6	367 008	1.5	53	3.9	792	6.0	51 833	5.7	
Jefferson .....	48	3.6	3 247	1.7	125 080	1.6	7	11.8	65	13.5	3 110	13.8	
Jennings .....	59	3.8	2 222	3.3	95 464	3.4	4	13.6	59	17.6	1 529	17.3	
Johnson .....	106	2.5	4 516	2.5	251 496	2.5	6	9.9	87	7.8	5 910	5.6	
Knox .....	307	1.1	34 287	.8	1 884 175	.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Kosciusko .....	156	1.9	6 528	2.2	338 512	1.9	34	4.7	508	4.2	29 532	3.5	
Lagrange .....	166	2.1	3 993	2.0	208 074	1.9	223	2.0	2 106	2.2	147 534	2.3	
Lake .....	70	2.6	3 101	2.4	167 974	2.3	23	5.9	270	6.4	19 430	6.7	
La Porte .....	114	2.5	4 186	2.4	234 245	2.6	26	6.3	343	6.8	20 161	6.0	
Lawrence .....	51	3.3	2 538	2.8	112 692	2.2	7	9.6	133	10.0	7 000	10.7	
Madison .....	117	2.3	5 232	2.1	317 658	2.0	13	7.0	130	6.4	9 236	5.4	
Marion .....	15	6.1	491	5.5	26 856	6.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Marshall .....	145	2.3	5 158	1.9	275 315	1.9	44	4.5	627	4.1	35 656	4.6	
Martin .....	31	4.7	2 165	2.9	102 654	2.8	1	40.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Miami .....	125	1.8	5 706	1.6	325 933	1.7	15	5.3	209	4.9	13 192	4.8	
Monroe .....	23	5.6	439	7.3	19 971	7.5	6	10.5	78	9.6	3 400	7.4	
Montgomery .....	121	2.1	5 893	2.4	334 942	1.4	14	7.9	176	8.6	12 968	9.0	

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.											
	Wheat for grain					Oats 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)
Morgan	72	3.1	3 969	3.2	184 452	3.2	4	15.3	49	17.3	2 244	12.5
Newton	36	4.0	1 560	3.4	90 608	3.7	13	7.0	163	9.1	12 396	9.2
Noble	206	1.8	6 481	2.0	352 768	2.1	49	4.0	564	4.1	35 481	4.1
Ohio	5	12.2	110	2.8	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Orange	34	4.4	3 719	1.8	199 457	1.7	4	16.9	75	18.5	4 590	18.2
Owen	58	3.3	2 414	4.0	113 683	3.9	8	9.5	161	11.0	5 485	12.5
Parke	91	2.5	8 599	1.7	425 794	1.6	6	11.5	80	13.3	2 360	11.1
Perry	36	4.8	706	6.2	26 627	6.9	7	12.2	51	13.9	1 900	16.1
Pike	66	3.1	4 942	2.9	234 460	3.0	2	18.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Porter	111	2.1	3 964	2.8	226 428	2.7	28	4.6	482	3.9	29 569	4.6
Posey	263	1.2	34 300	.9	1 955 081	.8	2	23.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Pulaski	76	2.9	2 486	2.6	137 128	2.8	14	5.0	334	3.5	18 918	3.8
Putnam	97	2.5	5 086	2.2	281 428	1.9	15	7.6	228	10.9	12 674	10.2
Randolph	215	1.6	9 422	1.7	527 826	1.6	53	3.8	687	4.1	50 176	4.5
Ripley	161	2.0	5 292	1.9	218 313	2.1	20	7.1	172	9.0	6 585	8.6
Rush	204	1.8	7 884	1.9	486 735	1.9	18	7.5	245	9.0	13 725	10.9
St. Joseph	108	2.4	4 073	3.1	205 029	3.0	15	7.4	144	8.9	9 657	8.8
Scott	34	4.2	1 800	3.3	69 890	3.3	—	—	—	—	—	—
Shelby	121	2.3	6 710	2.1	371 207	2.1	11	8.9	123	8.1	8 000	7.0
Spencer	157	2.0	12 781	1.2	621 523	1.2	3	16.5	29	15.2	1 636	22.4
Starke	17	6.0	616	4.4	25 943	3.2	3	16.5	25	15.8	2 105	15.9
Steuben	126	2.2	4 483	2.0	227 402	2.1	33	4.4	529	4.8	31 744	5.0
Sullivan	103	2.4	9 049	2.1	419 649	1.6	2	18.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Switzerland	19	6.6	453	2.5	22 821	2.0	4	15.7	17	16.3	935	10.5
Tippecanoe	122	2.2	6 350	2.2	383 049	2.3	16	6.4	310	5.7	19 290	6.3
Tipton	59	3.0	3 246	2.3	220 251	2.1	10	7.3	105	7.1	8 390	6.5
Union	82	2.6	2 517	3.2	142 143	3.0	9	10.3	86	11.0	6 295	11.9
Vanderburgh	108	2.0	7 217	1.9	373 972	1.8	—	—	—	—	—	—
Vermillion	48	3.0	1 728	2.8	94 013	2.9	7	10.3	78	12.7	4 880	17.1
Vigo	69	3.4	3 365	2.6	181 224	2.4	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wabash	193	1.8	8 460	1.7	483 278	1.6	21	6.9	344	8.0	17 971	8.0
Warren	57	3.5	3 854	5.9	199 864	4.0	13	7.1	391	3.2	28 983	2.5
Warrick	73	2.9	5 867	2.1	259 451	2.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Washington	92	2.7	4 097	2.8	155 855	3.0	7	10.7	52	14.8	3 005	22.7
Wayne	149	2.1	6 044	2.6	345 231	2.5	32	5.0	818	17.4	46 525	16.9
Wells	180	1.6	7 831	1.4	478 562	1.3	21	5.6	285	3.9	18 869	3.2
White	111	2.3	3 961	1.8	235 425	1.7	21	5.0	479	3.1	43 944	2.6
Whitley	238	1.6	12 588	1.6	693 544	1.5	24	6.0	399	4.7	22 507	4.2

  

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>Indiana</b>	<b>28 056</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>5 003 186</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>210 645 005</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>22 923</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>674 789</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>1 756 825</b>	<b>.5</b>
Adams	649	1.0	85 457	1.1	3 665 042	1.0	407	1.4	10 073	1.9	30 345	1.9
Allen	773	1.0	102 944	1.1	4 440 568	1.0	448	1.5	10 510	1.9	28 736	1.9
Bartholomew	332	.8	58 378	.8	2 470 848	.8	225	1.3	5 271	2.1	13 900	2.0
Benton	377	.7	116 750	.6	5 298 827	.6	71	3.1	2 074	2.3	6 546	2.3
Blackford	176	1.4	38 889	1.4	1 577 874	1.3	67	3.0	1 402	3.8	4 200	4.8
Boone	359	1.0	98 462	.8	4 304 167	.8	188	1.9	5 122	2.6	14 409	2.6
Brown	15	6.8	1 022	6.5	43 345	6.0	108	1.7	3 221	2.8	6 628	2.9
Carroll	352	.8	73 613	.6	3 686 483	.6	125	1.9	2 787	2.5	8 750	2.6
Cass	416	1.0	71 078	.8	3 368 654	.7	224	1.8	6 306	2.6	20 939	2.8
Clark	214	1.5	26 368	1.4	923 446	1.4	316	1.2	11 241	2.1	25 961	1.9
Clay	322	.9	52 915	1.1	2 046 732	1.1	194	1.7	6 122	2.7	14 197	3.0
Clinton	429	.8	102 392	.7	4 759 377	.7	104	2.7	1 849	3.9	5 714	4.1
Crawford	12	8.1	968	7.2	27 410	5.1	273	1.1	10 362	2.0	21 106	2.3
Daviess	331	1.5	54 040	1.1	1 972 280	1.1	518	1.2	10 897	1.7	23 175	1.8
Dearborn	115	2.3	6 785	3.5	214 862	3.6	469	.8	13 380	1.9	28 652	2.3
Decatur	398	1.0	62 057	.9	3 006 111	.9	221	1.6	5 393	2.1	14 717	2.3
De Kalb	375	1.0	50 246	1.1	1 982 863	1.1	203	1.7	5 659	2.3	16 420	2.7
Delaware	391	.9	77 999	.8	3 301 621	.7	175	1.9	3 602	2.3	10 802	2.4
Dubois	325	1.1	38 911	1.0	1 531 790	.9	419	1.0	16 215	1.2	40 261	1.5
Elkhart	424	1.2	42 251	1.2	1 819 951	1.2	688	.9	22 047	1.2	60 449	1.3
Fayette	210	1.7	29 014	2.1	1 247 880	2.0	201	1.9	5 517	3.2	16 794	3.6
Floyd	44	2.9	4 228	6.5	131 023	6.8	187	1.2	4 685	2.1	10 654	2.5
Fountain	327	1.1	75 286	1.1	2 966 173	1.0	198	1.8	5 146	2.8	13 116	3.0
Franklin	271	1.3	22 139	1.5	878 169	1.5	448	.9	11 670	1.4	29 076	1.6
Fulton	377	1.0	57 125	1.1	2 430 917	1.0	223	1.7	5 951	2.5	18 773	2.7
Gibson	384	.8	85 338	.6	3 252 986	.6	123	2.2	4 562	2.5	11 268	2.4
Grant	378	.8	91 265	.7	4 223 302	.7	139	2.1	3 459	3.0	9 112	2.4
Greene	264	1.3	44 818	1.2	1 586 204	1.2	550	.8	21 797	1.4	47 316	1.6
Hamilton	314	1.1	56 282	.9	2 598 856	.9	175	1.9	3 201	2.3	10 044	2.6

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)
Hancock	345	1.0	73 661	.8	3 288 860	.7	151	2.1	3 300	2.9	8 812	3.2
Harrison	208	1.7	23 913	1.8	647 390	1.8	622	.9	24 281	1.3	53 958	1.4
Hendricks	306	1.2	64 551	.8	2 786 357	.7	267	1.4	6 489	2.6	18 629	2.4
Henry	433	1.0	70 678	1.1	3 212 483	1.1	286	1.5	6 674	2.8	18 635	3.6
Howard	348	.8	64 600	.8	3 176 575	.8	137	2.1	3 061	4.6	7 926	4.0
Huntington	445	.8	80 190	.9	3 424 401	.8	168	1.9	4 397	2.3	12 908	2.9
Jackson	422	1.1	64 134	1.2	2 478 796	1.2	351	1.3	9 121	2.0	23 269	2.1
Jasper	428	.8	100 441	.7	4 269 993	.7	110	2.4	2 625	3.5	7 036	4.2
Jay	484	1.0	69 516	1.1	2 713 945	1.1	248	1.7	6 780	2.6	18 246	2.5
Jefferson	219	1.7	33 164	1.2	1 006 561	1.3	419	1.1	11 375	1.8	21 946	2.2
Jennings	233	1.5	38 660	1.6	1 415 431	1.4	262	1.5	6 305	2.2	16 224	2.3
Johnson	276	1.2	46 312	1.2	2 060 791	1.1	190	1.8	5 225	3.5	15 547	3.6
Knox	401	.9	107 839	.6	4 170 570	.6	155	2.0	4 865	2.2	11 488	2.4
Kosciusko	521	.9	71 941	.9	3 199 532	.8	380	1.2	11 851	1.4	34 144	1.5
Lagrange	222	1.8	32 666	1.3	1 412 842	1.3	888	.8	22 071	1.1	66 143	1.2
Lake	251	1.1	55 698	.9	2 277 975	.9	155	1.9	3 754	2.8	12 263	3.0
La Porte	411	1.1	76 809	.9	3 296 709	.8	276	1.6	10 490	1.9	34 871	2.0
Lawrence	165	1.7	20 293	1.7	723 627	1.6	572	.8	24 104	1.5	61 233	1.7
Madison	476	.8	97 000	.8	4 595 354	.8	218	1.6	3 884	2.3	10 770	2.3
Marion	59	3.1	9 482	2.6	379 779	2.7	63	3.4	1 357	7.9	3 473	7.9
Marshall	454	1.1	55 686	1.1	2 380 064	1.0	331	1.5	10 776	1.9	33 925	2.0
Martin	84	2.8	12 623	2.3	446 583	2.2	204	1.5	6 838	2.4	13 320	2.3
Miami	452	.7	76 551	.7	3 493 602	.7	221	1.4	7 456	1.9	19 607	2.1
Monroe	75	2.8	5 228	4.8	203 068	5.7	310	1.0	11 487	2.1	26 898	2.3
Montgomery	425	.9	106 616	.7	4 369 010	.6	223	1.7	5 557	3.3	16 259	3.0
Morgan	238	1.5	39 978	1.2	1 780 192	1.3	282	1.5	7 085	1.9	18 648	2.4
Newton	278	1.0	74 694	.8	3 330 517	.8	69	3.2	1 423	3.9	4 185	4.0
Noble	437	1.0	48 990	1.3	2 071 311	1.2	389	1.2	11 470	1.7	35 135	1.9
Ohio	17	6.7	1 704	3.9	74 464	3.6	176	1.4	5 071	2.4	10 759	2.6
Orange	126	2.2	17 977	2.0	681 285	2.1	325	1.2	12 170	2.1	26 687	2.4
Owen	165	1.8	18 068	2.0	667 238	2.0	318	1.2	11 652	1.7	25 348	1.9
Parke	243	1.3	55 717	.9	2 203 740	1.0	214	1.6	6 085	2.6	14 647	2.4
Perry	102	2.4	7 164	4.5	253 157	4.3	335	1.0	12 249	1.6	30 751	1.8
Pike	144	1.7	27 609	1.8	930 563	1.9	91	2.9	2 857	4.5	5 483	5.1
Porter	270	1.0	47 866	1.0	2 032 430	1.0	152	1.8	3 381	2.7	9 848	3.0
Posey	311	1.0	82 709	.8	3 169 805	.8	95	2.5	2 717	3.1	7 443	3.1
Pulaski	372	.9	83 250	.8	3 465 847	.8	130	2.3	3 556	3.0	12 174	3.0
Putnam	330	1.2	58 850	1.0	2 496 232	1.0	372	1.2	10 346	1.7	26 133	1.7
Randolph	563	.7	96 447	.8	3 940 478	.8	223	1.6	4 631	2.2	12 646	2.6
Ripley	421	1.1	45 078	1.3	1 608 347	1.3	374	1.3	8 829	2.3	22 501	2.2
Rush	473	1.1	88 600	.9	4 229 922	.9	216	1.8	6 007	2.1	17 923	2.0
St. Joseph	339	1.0	45 696	1.0	1 864 996	1.1	214	1.7	5 832	2.2	17 926	2.2
Scott	118	2.2	19 156	2.0	661 614	2.0	151	2.1	3 946	3.0	9 837	3.4
Shelby	404	.9	78 870	.8	3 533 601	.7	199	1.7	3 784	3.0	9 582	3.7
Spencer	293	1.3	53 838	1.1	1 912 968	1.1	319	1.2	11 415	2.0	26 503	2.4
Starke	185	1.6	25 900	1.4	970 785	1.2	93	2.9	2 448	3.7	6 649	4.6
Steuben	212	1.6	25 120	1.7	977 891	1.7	201	1.7	9 598	2.8	27 897	2.9
Sullivan	279	1.2	65 830	.9	2 438 033	.8	139	2.1	4 533	3.1	11 632	3.2
Switzerland	53	4.3	4 478	4.4	165 769	3.9	327	1.3	9 503	2.6	22 830	3.1
Tippecanoe	398	.9	95 325	.8	3 884 537	.8	230	1.6	5 516	2.4	15 063	2.6
Tipton	320	.8	70 257	.7	3 490 850	.7	59	3.5	1 029	6.2	3 155	6.2
Union	163	1.4	24 261	1.7	1 130 507	1.7	124	2.0	3 223	2.9	8 921	2.9
Vanderburgh	163	1.3	29 518	1.4	1 080 061	1.3	73	2.8	1 348	3.3	3 635	2.9
Vermillion	169	1.1	42 563	1.0	1 580 906	1.0	94	2.1	3 943	2.0	9 921	2.8
Vigo	234	1.4	43 874	1.3	1 531 631	1.3	146	2.3	3 488	3.0	7 801	4.0
Wabash	428	1.0	65 519	1.0	2 824 776	.9	197	1.9	5 553	2.5	16 290	2.7
Warren	229	1.2	70 243	.9	2 999 843	.8	128	2.3	3 694	3.4	9 810	3.5
Warrick	172	1.5	34 408	1.4	1 275 474	1.3	131	2.1	5 504	7.7	11 547	7.2
Washington	213	1.6	30 036	1.5	1 033 746	1.6	515	.9	21 895	1.5	55 114	1.6
Wayne	383	1.1	51 196	1.2	2 344 595	1.2	367	1.2	10 801	1.6	30 519	1.7
Wells	486	.7	87 566	.7	3 778 911	.7	128	2.1	3 257	2.6	11 556	2.2
White	426	.9	108 409	.6	4 805 806	.6	178	1.9	4 423	2.4	13 856	2.2
Whitley	404	1.1	51 150	1.0	2 234 118	.9	255	1.7	6 883	2.1	16 880	2.1

Selected crops harvested—Con.

Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)

Geographic area	Farms				Acres			
	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>Indiana</b>	<b>1 125</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>30 139</b>	<b>.7</b>				
Adams	11	10.2	38	14.8				
Allen	25	6.9	167	9.4				
Bartholomew	27	4.3	730	3.0				
Benton	—	—	—	—				

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.			
	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)			
	Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Blackford.....	4	13.8	(D)	(D)
Boone.....	5	14.8	37	19.1
Brown.....	9	9.6	34	12.1
Carroll.....	11	8.0	66	13.3
Cass.....	11	8.3	650	1.3
Clark.....	28	5.1	476	2.4
Clay.....	2	22.7	(D)	(D)
Clinton.....	8	10.3	65	19.3
Crawford.....	6	14.8	18	17.1
Daviess.....	39	5.1	735	9.0
Dearborn.....	11	9.7	37	13.8
Decatur.....	9	10.1	52	12.6
De Kalb.....	12	7.8	150	10.0
Delaware.....	12	6.8	1 000	.3
Dubois.....	3	16.9	(D)	(D)
Elkhart.....	62	3.6	1 338	1.8
Fayette.....	—	—	—	—
Floyd.....	20	4.5	98	4.2
Fountain.....	5	14.1	14	22.5
Franklin.....	16	6.5	57	10.9
Fulton.....	12	7.0	447	3.5
Gibson.....	28	4.8	1 003	5.3
Grant.....	9	8.9	(D)	(D)
Greene.....	7	9.9	18	13.7
Hamilton.....	11	9.5	207	12.6
Hancock.....	9	10.9	61	16.4
Harrison.....	18	6.9	171	2.7
Hendricks.....	15	7.5	120	3.4
Henry.....	9	10.0	281	6.2
Howard.....	14	5.8	674	2.4
Huntington.....	4	14.4	(D)	(D)
Jackson.....	25	5.9	713	6.6
Jasper.....	9	8.5	393	.9
Jay.....	8	9.4	(D)	(D)
Jefferson.....	10	10.2	38	18.3
Jennings.....	2	23.4	(D)	(D)
Johnson.....	13	9.1	50	16.2
Knox.....	66	3.0	5 055	2.3
Kosciusko.....	17	6.6	356	1.9
Lagrange.....	38	4.7	1 182	1.4
Lake.....	29	4.9	1 256	4.4
La Porte.....	24	5.4	1 125	1.3
Lawrence.....	5	10.4	28	5.7
Madison.....	15	6.8	1 220	2.1
Marion.....	17	6.0	487	4.0
Marshall.....	12	8.8	45	14.4
Martin.....	1	48.8	(D)	(D)
Miami.....	4	13.6	11	8.1
Monroe.....	5	13.9	7	16.3
Montgomery.....	5	12.2	49	9.5
Morgan.....	20	6.8	221	10.6
Newton.....	8	9.4	384	1.9
Noble.....	12	8.7	145	11.4
Ohio.....	5	10.1	17	12.9
Orange.....	4	12.7	11	4.9
Owen.....	4	12.7	5	13.2
Parke.....	20	7.9	148	12.6
Perry.....	—	—	—	—
Pike.....	3	16.8	(D)	(D)
Porter.....	19	5.8	900	3.5
Posey.....	3	23.4	12	26.0
Pulaski.....	4	16.7	5	20.1
Putnam.....	9	11.3	28	15.3
Randolph.....	8	7.4	409	.2
Ripley.....	16	6.6	196	3.9
Rush.....	2	—	(D)	(D)
St. Joseph.....	22	5.7	480	6.6
Scott.....	4	12.7	16	22.5
Shelby.....	13	8.5	171	1.7
Spencer.....	7	12.3	14	19.3
Starke.....	14	8.2	278	23.5
Steuben.....	11	9.5	304	14.5
Sullivan.....	29	4.9	1 785	4.1
Switzerland.....	5	15.3	9	17.4
Tippecanoe.....	10	8.1	94	2.1
Tipton.....	10	6.3	861	.4
Union.....	—	—	—	—
Vanderburgh.....	7	10.1	114	2.3
Vermillion.....	2	14.4	(D)	(D)
Vigo.....	8	9.2	80	13.0

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.				
	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)				
	Farms		Acres		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Wabash.....	5	15.7	15	17.0	
Warren .....	4	16.9	28	28.6	
Warrick .....	4	13.1	(D)	(D)	
Washington .....	19	6.2	242	3.5	
Wayne.....	12	8.8	68	8.6	
Wells .....	4	13.0	(D)	(D)	
White .....	14	6.8	169	6.0	
Whitley .....	7	12.8	16	16.1	

<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..	57 916	8 771	66 687	1.9	13.2
Land in farms ..... acres..	15 111 022	332 773	15 443 795	2.1	2.2
Average size of farm ..... acres..	261	38	232	(X)	(X)
<b>Farms by size of farm:</b>					
Less than 10 acres .....	4 183	2 306	6 489	9.9	35.5
10 to 49 acres .....	13 987	3 906	17 893	4.4	21.8
50 to 179 acres .....	19 913	2 197	22 110	3.1	9.9
180 acres or more .....	19 833	362	20 195	1.5	1.8
<b>Farms by value of sales:</b>					
Less than \$2,500 .....	13 022	5 634	18 656	5.5	30.2
\$2,500 to \$9,999 .....	12 289	1 598	13 887	3.5	11.5
\$10,000 or more .....	32 605	1 539	34 144	1.7	4.5
Market value of agricultural products sold ..... \$1,000..	5 229 977	-823	5 229 154	1.3	-
<b>Farms by type of organization:</b>					
Individual or family .....	49 293	8 723	58 016	2.1	15.0
Partnership, corporation, or other .....	8 623	48	8 671	3.4	.6
<b>Farms by tenure of operator:</b>					
Full owners .....	33 840	6 882	40 722	2.8	16.9
Part owners .....	19 019	1 425	20 444	2.2	7.0
Tenants .....	5 057	464	5 521	4.2	8.4
<b>Operators by place of residence:</b>					
On farm operated .....	44 066	6 373	50 439	2.2	12.6
Not on farm operated .....	9 670	1 106	10 776	3.9	10.3
Not reported .....	4 180	1 292	5 472	8.6	23.6
<b>Operators by principal occupation:</b>					
Farming .....	26 993	1 471	28 464	2.0	5.2
Other .....	30 923	7 300	38 223	2.9	19.1
<b>Operators by sex:</b>					
Male .....	54 695	7 657	62 352	1.9	12.3
Female.....	3 221	1 114	4 335	10.4	25.7
<b>Operators by race:</b>					
White .....	57 744	8 739	66 483	1.9	13.1
Black and other races .....	172	32	204	44.1	15.7
<b>Operators by years on present farm:</b>					
4 years or less .....	5 482	1 484	6 966	5.6	21.3
5 years or more .....	43 011	6 504	49 515	2.0	13.1
Not reported .....	9 423	783	10 206	6.1	7.7

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