
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	10.7	Corn for grain or seed	2.1
Land in farms	6.3	Wheat for grain	1.5
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹	7.0	Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Market value of agricultural products sold	1.4	Cattle and calves	8.3
Harvested cropland	2.9	Hogs and pigs	1.0
		Layers 20 weeks old and older	4.0

¹Data 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)
COMPLETE COUNT ITEM		SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:		Number of farms reporting:	
25	5.6	25	39.6
50	3.7	50	27.7
75	2.8	75	22.4
100	2.2	100	19.2
150	1.3	150	15.3
2004	200	12.9
3003	300	10.0
5002	500	6.8
7502	750	4.4
1,0002	1,000	2.5
1,500	(X)	1,500	(X)
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)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES¹		
Farms	31 318	.3	Total farm production expenses	31 306	.3
Land in farms	10 124 822	.2	Average per farm	2 458 575	.2
Average size of farm	323	.4	Livestock and poultry purchased	8 789	1.9
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹		
Total sales (see text)	31 318	.3	All farms	31 312	.3
Average per farm	3 127 383	.1	Average per farm	558 443	.7
Farms by value of sales:	99 859	.3	Farms with net gains ²	13 014	1.3
Less than \$1,000 (see text)	6 768	.5	Average net gain	663 635	.4
\$1,000 to \$2,499	4 743	.6	Average net loss	50 994	1.3
\$2,500 to \$4,999	7 910	.6	Farms with net losses	18 298	1.0
\$5,000 to \$9,999	4 954	.6	Average net loss	105 192	1.7
\$10,000 to \$19,999	17 697	.6	Government payments and other farm-related income	5 749	1.9
\$20,000 to \$24,999	4 387	.6	Government payments	9 439	.4
\$25,000 to \$39,999	30 576	.6	Other farm-related income ¹	94 255	.3
\$40,000 to \$49,999	2 982	.7	Customwork and other agricultural services	7 542	2.1
\$50,000 to \$99,999	41 151	.7	Gross cash rent or share payments	59 530	2.4
\$100,000 to \$249,999	684	1.2	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products	1 385	5.0
\$250,000 to \$499,999	15 076	1.2	Other farm-related income sources	14 515	2.6
\$500,000 or more	911	1.1	Total	1 912	4.8
Sales by commodity or commodity group:	28 252	1.1	Total	13 649	7.0
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	354	1.6	Government payments	9 439	.4
Grains	15 674	1.6	Other farm-related income ¹	94 255	.3
Corn for grain	1 014	1.1	Customwork and other agricultural services	7 542	2.1
Wheat	72 607	1.1	Gross cash rent or share payments	59 530	2.4
Soybeans	1 396	.7	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products	1 385	5.0
Sorghum for grain	229 299	.6	Other farm-related income sources	14 515	2.6
Barley	1 217	—	Total	1 912	4.8
Oats	440 159	—	Government payments	13 649	7.0
Other grains	1 908	—	Other farm-related income ¹	94 255	.3
Cotton and cottonseed	2 227 664	—	Customwork and other agricultural services	7 542	2.1
Tobacco	9 463	.4	Gross cash rent or share payments	59 530	2.4
Hay, silage, and field seeds	1 291 365	.1	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products	1 385	5.0
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons	4 582	.4	Other farm-related income sources	14 515	2.6
Fruits, nuts, and berries	665 468	.1	Total	1 912	4.8
Nursery and greenhouse crops	1 864	.6	Government payments	9 439	.4
Other crops	115 833	.2	Other farm-related income ¹	94 255	.3
Livestock, poultry, and their products	691	.8	Customwork and other agricultural services	7 542	2.1
Poultry and poultry products	21 890	.4	Gross cash rent or share payments	59 530	2.4
Dairy products	3 843	.4	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products	1 385	5.0
Cattle and calves	396 245	.2	Other farm-related income sources	14 515	2.6
Hogs and pigs	136	1.6	Total	1 912	4.8
Sheep, lambs, and wool	4 081	.6	Government payments	13 649	7.0
Other livestock and livestock products (see text)	—	—	Other farm-related income ¹	94 255	.3
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text)	24	5.8	Customwork and other agricultural services	7 542	2.1
	74	10.9	Gross cash rent or share payments	59 530	2.4
	533	.6	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products	1 385	5.0
	127 346	.2	Other farm-related income sources	14 515	2.6
	1 700	.4	Total	1 912	4.8
	551 014	.1	Government payments	13 649	7.0
	—	—	Other farm-related income ¹	94 255	.3
	3 769	.6	Customwork and other agricultural services	7 542	2.1
	14 208	.9	Gross cash rent or share payments	59 530	2.4
	507	1.4	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products	1 385	5.0
	6 209	1.3	Other farm-related income sources	14 515	2.6
	500	1.4	Total	1 912	4.8
	4 034	2.7	Government payments	13 649	7.0
	476	1.5	Other farm-related income ¹	94 255	.3
	35 366	1.0	Customwork and other agricultural services	7 542	2.1
	134	2.2	Gross cash rent or share payments	59 530	2.4
	15 066	.8	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products	1 385	5.0
	21 148	.4	Other farm-related income sources	14 515	2.6
	1 836 018	.1	Total	1 912	4.8
	1 921	.4	Government payments	13 649	7.0
	1 187 371	(L)	Other farm-related income ¹	94 255	.3
	460	1.1	Customwork and other agricultural services	7 542	2.1
	83 425	.5	Gross cash rent or share payments	59 530	2.4
	18 912	.4	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products	1 385	5.0
	214 842	.4	Other farm-related income sources	14 515	2.6
	425	1.4	Total	1 912	4.8
	80 052	.2	Government payments	13 649	7.0
	174	2.3	Other farm-related income ¹	94 255	.3
	216	2.8	Customwork and other agricultural services	7 542	2.1
	1 971	.7	Gross cash rent or share payments	59 530	2.4
	270 113	.1	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products	1 385	5.0
	787	1.2	Other farm-related income sources	14 515	2.6
	2 441	1.9	Total	1 912	4.8

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)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			TENURE OF OPERATOR		
Total cropland farms..	25 289	.3	All operators farms..	31 318	.3
Harvested cropland farms..	5 947 311	.2	Full owners farms..	10 124 822	.2
Farms by acres harvested:	19 198	.4	Part owners farms..	20 508	.4
1 to 9 acres farms..	4 338 710	.2	Tenants farms..	4 183 064	.4
10 to 19 acres farms..	2 508	.7	Land owned farms..	8 267	.4
20 to 29 acres farms..	11 904	.8	Owned land in farms farms..	4 118 781	.3
30 to 49 acres farms..	3 283	.6	Land rented or leased from others farms..	2 543	.6
50 to 99 acres farms..	42 440	.6	Land rented or leased to others farms..	1 822 977	.2
100 to 199 acres farms..	2 658	.7	OWNED AND RENTED LAND		
200 to 499 acres farms..	58 921	.7	Land owned farms..	28 847	.3
500 to 999 acres farms..	3 096	.6	Owned land in farms farms..	6 644 703	.3
1,000 acres or more farms..	112 216	.6	Land rented or leased from others farms..	28 775	.3
Cropland:	2 827	.6	Rented or leased land in farms farms..	6 046 550	.3
Pasture or grazing only farms..	184 482	.7	Land rented or leased to others farms..	3 286	.6
Other cropland farms..	1 586	.8	Land owned acres..	682 478	1.1
Total woodland farms..	204 803	.8	OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS		
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured farms..	1 222	.9	Operators by place of residence:		
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. farms..	378 003	.9	On farm operated	21 338	.4
Irrigated land farms..	804	.7	Not on farm operated	7 517	.4
Acres irrigated:	568 704	.6	Not reported	2 463	.6
1 to 9 acres farms..	1 214	—	Operators by principal occupation:		
10 to 49 acres farms..	2 777 237	—	Farming	12 753	.4
50 to 99 acres farms..	14 343	.4	Other	18 565	.4
100 to 199 acres farms..	1 124 094	.5	Operators by days worked off farm:		
200 to 499 acres farms..	5 627	.5	Any	17 989	.4
500 to 999 acres farms..	484 507	.7	200 days or more	13 004	.4
1,000 acres or more farms..	19 474	.4	Operators by sex:		
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured farms..	2 675 367	.4	Male farms..	28 438	.3
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. farms..	7 935	.4	Female farms..	9 527 196	.2
Irrigated land farms..	934 371	.5	Average age of operator years..	59.6	.5
Acres irrigated:	18 235	.4	FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
1 to 9 acres farms..	567 773	.4	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) farms..	27 452	.4
10 to 49 acres farms..	1 769	.5	Partnership farms..	6 194 139	.3
50 to 99 acres farms..	1 076 231	.1	Corporation:	2 753	.5
100 to 199 acres farms..	437	1.5	Family held farms..	3 012 236	.2
200 to 499 acres farms..	1 147	1.9	More than 10 stockholders farms..	803	.9
500 to 999 acres farms..	139	2.5	10 or less stockholders farms..	656 367	.6
1,000 acres or more farms..	3 101	2.7	Other than family held farms..	20	4.1
Harvested cropland irrigated farms..	75	2.6	More than 10 stockholders farms..	783	.9
Pasture and other land irrigated farms..	5 188	2.7	10 or less stockholders farms..	114	2.4
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs farms..	142	1.8	More than 10 stockholders farms..	123 187	1.2
Estimated market value of land and buildings farms..	20 038	1.8	10 or less stockholders farms..	15	5.4
Average per farm \$1,000..	322	.9	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. farms..	99	2.6
Average per acre dollars..	105 389	.9	Land owned acres..	196	2.2
Value of machinery and equipment farms..	219 271	.3	Land owned acres..	138 893	1.4
Average per farm \$1,000..	342	—	HIRED FARM LABOR¹		
Average per acre dollars..	722 097	—	Hired workers by days worked:		
Commercial fertilizer farms..	1 760	.5	150 days or more farms..	3 664	2.3
Acres on which used acres..	1 075 974	.1	Less than 150 days farms..	11 327	.9
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment farms..	20	6.4	Land owned acres..	8 597	1.8
Average per farm \$1,000..	257	7.2	Land owned acres..	23 815	2.1
Average per acre dollars..	572 593	.7	INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Commercial fertilizer farms..	5 331	.5	Farm-related injuries:		
Acres on which used acres..	572 593	.7	Operator and family members farms..	211	2.0
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment farms..	31 312	.3	Hired workers farms..	232	2.1
Average per farm \$1,000..	10 554 676	.9	Operator and family members number..	123	1.4
Average per acre dollars..	337 081	1.0	Hired workers number..	211	.9
Commercial fertilizer farms..	1 052	1.2	Farm-related deaths:		
Acres on which used acres..	2 939 611	.8	Operator and family members farms..	8	—
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment farms..	31 312	.3	Hired workers farms..	9	—
Average per farm \$1,000..	10 554 676	.9	Operator and family members number..	3	—
Average per acre dollars..	337 081	1.0	Hired workers number..	3	—

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY SIZE			LIVESTOCK		
1 to 9 acres	farms.. 1 108	1.0	Cattle and calves inventory	farms.. 19 319	.4
10 to 49 acres	acres.. 5 004	1.2	number.. 1 127 442		.4
50 to 69 acres	farms.. 5 863	.5	Beef cows	farms.. 17 151	.4
70 to 99 acres	acres.. 174 998	.6	number.. 590 402		.4
100 to 139 acres	farms.. 2 596	.7	Milk cows	farms.. 688	1.0
	acres.. 151 880	.7	number.. 45 540		.6
	farms.. 3 488	.6	Cattle and calves sold	farms.. 18 912	.4
	acres.. 287 458	.6	number.. 590 771		.4
	farms.. 3 703	.6	\$1,000.. 214 842		.4
	acres.. 431 055	.6	Hogs and pigs inventory	farms.. 662	1.2
			number.. 215 936		.4
			Hogs and pigs sold	farms.. 425	1.4
			number.. 756 595		.2
			\$1,000.. 80 052		.2
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms.. 231	2.0
			number.. 4 797		2.1
			Sheep and lambs sold	farms.. 164	2.3
			number.. 3 300		2.2
			Horses and ponies inventory	farms.. 5 679	.5
			number.. 31 591		.8
			Horses and ponies sold	farms.. 1 054	1.0
			number.. 3 950		1.9
			POULTRY		
			Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory		
			(see text)	farms.. 941	1.0
			number.. 6 537 982		1.1
			Layers 20 weeks old and older	farms.. 885	1.0
			number.. 5 328 691		1.0
			Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms.. 1 393	.2
			number.. 554 915 961		(L)
			SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED		
			Corn for grain or seed	farms.. 2 497	.6
			acres.. 405 393		.3
			bushels.. 43 851 007		.2
			Corn for silage or green chop	farms.. 271	1.5
			acres.. 24 202		.7
			tons, green.. 284 029		.5
			Sorghum for grain or seed	farms.. 154	1.6
			acres.. 25 499		.8
			bushels.. 1 648 269		.7
			Wheat for grain	farms.. 697	.8
			acres.. 155 049		.4
			bushels.. 6 547 211		.4
			Rice	farms.. 530	.6
			acres.. 234 244		.3
			cwt.. 13 330 366		.2
			Cotton	farms.. 1 701	.4
			acres.. 966 443		.1
			bales.. 1 714 762		.1
			Soybeans for beans	farms.. 3 851	.4
			acres.. 1 964 202		.2
			bushels.. 59 370 926		.2
			Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes	farms.. 25	6.6
			acres.. 61		5.6
			cwt.. 3 167		8.2
			Sweetpotatoes	farms.. 68	2.9
			acres.. 8 835		1.6
			bushels.. 1 875 843		1.6
			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass		
			silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms.. 13 999	.4
			acres.. 648 809		.4
			tons, dry.. 1 486 117		.5
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms.. 507	1.4
			acres.. 7 280		1.5
			Land in orchards	farms.. 902	1.1
			acres.. 13 428		1.4
FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM					
Oilseed and grain farming (1111)	farms.. 5 587	.5			
acres.. 3 414 221		.3			
Vegetable and melon farming (1112)	farms.. 369	1.6			
acres.. 91 484		1.1			
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113)	farms.. 501	1.5			
acres.. 59 263		2.5			
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114)	farms.. 419	1.6			
acres.. 32 521		2.6			
Other crop farming (1119)	farms.. 3 393	.5			
acres.. 2 352 723		.2			
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111)	farms.. 16 181	.4			
acres.. 3 295 884		.4			
Cattle feedlots (112112)	farms.. 389	1.6			
acres.. 68 092		2.1			
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212)	farms.. 424	1.1			
acres.. 171 250		.9			
Hog and pig farming (1122)	farms.. 257	1.8			
acres.. 44 956		1.4			
Poultry and egg production (1123)	farms.. 1 786	.4			
acres.. 252 610		.4			
Sheep and goat farming (1124)	farms.. 216	2.2			
acres.. 18 229		3.6			
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129)	farms.. 1 796	.8			
acres.. 323 589		.8			

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

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)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES¹		
Farms	10 466	.3	Total farm production expenses	10 184	.4
Land in farms	6 885 930	.2	Average per farm	2 348 226	.2
Average size of farm	658	.4	Livestock and poultry purchased	230 580	.4
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹		
Total sales (see text)	10 466	.3	All farms	10 184	.4
Average per farm	3 069 882	.1	Average per farm	609 928	.6
Farms by value of sales:	293 320	.3	Farms with net gains ²	59 891	.7
\$10,000 to \$19,999	2 982	.6	Average net gain	7 631	1.2
\$1,000	41 151	.6	Average net loss	653 569	.5
\$20,000 to \$24,999	684	1.2	Farms with net losses	43 641	2.6
\$1,000	15 076	1.2	Average net loss	17 094	4.3
\$25,000 to \$39,999	911	1.1	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
\$1,000	28 252	1.1	Government payments	4 116	.4
\$40,000 to \$49,999	354	1.5	Other farm-related income ¹	75 687	.2
\$1,000	15 674	1.5	Customwork and other agricultural services	3 234	2.8
\$50,000 to \$99,999	1 014	1.0	Gross cash rent or share payments	39 250	1.8
\$1,000	72 607	1.1	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products	746	6.2
\$100,000 to \$249,999	1 396	.7	Other farm-related income sources	12 784	2.5
\$1,000	229 299	.6	Government payments	605	8.2
\$250,000 to \$499,999	1 217	—	Other farm-related income sources	7 621	4.7
\$1,000	440 159	—	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
\$500,000 or more	1 908	—	Total	699	.7
Sales by commodity or commodity group:	2 227 664	—	Total	73 374	.2
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	5 397	.4			
Grains	1 280 489	.1			
Corn for grain	3 620	.4			
Wheat	662 440	.1			
Soybeans	1 474	.6			
Sorghum for grain	115 056	.2			
Barley	651	.7			
Oats	21 814	.4			
Other grains	3 248	.4			
Cotton and cottonseed	394 093	.1			
Tobacco	128	1.4			
Hay, silage, and field seeds	4 064	.6			
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons	—	—			
Fruits, nuts, and berries	—	—			
Nursery and greenhouse crops	18	6.5			
Other crops	(D)	(D)			
Livestock, poultry, and their products	531	.6			
Poultry and poultry products	(D)	(D)			
Dairy products	1 619	.4			
Cattle and calves	550 634	.1			
Hogs and pigs	—	—			
Sheep, lambs, and wool	—	—			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text)	1 313	.7			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text)	8 857	1.3			

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)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
Total cropland farms	9 280	.3	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) farms	8 069	.4
Harvested cropland acres	4 866 344	.2	Partnership farms	3 437 383	.4
Harvested cropland acres	8 419	.4	Partnership acres	1 647	.5
Cropland: acres	4 040 809	.1	Corporation: farms	2 684 531	.2
Pasture or grazing only farms	4 315	.5	Family held acres	628	.9
Pasture or grazing only acres	575 692	.6	More than 10 stockholders farms	587 104	.5
Total woodland farms	5 912	.4	10 or less stockholders farms	16	2.9
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured acres	1 064 776	.4	Other than family held farms	612	.9
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured farms	2 590	.5	More than 10 stockholders acres	72	2.3
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. farms	588 137	.6	10 or less stockholders farms	89 559	.9
Irrigated land acres	6 046	.4	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. farms	6	7.4
Harvested cropland irrigated farms	366 673	.3	10 or less stockholders farms	66	2.4
Pasture and other land irrigated acres	1 489	.4	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. farms	50	3.3
Pasture and other land irrigated farms	1 074 664	.4	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. acres	87 353	1.4
Pasture and other land irrigated acres	1 485	.1	HIRED FARM LABOR¹		
Pasture and other land irrigated farms	1 074 532	.1	Hired workers by days worked: farms		
Pasture and other land irrigated acres	9	4.5	150 days or more workers	3 011	2.0
Pasture and other land irrigated acres	132	1.5	Less than 150 days farms	10 622	.8
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs farms	1 270	.7	Less than 150 days workers	4 748	2.0
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs acres	173 790	.8		16 277	2.3
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS¹			INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Estimated market value of land and buildings farms	10 184	.4	Farm-related injuries: farms		
Average per farm \$1,000	6 616 375	.9	Operator and family members number	84	2.3
Average per farm dollars	649 683	.9	Hired workers farms	93	2.6
Average per acre dollars	989	1.2	Hired workers number	109	1.0
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT¹				196	.6
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment farms	10 184	.4	Farm-related deaths: farms	2	—
Average per farm \$1,000	1 143 476	.8	Operator and family members number	(D)	(D)
Average per farm dollars	112 282	.9	Hired workers farms	3	—
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS¹				(D)	(D)
Commercial fertilizer farms	7 343	1.1	FARMS BY SIZE		
acres on which used	2 572 158	.8	1 to 9 acres	194	2.0
TENURE OF OPERATOR			10 to 49 acres	815	.8
All operators farms	10 466	.3	50 to 69 acres	435	1.1
Full owners farms	6 885 930	.2	70 to 99 acres	632	1.0
Part owners farms	4 714	.4	100 to 139 acres	835	.9
Tenants farms	1 737 221	.4	140 to 179 acres	728	1.0
	4 255	.4	180 to 219 acres	627	1.1
	3 432 649	.3	220 to 259 acres	534	1.2
	1 497	.6	260 to 499 acres	2 088	.7
	1 716 060	.2	500 to 999 acres	1 695	.6
			1,000 to 1,999 acres	1 082	.5
			2,000 acres or more	801	—
OWNED AND RENTED LAND			FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM		
Land owned farms	9 020	.3	Oilseed and grain farming (1111)	2 170	.5
Owned land in farms farms	3 526 434	.3	Vegetable and melon farming (112)	133	2.2
Owned land in farms acres	8 969	.3	Fruit and tree nut farming (113)	82	3.2
Owned land in farms acres	3 253 826	.3	Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (114)	242	1.8
Land rented or leased from others farms	5 788	.4	Other crop farming (119)	1 536	.5
Rented or leased land in farms acres	3 698 137	.2	Beef cattle ranching and farming (1211)	3 488	.5
Rented or leased land in farms landlords	19 051	.4	Cattle feedlots (1212)	155	2.3
Rented or leased land in farms farms	5 752	.4	Dairy cattle and milk production (122)	417	1.1
Rented or leased land in farms acres	3 632 104	.2	Hog and pig farming (123)	117	2.0
Land rented or leased to others farms	1 157	.7	Poultry and egg production (124)	1 665	.3
Land rented or leased to others acres	338 641	.9	Sheep and goat farming (124)	4	10.0
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS			Animal aquaculture and other animal production (125, 1129)	457	1.1
Operators by place of residence:			LIVESTOCK		
On farm operated	7 019	.4	Cattle and calves inventory farms	5 892	.4
Not on farm operated	2 694	.5	Beef cows number	734 812	.4
Not reported	753	.8	Milk cows farms	5 122	.4
Operators by principal occupation:			Milk cows number	360 137	.5
Farming	7 005	.3	Milk cows farms	463	1.0
Other	3 461	.5	Milk cows number	44 841	.5
Operators by days worked off farm:			Cattle and calves sold farms	6 015	.4
Any	4 469	.5	Hogs and pigs inventory farms	440 831	.4
200 days or more	2 781	.6	Hogs and pigs sold \$1,000	171 124	.4
Operators by sex:			Hogs and pigs sold farms	229	1.5
Male	9 775	.3	Hogs and pigs sold number	211 744	.4
Female	691	.9	Hogs and pigs sold farms	204	1.6
Average age of operator years	53.5	.5	Hogs and pigs sold number	752 035	.2
			Hogs and pigs sold \$1,000	79 598	.2
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory farms	68	3.1
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory number	2 784	2.9
			Sheep and lambs sold farms	47	3.6
			Sheep and lambs sold number	2 058	2.7
			Horses and ponies inventory farms	1 515	.7
			Horses and ponies inventory number	10 280	1.6
			Horses and ponies sold farms	287	1.6
			Horses and ponies sold number	2 200	2.6

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)
POULTRY			SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED—Con.		
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text) farms..	334	1.3	Wheat for grain farms..	654	.7
Layers 20 weeks old and older farms..	6 524 601	1.0 acres..	153 999	.4
..... number..	300	1.4 bushels..	6 523 762	.4
..... farms..	5 317 316	1.0 farms..	530	.6
..... number..		 acres..	234 244	.3
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold farms..	1 367	.2 cwt..	13 330 366	.2
..... number..	554 915 035	(L) farms..	1 620	.4
SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED		 acres..	965 186	.1
Corn for grain or seed farms..	1 645	.5 bales..	1 713 514	.1
..... acres..	397 150	.3 farms..	3 251	.4
..... bushels..	43 412 894	.2 acres..	1 941 698	.2
Corn for silage or green chop farms..	201	1.3 bushels..	58 992 686	.2
..... acres..	23 541	.6 farms..	10	10.6
..... tons, green..	278 337	.5 acres..	52	6.7
Sorghum for grain or seed farms..	139	1.5 cwt..	2 404	11.0
..... acres..	25 284	.8 farms..	54	3.0
..... bushels..	1 640 192	.7 acres..	8 807	1.6
		 bushels..	1 872 675	1.5
			Soybeans for beans farms..	5 005	.4
		 acres..	391 608	.5
		 tons, dry..	955 406	.6
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) farms..	188	1.9
		 acres..	5 976	1.5
			Land in orchards farms..	250	1.6
		 acres..	6 387	1.4

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

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

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

Item	All farms		Farms with sales of \$10,000 or more	
	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate
Farms	-2.1	1.7	-10.3	1.1
Land in farms	-6	.9	-7.8	.5
Average size of farm	1.6	2.0	2.8	1.4
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹ :				
Average per farm	35.7	3.1	33.0	2.5
Average per acre	35.4	2.7	32.4	2.3
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹ :				
Average per farm	27.5	2.7	26.8	2.3
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres	-1.2	2.7	-13.8	2.8
10 to 49 acres	1.2	2.5	-2.4	1.7
50 to 179 acres	-2.8	1.1	-7.4	1.0
180 to 499 acres	-3.3	1.2	-12.5	1.2
500 to 999 acres	-4.3	1.5	-15.5	1.2
1,000 to 1,999 acres	-5.9	.5	-15.5	.4
2,000 acres or more	7.7	-	3.6	-
Total cropland	-8.5	1.6	-12.6	1.1
Harvested cropland	-8.8	.7	-10.3	.5
farms	-13.7	1.4	-12.7	1.1
acres	-1.5	.5	-1.3	.4
Irrigated land	-16.8	1.0	-9.3	.8
acres	21.9	.3	22.2	.3
Market value of agricultural products sold				
Average per farm	33.8	.4	35.1	.3
\$1,000	36.7	2.4	50.7	1.9
dollars				
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	12.6	.3	13.1	.3
Livestock, poultry, and their products	54.3	.5	57.0	.4
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than \$2,500	16.7	2.1	(X)	(X)
\$2,500 to \$4,999	-8.5	2.2	(X)	(X)
\$5,000 to \$9,999	-13.1	1.9	(X)	(X)
\$10,000 to \$24,999	-11.0	1.6	-11.0	1.5
\$25,000 to \$49,999	-24.7	1.5	-24.7	1.4
\$50,000 to \$99,999	-18.8	1.8	-18.8	1.8
\$100,000 to \$249,999	-29.6	.7	-29.6	.7
\$250,000 to \$499,999	-19.2	-	-19.2	-
\$500,000 or more	68.1	-	68.1	-
Total farm production expenses ¹	25.8	.6	26.8	.6
Average per farm	28.6	2.3	41.8	2.1
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹	-2.2	1.7	-10.6	1.3
Average per farm	74.7	2.4	72.3	2.0
farms	78.5	4.0	92.8	3.6
\$1,000				
dollars				
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming	-11.8	1.2	-12.2	1.0
Other	5.9	2.2	-6.4	1.7
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any	4.3	2.1	-5.9	1.5
200 days or more	7.3	2.2	-4.0	1.7
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory	-8.3	1.7	-9.1	1.3
farms	-2.2	1.3	-2.3	1.0
number	-9.0	1.7	-7.9	1.4
Beef cows3	1.4	1.4	1.3
farms	-43.4	1.0	-42.3	1.0
number	-29.4	.6	-29.1	.6
Cattle and calves sold	-6.8	1.7	-8.1	1.3
farms	1.8	1.2	1.1	1.0
number	-47.9	1.2	-52.4	1.1
Hogs and pigs inventory	34.2	1.5	42.0	1.6
farms	-54.5	1.1	-53.8	1.1
number	171.4	3.0	184.8	3.2
Sheep and lambs inventory	-2.5	3.4	-21.8	3.5
farms	-25.6	3.0	-35.1	3.3
number	-35.2	1.6	-14.4	2.1
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text)	-4.4	1.3	-4.3	1.3
farms	15.0	.5	14.2	.4
number	43.0	.1	43.0	.1
farms				
Selected crops harvested:				
Corn for grain or seed	-26.1	1.2	-7.7	1.2
farms	50.7	1.0	56.5	1.0
acres	83.7	1.1	88.7	1.1
bushels	-76.7	.4	-77.1	.4
Sorghum for grain or seed	-75.8	.2	-75.7	.2
farms	-77.0	.2	-77.0	.2
acres	-34.5	.8	-30.8	.8
bushels	-14.3	.5	-13.1	.5
Wheat for grain	-3.0	.5	-2.1	.5
farms	-29.1	.8	-28.8	.8
acres	-13.4	.4	-13.4	.4
bushels	-14.7	.4	-14.7	.4
Rice	-49.1	.6	-45.9	.6
farms	-27.5	.2	-27.3	.2
acres	-17.4	.2	-17.2	.2
bales	-17.1	1.0	-13.0	1.0
Soybeans for beans	18.8	.6	19.8	.5
farms	10.8	.5	11.5	.4
bushels				
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	-7.4	1.6	-6.9	1.3
farms	1.5	1.4	.3	1.2
acres	12.8	1.5	8.0	1.3
tons, dry				

¹Data 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 ¹		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Mississippi . . .	31 318	.3	10 124 822	.2	323	.4	337 081	1.0	1 621 991	.8
Adams	132	.5	64 561	2.1	489	2.2	294 818	4.2	5 138	4.4
Alcorn	449	.3	80 607	1.3	180	1.4	189 494	9.3	13 184	6.8
Amite	471	.2	118 137	.9	251	1.0	378 732	17.0	17 054	7.8
Attala	385	.2	128 723	.9	334	1.0	266 446	12.8	13 636	10.2
Benton	213	.3	81 444	1.2	382	1.2	271 776	7.0	12 138	12.2
Bolivar	394	.2	454 870	.2	1 154	.3	1 040 176	1.4	100 944	3.3
Calhoun	427	.4	141 817	1.0	332	1.1	276 357	10.3	29 891	8.3
Carroll	423	.2	142 892	.8	338	.8	246 231	7.2	21 618	8.9
Chickasaw	447	.4	138 040	1.0	309	1.1	226 188	15.1	15 101	12.5
Choctaw	217	.3	57 859	1.3	267	1.3	220 397	5.5	6 267	6.9
Claiborne	170	.4	81 229	1.7	478	1.7	342 758	11.6	6 894	9.1
Clarke	269	.2	52 018	1.7	193	1.7	160 350	11.3	5 941	13.7
Clay	367	.4	131 666	1.1	359	1.2	249 926	7.0	10 456	5.6
Coahoma	181	.2	272 809	.2	1 507	.3	1 450 551	1.1	49 662	3.5
Copiah	510	.3	120 681	1.2	237	1.3	222 024	9.4	14 638	8.0
Covington	475	.4	85 666	1.3	180	1.4	242 395	8.6	13 508	8.8
De Soto	467	.4	149 312	1.0	320	1.1	539 201	8.0	18 382	3.6
Forrest	291	.6	46 036	2.8	158	2.8	257 182	15.6	8 806	8.3
Franklin	158	.4	42 495	1.9	269	1.9	270 394	6.6	5 902	9.6
George	419	.6	41 744	2.3	100	2.4	166 731	7.9	12 126	12.2
Greene	334	.6	58 916	1.8	176	1.9	152 735	10.7	8 174	10.5
Grenada	211	.3	91 002	.9	431	1.0	312 560	4.2	9 580	6.5
Hancock	239	.6	36 237	3.3	152	3.4	268 190	12.1	6 222	9.7
Harrison	275	.7	17 871	3.0	65	3.0	222 545	12.7	8 874	9.9
Hinds	723	.3	196 393	.9	272	.9	334 132	5.2	36 936	4.4
Holmes	352	.4	189 866	.9	539	1.0	452 266	4.3	27 333	3.4
Humphreys	240	.2	198 236	.5	826	.5	816 425	1.7	40 176	.7
Issaquena	82	.3	112 746	.3	1 375	.4	1 274 505	2.1	20 715	2.2
Itawamba	387	.3	81 566	1.6	211	1.6	221 122	13.3	11 321	9.1
Jackson	321	.4	32 610	2.4	102	2.5	250 587	9.5	7 106	9.6
Jasper	367	.3	74 714	1.3	204	1.4	240 073	9.4	12 871	8.0
Jefferson	158	.5	63 517	2.1	402	2.2	348 097	8.2	5 619	5.5
Jefferson Davis	389	.5	78 668	1.8	202	1.9	172 343	8.3	13 710	18.2
Jones	773	.4	91 116	1.1	118	1.2	229 552	10.0	27 505	15.6
Kemper	382	.3	96 760	1.5	253	1.5	242 265	10.5	8 830	6.1
Lafayette	372	.4	102 123	1.4	275	1.5	260 363	10.6	10 545	10.5
Lamar	401	.6	74 162	2.0	185	2.1	367 723	20.1	11 318	20.4
Lauderdale	356	.3	74 742	1.5	210	1.6	164 715	10.3	8 011	13.2
Lawrence	308	.4	55 146	1.6	179	1.6	216 349	8.8	11 222	7.0
Leake	583	.3	104 050	1.4	178	1.4	200 514	5.2	21 646	5.9
Lee	488	.4	135 004	1.2	277	1.3	282 803	7.4	21 389	5.9
Leflore	246	.3	267 357	.4	1 087	.5	1 270 875	2.7	66 563	2.4
Lincoln	499	.3	98 854	1.2	198	1.2	239 752	10.7	15 719	7.2
Lowndes	378	.4	145 098	1.2	384	1.2	347 047	6.5	15 428	8.6
Madison	465	.3	182 095	.9	392	1.0	512 795	6.2	19 014	5.8
Marion	485	.5	97 378	1.7	201	1.8	333 520	13.0	11 242	5.8
Marshall	469	.5	181 342	1.1	387	1.3	436 670	6.8	20 308	10.3
Monroe	504	.3	162 346	1.1	322	1.1	291 883	6.4	24 616	9.1
Montgomery	286	.4	92 299	1.5	323	1.6	240 219	9.1	10 914	5.6
Neshoba	608	.2	140 511	.8	231	.8	226 885	5.5	21 683	5.3
Newton	543	.3	100 328	1.1	185	1.1	199 322	6.6	19 116	4.8
Noxubee	454	.5	193 558	1.2	426	1.3	363 433	7.4	24 599	5.4
Oktibbeha	329	.6	85 286	1.7	259	1.8	280 338	10.8	9 323	6.0
Panola	573	.4	238 468	.9	416	.9	386 066	6.2	29 228	4.9
Pearl River	609	.5	103 128	1.6	169	1.7	239 934	6.1	14 252	8.7
Perry	246	.6	31 903	2.3	130	2.4	192 755	13.6	6 907	19.0
Pike	437	.4	70 507	1.2	161	1.3	252 623	8.3	9 402	8.3
Pontotoc	552	.4	114 658	1.4	208	1.4	194 469	9.0	18 395	7.4
Prentiss	412	.4	88 081	1.4	214	1.5	188 575	9.5	12 887	10.1
Quitman	179	.5	169 557	.6	947	.8	746 564	8.1	24 862	5.8
Rankin	558	.3	117 296	1.1	210	1.1	297 808	8.0	17 630	5.0
Scott	674	.2	107 468	.8	159	.8	216 917	6.0	26 456	6.2
Sharkey	110	.1	165 581	.2	1 505	.3	1 266 357	1.2	29 146	.6
Simpson	550	.2	93 715	1.1	170	1.2	227 419	9.6	18 003	5.3
Smith	635	.2	94 798	1.0	149	1.0	233 715	5.9	20 592	5.7
Stone	212	.5	41 544	1.8	196	1.8	418 332	6.3	5 764	8.0
Sunflower	350	.2	348 290	.3	995	.4	1 160 409	1.8	83 617	1.5
Tallahatchie	355	.3	296 881	.5	836	.6	742 581	3.0	46 523	4.1
Tate	508	.4	134 657	1.1	265	1.2	287 667	8.9	18 469	6.1
Tippah	501	.5	113 847	1.2	227	1.3	180 791	7.2	11 118	7.0
Tishomingo	258	.4	44 866	1.9	174	2.0	186 952	12.3	6 974	9.8
Tunica	95	.3	202 353	.4	2 130	.5	1 971 293	2.8	32 905	3.3
Union	549	.2	102 243	.9	186	1.0	141 667	9.6	13 371	8.6
Walthall	538	.3	110 322	1.0	205	1.0	249 628	6.2	14 531	4.6
Warren	159	.3	97 829	1.0	615	1.0	546 553	3.5	11 363	2.6
Washington	283	.2	342 781	.2	1 211	.3	1 285 132	1.3	76 821	2.2
Wayne	458	.4	75 766	1.8	165	1.8	215 196	9.7	20 992	13.8
Webster	289	.3	78 623	1.1	272	1.1	200 890	11.1	12 877	9.1
Wilkinson	196	.4	109 267	1.0	557	1.1	573 403	5.7	7 195	4.4
Winston	458	.4	88 045	1.7	192	1.7	154 565	9.3	11 481	7.7
Yalobusha	278	.2	85 547	1.3	308	1.3	196 151	4.9	13 605	10.2
Yazoo	424	.3	312 298	.6	737	.6	548 289	4.0	37 712	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	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm ¹		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses ¹			
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
							Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Mississippi	51 801	.9	3 127 383	.1	99 859	.3	31 306	.3	2 458 575	.2
Adams	38 926	4.9	5 787	1.1	43 844	1.2	132	2.2	4 312	2.2
Alcorn	29 364	6.9	7 577	1.5	16 875	1.5	449	.7	5 706	4.7
Amite	36 207	7.9	28 071	.4	59 599	.5	471	.6	22 967	1.0
Attala	35 419	10.2	13 153	.6	34 164	.7	379	1.5	11 089	3.9
Benton	56 986	12.2	8 181	1.2	38 409	1.2	213	1.2	6 727	4.7
Bolivar	256 204	3.4	156 531	.1	397 286	.3	394	.6	113 391	.5
Calhoun	70 002	8.3	24 705	.7	57 856	.8	427	.8	16 469	2.6
Carroll	51 107	9.0	15 467	.5	36 565	.6	423	.8	12 702	2.7
Chickasaw	33 783	12.5	30 171	.4	67 496	.6	447	.7	19 944	3.2
Choctaw	28 879	7.0	8 554	.4	39 420	.5	217	1.6	6 509	1.4
Claiborne	40 552	9.3	6 204	1.5	36 493	1.5	170	1.7	5 713	1.8
Clarke	22 086	13.7	4 787	1.3	17 796	1.4	269	.7	4 098	3.2
Clay	28 412	5.7	11 325	1.2	30 857	1.3	368	.8	9 510	6.7
Coahoma	275 900	3.6	96 217	.1	531 588	.3	180	.8	72 510	.4
Copiah	28 759	8.1	45 263	.3	88 751	.4	509	.7	37 909	.9
Covington	28 437	8.8	43 452	.3	91 479	.5	475	.8	34 427	.9
De Soto	39 362	3.7	26 937	.5	57 680	.7	467	.7	20 457	1.5
Forrest	30 261	8.3	11 952	.5	41 072	.8	291	1.1	10 285	1.4
Franklin	37 356	9.7	3 658	1.9	23 154	2.0	158	1.6	3 075	3.1
George	29 009	12.3	9 105	1.6	21 730	1.7	418	.8	7 543	7.2
Greene	24 473	10.6	11 830	.7	35 419	.9	334	.9	10 537	2.7
Grenada	45 401	6.6	9 703	.5	45 985	.6	211	1.1	7 268	2.4
Hancock	26 143	9.8	2 139	3.9	8 951	3.9	238	1.4	2 602	8.3
Harrison	32 386	10.0	2 572	4.6	9 354	4.6	274	1.1	2 234	12.5
Hinds	51 087	4.4	51 506	.2	71 239	.4	723	.5	39 553	1.7
Holmes	77 650	3.5	37 086	.5	105 359	.6	352	.9	29 120	2.2
Humphreys	168 102	1.0	123 981	.1	516 587	.2	239	.7	93 799	.2
Issaquena	252 620	2.7	29 964	.3	365 415	.4	82	1.5	23 210	.7
Itawamba	29 253	9.1	14 480	.7	37 416	.8	387	.8	11 284	2.4
Jackson	22 137	9.6	4 792	1.4	14 927	1.5	321	.9	4 989	4.4
Jasper	35 070	8.0	28 471	.4	77 577	.6	367	.8	24 221	2.2
Jefferson	35 792	5.8	7 731	.9	48 932	1.0	157	1.8	6 934	2.1
Jefferson Davis	35 244	18.2	15 337	1.1	39 426	1.2	389	.9	12 973	3.1
Jones	35 582	15.6	99 339	.2	128 511	.5	773	.6	75 609	1.4
Kemper	23 056	6.2	8 370	1.2	21 911	1.2	383	.7	6 767	4.3
Lafayette	28 346	10.5	6 125	1.0	16 465	1.1	372	.7	5 676	5.2
Lamar	28 295	20.4	33 705	.4	84 052	.7	400	.9	31 241	1.6
Lauderdale	22 502	13.2	4 733	1.1	13 295	1.2	356	.9	4 241	5.9
Lawrence	36 436	7.1	23 819	.3	77 334	.5	308	1.0	19 035	1.0
Leake	37 129	5.9	97 366	.2	167 008	.4	583	.6	77 481	.9
Lee	43 829	6.0	20 823	.8	42 669	.9	488	.8	16 406	4.6
Leflore	270 581	2.5	114 960	.2	467 318	.3	246	.6	94 568	.5
Lincoln	31 500	7.2	31 483	.5	63 091	.6	499	.6	26 522	2.5
Lowndes	40 706	8.6	45 309	.4	119 865	.6	379	.7	20 630	1.8
Madison	40 891	5.9	24 186	.6	52 013	.7	465	.7	18 847	2.6
Marion	23 228	5.9	28 576	.6	58 920	.8	484	.7	23 125	1.9
Marshall	43 300	10.4	14 102	1.1	30 068	1.2	469	.9	12 128	5.0
Monroe	48 842	9.2	16 888	.9	33 508	1.0	504	.7	13 241	3.2
Montgomery	38 030	5.6	9 990	1.7	34 928	1.8	287	.8	7 097	5.1
Neshoba	35 663	5.3	87 249	.1	143 502	.2	608	.5	73 698	.6
Newton	35 140	4.8	88 505	.2	162 993	.4	544	.6	72 654	.6
Noxubee	53 945	5.4	43 558	.6	95 942	.8	456	.7	29 130	2.3
Oktibbeha	28 337	6.0	8 788	.7	26 713	.9	329	.9	7 137	2.5
Panola	51 009	4.9	31 022	.4	54 140	.6	573	.6	24 223	2.9
Pearl River	23 441	8.7	8 838	1.7	14 513	1.8	608	.7	8 286	6.9
Perry	28 191	19.0	9 167	.9	37 264	1.0	245	1.2	7 809	2.4
Pike	21 514	8.3	49 577	.3	113 449	.5	437	.7	38 474	.5
Pontotoc	33 324	7.4	8 620	1.4	15 616	1.4	552	.8	8 898	7.5
Prentiss	31 279	10.1	7 577	1.3	18 391	1.3	412	.7	6 273	4.6
Quitman	138 896	5.9	46 178	.4	257 976	.6	179	.9	34 161	2.6
Rankin	31 594	5.0	51 306	.3	91 945	.4	558	.5	43 639	.9
Scott	39 252	6.2	174 534	.1	258 952	.2	674	.4	146 881	.4
Sharkey	264 968	1.0	59 095	.2	537 224	.2	110	.8	48 546	.8
Simpson	32 733	5.4	103 126	.1	187 502	.3	550	.6	88 811	.8
Smith	32 429	5.7	129 243	.1	203 532	.2	635	.4	109 423	.4
Stone	27 319	8.1	4 152	1.4	19 587	1.5	211	1.0	4 278	8.0
Sunflower	238 905	1.6	164 335	.1	469 528	.3	350	.5	119 307	.6
Tallahatchie	131 051	4.2	82 675	.3	232 887	.4	355	.6	60 499	1.1
Tate	36 356	6.2	24 406	.9	48 042	1.0	508	.7	16 267	2.4
Tippah	22 192	7.1	9 480	1.7	18 921	1.8	501	.7	8 374	5.8
Tishomingo	27 030	9.8	2 778	1.9	10 766	2.0	258	1.0	2 666	8.4
Tunica	346 366	3.4	64 267	.1	676 490	.3	95	.8	45 085	.3
Union	24 354	8.6	9 866	.9	17 971	.9	549	.6	7 757	5.8
Walthall	27 060	4.6	50 771	.3	94 370	.4	537	.6	41 578	1.4
Warren	71 467	3.0	12 298	.6	77 345	.7	159	1.5	9 457	1.3
Washington	271 451	2.2	146 480	.1	517 598	.2	283	.5	104 855	.5
Wayne	45 935	13.8	62 626	.2	136 739	.5	457	.6	53 338	.6
Webster	44 402	9.2	12 512	1.0	43 294	1.0	290	1.0	9 787	3.3
Wilkinson	36 707	4.6	5 296	1.1	27 020	1.2	196	1.3	5 300	3.5

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	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm ¹		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses ¹					
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total farm production expenses					
							Farms		Value			
							Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		
Winston	25 068	7.7	8 282	1.4	18 082	1.5	458	.8	6 454	7.7		
Yalobusha	48 939	10.2	9 494	.7	34 150	.7	278	1.0	8 718	5.1		
Yazoo	88 944	2.6	74 823	.2	176 468	.4	424	.6	60 132	.7		
Farm production expenses ¹ —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)
Mississippi ...	8 789	1.9	229 688	.5	18 062	1.0	845 628	.2	10 424	1.6	65 961	.6
Adams	28	17.5	116	13.9	80	5.7	175	16.1	49	9.3	317	2.7
Alcorn	131	14.6	422	14.0	239	9.0	338	11.9	129	16.5	307	25.5
Amite	101	17.2	2 026	3.0	296	5.6	14 143	.5	135	13.9	114	9.3
Attala	131	14.4	964	26.1	230	8.3	2 421	3.3	64	23.1	218	5.7
Benton	69	18.0	175	40.4	131	9.6	219	16.7	89	15.5	406	5.7
Bolivar	5	—	205	—	11	—	5 292	—	351	3.6	7 206	1.3
Calhoun	35	36.5	233	4.6	186	13.5	475	10.2	195	9.6	1 334	4.8
Carroll	120	16.8	427	9.2	319	4.7	1 786	13.6	137	15.5	499	4.0
Chickasaw	120	18.7	5 055	2.1	223	9.7	3 958	2.9	128	15.2	514	6.9
Choctaw	39	16.2	1 525	.7	111	7.7	2 331	.8	53	12.6	73	10.7
Claiborne	46	15.5	1 012	2.7	101	7.0	369	7.8	48	13.7	178	3.3
Clarke	44	30.7	347	9.2	179	8.5	2 257	1.9	47	30.1	23	30.3
Clay	161	10.7	3 094	16.2	243	7.7	865	10.6	64	24.7	239	3.6
Coahoma	8	3.3	(D)	(D)	17	23.5	495	3.8	143	5.7	3 846	.2
Copiah	165	11.8	8 086	2.6	330	6.6	17 538	.3	112	14.9	166	11.0
Covington	168	13.4	8 027	1.6	289	8.4	13 809	.4	190	13.2	280	4.0
De Soto	119	18.5	526	19.3	287	9.1	1 033	14.9	98	19.0	925	1.0
Forrest	117	14.0	1 135	6.2	195	6.5	5 425	.6	115	15.5	147	12.1
Franklin	32	15.5	147	11.0	90	9.3	1 454	1.2	44	15.2	59	20.3
George	128	16.9	324	23.1	214	10.9	1 066	26.1	178	13.5	409	3.4
Greene	119	15.9	1 438	11.8	252	7.4	6 152	2.8	112	16.5	79	39.1
Grenada	49	24.3	292	22.1	145	8.3	352	14.1	64	17.6	473	3.3
Hancock	90	10.3	274	12.8	182	4.3	547	10.4	89	11.2	52	23.8
Harrison	71	22.7	172	32.2	144	12.2	397	31.3	86	16.4	(D)	(D)
Hinds	190	13.4	2 078	8.1	428	6.3	(D)	(D)	203	12.7	798	8.3
Holmes	82	18.7	791	45.7	176	10.8	528	12.4	121	13.2	1 273	6.5
Humphreys	43	16.1	4 389	.4	89	11.2	23 235	.1	144	5.4	2 106	.5
Issaquena	5	67.4	(D)	(D)	11	30.6	452	.4	71	4.6	1 516	.8
Itawamba	139	14.8	1 304	5.3	234	9.8	6 575	1.5	96	18.0	144	14.1
Jackson	110	15.8	410	14.4	217	7.9	655	12.6	147	11.6	180	8.0
Jasper	130	15.4	2 593	6.0	230	9.4	16 833	1.8	95	21.0	47	19.3
Jefferson	25	18.9	306	14.6	91	8.1	2 023	1.1	42	15.3	293	1.2
Jefferson Davis	94	21.7	1 076	14.3	194	11.1	7 575	.6	152	16.9	130	20.0
Jones	362	9.9	15 047	1.9	548	6.4	47 023	1.6	135	20.1	99	36.3
Kemper	83	23.4	880	4.0	235	9.1	2 550	3.9	94	20.2	50	36.8
Lafayette	85	20.6	198	29.4	184	13.0	434	15.8	108	19.2	232	10.9
Lamar	132	14.3	12 474	.6	222	10.8	11 221	2.1	108	20.5	156	14.6
Lauderdale	106	19.0	312	30.6	262	7.4	509	13.8	66	26.5	(D)	(D)
Lawrence	84	13.5	1 405	3.3	193	7.1	12 642	.3	85	15.1	187	13.9
Leake	234	9.8	10 926	.9	423	4.6	49 648	1.2	105	16.1	88	21.5
Lee	134	16.8	1 193	30.4	275	9.1	2 544	4.9	169	12.7	739	11.6
Leflore	10	2.9	(D)	(D)	37	22.3	13 404	-.2	170	5.6	3 469	1.4
Lincoln	169	15.5	2 360	3.5	347	7.0	15 449	2.5	170	15.7	185	10.2
Lowndes	66	26.1	1 232	22.0	165	14.5	3 955	.8	126	18.4	590	8.7
Madison	106	18.0	738	9.5	246	9.8	1 129	8.6	148	13.4	813	2.0
Marion	135	16.1	2 683	9.3	332	7.1	13 906	1.2	155	15.3	77	14.6
Marshall	94	19.9	439	17.5	277	7.7	1 033	9.7	140	15.1	746	8.5
Monroe	103	20.4	1 377	3.3	236	10.4	1 550	9.7	181	12.4	690	5.7
Montgomery	81	16.9	647	38.8	173	8.4	784	5.5	100	13.9	232	14.9
Neshoba	237	10.9	10 558	1.2	448	6.0	50 718	.2	135	18.6	87	22.5
Newton	248	10.5	15 221	1.2	405	5.2	45 685	.3	120	17.9	105	18.8
Noxubee	124	14.3	6 007	5.1	241	7.1	7 117	6.3	149	14.6	828	8.1
Oktibbeha	80	22.8	892	6.9	210	7.2	1 987	2.4	58	16.9	97	5.3
Panola	122	17.8	388	26.1	344	6.3	721	7.5	182	10.2	1 470	1.9
Pearl River	186	13.8	1 059	17.6	408	6.4	1 677	23.3	171	14.6	134	10.7
Perry	65	21.6	836	2.5	147	9.4	4 893	.8	75	20.0	29	17.6
Pike	122	18.5	8 529	1.8	265	7.8	17 238	.4	151	15.0	145	13.6
Pontotoc	108	17.3	466	28.4	237	9.8	923	8.0	202	10.3	479	20.0
Prentiss	64	26.3	150	24.7	153	14.5	718	8.5	134	14.5	376	5.7
Quitman	—	—	—	—	2	—	(D)	(D)	129	11.5	2 355	6.5
Rankin	200	12.6	4 774	3.6	375	6.0	28 034	.3	214	11.6	384	10.7
Scott	301	7.4	23 566	.5	447	5.9	99 527	.1	168	15.6	141	33.4
Sharkey	4	—	108	—	14	24.1	4 663	.7	87	4.8	2 504	1.8
Simpson	237	9.0	15 881	1.1	430	4.5	56 054	.1	164	14.0	164	8.7

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Smith	323	7.0	11 927	1.2	456	5.2	81 040	.1	186	13.2	112	14.3
Stone	46	19.2	338	7.0	131	7.9	938	6.6	85	12.7	84	17.5
Sunflower	49	21.0	3 882	.3	90	16.0	19 405	.2	250	5.6	4 884	1.6
Tallahatchie	70	22.3	546	16.3	149	12.8	733	8.4	142	12.6	4 006	2.5
Tate	176	14.9	1 487	9.4	337	7.2	3 004	4.5	159	14.3	528	3.1
Tippah	172	13.6	355	18.9	308	8.0	749	12.6	204	12.3	1 051	5.4
Tishomingo	49	19.7	199	14.6	131	10.7	816	3.6	71	14.5	104	39.5
Tunica	6	—	(D)	(D)	11	35.5	(D)	(D)	80	7.1	2 419	.5
Union	138	22.5	776	5.3	287	12.0	1 754	3.2	147	18.5	360	29.5
Walthall	156	12.3	3 837	2.7	339	6.3	26 456	1.4	164	13.5	265	11.6
Warren	43	12.4	154	29.9	78	7.1	332	9.7	63	9.3	718	2.7
Washington	25	41.6	2 422	1.5	14	—	8 277	—	230	4.0	5 026	.9
Wayne	181	10.7	7 554	.8	346	6.9	34 267	.3	141	17.1	118	37.8
Webster	77	16.1	748	4.4	147	8.1	1 687	2.6	62	18.1	232	8.7
Wilkinson	48	11.5	1 149	9.9	146	6.0	509	3.5	58	13.7	136	3.9
Winston	106	20.0	632	10.7	302	7.5	2 437	13.2	68	26.0	53	18.8
Yalobusha	55	22.5	205	31.8	155	9.8	464	22.0	86	11.3	398	4.0
Yazoo	73	23.0	490	10.4	190	10.4	5 201	.9	238	7.7	3 113	3.7
Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Commercial fertilizer				Agricultural chemicals				Petroleum products			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Mississippi	18 698	1.0	114 194	.7	10 465	1.6	199 962	.4	28 744	.5	100 997	.5
Adams	60	7.9	326	2.2	38	12.9	874	4.2	108	3.6	274	3.4
Alcorn	260	8.2	854	9.0	139	15.8	337	6.5	421	2.6	427	6.3
Amite	292	6.4	616	9.1	85	15.5	72	16.3	443	2.7	741	4.4
Attala	206	8.5	847	5.5	106	17.8	807	3.7	329	4.7	667	4.5
Benton	145	9.3	751	4.9	66	15.6	686	4.2	208	2.5	585	12.0
Bolivar	276	5.8	7 631	1.0	339	3.8	22 538	.6	374	2.7	7 102	.8
Calhoun	276	8.9	2 106	4.2	167	13.7	2 648	4.6	405	2.9	1 205	3.9
Carroll	265	6.6	1 241	4.8	127	16.4	1 833	1.0	382	3.1	915	9.0
Chickasaw	229	11.0	1 240	9.5	149	12.4	764	16.0	382	4.5	904	11.8
Choctaw	115	6.4	321	7.8	49	12.7	201	4.7	190	3.0	218	5.4
Claiborne	109	6.4	943	3.9	26	20.7	411	2.5	151	3.6	292	5.1
Clarke	181	10.3	240	19.6	36	34.0	16	59.4	254	3.5	224	10.0
Clay	199	10.1	733	8.7	104	16.7	669	4.4	329	4.0	451	8.1
Coahoma	114	6.0	4 487	1.2	148	5.3	14 705	.2	177	.8	3 814	.5
Copiah	286	7.4	711	5.8	77	17.6	322	1.5	468	2.5	1 110	6.9
Covington	338	5.0	911	6.9	113	16.1	221	5.6	428	2.5	1 207	1.9
De Soto	186	13.4	1 503	1.7	111	19.1	2 449	1.5	439	3.0	1 273	2.0
Forrest	198	7.4	422	5.1	90	18.2	(D)	(D)	259	3.6	336	7.1
Franklin	103	8.1	199	9.4	43	16.8	72	33.3	140	5.1	164	6.6
George	312	6.5	610	8.7	142	13.9	316	4.5	374	3.9	382	6.6
Greene	229	8.3	503	20.1	104	18.5	115	31.7	334	.9	329	10.8
Grenada	110	11.7	915	3.9	68	16.6	1 158	1.2	198	3.2	510	3.6
Hancock	177	4.0	336	9.9	39	18.2	40	10.6	224	2.4	190	9.2
Harrison	151	11.5	214	19.9	105	18.3	38	23.9	258	3.7	239	12.8
Hinds	361	8.3	1 664	6.1	202	14.5	1 861	3.7	656	2.9	1 220	5.2
Holmes	183	11.2	2 778	4.1	163	12.1	5 852	3.4	307	4.7	1 466	2.9
Humphreys	153	6.0	3 197	.5	159	5.2	10 501	.6	229	2.2	5 316	.4
Issaquena	54	6.4	1 637	1.1	72	4.0	4 748	1.3	82	1.5	1 362	.9
Itawamba	224	9.1	486	10.4	94	18.7	289	7.9	367	3.5	416	6.7
Jackson	240	6.6	539	8.0	124	13.4	365	2.5	299	3.1	341	13.2
Jasper	213	9.8	342	19.0	64	24.9	36	26.3	322	4.5	614	5.6
Jefferson	82	9.0	370	9.1	36	17.8	695	3.2	145	4.1	320	3.6
Jefferson Davis	235	9.3	517	16.1	82	21.3	56	20.9	329	2.4	592	17.2
Jones	434	7.5	1 064	20.4	259	12.7	147	26.0	743	1.6	1 937	5.2
Kemper	287	6.7	518	11.9	60	28.2	30	20.4	340	4.1	330	9.8
Lafayette	228	10.6	793	7.3	87	21.1	703	2.9	337	2.7	398	9.9
Lamar	249	9.2	924	7.4	146	14.5	162	25.9	370	3.3	598	7.6
Lauderdale	196	11.9	298	19.8	46	31.3	(D)	(D)	331	3.2	368	9.2
Lawrence	216	6.0	553	8.3	56	18.3	177	3.5	285	3.2	477	4.6
Leake	252	10.7	451	14.9	130	16.2	207	15.5	540	1.7	1 842	2.4
Lee	321	7.2	1 668	5.0	187	11.0	1 744	6.0	405	4.5	1 217	10.3
Leflore	162	7.7	5 115	.7	184	6.6	13 391	1.1	236	2.5	4 521	2.4
Lincoln	320	6.6	863	9.4	164	15.0	165	6.1	490	1.5	798	7.6
Lowndes	203	11.9	1 165	5.2	169	14.6	809	3.1	313	5.8	646	6.7
Madison	277	8.8	2 293	5.5	156	12.3	3 155	3.0	390	4.3	1 226	5.3
Marion	336	6.4	801	7.3	102	17.8	36	21.3	458	2.9	574	5.6
Marshall	335	5.7	1 696	6.6	184	12.4	1 125	8.9	447	2.3	933	5.3
Monroe	298	8.0	1 824	4.4	206	10.6	1 373	5.9	464	3.3	824	5.5
Montgomery	202	6.2	705	8.5	146	9.5	892	4.2	269	2.8	431	5.9
Neshoba	390	7.0	884	13.5	153	16.5	74	28.2	554	3.5	1 404	4.3
Newton	307	9.1	742	11.9	137	16.2	154	11.1	507	2.4	1 347	5.0
Noxubee	223	10.9	2 310	7.9	170	13.7	1 427	9.4	407	4.2	1 005	4.4
Oktibbeha	183	10.0	492	12.7	87	21.9	127	7.0	294	4.2	356	7.8
Panola	284	9.2	2 747	4.3	202	10.5	3 450	4.1	512	2.7	1 730	3.8

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 ¹ —Con.											
	Commercial fertilizer				Agricultural chemicals				Petroleum products			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Pearl River	446	5.4	1 124	12.1	184	13.8	111	16.4	577	2.1	547	8.3
Perry	134	10.5	233	13.8	57	23.5	34	35.3	215	5.1	183	9.4
Pike	251	9.4	660	7.1	100	20.9	78	13.3	414	2.5	816	2.0
Pontotoc	301	6.9	1 073	11.1	186	11.0	1 017	8.9	463	3.6	685	12.2
Prentiss	218	10.1	857	10.4	147	12.3	632	5.1	388	2.6	540	7.1
Quitman	110	13.4	2 846	12.6	144	6.8	7 063	3.3	165	6.0	2 115	3.2
Rankin	332	6.2	830	12.7	193	13.5	550	17.4	522	2.4	983	4.8
Scott	293	8.6	639	13.6	174	12.8	405	48.2	653	1.5	2 715	2.3
Sharkey	76	4.5	2 926	1.3	90	4.5	9 209	1.4	105	2.2	2 751	4.3
Simpson	337	5.6	820	20.0	154	14.6	213	15.8	515	1.8	1 684	2.6
Smith	222	10.6	466	20.1	184	11.3	100	21.4	609	2.4	2 022	3.3
Stone	144	8.2	530	23.1	67	16.0	90	25.9	198	3.1	215	17.1
Sunflower	180	7.3	5 043	.9	254	4.8	15 449	1.4	321	2.8	6 643	1.0
Tallahatchie	219	9.3	5 600	.6	157	13.2	11 570	1.1	317	2.6	3 320	2.1
Tate	303	8.5	1 547	6.3	178	13.2	1 300	5.0	458	2.5	968	4.2
Tippah	365	6.0	963	17.2	192	13.6	364	7.0	455	3.2	433	7.7
Tishomingo	163	6.6	379	13.6	92	15.2	169	34.8	236	3.6	178	9.2
Tunica	59	7.7	2 509	.5	83	6.3	8 936	.6	91	3.8	2 608	.6
Union	352	8.3	825	11.8	190	16.2	475	10.5	520	2.7	510	9.5
Walthall	336	6.6	1 137	6.0	109	16.6	150	7.7	472	3.2	1 070	3.1
Warren	72	8.2	658	2.2	67	6.6	2 099	1.1	140	2.0	518	2.5
Washington	207	7.0	6 181	1.5	225	3.8	18 925	1.2	282	.5	5 700	.5
Wayne	327	6.2	480	18.6	141	15.4	138	18.5	446	2.1	865	3.9
Webster	174	8.1	773	6.2	110	13.7	1 384	10.7	263	3.5	420	4.1
Wilkinson	109	8.6	381	8.3	35	15.2	289	.7	163	4.1	263	5.5
Winston	294	6.7	493	11.6	89	20.8	120	6.4	377	4.7	346	11.1
Yalobusha	149	10.1	856	6.5	109	11.9	1 778	15.2	267	2.9	645	4.9
Yazoo	260	7.1	5 269	1.2	256	6.9	11 873	1.2	409	2.3	3 084	1.6

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Electricity				Hired farm labor				Contract labor			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Mississippi ...	13 352	1.4	32 857	.6	9 628	1.7	169 897	.4	2 986	3.4	15 078	1.9
Adams	46	9.1	29	6.7	53	9.1	569	2.2	22	15.4	85	14.5
Alcorn	106	17.6	38	12.4	73	21.6	381	4.1	22	45.1	(D)	(D)
Amite	192	10.3	231	4.5	100	15.4	1 139	1.6	52	21.3	44	11.1
Attala	142	14.6	112	10.1	145	14.5	1 557	2.5	24	39.3	71	15.6
Benton	72	17.8	49	27.2	55	16.2	822	15.4	12	48.3	33	34.6
Bolivar	276	7.5	2 647	1.3	275	5.3	13 359	1.2	63	21.5	777	1.5
Calhoun	158	13.3	136	8.6	150	14.6	2 017	3.7	21	40.4	58	11.0
Carroll	217	10.1	162	9.9	109	19.8	958	4.2	34	34.5	223	2.1
Chickasaw	137	14.0	278	12.4	131	18.8	1 384	6.9	41	38.8	301	2.9
Choctaw	50	14.2	61	5.8	30	16.5	214	3.0	18	24.3	14	18.2
Claiborne	74	8.4	52	6.8	53	9.9	480	4.0	14	25.8	86	11.0
Clarke	97	17.0	62	20.1	41	31.8	34	58.6	21	47.5	38	80.2
Clay	138	13.9	94	15.7	130	16.0	439	3.9	45	32.2	71	18.4
Coahoma	129	5.3	579	.4	125	6.2	9 935	.2	46	8.7	(D)	(D)
Copiah	214	10.4	269	7.4	130	13.8	564	4.0	39	26.4	72	10.5
Covington	186	13.0	450	1.4	116	14.7	925	5.5	34	23.1	81	7.2
De Soto	195	13.4	229	7.4	112	15.9	2 738	1.9	75	22.8	403	13.4
Forrest	145	10.0	85	5.9	102	16.3	311	7.1	19	45.3	(D)	(D)
Franklin	57	13.7	25	8.5	29	13.5	125	8.0	11	32.8	28	30.5
George	191	11.6	129	11.0	79	19.1	1 556	28.9	48	22.4	353	42.5
Greene	146	14.1	102	8.5	110	17.7	143	23.4	41	32.7	82	37.9
Grenada	69	13.1	58	9.2	56	17.6	770	4.9	4	—	45	—
Hancock	97	10.7	53	14.4	54	13.1	59	22.2	19	30.0	23	27.8
Harrison	136	12.7	49	22.8	39	28.4	(D)	(D)	6	62.5	20	28.8
Hinds	252	12.5	895	7.5	247	12.1	4 812	1.7	115	19.0	(D)	(D)
Holmes	142	13.7	230	5.0	158	12.2	3 178	1.2	17	39.8	154	4.9
Humphreys	151	5.2	2 602	.2	148	6.9	11 108	.1	55	13.1	661	2.3
Issaquena	52	9.6	329	2.0	53	7.1	2 740	1.0	14	19.4	(D)	(D)
Itawamba	148	14.2	128	9.1	52	25.6	71	12.6	2	—	(D)	(D)
Jackson	149	11.1	100	17.1	49	26.6	453	5.6	35	30.0	89	14.5
Jasper	134	15.4	231	2.5	74	21.5	326	2.0	17	47.9	11	43.6
Jefferson	62	12.6	57	7.5	69	10.9	504	3.2	11	31.0	70	7.8
Jefferson Davis	98	21.6	92	21.8	106	22.6	365	38.3	21	60.2	36	10.3
Jones	372	8.4	778	3.8	172	16.2	775	12.6	57	28.0	88	12.5
Kemper	144	16.1	184	7.3	101	20.4	279	8.9	32	39.3	128	60.2
Lafayette	179	12.6	58	18.8	83	17.5	315	10.5	24	49.5	99	45.0
Lamar	154	13.8	162	8.9	100	18.5	751	6.2	65	25.1	152	16.9
Lauderdale	142	14.6	72	12.3	43	31.2	(D)	(D)	43	30.5	85	32.8
Lawrence	84	14.4	120	3.9	80	14.6	256	12.7	15	34.0	57	8.9
Leake	205	10.2	1 039	6.0	132	12.6	3 351	1.0	25	34.5	117	1.9
Lee	208	12.1	179	11.9	137	14.5	1 318	1.5	44	34.1	122	15.8
Leflore	177	8.2	2 102	.6	168	8.6	11 648	1.3	34	19.1	(D)	(D)
Lincoln	218	11.1	328	15.7	171	13.0	836	13.2	66	30.3	255	35.2
Lowndes	162	13.7	116	7.0	119	12.7	3 709	.2	26	43.5	75	16.8

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 ¹ —Con.											
	Electricity				Hired farm labor				Contract labor			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Madison	204	11.7	116	11.3	179	11.8	1 905	6.7	34	29.0	173	12.2
Marion	204	10.9	254	9.7	172	15.1	536	20.5	62	24.6	118	27.0
Marshall	138	15.2	105	12.4	174	12.1	904	10.5	40	33.2	143	25.7
Monroe	222	11.6	161	16.4	120	16.9	623	9.4	23	42.4	58	12.5
Montgomery	122	10.7	57	9.2	80	15.4	484	5.5	13	44.3	35	27.6
Neshoba	243	10.2	563	2.4	148	15.6	1 037	6.7	26	40.4	59	24.7
Newton	264	10.3	768	1.8	172	12.4	1 321	4.0	49	31.1	51	13.1
Noxubee	251	9.3	721	13.4	199	11.7	1 407	5.8	28	34.8	74	17.2
Oktoberfest	138	15.5	186	9.3	67	20.4	623	5.1	29	40.9	34	29.1
Panola	222	11.6	153	14.3	263	10.5	2 642	4.9	73	25.0	179	20.3
Pearl River	275	10.0	141	12.1	97	19.0	360	10.4	35	29.9	81	9.0
Perry	109	13.0	86	9.2	53	22.2	107	18.1	16	41.3	47	52.7
Pike	206	12.4	395	6.7	151	15.3	714	4.2	33	38.4	92	27.5
Pontotoc	160	11.5	82	10.7	81	19.8	711	14.9	41	30.9	55	41.9
Prentiss	141	13.8	61	8.1	86	20.9	322	16.9	28	37.9	23	32.0
Quitman	101	11.0	332	5.3	108	12.0	4 108	3.3	35	27.9	(D)	(D)
Rankin	212	11.4	317	3.2	169	13.9	617	4.1	49	28.0	80	10.8
Scott	326	7.4	1 397	1.5	216	9.7	2 935	.9	93	17.3	747	5.9
Sharkey	84	6.1	851	1.0	85	6.2	5 139	.3	21	(L)	548	(L)
Simpson	289	8.5	826	1.6	177	12.2	2 179	3.2	100	17.6	217	20.8
Smith	317	7.9	945	5.0	227	8.5	1 073	7.9	65	12.4	176	14.6
Stone	91	11.3	72	6.9	54	16.1	648	3.5	8	41.3	59	12.5
Sunflower	275	5.8	3 220	.7	238	4.3	13 272	.2	75	9.1	1 475	2.1
Tallahatchie	182	12.2	616	3.7	124	13.2	6 141	1.6	53	29.0	874	9.0
Tate	170	15.0	173	4.9	109	15.9	1 656	3.2	38	31.7	132	7.4
Tippah	202	13.0	93	11.8	154	16.7	1 376	2.2	28	38.1	30	15.7
Tishomingo	106	12.8	38	8.5	35	25.1	55	38.5	—	—	—	—
Tunica	57	—	692	—	72	7.7	6 450	.2	18	18.8	268	.4
Union	194	16.1	69	16.8	121	25.1	216	19.0	47	40.0	94	50.9
Walthall	264	7.6	529	4.3	195	11.8	1 522	5.7	67	23.2	161	17.2
Warren	74	7.7	77	4.3	61	9.4	764	2.3	27	12.5	120	5.6
Washington	175	6.4	1 552	.1	219	5.5	10 678	.1	52	13.0	1 239	.7
Wayne	200	11.0	379	2.1	127	14.9	1 264	15.0	76	23.5	109	22.6
Webster	95	11.2	112	7.8	91	13.7	1 047	2.5	19	19.7	66	6.6
Wilkinson	75	11.1	49	7.2	65	13.2	283	3.9	28	23.0	37	26.4
Winston	143	15.7	100	21.5	103	19.4	243	25.0	18	41.0	121	3.4
Yalobusha	105	13.6	82	7.8	99	12.3	682	8.6	15	38.0	46	8.7
Yazoo	213	9.7	705	1.9	178	10.0	5 772	1.1	75	19.0	428	14.0

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —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)
Mississippi	23 693	.8	128 677	.6	6 965	2.1	60 166	.9	10 610	1.6	108 338	.8
Adams	90	5.7	379	4.1	22	15.4	159	2.0	25	15.8	270	2.4
Alcorn	307	7.0	677	9.9	81	23.1	93	13.5	133	15.3	672	24.9
Amite	348	5.7	719	7.8	120	14.4	166	11.2	118	15.6	941	6.8
Attala	253	7.7	743	5.2	86	18.8	176	14.4	120	16.0	770	15.2
Benton	184	5.5	615	7.1	52	22.3	403	5.2	81	14.8	491	12.9
Bolivar	353	3.4	7 691	1.6	216	8.8	5 465	2.8	257	7.4	6 032	2.5
Calhoun	358	5.2	1 635	4.2	111	18.0	324	8.1	177	11.9	1 358	4.2
Carroll	312	6.3	1 218	6.8	71	23.6	329	8.6	146	15.8	935	15.2
Chickasaw	330	6.7	966	9.1	61	26.1	136	7.8	139	15.6	1 759	5.5
Choctaw	140	6.0	311	18.9	51	12.7	78	10.7	48	13.9	351	7.5
Claiborne	133	5.0	412	5.4	34	18.6	184	7.0	48	12.1	509	8.9
Clarke	193	7.4	225	14.1	47	32.1	32	39.3	95	18.7	161	16.7
Clay	296	6.3	592	10.8	80	23.6	117	22.1	136	15.8	762	9.7
Coahoma	165	3.7	5 805	.2	93	6.7	3 458	.3	116	4.2	3 573	.4
Copiah	371	6.0	945	5.7	103	17.1	267	12.7	146	14.3	1 067	7.8
Covington	330	6.6	875	7.2	94	19.5	112	16.4	179	12.4	1 132	9.8
De Soto	346	6.5	1 445	3.7	70	25.5	567	2.5	78	20.1	1 457	5.6
Forrest	222	5.5	395	7.6	62	24.0	152	16.8	86	17.7	583	10.9
Franklin	100	8.9	174	10.0	47	17.6	33	15.7	45	12.0	145	7.1
George	313	6.3	527	11.3	96	21.6	122	25.8	121	16.2	430	19.6
Greene	272	6.3	435	12.8	79	23.2	41	31.2	81	22.1	335	10.6
Grenada	140	9.5	712	4.8	35	24.6	386	3.7	62	18.3	292	7.4
Hancock	196	3.6	265	9.9	19	24.0	13	27.4	56	14.3	202	16.0
Harrison	222	6.7	366	18.2	22	42.3	15	70.7	34	35.7	165	42.8
Hinds	564	4.8	2 701	6.5	148	13.9	320	11.5	180	14.5	810	17.1
Holmes	272	6.3	2 379	3.9	105	18.6	1 699	1.4	106	18.0	1 332	4.6
Humphreys	187	5.7	7 611	.5	134	5.1	2 585	.5	127	7.0	5 439	.3
Issaquena	77	3.8	1 743	1.3	58	7.6	1 823	3.2	62	5.7	1 488	2.1
Itawamba	242	9.6	307	9.8	78	24.6	79	28.6	135	16.5	430	20.3
Jackson	259	5.4	479	17.3	74	21.0	56	23.9	115	13.3	454	16.1
Jasper	266	7.7	579	12.6	47	33.5	41	44.8	140	14.5	792	7.7
Jefferson	117	6.2	389	4.3	26	19.6	121	6.1	46	14.2	289	9.9
Jefferson Davis	291	5.7	564	10.2	92	27.4	95	30.8	103	20.6	514	13.5
Jones	569	5.3	1 485	9.7	147	19.5	207	34.7	181	11.4	1 441	2.9

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —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)
Kemper	245	8.8	365	13.4	65	23.7	112	40.2	83	23.5	186	21.7
Lafayette	299	7.1	757	19.1	82	22.6	120	14.6	98	20.6	458	25.6
Lamar	270	8.2	693	16.2	66	18.8	201	20.0	135	13.6	1 279	6.5
Lauderdale	246	8.8	354	16.4	49	29.5	107	31.3	76	22.6	276	25.5
Lawrence	251	5.1	468	10.7	54	20.7	90	11.8	77	14.9	507	8.8
Leake	402	4.9	1 509	4.4	117	17.3	256	20.0	231	9.5	2 133	6.9
Lee	338	6.2	1 622	7.9	104	20.6	308	14.9	155	14.7	1 266	13.4
Leflore	236	2.5	6 864	1.1	126	9.9	4 716	2.5	144	8.5	3 780	.8
Lincoln	402	4.5	944	8.8	105	23.3	164	37.3	144	15.0	962	6.1
Lowndes	290	6.6	3 195	2.0	68	25.9	134	21.9	139	16.4	1 682	3.0
Madison	312	7.4	1 693	5.9	89	18.3	611	6.1	137	13.5	1 613	10.0
Marion	398	6.0	688	8.9	109	22.6	95	21.9	178	14.3	1 214	7.2
Marshall	398	4.7	1 261	8.7	72	22.8	171	8.0	165	14.4	1 119	10.9
Monroe	366	6.6	1 148	10.0	97	19.4	215	12.4	177	12.7	727	11.3
Montgomery	227	5.5	680	8.2	38	26.3	84	18.9	99	13.5	573	8.6
Neshoba	436	6.4	1 133	8.5	43	30.1	53	21.9	179	11.5	1 682	5.2
Newton	465	4.3	1 358	13.1	73	22.1	101	20.4	188	11.2	1 597	3.4
Noxubee	332	6.0	1 841	5.0	93	16.6	491	6.7	193	9.4	2 115	8.6
Okfuskee	230	6.1	689	10.2	47	29.2	69	16.5	106	17.6	537	8.6
Panola	464	3.5	2 034	4.4	133	14.5	1 287	10.6	254	9.9	2 264	8.1
Pearl River	454	5.6	844	16.9	52	27.8	114	41.8	102	18.3	567	28.6
Perry	198	6.5	366	18.0	26	29.9	25	42.3	36	23.7	326	17.4
Pike	320	6.7	1 153	4.9	104	18.7	171	17.4	88	19.7	1 218	8.0
Pontotoc	359	4.5	810	7.5	103	18.1	207	21.3	168	12.6	918	14.5
Prentiss	299	6.9	640	9.3	39	32.3	103	15.2	137	14.8	601	19.7
Quitman	151	7.9	2 380	2.6	92	15.0	1 298	8.7	107	10.7	1 255	6.8
Rankin	469	3.9	1 010	6.2	116	16.3	326	14.7	163	11.8	1 191	6.8
Scott	581	3.4	2 512	3.6	134	15.4	290	12.1	292	8.3	3 467	2.2
Sharkey	97	4.2	3 147	1.3	58	6.9	3 634	1.0	83	5.1	2 274	1.0
Simpson	444	4.3	1 550	3.9	88	19.5	410	77.6	182	10.9	2 560	7.6
Smith	496	5.1	1 676	4.2	135	19.1	220	13.7	295	9.1	2 996	5.6
Stone	139	8.6	369	6.4	18	32.0	47	6.4	40	14.5	253	24.5
Sunflower	316	2.9	8 059	1.4	241	6.1	5 974	1.7	270	3.0	5 621	.7
Tallahatchie	280	6.0	4 916	2.0	118	16.6	2 749	1.2	178	13.1	4 027	1.7
Tate	330	6.6	1 244	4.9	108	18.4	298	9.6	177	13.0	909	6.3
Tippah	415	4.7	695	10.0	194	12.3	196	11.5	173	13.5	527	13.2
Tishomingo	137	10.5	195	13.3	52	22.2	39	29.8	54	20.1	123	18.2
Tunica	86	6.0	3 688	.6	60	6.6	2 534	.6	63	8.2	1 688	.4
Union	374	7.5	806	19.1	138	20.8	232	37.0	179	18.2	521	21.7
Walthall	376	5.7	1 145	7.6	127	15.1	274	11.8	160	11.8	1 517	4.8
Warren	122	3.5	738	3.3	45	10.0	662	2.7	56	10.5	319	5.2
Washington	240	5.8	7 563	1.3	158	7.4	4 855	2.0	172	7.6	5 948	1.9
Wayne	373	5.0	754	7.0	83	22.6	162	34.8	185	12.0	1 370	4.8
Webster	206	5.8	707	15.1	49	16.7	268	5.5	127	10.6	685	11.9
Wilkinson	130	6.9	345	6.7	31	19.3	416	2.2	54	13.2	319	11.6
Winston	288	7.7	496	13.4	81	22.3	87	23.7	103	19.6	338	12.0
Yalobusha	230	5.3	924	6.0	41	21.5	615	1.9	101	13.3	536	10.6
Yazoo	358	4.5	4 279	2.0	183	10.0	4 721	1.4	185	10.3	2 910	2.9

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Cash rent				Property taxes paid				All other farm production expenses			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms	Value		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Mississippi	6 694	2.0	139 942	.4	28 651	.5	34 748	1.2	24 928	.7	212 442	.3
Adams	24	13.2	199	1.7	117	3.6	117	6.1	101	5.4	423	4.3
Alcorn	46	26.5	(D)	(D)	429	2.3	299	9.9	349	5.7	505	12.6
Amite	70	18.2	138	16.6	428	2.9	283	8.0	401	4.1	1 595	2.3
Attala	97	17.2	240	8.8	352	3.5	432	9.5	276	7.1	1 063	7.8
Benton	49	20.9	627	6.0	193	4.6	239	10.3	157	7.6	627	8.1
Bolivar	267	6.3	16 125	.9	277	5.2	1 251	1.2	355	3.3	10 070	.8
Calhoun	117	16.1	1 179	7.3	394	3.3	447	13.3	358	5.3	1 314	7.5
Carroll	113	17.8	785	3.8	364	4.3	321	9.0	324	5.5	1 072	3.8
Chickasaw	82	20.7	617	9.3	395	4.3	686	24.1	325	7.3	1 381	2.5
Choctaw	28	20.3	33	33.2	196	2.8	139	7.9	164	4.5	640	2.2
Claiborne	43	15.2	311	4.7	149	3.8	154	12.6	143	3.9	317	3.4
Clarke	46	29.9	42	22.9	257	2.7	142	10.9	194	9.1	253	13.1
Clay	57	24.5	465	3.2	343	3.3	271	10.3	291	5.1	648	9.7
Coahoma	134	6.0	12 235	1.1	133	5.5	758	1.6	163	4.5	7 987	.4
Copiah	72	17.1	235	5.0	478	2.7	448	8.9	360	5.2	6 111	.7
Covington	73	22.1	192	10.9	407	3.9	295	10.1	356	5.2	5 911	.8
De Soto	117	17.4	2 595	1.1	415	3.7	438	7.1	385	5.1	2 878	1.8
Forrest	27	37.0	56	6.5	281	2.2	234	10.7	242	4.6	612	4.0
Franklin	26	15.0	64	19.6	146	3.6	124	5.5	120	6.0	261	3.5
George	31	35.8	63	9.8	393	3.1	304	10.6	353	4.9	949	10.9
Greene	57	24.4	33	26.4	295	5.0	244	3.0	274	6.2	506	10.8
Grenada	42	23.4	366	2.2	204	2.4	185	6.9	139	9.1	753	2.4
Hancock	13	42.9	33	86.5	211	3.2	240	26.3	192	4.1	275	14.6
Harrison	1	—	(D)	(D)	243	5.4	144	12.6	222	6.9	280	15.8

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 ¹ —Con.											
	Cash rent				Property taxes paid				All other farm production expenses			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Hinds	151	15.9	839	4.8	641	3.2	590	6.5	563	4.6	4 012	2.3
Holmes	108	16.7	4 171	.5	313	4.2	524	12.7	251	7.7	2 766	1.8
Humphreys	131	7.4	4 921	.5	178	4.5	978	.8	197	5.5	9 150	.2
Issaquena	52	8.5	2 621	1.9	76	1.6	391	3.2	82	1.5	2 109	.5
Itawamba	63	24.9	(D)	(D)	360	3.1	309	19.1	268	7.6	684	7.4
Jackson	32	31.2	124	12.9	321	.9	297	10.7	281	4.0	447	5.7
Jasper	45	33.1	30	30.2	335	4.1	355	17.0	299	6.2	1 382	3.4
Jefferson	29	16.4	442	4.7	152	2.1	325	14.5	112	6.8	730	1.8
Jefferson Davis	50	23.4	93	29.3	377	2.0	306	10.2	303	6.6	961	3.4
Jones	120	22.8	331	21.8	698	3.2	565	8.3	654	3.2	4 622	2.1
Kemper	59	26.2	130	40.6	376	1.8	274	16.3	227	9.1	752	6.1
Lafayette	43	30.1	174	15.6	362	2.5	465	11.7	288	7.6	471	6.0
Lamar	48	26.4	64	12.7	374	3.0	423	20.8	283	7.6	1 980	4.3
Lauderdale	65	26.6	(D)	(D)	317	4.6	271	13.8	280	6.1	485	8.5
Lawrence	56	20.8	131	6.0	288	2.9	243	8.4	231	6.4	1 721	1.3
Leake	76	16.2	188	2.4	576	1.0	534	8.8	459	4.0	5 193	2.9
Lee	128	16.8	717	21.7	428	4.1	492	10.7	376	5.3	1 278	8.2
Leflore	149	8.9	11 622	1.2	196	4.7	944	4.5	226	4.6	10 143	.3
Lincoln	93	21.9	323	14.9	469	3.0	428	10.7	406	4.9	2 462	2.4
Lowndes	72	21.4	1 040	5.2	316	6.2	311	10.2	303	5.5	1 973	3.4
Madison	70	18.6	1 415	8.9	430	2.7	490	8.5	356	4.9	1 479	3.7
Marion	74	20.4	104	16.6	462	2.6	403	13.5	371	5.5	1 634	3.4
Marshall	115	17.8	903	10.3	435	3.2	506	16.6	401	4.5	1 046	8.2
Monroe	132	12.1	1 024	6.9	471	3.1	373	9.9	340	7.0	1 274	8.0
Montgomery	76	16.3	391	9.0	261	3.3	227	7.7	249	4.1	873	14.6
Neshoba	89	21.4	358	2.2	584	2.3	435	9.0	493	5.4	4 653	2.0
Newton	65	27.2	76	16.9	519	2.3	457	7.0	470	4.1	3 673	1.1
Noxubee	158	14.2	794	7.2	430	3.0	660	6.9	359	6.0	2 336	8.1
Oktibbeha	80	21.6	178	15.9	309	3.1	242	13.7	247	6.5	628	5.8
Panola	159	11.5	2 335	2.9	529	2.6	617	7.5	484	4.2	2 206	2.3
Pearl River	94	23.2	282	32.6	573	2.4	431	6.0	509	3.9	814	7.8
Perry	13	49.4	42	11.8	223	4.2	166	11.1	174	7.7	435	6.5
Pike	54	25.7	116	10.7	402	3.1	346	9.8	329	6.3	6 805	.7
Pontotoc	126	16.3	420	15.4	532	1.7	444	24.9	382	5.7	607	7.9
Prentiss	63	25.9	419	6.5	369	4.2	257	11.8	295	5.1	574	7.4
Quitman	120	12.3	5 644	3.7	156	4.4	425	11.2	165	6.0	3 766	1.1
Rankin	108	19.7	433	14.5	484	3.7	425	7.4	457	4.4	3 687	1.2
Scott	112	15.6	333	19.6	657	1.2	933	9.2	580	3.4	7 274	.6
Sharkey	74	6.9	6 024	.5	76	6.8	501	1.4	106	2.1	4 265	.5
Simpson	94	18.6	571	16.7	513	2.5	573	9.1	481	3.6	5 108	1.0
Smith	84	20.0	272	6.3	634	.4	591	6.1	542	4.2	5 806	1.0
Stone	22	33.6	40	35.6	203	2.4	220	17.2	148	6.7	376	11.1
Sunflower	220	6.1	12 703	2.1	267	4.6	1 185	4.1	321	2.9	12 491	.8
Tallahatchie	108	14.7	8 377	.3	317	4.2	1 081	1.2	274	7.8	5 943	.6
Tate	153	13.3	734	5.1	491	1.8	361	4.9	410	4.9	1 926	4.2
Tippah	64	25.4	250	55.1	471	2.9	345	9.2	401	5.3	947	6.6
Tishomingo	49	22.3	92	30.4	220	5.0	102	21.7	169	7.4	178	13.7
Tunica	61	5.6	5 834	.5	64	8.7	283	8.2	91	3.8	4 305	1.2
Union	46	43.1	159	5.8	508	2.9	277	11.2	440	5.9	683	8.3
Walthall	108	16.0	145	7.9	518	2.0	351	4.5	429	4.6	3 019	4.0
Warren	48	10.2	992	1.1	138	3.1	237	3.7	130	4.5	1 068	1.8
Washington	190	6.3	14 897	.7	222	4.8	1 367	1.2	250	3.5	10 225	.4
Wayne	63	22.3	244	2.4	449	1.7	400	10.0	392	4.5	5 234	1.6
Webster	42	22.0	518	14.5	273	2.8	231	8.7	227	5.7	907	3.8
Wilkinson	34	18.1	212	5.6	188	1.8	341	4.9	161	4.8	570	4.4
Winston	59	27.5	59	17.1	417	3.8	203	9.4	318	7.1	726	11.9
Yalobusha	75	16.8	772	5.6	242	3.7	198	6.3	248	3.8	519	5.6
Yazoo	190	8.9	6 811	1.5	361	3.7	841	4.5	396	3.0	4 636	1.2
	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹				Total cropland				Harvested cropland			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Acres		Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Mississippi	31 312	.3	558 443	.7	25 289	.3	5 947 311	.2	19 198	.4	4 338 710	.2
Adams	132	2.2	765	12.5	94	1.9	29 283	1.1	58	3.2	16 784	1.0
Alcorn	449	.7	673	45.9	382	.6	43 281	1.3	288	1.0	25 909	1.6
Amite	471	.6	3 522	8.1	365	.6	43 374	1.1	263	1.0	14 108	1.6
Attala	385	.7	2 460	11.4	289	.8	42 637	.9	221	1.1	22 000	1.0
Benton	213	1.2	1 702	26.4	175	.9	43 084	1.1	133	1.4	30 852	1.1
Bolivar	394	.6	37 007	2.7	384	.3	416 300	.2	373	.4	406 008	.2
Calhoun	427	.8	7 210	10.2	362	.8	82 672	1.0	299	1.0	58 360	1.0
Carroll	423	.8	1 073	19.9	336	.5	63 571	1.0	266	.8	37 925	.9
Chickasaw	447	.7	9 346	2.8	377	.8	81 041	1.2	249	1.3	45 640	1.0
Choctaw	217	1.6	2 021	5.6	158	1.2	16 407	1.9	128	1.6	6 695	2.0
Claiborne	170	1.7	343	28.8	123	1.5	29 031	1.9	86	2.4	14 223	2.1
Clarke	269	.7	378	39.0	220	.8	19 172	2.0	160	1.2	6 283	2.1
Clay	368	.8	1 630	15.9	294	.9	60 829	1.7	208	1.5	33 503	1.4
Coahoma	180	.8	22 141	.5	168	.7	251 754	.2	162	.8	244 620	.2

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹				Total cropland				Harvested cropland			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Acres		Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Copiah	509	.7	6 771	5.7	380	.8	44 731	1.6	258	1.2	16 342	1.7
Covington	475	.8	7 950	3.5	374	.8	33 439	1.6	269	1.3	13 891	2.1
De Soto	467	.7	5 430	4.5	363	.9	103 087	.9	261	1.4	79 290	.6
Forrest	291	1.1	699	21.2	226	1.3	15 751	2.3	150	2.0	6 926	2.1
Franklin	158	1.6	284	20.0	119	1.5	12 814	3.2	83	2.4	5 680	4.9
George	418	.8	2 541	21.0	376	.9	18 722	1.8	297	1.2	11 200	2.2
Greene	334	.9	1 008	25.4	290	1.0	16 809	2.2	225	1.4	7 322	2.0
Grenada	211	1.1	1 866	7.0	177	1.0	45 247	1.0	136	1.5	31 393	.8
Hancock	238	1.4	-253	(H)	194	1.2	16 576	4.5	130	2.2	5 039	3.9
Harrison	274	1.1	-226	(H)	218	1.3	7 827	3.3	165	1.9	2 484	3.6
Hinds	723	.5	10 994	3.7	506	.7	89 203	1.2	337	1.1	45 590	1.2
Holmes	352	.9	5 740	7.0	273	1.0	119 402	.9	216	1.4	94 691	.6
Humphreys	239	.7	24 626	.2	160	.9	144 503	.6	143	1.0	137 374	.6
Issaquena	82	1.5	6 554	1.7	77	.3	96 279	.3	72	1.0	91 931	.3
Itawamba	387	.8	1 476	17.4	311	.7	36 786	1.8	260	1.0	21 553	2.0
Jackson	321	.9	6	(H)	266	.9	15 020	2.2	188	1.5	7 234	1.9
Jasper	367	.8	3 734	13.6	300	.8	24 971	1.8	210	1.2	7 038	1.9
Jefferson	157	1.8	268	49.5	121	1.5	25 427	2.4	79	2.5	14 069	2.1
Jefferson Davis	389	.9	1 451	30.9	312	1.0	34 082	2.4	235	1.5	9 874	2.5
Jones	773	.6	18 377	6.0	587	.8	39 052	1.4	400	1.1	15 207	1.8
Kemper	383	.7	396	44.8	299	.8	33 311	1.8	227	1.1	10 477	2.2
Lafayette	372	.7	-116	(H)	313	.8	43 958	1.4	226	1.4	23 619	1.2
Lamar	400	.9	1 613	34.4	336	1.0	24 772	2.3	249	1.4	10 659	3.2
Lauderdale	356	.9	96	(H)	270	.9	21 617	2.0	197	1.4	7 369	2.3
Lawrence	308	1.0	3 365	5.5	255	.8	23 646	1.8	174	1.5	9 788	2.1
Leake	583	.6	15 591	3.4	441	.7	40 155	1.5	329	1.0	16 018	2.2
Lee	488	.8	3 152	18.5	398	.8	93 413	1.4	317	1.1	70 338	1.3
Leflore	246	.6	18 846	3.8	225	.6	230 162	.3	212	.8	215 952	.3
Lincoln	499	.6	3 340	20.8	407	.7	44 196	1.2	282	1.1	14 387	1.7
Lowndes	379	.7	22 261	1.7	305	.9	70 737	1.3	212	1.4	44 863	1.3
Madison	465	.7	4 036	11.3	351	.8	89 870	1.0	247	1.2	61 091	.7
Marion	484	.7	3 812	11.9	387	.9	35 764	1.9	297	1.3	12 709	2.0
Marshall	469	.9	2 053	20.0	386	.9	88 437	1.2	284	1.4	50 198	1.2
Monroe	504	.7	1 273	30.8	428	.6	100 120	1.2	328	1.0	64 399	1.1
Montgomery	287	.8	1 394	11.7	237	1.0	38 376	1.8	177	1.5	23 902	2.1
Neshoba	608	.5	10 233	4.0	508	.4	51 299	1.2	412	.6	19 295	1.7
Newton	544	.6	12 063	3.1	439	.6	44 015	1.5	329	.9	17 819	1.6
Noxubee	456	.7	14 214	4.9	367	.9	100 043	1.2	274	1.2	66 001	1.2
Oktoberbeha	329	.9	618	43.2	260	1.1	42 020	2.4	190	1.7	14 217	1.5
Panola	573	.6	6 731	4.8	479	.7	151 469	.8	361	1.1	104 035	.5
Pearl River	608	.7	-877	71.0	492	.8	44 008	1.8	303	1.4	14 810	2.3
Perry	245	1.2	575	26.3	206	1.2	11 471	1.9	141	1.9	4 262	2.3
Pike	437	.7	8 751	2.6	357	.8	34 813	1.3	252	1.3	13 991	1.5
Pontotoc	552	.8	-146	(H)	448	.7	65 104	1.6	327	1.1	37 745	2.0
Prentiss	412	.7	432	72.0	342	.8	51 020	1.8	268	1.1	32 330	2.0
Quitman	179	.9	11 502	4.2	170	.7	156 200	.6	157	1.0	145 369	.6
Rankin	558	.5	4 649	8.7	415	.7	49 560	1.4	325	.9	22 026	1.8
Scott	674	.4	23 465	2.3	517	.5	46 042	1.1	396	.7	19 439	1.5
Sharkey	110	.8	10 215	1.9	100	.4	152 823	.2	97	.4	148 870	.2
Simpson	550	.6	14 027	2.7	422	.6	38 998	1.3	287	1.0	12 150	1.5
Smith	635	.4	17 400	2.2	496	.5	35 632	1.0	369	.7	14 246	1.4
Stone	211	1.0	-96	(H)	177	1.1	12 889	2.7	129	1.9	3 630	3.2
Sunflower	350	.5	40 918	.7	281	.6	296 230	.3	273	.6	285 261	.3
Tallahatchie	355	.6	16 948	2.7	307	.8	249 974	.5	256	1.0	222 703	.4
Tate	508	.7	5 762	6.1	386	.9	76 639	1.2	313	1.2	50 721	1.3
Tippah	501	.7	326	(H)	438	.7	47 447	1.8	346	1.1	25 309	2.7
Tishomingo	258	1.0	90	(H)	218	.9	17 204	2.1	162	1.5	8 118	3.5
Tunica	95	.8	18 264	.2	89	.6	185 374	.3	85	.7	177 299	.3
Union	549	.6	285	92.9	460	.5	49 906	1.1	386	.7	33 138	1.3
Walthall	537	.6	7 045	8.6	449	.6	50 190	1.1	328	.9	20 676	.9
Warren	159	1.5	2 425	4.1	117	1.4	51 195	1.0	85	2.0	40 844	.9
Washington	283	.5	40 613	.4	262	.5	308 367	.2	251	.5	298 761	.2
Wayne	457	.6	6 940	6.6	374	.7	27 922	1.5	292	1.1	12 051	1.6
Webster	290	1.0	1 976	16.0	210	1.1	34 994	1.5	173	1.5	24 481	1.5
Wilkinson	196	1.3	-212	49.1	156	1.3	37 911	1.4	110	1.9	14 304	1.8
Winston	458	.8	1 024	29.5	374	.8	35 935	1.7	295	1.1	13 629	1.9
Yalobusha	278	1.0	815	43.5	216	.9	41 300	1.2	171	1.2	24 132	1.0
Yazoo	424	.6	10 791	4.7	362	.6	208 619	.5	289	.9	174 241	.4
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)
Mississippi ...	1 769	.5	1 076 231	.1	19 319	.4	1 127 442	.4	17 151	.4	590 402	.4
Adams	8	12.8	40	22.2	75	2.5	4 498	3.3	66	2.7	(D)	(D)
Alcorn	4	17.9	(D)	(D)	285	1.0	10 332	2.2	252	1.2	5 091	2.1
Amite	4	14.7	(D)	(D)	350	.7	19 968	1.3	302	.9	9 276	1.8
Attala	6	9.6	124	4.1	254	.9	13 310	1.5	234	1.0	(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	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)
Benton	3	16.3	(D)	(D)	123	1.5	7 281	2.2	113	1.7	4 586	2.2
Bolivar	240	.8	230 292	.3	17	6.2	3 027	2.0	15	6.5	1 911	2.7
Calhoun	2	24.5	(D)	(D)	247	1.3	14 558	1.8	226	1.4	(D)	(D)
Carroll	12	4.7	2 940	1.1	274	.8	15 927	1.3	245	.9	(D)	(D)
Chickasaw	2	—	(D)	(D)	246	1.3	21 312	1.5	216	1.5	10 008	1.9
Choctaw	2	—	(D)	(D)	137	1.5	5 959	2.4	124	1.7	(D)	(D)
Claiborne	2	—	(D)	(D)	120	1.5	11 228	3.3	107	1.8	6 270	3.5
Clarke	8	9.8	30	11.4	208	.9	8 611	1.8	190	1.0	5 336	1.6
Clay	5	13.5	(D)	(D)	236	1.3	18 784	1.4	180	1.8	6 796	1.9
Coahoma	94	1.2	110 810	.2	8	12.4	559	19.5	7	13.4	294	19.1
Copiah	6	10.5	40	5.5	381	.8	23 144	2.2	337	.9	13 325	1.9
Covington	15	7.9	382	5.6	325	1.0	22 441	1.2	282	1.2	9 593	1.4
De Soto	18	4.9	7 322	.1	270	1.3	13 429	1.7	240	1.5	6 849	2.0
Forrest	14	8.3	696	1.3	169	1.9	6 799	2.9	157	2.0	(D)	(D)
Franklin	3	16.0	6	23.5	116	1.5	5 642	3.0	108	1.7	(D)	(D)
George	49	3.9	977	12.1	278	1.4	8 850	2.0	223	1.7	4 642	2.3
Greene	8	12.3	19	15.4	249	1.3	9 802	2.3	218	1.5	5 268	2.1
Grenada	9	5.3	2 702	(L)	142	1.4	14 007	1.2	126	1.7	(D)	(D)
Hancock	9	12.5	41	23.2	188	1.4	7 673	3.1	167	1.6	4 095	3.5
Harrison	31	6.0	173	21.3	151	2.1	3 771	3.9	122	2.6	1 971	4.3
Hinds	14	7.9	111	17.2	448	.9	34 410	1.3	402	1.0	(D)	(D)
Holmes	38	2.9	35 750	.7	182	1.7	10 468	2.8	172	1.7	(D)	(D)
Humphreys	67	1.7	43 080	.8	11	6.2	160	6.3	11	6.2	93	6.5
Issaquena	18	2.8	12 263	1.2	9	7.1	1 795	4.9	8	7.0	1 044	5.1
Itawamba	5	13.6	(D)	(D)	246	1.1	9 606	2.4	226	1.2	5 413	2.6
Jackson	32	5.2	183	9.9	203	1.4	7 114	2.4	174	1.6	3 763	2.8
Jasper	2	15.0	(D)	(D)	264	.9	12 316	1.5	246	1.0	7 127	1.6
Jefferson	5	13.0	(D)	(D)	116	1.6	5 625	3.1	105	1.8	(D)	(D)
Jefferson Davis	10	9.2	165	7.9	258	1.3	16 752	2.1	238	1.5	(D)	(D)
Jones	18	7.9	72	6.7	547	.8	27 430	1.6	490	.9	15 231	1.9
Kemper	—	—	—	—	293	.8	15 273	2.0	270	.9	(D)	(D)
Lafayette	1	38.4	(D)	(D)	231	1.3	10 248	1.9	211	1.5	(D)	(D)
Lamar	20	7.4	202	8.0	277	1.3	33 713	1.0	239	1.5	9 060	2.2
Lauderdale	9	9.7	42	10.1	257	1.0	11 751	2.2	233	1.1	(D)	(D)
Lawrence	4	15.2	11	21.7	238	.9	10 739	2.2	216	1.1	(D)	(D)
Leake	5	8.4	(D)	(D)	416	.7	21 515	1.1	384	.8	12 234	1.4
Lee	8	8.9	(D)	(D)	297	1.2	16 061	1.9	272	1.3	8 954	2.3
Leflore	117	1.3	93 098	.5	21	5.0	2 574	3.7	19	5.5	(D)	(D)
Lincoln	7	10.9	39	15.0	395	.7	25 082	1.2	338	.9	11 226	1.7
Lowndes	10	8.4	882	5.8	178	1.7	14 718	2.0	150	2.0	(D)	(D)
Madison	8	7.8	(D)	(D)	262	1.2	20 782	1.5	235	1.3	12 183	1.6
Marion	13	9.0	99	17.8	344	1.1	19 537	1.4	306	1.2	9 534	1.7
Marshall	6	13.0	(D)	(D)	315	1.2	22 032	1.7	288	1.4	13 277	2.0
Monroe	13	6.8	760	4.4	290	1.1	18 065	1.5	262	1.3	9 633	1.9
Montgomery	4	14.3	351	9.2	199	1.3	11 484	2.6	179	1.5	6 591	2.8
Neshoba	6	9.4	23	10.3	449	.5	25 801	1.0	402	.6	14 093	1.2
Newton	3	23.5	(D)	(D)	394	.8	24 191	1.4	353	.9	12 390	1.7
Noxubee	9	—	1 656	—	233	1.5	22 936	1.5	195	1.8	12 021	1.6
Oktober	16	8.3	138	15.0	218	1.4	13 765	1.5	189	1.7	6 070	1.8
Panola	19	3.4	10 191	.6	345	1.1	21 862	1.6	318	1.2	(D)	(D)
Pearl River	34	5.4	221	5.7	425	1.0	25 496	1.8	365	1.2	13 062	1.8
Perry	6	14.1	43	9.4	181	1.4	6 643	2.3	165	1.6	3 624	2.4
Pike	10	9.9	29	13.0	338	.9	20 113	1.0	282	1.1	7 743	1.8
Pontotoc	4	11.1	89	12.0	314	1.2	13 428	2.4	286	1.3	7 799	2.3
Prentiss	2	—	(D)	(D)	208	1.4	7 751	2.4	189	1.6	4 439	2.3
Quitman	64	2.0	29 497	.7	5	15.5	(D)	(D)	4	17.3	(D)	(D)
Rankin	11	8.3	198	6.9	365	.8	22 326	1.2	322	1.0	12 547	1.4
Scott	3	15.3	25	15.5	473	.6	26 397	.9	430	.6	15 314	1.0
Sharkey	35	1.1	21 722	.3	2	—	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)
Simpson	6	11.4	(D)	(D)	387	.7	21 037	1.6	339	.8	(D)	(D)
Smith	11	5.5	69	2.8	449	.6	22 805	1.0	390	.7	12 617	1.2
Stone	10	7.6	110	5.9	150	1.5	8 346	2.9	132	1.8	4 769	3.8
Sunflower	175	1.0	155 588	.3	24	6.0	1 008	8.1	18	7.1	525	8.1
Tallahatchie	79	1.4	95 267	.3	125	2.0	7 326	2.7	117	2.1	4 211	2.6
Tate	12	8.0	1 082	19.7	372	.9	29 273	1.7	335	1.1	13 415	2.3
Tippah	3	15.3	(D)	(D)	334	1.1	13 256	1.9	311	1.2	7 379	2.1
Tishomingo	2	23.1	(D)	(D)	161	1.5	4 923	2.5	146	1.7	2 911	2.7
Tunica	46	1.4	60 060	.1	7	7.6	1 664	12.7	6	8.9	1 170	17.4
Union	3	14.3	8	14.1	352	.8	12 822	1.5	320	.9	7 338	1.6
Walthall	7	6.2	(D)	(D)	409	.7	31 354	.8	299	1.0	9 456	1.6
Warren	4	11.7	(D)	(D)	72	2.5	7 716	1.5	65	2.7	5 980	1.3
Washington	150	.9	136 541	.2	18	6.6	2 316	5.5	14	7.6	1 242	4.6
Wayne	16	7.8	242	6.4	325	1.0	15 740	1.6	291	1.1	8 798	1.6
Webster	4	17.4	(D)	(D)	175	1.5	10 575	2.0	155	1.7	5 780	1.9
Wilkinson	2	10.0	(D)	(D)	146	1.4	13 726	1.7	128	1.7	6 738	2.0
Winston	2	32.2	(D)	(D)	320	1.0	15 718	1.8	289	1.1	9 073	2.0
Yalobusha	2	16.5	(D)	(D)	188	1.1	10 604	1.7	170	1.2	6 246	1.8
Yazoo	25	2.2	14 643	(L)	209	1.3	15 887	1.4	194	1.4	(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.											
	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)
Mississippi	688	1.0	45 540	.6	662	1.2	215 936	.4	231	2.0	4 797	2.1
Adams	1	—	(D)	(D)	6	13.7	94	14.7	—	—	—	—
Alcorn	5	11.9	48	18.0	15	6.8	1 253	2.6	2	18.6	(D)	(D)
Amite	31	3.6	3 193	1.9	11	7.6	71	8.3	—	—	—	—
Attala	2	16.8	(D)	(D)	6	9.2	148	11.7	2	17.9	(D)	(D)
Benton	4	13.7	12	16.2	4	11.7	47	12.3	1	25.9	(D)	(D)
Bolivar	—	—	—	—	8	10.1	169	18.0	3	9.9	93	13.1
Calhoun	3	15.7	(D)	(D)	12	8.7	4 870	8.2	1	34.1	(D)	(D)
Carroll	11	6.4	(D)	(D)	17	5.2	359	13.9	2	15.4	(D)	(D)
Chickasaw	13	7.1	873	4.2	12	5.3	35 416	(L)	1	22.8	(D)	(D)
Choctaw	2	13.6	(D)	(D)	8	6.9	28 923	.6	—	—	—	—
Claiborne	6	10.6	64	9.2	6	11.5	694	3.3	—	—	—	—
Clarke	7	10.6	115	34.8	8	8.3	(D)	(D)	5	10.1	122	10.3
Clay	5	12.3	355	12.5	6	14.6	45	14.8	2	15.6	(D)	(D)
Coahoma	—	—	—	—	4	21.0	53	23.3	—	—	—	—
Copiah	16	5.3	1 159	1.5	13	6.9	(D)	(D)	5	14.5	24	30.5
Covington	8	12.1	55	22.8	7	13.4	147	22.6	1	45.6	(D)	(D)
De Soto	8	12.8	322	10.2	11	10.2	(D)	(D)	11	9.9	153	12.1
Forrest	4	16.3	(D)	(D)	9	11.9	78	14.1	—	—	—	—
Franklin	4	13.1	(D)	(D)	2	17.2	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
George	10	10.6	332	2.0	15	8.2	316	12.9	4	16.2	36	21.3
Greene	—	—	—	—	6	16.8	71	19.8	5	12.6	199	10.6
Grenada	1	29.1	(D)	(D)	1	29.1	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Hancock	7	13.2	299	10.8	10	10.3	405	6.5	5	13.1	87	12.8
Harrison	4	20.4	212	15.9	6	14.0	53	33.3	5	19.8	74	23.4
Hinds	8	8.6	(D)	(D)	15	6.3	833	6.0	7	10.3	71	15.2
Holmes	2	24.7	(D)	(D)	19	7.4	440	10.7	—	—	—	—
Humphreys	—	—	—	—	8	9.5	155	11.5	—	—	—	—
Issaquena	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Itawamba	6	9.5	159	3.6	5	10.9	(D)	(D)	2	19.3	(D)	(D)
Jackson	12	7.8	38	7.9	11	9.5	67	18.5	6	14.1	25	17.8
Jasper	7	10.7	372	7.9	6	11.1	58	17.3	2	15.2	(D)	(D)
Jefferson	2	19.8	(D)	(D)	5	13.0	18	17.7	—	—	—	—
Jefferson Davis	2	26.1	(D)	(D)	10	11.1	112	14.2	4	16.2	14	16.2
Jones	17	6.9	983	4.6	13	8.8	(D)	(D)	10	8.5	433	2.4
Kemper	3	11.7	(D)	(D)	9	8.6	81	11.7	3	16.9	(D)	(D)
Lafayette	1	29.9	(D)	(D)	3	11.8	(D)	(D)	2	27.0	(D)	(D)
Lamar	9	12.1	146	19.6	9	12.3	168	25.2	3	17.9	(D)	(D)
Lauderdale	1	35.0	(D)	(D)	13	7.9	237	11.1	5	11.0	43	13.1
Lawrence	3	9.7	(D)	(D)	5	13.6	(D)	(D)	1	26.0	(D)	(D)
Leake	7	7.2	458	6.5	6	14.3	14	15.1	4	16.3	31	16.5
Lee	8	7.9	769	2.3	5	15.6	23	20.0	7	10.6	77	12.4
Leflore	2	16.1	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lincoln	46	3.5	3 163	2.4	6	11.4	20	12.2	3	15.8	35	18.2
Lowndes	1	27.2	(D)	(D)	15	7.6	(D)	(D)	1	40.4	(D)	(D)
Madison	4	13.7	20	17.1	5	10.3	43	12.5	1	29.9	(D)	(D)
Marion	33	3.9	2 212	2.7	8	12.5	104	19.5	3	21.2	(D)	(D)
Marshall	4	13.8	366	10.0	11	10.1	66	20.7	3	18.9	48	24.9
Monroe	4	—	370	—	14	6.4	8 346	3.6	—	—	—	—
Montgomery	—	—	—	—	4	12.7	(D)	(D)	6	12.5	85	14.8
Neshoba	12	5.6	1 017	4.0	5	12.8	35	15.7	1	24.7	(D)	(D)
Newton	20	5.4	1 601	2.9	7	10.9	304	2.3	—	—	—	—
Noxubee	18	6.4	1 417	4.9	24	5.3	33 469	1.6	3	13.4	(D)	(D)
Oktibbeha	12	4.9	1 753	.1	9	9.6	8 950	.1	3	14.6	(D)	(D)
Panola	1	22.4	(D)	(D)	4	14.3	9	15.2	—	—	—	—
Pearl River	25	5.8	734	5.4	14	8.6	64	11.6	15	8.5	397	14.6
Perry	—	—	—	—	7	13.0	44	17.1	1	—	(D)	(D)
Pike	49	2.8	4 676	1.4	18	6.8	564	14.6	5	13.6	23	19.2
Pontotoc	12	7.7	248	7.7	6	10.7	(D)	(D)	8	10.8	131	14.1
Prentiss	9	7.4	310	3.5	5	9.7	(D)	(D)	3	17.1	32	18.1
Quitman	—	—	—	—	1	36.8	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Rankin	7	7.7	316	2.6	13	6.4	594	6.3	13	7.8	331	12.4
Scott	9	6.5	396	4.9	6	12.9	99	16.0	4	11.4	25	10.8
Sharkey	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Simpson	2	—	(D)	(D)	10	6.8	(D)	(D)	6	8.8	134	15.6
Smith	9	7.3	230	1.3	9	6.1	317	16.3	2	12.3	(D)	(D)
Stone	13	8.5	308	12.1	9	9.0	114	11.5	5	13.9	254	4.5
Sunflower	—	—	—	—	3	15.7	(D)	(D)	2	—	(D)	(D)
Tallahatchie	—	—	—	—	4	15.1	(D)	(D)	4	17.6	122	17.3
Tate	20	5.6	2 583	1.1	10	9.5	627	3.7	5	14.1	(D)	(D)
Tippah	10	11.7	385	9.8	10	10.4	241	17.1	3	15.3	20	17.3
Tishomingo	—	—	—	—	10	9.7	211	7.7	2	20.3	(D)	(D)
Tunica	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Union	10	7.5	162	7.8	15	6.0	87	11.3	7	7.7	12	14.3
Walthall	85	2.1	8 577	1.1	17	6.3	224	12.4	2	19.1	(D)	(D)
Warren	3	19.1	11	19.8	2	15.5	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Washington	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	29.4	(D)	(D)
Wayne	3	20.6	10	22.5	6	13.6	97	21.6	2	25.5	(D)	(D)
Webster	6	10.9	152	8.9	6	10.6	(D)	(D)	1	28.6	(D)	(D)
Wilkinson	3	17.3	4	18.8	1	31.4	(D)	(D)	1	20.0	(D)	(D)
Winston	9	8.8	388	6.7	6	11.9	(D)	(D)	1	26.1	(D)	(D)
Yalobusha	6	11.3	214	4.9	7	8.9	(D)	(D)	1	27.6	(D)	(D)
Yazoo	1	30.9	(D)	(D)	10	8.6	6 669	1.2	2	23.6	(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)
Mississippi	885	1.0	5 328 691	1.0	1 393	.2	554 915 961	(L)
Adams	2	29.5	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Alcorn	16	6.6	530	12.1	—	—	—	—
Amite	13	7.2	243	8.0	13	—	10 060 100	—
Attala	10	7.5	145	9.2	3	—	1 388 400	—
Benton	3	13.8	38	14.6	—	—	—	—
Bolivar	1	38.8	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Calhoun	9	10.3	93	11.8	—	—	—	—
Carroll	12	6.3	179	7.7	—	—	—	—
Chickasaw	11	9.1	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Choctaw	1	29.4	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Claiborne	3	20.4	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Clarke	8	8.5	163	12.9	4	6.4	1 519 212	(L)
Clay	9	10.6	199	11.5	—	—	—	—
Coahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Copiah	11	7.8	384	18.3	24	—	12 773 537	—
Covington	25	5.0	251 385	4.3	31	1.0	9 805 082	.2
De Soto	21	7.4	856	15.3	2	19.4	(D)	(D)
Forrest	6	16.9	91	18.3	17	2.7	4 244 018	(L)
Franklin	3	19.4	35	19.8	1	—	(D)	(D)
George	19	8.2	329	10.5	—	—	—	—
Greene	13	8.9	59 920	6.0	14	1.2	4 682 300	.3
Grenada	3	16.8	73	19.8	—	—	—	—
Hancock	10	12.2	144	15.6	1	44.1	(D)	(D)
Harrison	19	8.4	2 227	22.1	5	15.5	16	28.8
Hinds	12	7.3	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Holmes	10	9.5	190	12.7	1	35.5	(D)	(D)
Humphreys	1	28.7	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Issaquena	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Itawamba	5	14.3	(D)	(D)	21	1.7	5 331 000	.5
Jackson	25	6.0	484	5.9	—	—	—	—
Jasper	9	7.8	87 138	9.5	39	1.7	13 615 795	.4
Jefferson	6	13.5	109	13.6	3	—	1 509 696	—
Jefferson Davis	20	7.9	136 521	14.8	15	4.5	6 097 600	.9
Jones	26	5.8	187 513	6.2	137	.8	39 468 857	.2
Kemper	22	5.5	115 656	9.8	1	—	(D)	(D)
Lafayette	5	13.4	54	13.3	—	—	—	—
Lamar	12	9.3	47 831	5.1	20	2.1	7 506 002	(L)
Lauderdale	10	9.2	162	10.6	—	—	—	—
Lawrence	14	6.5	107 895	(L)	17	1.1	10 090 262	.2
Leake	22	5.1	413 769	3.8	114	.9	38 983 642	.2
Lee	12	7.2	39 499	.1	9	5.3	1 309 634	.9
Leflore	1	41.6	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Lincoln	14	7.9	(D)	(D)	18	3.6	11 096 466	.5
Lowndes	5	12.2	23	12.7	—	—	—	—
Madison	10	8.9	64 131	18.2	2	14.9	(D)	(D)
Marion	27	5.5	296 968	7.0	20	3.0	9 188 819	.5
Marshall	12	9.9	219	17.6	1	40.2	(D)	(D)
Monroe	6	10.9	75	13.9	—	—	—	—
Montgomery	5	13.8	85	16.2	—	—	—	—
Neshoba	17	5.9	123 917	7.3	97	.8	41 392 605	.1
Newton	18	6.7	189 598	8.2	83	.9	37 675 733	.2
Noxubee	9	8.9	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Oktoberbeha	5	13.4	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)
Panola	5	15.5	67	19.0	—	—	—	—
Pearl River	40	5.4	939	10.3	3	19.4	(D)	(D)
Perry	14	7.6	69 178	15.8	13	3.1	3 866 000	.9
Pike	13	9.5	(D)	(D)	17	2.4	11 577 916	(L)
Pontotoc	7	10.4	161	10.8	1	—	(D)	(D)
Prentiss	12	7.7	255	12.4	1	40.9	(D)	(D)
Quitman	1	36.8	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Rankin	21	5.5	94 587	6.8	52	1.1	23 440 378	.2
Scott	26	3.0	318 265	3.1	178	.5	83 590 286	.1
Sharkey	1	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Simpson	22	5.2	278 453	4.9	99	.7	45 525 198	.1
Smith	13	4.6	135 625	(L)	186	.3	68 598 592	.1
Stone	14	8.0	382	5.1	2	—	(D)	(D)
Sunflower	2	23.6	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Tallahatchie	6	13.5	135	19.8	—	—	—	—
Tate	14	8.7	294	10.3	—	—	—	—
Tippah	17	8.1	319	12.5	2	26.0	(D)	(D)
Tishomingo	7	11.3	133	11.7	1	—	(D)	(D)
Tunica	1	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Union	11	8.0	(D)	(D)	3	—	(D)	(D)
Walthall	14	6.5	73 600	8.3	26	1.0	17 319 791	.1
Warren	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Washington	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wayne	19	6.0	172 961	2.1	91	.6	28 663 026	.1
Webster	6	11.5	114	16.3	—	—	—	—
Wilkinson	5	15.4	52	15.3	—	—	—	—
Winston	17	7.1	97 696	11.8	4	12.4	679 600	3.4
Yalobusha	7	9.5	142	12.9	—	—	—	—
Yazoo	2	22.5	(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					Sorghum for grain or seed							
	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)	
Mississippi	2 497	.6	405 393	.3	43 851 007	.2	154	1.6	25 499	.8	1 648 269	.7	
Adams	6	6.1	2 507	.1	278 414	(L)	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Alcorn	66	3.1	6 808	2.5	469 947	2.9	3	12.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Amite	5	9.4	125	1.9	9 080	2.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Attala	18	4.9	840	3.2	84 855	3.3	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Benton	52	2.8	7 564	.9	807 659	.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Bolivar	35	1.9	13 997	1.1	1 759 245	.9	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Calhoun	60	3.2	5 845	3.4	419 599	4.2	2	16.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Carroll	36	3.1	4 033	2.7	475 033	2.4	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Chickasaw	32	4.1	4 674	2.1	344 099	1.9	5	9.1	427	14.7	11 611	15.7	
Choctaw	13	7.5	401	7.4	27 235	2.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Claiborne	12	6.9	3 296	2.8	358 225	2.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Clarke	16	5.7	259	6.0	19 510	7.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Clay	22	5.6	3 913	2.3	264 692	2.5	2	22.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Coahoma	20	—	9 084	—	1 162 911	—	6	—	774	—	55 211	—	
Copiah	7	10.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Covington	29	5.6	1 610	9.0	173 289	8.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	
De Soto	32	3.5	13 232	1.2	1 548 056	1.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Forrest	14	7.8	358	10.0	37 275	9.9	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Franklin	7	11.8	1 095	14.7	102 970	15.6	—	—	—	—	—	—	
George	67	3.7	2 346	7.1	211 262	8.2	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Greene	57	4.4	907	6.4	75 418	8.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Grenada	13	5.6	3 540	1.9	329 232	1.0	1	32.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Hancock	2	22.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Harrison	7	14.4	67	21.7	5 093	19.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Hinds	28	3.6	5 333	1.2	468 586	1.3	2	12.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Holmes	51	3.0	16 339	1.5	1 924 067	1.4	5	—	960	—	68 210	—	
Humphreys	28	2.7	6 916	2.2	805 846	1.5	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Issaquena	29	2.8	11 403	2.3	1 298 374	2.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Itawamba	43	3.8	4 147	3.6	249 579	3.6	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Jackson	9	7.0	959	3.9	111 840	2.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Jasper	15	7.3	143	11.1	6 998	11.6	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Jefferson	4	13.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Jefferson Davis	26	6.7	416	10.5	28 550	13.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Jones	17	7.7	206	8.9	13 627	8.3	1	31.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Kemper	16	6.3	172	10.2	15 678	15.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Lafayette	22	6.5	2 003	4.0	183 647	4.3	2	24.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Lamar	24	7.1	543	14.8	51 195	16.3	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Lauderdale	10	9.3	103	12.7	3 520	15.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Lawrence	15	7.3	1 723	2.9	115 770	3.0	1	39.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Leake	15	7.4	183	8.3	10 256	7.6	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Lee	58	3.3	8 034	2.4	567 076	2.2	3	12.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Leflore	50	1.6	19 661	1.0	2 418 714	1.0	12	—	3 834	—	326 227	—	
Lincoln	14	7.0	2 121	1.8	181 875	1.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Lowndes	55	3.2	11 233	1.7	1 104 719	1.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Madison	27	3.9	5 658	1.8	689 266	1.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Marion	28	6.3	424	10.4	27 304	9.8	1	42.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Marshall	45	4.3	9 361	1.8	1 039 441	1.7	4	17.2	156	17.9	3 302	17.9	
Monroe	74	2.8	11 439	1.6	801 176	1.6	5	9.7	55	10.8	4 120	10.5	
Montgomery	40	4.0	3 479	5.5	326 574	6.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Neshoba	16	6.1	153	14.5	9 083	27.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Newton	16	6.2	586	.8	46 994	.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Noxubee	95	2.1	22 459	1.4	2 340 491	1.6	2	24.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Oktibbeha	4	—	297	—	25 950	—	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Panola	48	2.8	18 596	1.1	2 241 640	.6	4	7.9	759	1.5	17 372	3.9	
Pearl River	19	7.8	408	13.5	31 032	15.3	1	39.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Perry	18	7.4	333	7.9	27 126	7.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Pike	16	7.0	788	6.8	62 605	7.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Pontotoc	48	3.9	4 052	3.9	332 678	4.1	4	19.3	229	27.4	12 950	28.8	
Prentiss	47	3.7	3 393	2.7	260 884	2.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Quitman	11	5.4	2 788	.7	337 246	.8	32	3.8	6 559	1.8	332 319	1.8	
Rankin	14	7.0	1 003	6.9	73 183	8.7	1	26.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Scott	16	6.5	589	7.0	41 967	7.9	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Sharkey	36	1.5	14 426	.3	2 012 082	.3	5	—	1 254	—	92 902	—	
Simpson	12	6.7	1 146	1.5	97 995	1.3	1	32.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Smith	11	6.4	166	5.0	12 625	4.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Stone	19	7.6	314	11.6	18 104	11.9	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Sunflower	41	.8	22 901	.1	2 720 123	.1	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Tallahatchie	55	1.9	24 773	.6	3 110 847	.4	5	7.3	922	.9	62 391	.7	
Tate	50	3.7	8 646	2.2	891 347	2.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Tippah	109	2.7	4 432	3.5	360 936	4.0	1	44.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Tishomingo	35	5.0	1 041	5.9	69 490	7.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Tunica	13	—	4 972	—	629 921	—	3	15.1	779	14.5	57 632	13.7	
Union	61	2.8	3 262	2.3	268 434	2.4	1	20.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Walthall	15	5.6	183	2.2	15 664	2.2	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Warren	8	7.1	1 809	1.3	211 526	.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Washington	64	.9	21 162	.2	2 708 542	.2	17	2.5	3 043	1.7	287 655	1.5	
Wayne	55	4.0	1 418	3.4	95 150	3.5	1	38.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Webster	24	4.9	1 660	3.2	125 424	1.9	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Wilkinson	5	13.4	45	10.8	3 690	9.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Winston	30	5.6	730	10.2	58 494	11.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Yalobusha	16	4.5	1 579	3.2	119 653	1.5	2	16.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Yazoo	99	1.8	24 773	1.0	2 902 611	.8	7	—	2 888	—	122 085	—	

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					Rice						
	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)	Hundredweight	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Mississippi	697	.8	155 049	.4	6 547 211	.4	530	.6	234 244	.3	13 330 366	.2
Adams	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alcorn	2	19.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Amite	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Attala	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Benton	7	9.7	2 116	1.2	86 829	1.8	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bolivar	127	1.3	38 586	.7	1 789 011	.7	153	.9	73 526	.6	4 167 142	.4
Calhoun	4	8.5	222	3.1	5 860	1.2	—	—	—	—	—	—
Carroll	6	4.4	1 230	.2	50 230	.1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Chickasaw	3	7.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Choctaw	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Claiborne	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Clarke	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Clay	5	10.4	445	3.4	14 961	3.1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Coahoma	42	1.5	15 598	.4	657 709	.4	26	1.3	7 652	.6	466 099	.5
Copiah	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Covington	5	13.2	972	5.8	45 237	4.9	—	—	—	—	—	—
De Soto	15	5.3	2 379	2.2	100 020	2.2	4	—	2 650	—	124 290	—
Forrest	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Franklin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
George	9	7.4	1 103	7.1	37 743	7.2	—	—	—	—	—	—
Greene	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Grenada	3	9.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	3	—	1 470	—	88 640	—
Hancock	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Harrison	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hinds	9	5.5	927	7.8	16 826	7.7	—	—	—	—	—	—
Holmes	9	5.6	1 338	2.8	54 785	1.4	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Humphreys	24	3.6	7 512	1.5	270 931	1.5	14	3.9	4 795	1.4	256 025	1.2
Issaquena	17	3.9	2 920	1.4	142 896	1.1	5	—	5 246	—	331 839	—
Itawamba	4	11.1	107	6.8	4 111	4.9	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jackson	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	47.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Jasper	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jefferson	1	35.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Jefferson Davis	3	16.3	263	18.6	9 000	13.6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jones	2	26.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kemper	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lafayette	1	29.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lamar	7	13.0	753	15.4	23 785	15.6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lauderdale	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lawrence	2	24.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Leake	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lee	4	9.4	410	2.8	12 980	1.2	—	—	—	—	—	—
Leflore	17	4.7	4 281	6.3	157 954	4.4	37	2.9	16 257	1.2	945 378	1.2
Lincoln	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lowndes	12	6.7	2 094	3.1	84 488	3.5	—	—	—	—	—	—
Madison	3	16.0	460	7.3	23 580	6.1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Marion	1	42.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Marshall	7	5.4	1 379	3.0	59 069	2.8	—	—	—	—	—	—
Monroe	8	8.4	632	16.0	18 986	17.8	—	—	—	—	—	—
Montgomery	2	15.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Neshoba	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Newton	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Noxubee	18	4.8	1 597	1.6	60 330	2.4	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Oktibbeha	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Panola	21	3.4	4 703	.6	204 273	.4	3	—	1 178	—	66 706	—
Pearl River	5	13.1	886	14.0	30 476	15.8	—	—	—	—	—	—
Perry	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pike	2	14.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pontotoc	6	12.8	105	12.1	2 132	10.8	—	—	—	—	—	—
Prentiss	8	10.2	721	8.8	21 455	7.8	—	—	—	—	—	—
Quitman	29	4.2	4 723	3.3	176 136	3.0	39	2.1	14 123	.9	801 328	.8
Rankin	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Scott	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sharkey	27	2.5	6 458	.2	282 238	.3	17	2.0	5 520	1.1	328 744	1.1
Simpson	1	23.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Smith	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Stone	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sunflower	46	2.8	10 464	1.9	447 141	1.8	81	1.5	33 543	.5	1 861 954	.5
Tallahatchie	23	3.8	3 478	1.7	142 188	1.8	41	2.5	16 375	1.2	870 075	.9
Tate	15	7.4	1 641	3.9	49 960	3.9	5	15.4	669	14.5	30 703	17.4
Tippah	4	18.8	120	19.3	2 585	25.5	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tishomingo	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tunica	22	3.0	4 789	2.7	179 131	2.6	22	2.1	15 995	.2	881 954	.2
Union	5	10.3	165	12.6	4 346	13.5	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walthall	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Warren	6	7.7	1 434	4.2	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Washington	67	1.8	19 047	.7	881 404	.6	71	1.3	32 849	.4	1 969 803	.3
Wayne	4	14.8	520	10.3	17 900	14.9	—	—	—	—	—	—
Webster	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wilkinson	1	41.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Winston	1	33.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yalobusha	2	13.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yazoo	11	3.0	3 267	.7	134 992	.5	3	—	1 117	—	63 100	—

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.												
	Cotton					Soybeans for beans							
	Farms		Acres		Quantity			Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bales	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Mississippi	1 701	.4	966 443	.1	1 714 762	.1	3 851	.4	1 964 202	.2	59 370 926	.2	
Adams	6	7.2	2 282	.8	4 548	.8	8	7.1	11 500	1.0	325 700	1.4	
Alcorn	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	45	3.8	9 672	2.3	238 163	2.2	
Amite	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	24.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Attala	21	4.1	9 588	1.4	15 934	1.5	13	2.8	1 920	1.9	59 746	2.2	
Benton	9	3.6	2 459	.4	3 125	.3	46	3.1	15 276	2.0	484 008	1.5	
Bolivar	97	1.6	63 027	.3	117 032	.2	336	.6	238 035	.3	8 217 546	.3	
Calhoun	67	2.6	21 729	1.3	30 513	1.2	69	2.7	14 659	1.9	301 323	1.6	
Carroll	31	2.6	13 022	.7	22 868	.5	38	2.8	8 348	3.1	247 419	3.2	
Chickasaw	11	6.3	3 082	2.5	5 656	1.6	74	2.7	23 754	1.4	495 131	2.2	
Choctaw	3	9.0	1 167	1.6	(D)	(D)	2	18.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Claiborne	3	—	2 045	—	2 856	—	5	7.1	2 702	2.0	85 696	1.0	
Clarke	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	11.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Clay	7	6.4	2 462	1.1	3 717	1.2	35	3.6	16 192	1.9	371 988	1.8	
Coahoma	92	1.4	80 766	.3	160 808	.2	135	1.1	137 263	.3	4 603 218	.3	
Copiah	4	6.4	2 044	2.5	3 035	.8	4	7.5	806	(L)	16 163	(L)	
Covington	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	5	8.6	1 386	8.6	28 821	5.7	
De Soto	18	3.1	11 785	.6	20 584	.5	56	3.1	40 570	.5	1 375 443	.4	
Forrest	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Franklin	3	11.7	680	12.9	1 428	12.9	5	12.7	412	16.0	10 994	17.7	
George	5	9.9	1 136	8.0	1 654	5.7	15	6.4	1 629	3.5	34 895	3.8	
Greene	4	16.3	780	6.7	835	6.0	2	8.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Grenada	19	4.6	7 452	1.2	11 178	1.0	20	3.0	9 917	1.7	220 643	1.9	
Hancock	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Harrison	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Hinds	28	2.8	13 111	.4	19 985	.3	30	3.2	8 393	2.7	195 309	2.4	
Holmes	57	2.5	34 930	.7	66 784	.5	69	2.6	34 943	1.3	1 102 307	1.3	
Humphreys	93	1.5	55 206	.6	102 624	.4	122	1.3	68 029	.9	1 884 394	.9	
Issaquena	29	2.2	18 681	.3	31 170	.2	66	1.5	55 710	.4	1 549 207	.4	
Itawamba	7	11.7	1 114	6.7	1 231	5.5	59	3.1	9 119	3.3	160 441	2.8	
Jackson	4	11.9	2 216	2.8	2 218	2.8	4	4.5	157	8.1	5 429	6.9	
Jasper	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Jefferson	6	5.8	3 219	2.3	4 708	2.5	9	6.5	5 204	3.2	158 911	2.8	
Jefferson Davis	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	300	—	11 700	—	
Jones	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	15.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Kemper	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	24.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Lafayette	16	4.8	7 477	.5	10 295	.5	17	5.7	3 975	3.6	113 405	2.7	
Lamar	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	14.3	532	16.0	11 160	17.0	
Lauderdale	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Lawrence	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	4	11.0	880	8.3	15 300	11.2	
Leake	9	9.0	1 863	11.5	2 810	10.9	10	9.6	1 575	12.3	47 311	13.4	
Lee	11	4.1	6 722	.4	9 210	.3	129	2.2	42 531	1.6	1 084 167	1.5	
Leflore	107	1.3	69 683	.3	134 708	.2	184	1.0	103 636	.5	3 465 597	.5	
Lincoln	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	31.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Lowndes	18	6.0	5 151	3.0	7 099	3.2	68	2.9	19 137	2.2	545 458	1.8	
Madison	42	2.2	27 237	.7	39 874	.7	48	2.7	16 591	1.9	420 352	1.8	
Marion	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	42.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Marshall	4	—	620	—	805	—	60	3.6	23 982	1.8	833 088	1.7	
Monroe	27	4.5	11 436	1.7	13 662	1.8	85	2.6	27 666	2.0	559 219	2.2	
Montgomery	36	4.1	10 297	2.7	15 173	2.6	17	5.7	3 463	5.8	107 165	5.8	
Neshoba	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	20.6	206	18.4	4 767	19.7	
Newton	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	5	6.5	1 960	7.5	51 700	7.7	
Noxubee	14	2.9	5 293	.5	7 789	.7	102	2.2	26 532	1.9	791 233	1.9	
Oktibbeha	5	8.8	702	.7	873	.8	10	5.5	1 826	1.2	50 576	.6	
Panola	53	2.4	21 897	.8	34 200	.6	122	2.0	46 189	.8	1 220 568	1.1	
Pearl River	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	10.9	2 512	7.0	54 154	6.7	
Perry	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Pike	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Pontotoc	17	5.2	6 159	1.2	6 278	1.2	108	2.4	17 624	3.7	347 171	2.8	
Prentiss	8	5.7	1 072	1.8	1 391	1.1	87	2.6	21 619	2.7	510 798	2.5	
Quitman	56	2.3	26 981	.9	51 670	.7	141	1.2	94 134	.8	2 751 772	.7	
Rankin	15	5.5	4 337	5.4	6 465	4.6	23	5.1	4 936	3.6	109 389	3.4	
Scott	6	7.7	1 622	6.6	2 348	5.8	11	7.2	1 831	5.2	28 010	7.8	
Sharkey	41	1.4	34 603	.2	63 895	.2	95	.5	91 416	.4	2 670 764	.4	
Simpson	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	16.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Smith	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Stone	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Sunflower	81	1.3	58 271	.3	109 136	.3	249	.8	165 692	.5	5 599 916	.4	
Tallahatchie	93	1.9	66 914	.4	125 122	.4	151	1.4	107 550	.8	3 184 126	.8	
Tate	30	4.9	6 644	2.3	11 412	2.2	73	3.1	15 710	2.4	453 128	2.6	
Tippah	5	15.1	469	15.0	556	15.3	77	3.2	11 908	4.6	333 325	5.3	
Tishomingo	4	6.5	728	5.0	560	4.5	24	4.9	2 494	8.3	40 426	8.8	
Tunica	35	—	38 672	—	73 786	—	81	.9	112 504	.4	3 273 812	.3	
Union	13	5.1	1 942	5.7	2 212	5.6	116	1.8	19 441	1.9	391 961	1.7	
Walthall	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	5.7	1 200	2.1	29 340	1.7	
Warren	14	—	10 649	—	17 456	—	37	3.1	26 449	1.4	717 198	1.2	
Washington	123	1.0	89 884	.2	168 931	.2	209	.8	140 362	.3	4 885 774	.3	
Wayne	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	15.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Webster	53	3.3	14 718	2.0	21 151	1.8	14	6.8	1 137	3.8	29 692	4.2	
Wilkinson	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	7.9	4 966	.4	152 613	.5	
Winston	6	11.4	914	5.5	1 470	4.8	3	11.2	620	3.0	19 895	2.5	
Yalobusha	26	3.9	10 409	.8	18 270	.6	33	3.4	4 543	3.0	114 123	2.3	
Yazoo	102	1.4	64 441	.5	112 427	.4	142	1.4	75 480	.8	2 078 603	.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	Selected crops harvested—Con.					
	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Mississippi	13 999	.4	648 809	.4	1 486 117	.5
Adams	32	5.3	1 961	6.3	3 043	7.3
Alcorn	243	1.2	8 593	2.5	16 737	2.6
Amite	248	1.0	13 671	1.8	25 650	1.6
Attala	192	1.2	9 468	1.8	22 361	2.0
Benton	93	2.0	5 265	3.0	11 700	2.9
Bolivar	8	8.9	534	11.0	1 034	13.6
Calhoun	214	1.4	10 526	2.4	22 986	2.4
Carroll	208	1.0	10 517	1.5	23 094	1.7
Chickasaw	190	1.6	11 639	2.1	22 709	2.5
Choctaw	113	1.8	4 304	3.1	8 869	3.5
Claiborne	76	2.6	5 632	4.4	13 230	4.5
Clarke	137	1.5	5 472	2.4	13 721	2.3
Clay	179	1.7	11 118	2.6	23 620	2.8
Coahoma	8	9.0	695	22.5	2 223	27.3
Copiah	234	1.4	11 476	2.4	25 460	2.8
Covington	232	1.4	8 840	2.0	19 705	2.3
De Soto	198	1.8	11 128	3.3	24 100	3.9
Forrest	101	2.8	3 366	4.0	7 198	4.0
Franklin	70	2.8	3 343	5.0	7 130	4.9
George	200	1.9	5 202	2.5	12 201	3.0
Greene	179	1.8	5 366	2.5	12 938	3.7
Grenada	108	2.0	7 189	2.9	17 203	2.7
Hancock	107	2.6	4 452	4.3	10 705	4.5
Harrison	72	3.7	1 539	4.2	3 048	5.4
Hinds	266	1.4	15 712	3.3	33 882	2.1
Holmes	132	2.2	7 059	3.0	16 936	3.4
Humphreys	5	6.3	108	3.5	210	3.6
Issaquena	7	10.1	456	7.8	1 291	3.7
Itawamba	194	1.4	6 927	2.5	15 655	3.1
Jackson	120	2.2	3 438	3.1	6 512	3.7
Jasper	198	1.3	6 811	2.0	17 572	2.1
Jefferson	63	3.1	3 415	5.2	6 957	7.2
Jefferson Davis	202	1.8	8 291	2.7	19 467	2.9
Jones	348	1.3	14 062	1.9	36 419	2.3
Kemper	212	1.2	10 093	2.2	27 119	2.8
Lafayette	200	1.5	10 159	2.2	19 443	2.4
Lamar	186	1.8	7 946	3.2	23 208	4.8
Lauderdale	171	1.5	7 145	2.3	16 994	2.9
Lawrence	161	1.6	5 738	2.9	15 371	3.3
Leake	301	1.1	12 346	1.8	34 163	1.6
Lee	234	1.5	11 512	3.1	29 324	3.4
Leflore	18	5.7	1 388	5.5	3 452	6.0
Lincoln	263	1.2	11 481	1.9	27 874	2.5
Lowndes	118	2.4	7 951	2.9	15 817	3.8
Madison	180	1.7	11 569	1.9	24 916	2.6
Marion	251	1.5	11 352	1.9	27 374	2.0
Marshall	227	1.7	14 669	2.5	28 337	2.8
Monroe	239	1.4	13 587	1.6	26 525	1.7
Montgomery	146	1.9	5 947	2.9	14 213	3.1
Neshoba	392	.7	18 473	1.8	47 470	1.3
Newton	313	1.0	14 327	1.7	39 905	1.8
Noxubee	174	1.8	9 775	2.3	18 920	2.8
Oktibbeha	169	1.9	10 588	2.0	19 099	2.1
Panola	230	1.6	14 080	2.1	34 779	2.8
Pearl River	226	1.8	9 361	2.7	22 391	3.0
Perry	123	2.1	3 527	2.6	8 900	3.3
Pike	216	1.5	11 966	1.7	26 414	1.8
Pontotoc	239	1.5	9 633	2.3	18 928	2.5
Prentiss	190	1.6	5 583	2.8	12 312	3.0
Quitman	3	22.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Rankin	285	1.1	11 584	1.6	28 214	1.5
Scott	378	.8	15 500	1.5	40 355	1.3
Sharkey	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Simpson	265	1.0	10 079	1.8	24 156	1.8
Smith	358	.7	13 032	1.5	30 067	1.9
Stone	91	2.6	2 637	3.6	6 579	3.7
Sunflower	16	7.1	763	13.3	1 527	13.0
Tallahatchie	101	2.4	5 993	3.1	14 260	3.2
Tate	248	1.5	16 911	2.3	41 977	2.2
Tippah	275	1.4	8 517	2.1	18 294	2.3
Tishomingo	133	1.8	4 004	3.3	8 336	3.3
Tunica	6	8.9	1 802	12.5	3 735	14.5
Union	314	.9	8 712	1.5	15 892	1.7
Walthall	312	.9	17 485	1.1	39 115	1.6
Warren	36	4.3	1 496	4.3	2 593	5.1
Washington	16	6.9	1 293	6.6	2 811	10.8
Wayne	244	1.3	10 024	1.8	23 613	2.2
Webster	134	1.9	7 087	2.7	16 699	4.6
Wilkinson	96	2.2	8 643	3.0	20 268	2.8
Winston	266	1.3	11 103	2.1	27 336	2.5
Yalobusha	144	1.4	7 590	2.0	16 230	2.2
Yazoo	121	2.2	6 307	2.8	14 888	3.1

¹Data 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 ¹	Adjusted census		Coverage adjustment (percent)
			Total	Relative standard error (percent)	
Farms number..	31 318	10 807	42 125	3.0	25.7
Land in farms acres..	10 124 822	1 033 474	11 158 296	4.2	9.3
Average size of farm acres..	323	96	265	(X)	(X)
Farms by size of farm:					
Less than 10 acres	1 108	838	1 946	23.4	43.1
10 to 49 acres	5 863	4 568	10 431	7.3	43.8
50 to 179 acres	12 443	4 059	16 502	4.5	24.6
180 acres or more	11 904	1 342	13 246	3.5	10.1
Farms by value of sales:					
Less than \$2,500	11 511	8 717	20 228	5.3	43.1
\$2,500 to \$9,999	9 341	921	10 262	4.1	9.0
\$10,000 or more	10 466	1 169	11 635	4.9	10.0
Market value of agricultural products sold \$1,000..	3 127 383	-47 114	3 080 270	4.4	-1.5
Farms by type of organization:					
Individual or family	27 452	10 600	38 052	3.2	27.9
Partnership, corporation, or other	3 866	207	4 073	6.7	5.1
Farms by tenure of operator:					
Full owners	20 508	8 054	28 562	3.8	28.2
Part owners	8 267	2 084	10 351	4.9	20.1
Tenants	2 543	669	3 212	9.7	20.8
Operators by place of residence:					
On farm operated	21 338	8 942	30 280	3.8	29.5
Not on farm operated	7 517	1 404	8 921	5.0	15.7
Not reported	2 463	461	2 924	8.5	15.8
Operators by principal occupation:					
Farming	12 753	558	13 311	3.4	4.2
Other	18 565	10 249	28 814	4.0	35.6
Operators by sex:					
Male	28 438	9 246	37 684	3.1	24.5
Female.....	2 880	1 561	4 441	10.6	35.1
Operators by race:					
White	29 094	9 459	38 553	3.1	24.5
Black and other races	2 224	1 348	3 572	13.3	37.7
Operators by years on present farm:					
4 years or less	3 993	2 134	6 127	7.8	34.8
5 years or more	21 145	8 433	29 578	3.4	28.5
Not reported	6 180	240	6 420	8.8	3.7

¹ See text in Appendix C regarding coverage estimates.