



ICPSR 4686

Evaluation of the Agriculture Crime Technology Information and Operation Network (ACTION) in Nine Counties in California, 2004-2005

Daniel P. Mears
Florida State University

Shelli B. Rossman
Urban Institute

User Guide



National Institute of Justice
Data Resources Program

ICPSR

P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
www.icpsr.umich.edu

Terms of Use

The terms of use for this study can be found at:
<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/cocoon/ICPSR/TERMS/4686.xml>

Bibliographic Description

ICPSR Study No.: 4686

Title: Evaluation of the Agriculture Crime Technology Information and Operation Network (ACTION) in Nine Counties in California, 2004-2005

Principal Investigator(s): Daniel P. Mears, Florida State University

Shelli B. Rossman, Urban Institute

Funding Agency: United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice

Grant Number: 2003-DD-BX-1017

Bibliographic Citation: Mears, Daniel P., and Shelli B. Rossman. Evaluation of the Agriculture Crime Technology Information and Operation Network (ACTION) in Nine Counties in California, 2004-2005 [Computer file]. ICPSR04686-v1. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2009. doi:10.3886/ICPSR04686

Scope of Study

Summary: The Urban Institute and Florida State University multidisciplinary research team employed a multimethod approach to evaluate the Agricultural Crime, Technology, Information, and Operations Network (ACTION) project. The goal of the research was to provide policymakers, practitioners, program developers, and funders with empirically-based information about whether ACTION works. Two paper-and-pencil, self-administered surveys -- one in fall 2004 and the second in fall 2005 -- were sent to samples of farmers in the nine ACTION counties in California. The researchers identified farms using lists provided by Agricultural Commissioners in each county. The survey instruments asked farmers about experiences with agricultural crime victimization during the 12 months prior to the survey. It also asked questions about characteristics of their farm operations and the activities that they take to prevent agricultural crime. Advance notice of the study was given to farmers through the use of postcards, then surveys were sent to farmers in three waves at one-month intervals, with the second and third waves targeting nonrespondents. The Fall 2004 Agricultural Crime Survey (Part 1) contains data on 823 respondents (farms) and the Fall 2005 Agricultural Crime Survey (Part 2) contains data on 818 respondents (farms).

Subject Term(s): agricultural census, agricultural policy, agriculture, burglary, crime, crime control, crime control programs, crime costs, crime prevention, crime reduction, crime reporting, farmers, farming communities, farms, larceny, law enforcement, security, security systems, surveillance, surveillance equipment, victimization

Smallest Geographic Unit: county

Geographic Coverage: California, United States

Time Period: 2004 - 2005, fall 2004 and fall 2005

Date(s) of Collection: 2004 - 2005, fall 2004 and fall 2005

Unit of Observation: farm

Universe: All farms in nine California counties during 2004 and 2005.

Data Type: survey data

Data Collection Notes: The Agricultural Census and Census Bureau data collected during this project, as well as data from the site visits and interviews, are not available as part of this collection.

Methodology

Purpose of the Study: Agricultural crime is a serious problem in the United States, yet few prevention or reduction interventions have been developed or evaluated to combat this problem. Accordingly, the Urban Institute and Florida State University multidisciplinary research team employed a multimethod approach to evaluate the Agricultural Crime, Technology, Information, and Operations Network (ACTION) project, located along the southern coast and central valley of California and supported by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The goal of the research was to provide policymakers, practitioners, program developers, and funders with empirically-based information about whether ACTION works. The objectives included assessing the effectiveness of the ACTION project in reducing agricultural crime, examining the costs and benefits and cost-benefit analysis (CBA) issues related to evaluating the program, and identifying how programs like ACTION can be effectively adopted by other jurisdictions.

Study Design: Two paper-and-pencil, self-administered surveys -- one in fall 2004 and the second in fall 2005 -- were sent to samples of farmers in the nine Agricultural Crime, Technology, Information, and Operations Network (ACTION) counties in California. The researchers identified farms using lists provided by Agricultural Commissioners in each county. Specifically, an ACTION staff member contacted each county's Agricultural

Commissioner office and obtained their most accurate pesticide permit holder lists in June and July of 2004. This list was used for the 2005 survey as well. Before sampling for the second wave of survey mailings in 2005, the researchers confirmed with Agricultural Commissioners' offices that their lists of pesticide permit holders do not change more than 10 percent from year to year as permits are valid for three years at a time.

The lists provided relatively complete enumerations of farm operations that use pesticides -- which typically includes all but the smallest operations and livestock operations that do not grow their own feed -- because these farms must register with the Agricultural Commissioners. Conversations with Commissioners' offices and representatives from the National Agriculture Statistics Service indicated that the sampling approach was likely to capture the majority of pesticide users, particularly medium and large operations. Nonetheless, any results using these data may not fully generalize to all farms, such as those focused primarily on livestock or that do not use pesticides, or to farms beyond the study region. The survey instruments, developed with the assistance of experts who consulted on the project and with farmers, and drawing on instruments used in previous studies (e.g., Bean and Lawrence 1978; Farmer and Voth 1989; Cleland 1990), were administered in the fall (2004 and 2005, respectively) and asked farmers about experiences with agricultural crime victimization during the 12 months prior to the survey. It also asked questions about characteristics of their farm operations and the activities that they take to prevent agricultural crime.

Advance notice of the study was given to farmers through the use of postcards, then surveys were sent to farmers in three waves at one-month intervals, with the second and third waves targeting nonrespondents. Cover letters were included, as was a letter of support from the California Farm Bureau Federation and a self-addressed, stamped return envelope. For the first survey, concern about the relatively low response rate prompted the researchers to reconsider incentive options for the follow-up mailing. The research team decided to provide a one or two dollar incentive in each survey mailed in the third follow-up. Because prior research provided no basis for determining whether two dollars would garner more responses than would one dollar, half the final follow-up received two dollar incentives and the other half received one dollar incentives. Subsequently, the researchers found little difference in the response rates of farmers who received one dollar versus two dollars. However, the incentives did appear to boost the response rate. Given the improvement gained from using the incentives, and the lack of difference in using one dollar versus two dollars, the second-year survey included one dollar incentives in all three waves of mailings. In addition, a raffle incentive was introduced in the final follow-up; respondents who returned the survey within three weeks were eligible to win \$100. The Fall 2004 Agricultural Crime Survey (Part 1) contains

data on 823 respondents (farms) and the Fall 2005 Agricultural Crime Survey (Part 2) contains data on 818 respondents (farms).

Sample: The researchers sent surveys to samples of farmers in the nine Agricultural Crime, Technology, Information, and Operations Network (ACTION) counties. For the Fall 2004 Agricultural Crime Survey (Part 1), a total of 2,286 surveys were initially mailed, but 64 were returned due to bad addresses. Of the 2,222 mailed surveys with good addresses, collectively constituting the eligible survey pool, 960 were returned. Of these, 134 were not farmers (having so indicated on the instrument) and 3 were not completed. Thus, the final sample was 823 respondents (farms). For the Fall 2005 Agricultural Crime Survey (Part 2), a total of 2,286 surveys were initially mailed, but 30 were returned due to bad addresses. Of the 2,256 mailed surveys with good addresses, collectively constituting the eligible survey pool, 1,004 were returned. Of these, 157 were not farmers (having so indicated on the instrument) and 29 were not completed. Thus, the final sample was 818 respondents (farms).

Weight: none

Sources of Information: Data were obtained from mail surveys.

Mode of Data Collection: mail questionnaire

Description of Variables: The survey asked farmers about experiences with agricultural crime victimization during the 12 months prior to the survey. It also asked questions about characteristics of their farm operations and the activities that they take to prevent agricultural crime. More specifically, variables in the Fall 2004 Agricultural Crime Survey (Part 1) included questions about crime on the survey respondent's farm or ranch, the reporting of crime on the respondent's farm or ranch, the protection of farm or ranch assets, law enforcement in the respondent's county, and general characteristics of the respondent's farm or ranch operation. Similarly, the Fall 2005 Agricultural Crime Survey (Part 2) included variables relating to crime on the respondent's farm and in his or her county, law enforcement in the respondent's county, information about agriculture crime, safety and security on the respondent's property, as well as information about the respondent and his or her farm or ranch operation.

Response Rates: Of the 2,222 mailed surveys with good addresses for the Fall 2004 Agricultural Crime Survey (Part 1), 960 were returned which resulted in a response rate of 43.2 percent. Of the 2,256 mailed surveys with good addresses for the Fall 2005 Agricultural Crime Survey (Part 2), 1,004 were returned which resulted in a response rate of 44.5 percent.

Presence of Common Scales: Several Likert-type scales were used.

Extent of Processing: Created variable labels and/or value labels.
Standardized missing values.
Checked for undocumented or out-of-range codes.

Access and Availability

Note: A list of the data formats available for this study can be found in the [summary of holdings](#). Detailed file-level information (such as record length, case count, and variable count) is listed in the [file manifest](#).

Restrictions: The data are restricted from general dissemination. Users interested in obtaining these data must complete a Restricted Data Use Agreement form and specify the reasons for the request. A copy of the Restricted Data Use Agreement form can be requested by calling 800-999-0960. Researchers can also download this form as a Portable Document Format (PDF) file from the download page associated with this dataset. Completed forms should be returned to: Director, National Archive of Criminal Justice Data, Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, Institute for Social Research, P.O. Box 1248, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248, or by fax: 734-647-8200.;

Original ICPSR Release: 2009

Dataset(s):

- DS1: Fall 2004 Agricultural Crime Survey
- DS2: Fall 2005 Agricultural Crime Survey

Publications

Final Reports and Other Publication Resources: A list of publications related to, or based on, this data collection can be accessed from the study's download page on the NACJD Web site or through the ICPSR Bibliography of Data-Related Literature at <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/ICPSR/citations/index.html>. The list of citations includes links to abstracts and publications in Portable Document Format (PDF) files or text files when available.

Final reports and other publications describing research conducted on a variety of criminal justice topics are available from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS). NCJRS was established in 1972 by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), an agency of the U.S. Department of Justice, to provide research findings to criminal justice professionals and researchers. NCJRS operates specialized clearinghouses that are staffed by information specialists who supply a range of reference, referral, and distribution services. Publications can be obtained from NCJRS at

NIJ/NCJRS, Box 6000, Rockville, MD, 20849-6000, 800-851-3420 or 301-519-5500. TTY Service for the Hearing Impaired is 877-712-9279 (toll-free) or 301-947-8374 (local). The URL for the NCJRS Web site is:

<http://www.ncjrs.org/>

NIJ Data Resources Program

About the DRP: The National Institute of Justice Data Resources Program (DRP) makes datasets from NIJ-funded research and evaluation projects available to the research community and sponsors research and training activities devoted to secondary data analysis. Datasets are archived by the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) at the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan.

The NACJD maintains a World Wide Web site with instructions for transferring files and sending messages. Criminal justice data funded by the Department of Justice are available via the Internet at this site at no charge to the user. NACJD may be contacted at NACJD/ICPSR, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI, 48106-1248, 800-999-0960. The URL for the NACJD Web site is:

<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD/>

Data Completeness Report

Notes: (1) Variables are individually listed only if they have greater than 5% missing data. These variables are listed under the appropriate percentage category in the order in which they appear in the data file. (2) The Data Completeness Report only captures information about system missing or other values that are declared missing. Codes that have a label implying that they are missing but that are not declared missing values are not reflected in this report. Data users should consult the codebook for more specific information about missing values. (3) Some variables that have 100% missing data may have been blanked by ICPSR to protect respondent confidentiality. Data users should consult the codebook for more specific information about blanked variables. (4) Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Fall 2004 Agricultural Crime Survey

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 823)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
1.3% (4 of 314 variables)	have 0% Missing Values
0.0% (0 of 314 variables)	have 0% - 1% Missing Values
0.6% (2 of 314 variables)	have 1% - 3% Missing Values
6.7% (21 of 314 variables)	have 3% - 5% Missing Values
2.5% (8 of 314 variables)	have 5% - 10% Missing Values
Q3TRSH	CONCERN TRASH DUMP 8.5%
NQ4CRIM	THEFT COMPARED TO PREVIOUS YEARS ON FARM 5.3%
NQ5STOR	THEFT STORIES COMPARED TO PREVIOUS YRS 5.5%
NQ13_CHEM	ANY CHEMICAL/FUEL THEFT IN PAST 12 MONTHS 6.7%
NQ31UNIT	AG CRIME UNIT CONTACTED FARMER 6.7%
NQ51DOB	(OPERATOR) YEAR OF BIRTH 9.8%
NQ52SEX	(OPERATOR) GENDER 7.7%
NQ55RACE	(OPERATOR) HISPANIC ORIGIN 7.8%
10.2% (32 of 314 variables)	have 10% - 20% Missing Values
Q3CROP	CONCERN CROP THEFT 17.0%
Q3CHEM	CONCERN CHEMICAL THEFT 13.2%
Q3EQU	CONCERN EQUIP. THEFT 10.9%
Q3VAND	CONCERN VANDALISM 13.0%
Q3TRES	CONCERN TRESPASSING 11.5%
Q3DUMP	CONCERN TOXIC DUMP 15.1%
Q3PASS	CONCERN ASSAULT ON PERSON 15.8%
Q3EASS	CONCERN ASSAULT ON EMPLOYEE 19.2%
Q3BURG	CONCERN BURGLARY 11.3%
NQ21_NEI	NEIGHBORS & STOLEN GOODS 14.1%
NQ26_COST	COST OF SECURITY 10.7%
NQ27CHEM	% CHEMICALS LOCKED 16.2%
NQ27TOOL	% TOOLS LOCKED 12.5%
NQ28BAR	% COMMODITIES CANNOT SEE FROM ROAD 12.9%
NQ301NEI	NEIGHBORS WATCH FARM WHEN OUT TOWN 16.4%

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Fall 2004 Agricultural Crime Survey

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 823)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
NQ303INS	MACHINARY INSURANCE	14.3%
NQ307LOC	LOCK FARM BUILDINGS	11.5%
NQ308PES	LOCK PESTICIDES	10.4%
NQ3015NEI	FARM BUILDINGS VISIBLE TO NEIGHBORS	19.4%
NQ3017LIG	LIGHTS OUTSIDE BUILDINGS	14.6%
NQ3018KEY	REMOVE KEYS FROM VEHICLES	11.4%
NQ3019TRE	NO TRESPASSING SIGNS	15.1%
NQ3026INS	HOME INSURANCE	11.1%
NQ3027LIG	HOUSE LIGHTS ON	14.3%
NQ3028DOG	WATCH DOG	14.0%
NQ3029GUN	HAVE GUNS	13.6%
Q32PROT	AG UNIT QUALITY OF PROTECTION	18.8%
NQ37HOUSE	LOCATION OF HOUSE/OFFICE	14.7%
NQ43FAM	FAMILY / INDIVIDUAL OPERATION	12.2%
NQ44PROD1	LARGEST ANNUAL GROSS INCOME GENERATOR	12.4%
NQ46MKTVA	MKT VALUE OF PRODUCTS >\$1000	11.4%
Q50HELP	# HIRED WORKERS	11.8%
12.4% (39 of 314 variables)	have 20% - 40% Missing Values	
Q3LIVE	CONCERN LIVESTOCK THEFT	24.4%
Q3BIOT	CONCERN BIOTERRORISM	20.8%
NQ20_LOSS	VALUE OF LOSS BEFORE REPORT	27.7%
NQ23_INF1	INFO SOURCE - FARM MAGS	24.4%
NQ23_INF2	INFO SOURCE - FRIENDS, ETC.	27.7%
NQ23_INF4	INFO SOURCE - NEWSPAPER, ETC	22.1%
NQ23_INF5	INFO SOURCE - LOCAL LAW	37.8%
NQ23_INF6	INFO SOURCE - FARM BUREAU	27.2%
NQ27TRAC	% TRACTORS LOCKED	21.1%
NQ27EQUI	% EQUIPMENT LOCKED	30.4%
NQ29SEC2	SECURE BUILDINGS- FENCE	35.6%
NQ29SEC3	SECURE BUILDINGS- LIGHT	28.1%
NQ304REC	SERIAL NUMBERS ON EQUIPMENT	21.5%
NQ305OVE	MACHINES OUT OF SITE OVERNIGHT	22.8%
NQ3010WIN	LOCK WINDOWS	25.4%
NQ3011INS	CROP INSURANCE	29.4%
NQ3012SHE	INFORM SHERIFF WHEN OUT OF TOWN	23.2%
NQ3016FUE	LOCK FUEL TANKS	23.8%
NQ3020GAT	LOCK FARM GATES	35.5%

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Fall 2004 Agricultural Crime Survey

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 823)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
NQ3021DEC	SECURITY DECALS	22.7%
NQ3022LOC	LOCK MACHINERY	23.9%
NQ3023BAR	BARS ON WINDOWS	30.5%
NQ3024ALA	ALARM SYSTEMS IN BUILDINGS	21.9%
NQ3025CAM	SECURITY CAMERAS	23.8%
NQ3030GEE	HAVE GEESE	25.9%
NQ34CNG	AG UNIT INTEREST CHANGE	22.8%
NQ46A_VAL	ACTUAL MKT VALUE OF PRODUCTS	37.8%
NQ47_LT40	# TRACTORS < 40 HORSEPOWER	32.1%
NQ47LT99	# TRACTORS < 99 HORSEPOWER	25.8%
Q48MV_EQ	MKT VALUE ALL EQUIPMENT	22.1%
Q49MV_RE	MKT VALUE ALL REAL ESTATE	28.2%
Q50A_MIG	# MIGRANT WORKERS	30.6%
Q50B_PT	# PART TIME WORKERS	32.2%
NQ54SM	BUYING STOLEN GOODS SMALL BUSINESSES AND MARKETS	35.4%
NQ54FAR	BUYING STOLEN GOODS OTHER FARMERS	33.7%
NQ54COM	BUYING STOLEN GOODS COMMERCIAL DISTRIBUTORS	40.0%
NQ54COU	BUYING STOLEN GOODS PEOPLE AND BUSINESSES IN OTHER COUNTRIES	35.4%
NQ54DRG	BUYING STOLEN GOODS PRODUCERS OF ILLICIT DRUGS	34.6%
NQ55AWH	(OPERATOR) RACE- WHITE	21.1%
65.9% (207 of 314 variables)	have 40% - 99% Missing Values	
NQ2AMO	MONTH STOP FARMING	97.3%
Q3OTH	CONCERN OTHER	87.8%
NQ8FAM	QOL -FAMILY MEMBER ALWAYS PRESENT	68.8%
NQ8VICT	QOL -WORRY MORE	62.9%
NQ8STR	QOL -DON'T TRUST STRANGERS	58.0%
NQ8WAT	QOL -ALWAYS KEEP WATCH	57.0%
NQ8VAC	QOL -RARELY/NEVER VACATION	69.6%
NQ8OTH	QOL - OTHER	73.9%
Q9A_NTL	# TOOL/SM. EQUIP THEFTS	68.3%
Q9A_VTL	\$ TOOL/SM. EQUIP THEFTS	66.7%
Q9A_RTL	# REPORTED TOOL/SM. EQUIP THEFTS TO LAW	69.3%
NQ9A_STL	SUSPECT OF TOOL THEFT	71.6%
Q9B_VA1	\$ TOOL/EQUIP1	52.6%
Q9B_VA2	\$ TOOL/EQUIP2	62.2%
NQ9B_IN1	FILED CLAIM TO INSURANCE TOOL/EQUIP1	72.1%
NQ9B_IN2	FILED CLAIM TO INSURANCE TOOL/EQUIP2	87.2%

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Fall 2004 Agricultural Crime Survey

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 823)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
NQ9B_RP1	REPORT TOOL/EQUIP1 TO LE	72.2%
NQ9B_RP2	REPORT TOOL/EQUIP2 TO LE	87.1%
NQ9B_RE1	TOOL/EQUIP1 RECOVERED	71.9%
NQ9B_RE2	TOOL/EQUIP2 RECOVERED	87.1%
NQ9B_MO1	MONTH TOOL THEFT1	76.8%
NQ9B_MO2	MONTH TOOL THEFT2	88.8%
Q10A_NT	# TRACTOR THEFTS	94.3%
Q10A_TS	# TRACTORS STOLEN	98.5%
Q10A_VT	VALUE TRACTORS STOLEN	92.2%
Q10A_RT	# TRACTOR THEFTS REPORTED TO LAW	94.3%
NQ10A_ST	SUSPECT OF TRACTOR THEFT	99.0%
Q10B_VA1	VALUE TRACTOR THEFT1	95.6%
Q10B_VA2	VALUE TRACTOR THEFT2	96.2%
NQ10B_IN1	FILE TRACTOR THEFT1 TO INSURANCE	99.1%
NQ10B_IN2	FILE TRACTOR THEFT2 TO INSURANCE	99.6%
NQ10B_RP1	REPORT TRACTOR THEFT1 TO LAW	99.3%
NQ10B_RP2	REPORT TRACTOR THEFT2 TO LAW	99.8%
NQ10B_RE1	TRACTOR THEFT1 RECOVERED	99.1%
NQ10B_RE2	TRACTOR THEFT2 RECOVERED	99.8%
NQ10B_MO1	MONTH TRACTOR THEFT1	99.3%
NQ10B_MO2	MONTH TRACTOR THEFT2	99.8%
Q11A_NLE	# LG EQUIP THEFTS	90.0%
Q11A_VLE	\$ LG EQUIP THEFTS	88.0%
Q11A_RLE	# REPORT LG EQUIP THEFTS TO LAW	90.0%
Q11A_SLE	SUSPECT LRG EQUIP THEFT	94.7%
Q11B_VA1	\$ LG EQUIP THEFT1	66.5%
Q11B_VA2	\$ LG EQUIP THEFT2	68.8%
NQ11B_IN1	FILE LG EQUIP THEFT1 TO INSURANCE	94.7%
NQ11B_IN2	FILE LG EQUIP THEFT2 TO INSURANCE	98.2%
NQ11B_RP1	REPORT LG EQUIP THEFT1 TO LAW	94.8%
NQ11B_RP2	REPORT LG EQUIP THEFT2 TO LAW	98.3%
NQ11B_RE1	LG EQUIP THEFT1 RECOVERED	94.8%
NQ11B_RE2	LG EQUIP THEFT2 RECOVERED	98.3%
NQ11B_MO1	MONTH OF LG EQUIP THEFT1	95.6%
NQ11B_MO2	MONTH OF LG EQUIP THEFT2	98.3%
Q12A_NLV	# LIVESTOCK THEFTS	92.8%
Q12A_VLV	\$ OF LIVESTOCK THEFTS	90.4%

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Fall 2004 Agricultural Crime Survey

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 823)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
Q12A_RLV	# REPORT LIVESTOCK THEFT TO LAW	92.8%
NQ12A_SLV	SUSPECT OF LIVESTOCK THEFT	97.8%
Q12B_VA1	\$ LIVESTOCK THEFT1	70.4%
Q12B_VA2	\$ LIVESTOCK THEFT2	72.2%
NQ12B_IN1	FILE LIVESTOCK THEFT1 TO INSURANCE	97.6%
NQ12B_IN2	FILE LIVESTOCK THEFT2 TO INSURANCE	99.5%
NQ12B_RP1	REPORT LIVESTOCK THEFT1 TO LAW	97.7%
NQ12B_RP2	REPORT LIVESTOCK THEFT2 TO LAW	99.6%
NQ12B_RE1	LIVESTOCK THEFT1 RECOVERED	97.8%
NQ12B_RE2	LIVESTOCK THEFT2 RECOVERED	99.6%
NQ12B_MO1	MONTH LIVESTOCK THEFT1	98.3%
Q13A_NCH	# CHEM/FUEL THEFTS	83.4%
Q13A_VCH	\$ CHEM/FUEL THEFTS	81.3%
Q13A_RCH	# REPORT CHEM/FUEL THEFTS TO LAW	82.9%
NQ13A_SCH	SUSPECT OF CHEM THEFT	86.8%
Q13B_VA1	\$ CHEM/FUEL THEFT1	62.9%
Q13B_VA2	\$ CHEM/FUEL THEFT2	68.4%
NQ13B_IN1	FILE CHEM/FUEL THEFT1 TO INSURANCE	88.3%
NQ13B_IN2	FILE CHEM/FUEL THEFT2 TO INSURANCE	96.2%
NQ13B_RP1	REPORT CHEM/FUEL THEFT1 TO LAW	88.3%
NQ13B_RP2	REPORT CHEM/FUEL THEFT2 TO LAW	96.5%
NQ13B_RE1	CHEM/FUEL THEFT1 RECOVERED	88.7%
NQ13B_RE2	CHEM/FUEL THEFT2 RECOVERED	96.5%
NQ13B_MO1	MONTH OF CHEM/FUEL THEFT1	90.4%
NQ13B_MO2	MONTH OF CHEM/FUEL THEFT2	97.3%
Q14A_NCO	# COMMODITY THEFTS	88.3%
Q14A_VCO	\$ COMMODITY THEFTS	86.1%
Q14A_RCO	# REPORTED COMMODITY THEFTS TO LAW	87.2%
NQ14A_SCO	SUSPECT OF COMMODITY THEFT	92.1%
Q14B_VA1	\$ COMM THEFT1	65.5%
Q14B_VA2	\$ COMM THEFT2	68.7%
NQ14B_IN1	FILED COMM THEFT1 TO INSURANCE	91.9%
NQ14B_IN2	FILED COMM THEFT2 TO INSURANCE	97.2%
NQ14B_RP1	REPORTED COMM THEFT1 TO LAW	92.0%
NQ14B_RP2	REPORTED COMM THEFT2 TO LAW	97.3%
NQ14B_RE1	COMM THEFT1 RECOVERED	92.1%
NQ14B_RE2	COMM THEFT2 RECOVERED	97.3%

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Fall 2004 Agricultural Crime Survey

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 823)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
NQ14B_MO1	MONTH OF COMM THEFT1	92.7%
NQ14B_MO2	MONTH OF COMM THEFT2	97.6%
Q15A_NVD	# OF VANDALISMS	50.9%
Q15A_VVD	\$ OF VANDALISMS	61.4%
Q15A_RVD	# REPORTED VAND. TO LAW	50.9%
NQ15A_SVD	SUSPECTS OF VAND.	52.7%
Q15B_VA1	\$ VANDALISM1	55.7%
Q15B_VA2	\$ VANDALISM2	67.0%
NQ15B_IN1	FILE VANDALISM1 TO INSURANCE	44.7%
NQ15B_IN2	FILE VANDALISM2 TO INSURANCE	63.7%
NQ15B_RP1	REPORT VANDALISM1 TO LAW	45.7%
NQ15B_RP2	REPORT VANDALISM2 TO LAW	64.0%
NQ15B_MO1	MONTH OF VANDALISM1	72.1%
NQ15B_MO2	MONTH OF VANDALISM2	87.6%
Q16A_NB	# BURGLARIES	84.8%
Q16A_VB	\$ BURGLARIES	83.4%
Q16A_RB	REPORT BURGLARIES TO LAW=	85.2%
NQ16A_SB	SUSPECT OF BURGLARIES	89.6%
Q16B_VA1	\$ BURGLARY1	64.6%
Q16B_VA2	\$ BURGLARY2	67.9%
NQ16B_IN1	FILE BURGLARY1 TO INSURANCE	67.0%
NQ16B_IN2	FILE BURGLARY2 TO INSURANCE	70.6%
NQ16B_RP1	REPORT BURGLARY1 TO LAW	67.2%
NQ16B_RP2	REPORT BURGLARY2 TO LAW	70.8%
NQ16B_RE1	RECOVERED BURGLARY1 ITEMS	67.4%
NQ16B_RE2	RECOVERED BURGLARY2 ITEMS	70.8%
NQ16B_MO1	MONTH OF BURGLARY1	92.2%
NQ16B_MO2	MONTH OF BURGLARY2	97.2%
Q17A_NU	# TIMES MISREPRESENTATON	96.7%
Q17B_RP	# REPORT MISREPRESENTATION	96.7%
Q17C_SUS	OFFENDERS OF FRAUD. SALE CAUGHT	99.5%
NQ18_NOT1	NOT REPORT - NOT APPLICABLE	43.3%
NQ18_NOT2	NOT REPORT - CRIME NOT SERIOUS ENOUGH	59.2%
NQ18_NOT3	NOT REPORT - LE DO NOTHING	54.3%
NQ18_NOT4	NOT REPORT - NO PROOF	66.8%
NQ18_NOT5	NOT REPORT - INSURANCE	65.9%
NQ18_NOT6	NOT REPORT - OTHER	66.8%

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Fall 2004 Agricultural Crime Survey

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 823)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
NQ19_RPT1	REPORT - NOT APPLICABLE	54.8%
NQ19_RPT2	REPORT - SERIOUSNESS	71.7%
NQ19_RPT3	REPORT - STOP CRIME	66.0%
NQ19_RPT4	REPORT - OFFENDER CAUGHT	67.2%
NQ19_RPT5	REPORT - INSURANCE	73.5%
NQ19_RPT6	REPORT - OTHER	76.3%
NQ23_INF3	INFO SOURCE - COUNTY EXTENSION	44.0%
NQ23_INF7	INFO SOURCE - OTHER CIVIC ORG	47.9%
NQ23_INF8	INFO SOURCE - CA DEPT AG	45.6%
NQ23_INF9	INFO SOURCE - HARDWARE STORE	48.0%
NQ23_INF10	INFO SOURCE - LOCKSMITH	48.8%
NQ23_INF11	INFO SOURCE - FARM COMM ORG	46.4%
NQ23_INF12	INFO SOURCE - OTHER	43.4%
NQ24A_MO	MONTH START OAN	89.8%
NQ24A_YR	YEAR BEGIN OAN USE	84.2%
NQ24B_PCT	% EQUIP MARKED W/OAN	84.2%
NQ24C_Y1	WHY OAN- HEARD OF	84.1%
NQ24C_Y2	WHY OAN- HAD THEFT	84.1%
NQ24C_Y3	WHY OAN- LAW SAID TO	84.1%
NQ24C_Y4	WHY OAN- OTHER START OAN	86.1%
NQ25A_MO	SURVEILLANCE START MONTH	87.0%
NQ25A_YR	SURVEILLANCE START YEAR	81.5%
NQ25B_TY1	TYPE EQUIP -VIDEO CAMERA	84.0%
NQ25B_TY2	TYPE EQUIP -MOTION DETECTOR	79.7%
NQ25B_TY3	TYPE EQUIP -SECURITY ALARM	78.9%
NQ25B_TY4	TYPE EQUIP -CC TV	85.7%
NQ25B_TY5	TYPE EQUIP -OTHER	85.3%
NQ25C_CHG	SURVEILLANCE USE CHANGE	78.6%
NQ25D_Y1	WHY SURV. - HEARD OF PROG.	87.4%
NQ25D_Y2	WHY SURV. - HAD THEFT	81.0%
NQ25D_Y3	WHY SURV. - LAW SAID TO	86.0%
NQ25D_Y4	WHY SURV. - OTHER	85.3%
NQ25E_LE	LAW USE SURV. ON PROPERTY	69.5%
NQ27LIVE	% LIVESTOCK LOCKED	74.5%
NQ27COMM	% COMMODITIES LOCKED	55.8%
NQ29SEC1	SECURE BUILDINGS- NONE	40.6%
NQ29SEC4	SECURE BUILDINGS- SURV. EQUIP	45.1%

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Fall 2004 Agricultural Crime Survey

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 823)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
NQ29SEC5	SECURE BUILDINGS- OTHER	45.7%
NQ302ID	USE LIVESTOCK ID	68.3%
NQ306GUA	FARM HAS SECURITY GUARDS	41.6%
NQ309PAI	PAINT TREES/CROPS	45.3%
NQ3013TAT	TATTOO STORAGE MATERIALS	52.4%
NQ3014ID	USE GRAIN CONFETTI ID	62.9%
Q33INTER	AG UNIT INTEREST IN ASSISTING	54.3%
NQ43PARTN	PARTNERSHIP OPERATION	43.7%
NQ43REGPA	REGISTERED PARTNERSHIP	84.9%
Q43INCORP	INCORPORATED	45.2%
NQ43FAMCO	FAMILY-HELD CORPORATION	86.0%
NQ43STOCK	CORP W/ MORE THAN 10 STOCKHOLDERS	88.5%
NQ44PROD2	2ND GROSS INCOME GENERATOR	79.5%
NQ44PROD3	3RD GROSS INCOME GENERATOR	91.5%
NQ44PROD4	4TH GROSS INCOME GENERATOR	97.0%
NQ44PROD5	5TH GROSS INCOME GENERATOR	98.1%
NQ44PROD6	SMALLEST ANNUAL GROSS INCOME	93.6%
NQ47GT100	# TRACTORS > 100 HORSEPOWER	43.4%
NQ47COMB	# COMBINES	50.7%
NQ47COTT	# COTTEN PICKERS	49.9%
NQ47HARV	# HARVESTERS	50.1%
NQ47BALER	# BALERS	48.7%
NQ53FRMRS	OTHER FARMERS RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEFT	60.5%
NQ53EMPL	EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEFT	54.6%
NQ53FAMI	FAMILY RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEFT	58.8%
NQ53MIGR	LEGAL MIGRANTS RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEFT	55.8%
NQ53NEIG	NEIGHBORS RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEFT	57.6%
NQ53ILLEG	ILLEGAL RESIDENTS RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEFT	48.4%
NQ53RINGS	ORGANIZED THEFT RINGS RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEFT	43.6%
NQ53DRUGS	DRUG RING RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEFT	49.9%
Q53OTH	OTHER POP. RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEFT	97.0%
NQ54OTH	BUYING STOLEN GOODS OTHER	93.6%
NQ54B_SM	LIKELIHOOD OF BUYING STOLEN- SMALL BUSINESSES AND MARKETS	42.4%
NQ54B_FAR	LIKELIHOOD OF BUYING STOLEN- OTHER FARMERS	42.3%
NQ54B_COM	LIKELIHOOD OF BUYING STOLEN- COMMERCIAL DISTRIBUTORS	46.5%
NQ54B_COU	LIKELIHOOD OF BUYING STOLEN- PEOPLE AND BUSINESSES IN OTHER COUNTRIES	43.5%

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Fall 2004 Agricultural Crime Survey

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 823)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
NQ54B_DRG	LIKELIHOOD OF BUYING STOLEN- PRODUCERS OF ILLICIT DRUGS	42.4%
NQ54B_OTH	LIKELIHOOD OF BUYING STOLEN- OTHER	90.9%
NQ55ABL	(OPERATOR) RACE- BLACK	55.7%
NQ55_NA	(OPERATOR) RACE- A. INDIAN /AL.	56.0%
NQ55API	(OPERATOR) RACE- PACIFIC ISLANDER	56.0%
NQ55AAS	(OPERATOR) RACE- ASIAN	54.2%
NQ55AOTH	(OPERATOR) RACE- OTHER	53.2%
0.3% (1 of 314 variables)	have 100% missing values	
NQ12B_MO2	MONTH LIVESTOCK THEFT2	100.0%

Data Completeness Report

Notes: (1) Variables are individually listed only if they have greater than 5% missing data. These variables are listed under the appropriate percentage category in the order in which they appear in the data file. (2) The Data Completeness Report only captures information about system missing or other values that are declared missing. Codes that have a label implying that they are missing but that are not declared missing values are not reflected in this report. Data users should consult the codebook for more specific information about missing values. (3) Some variables that have 100% missing data may have been blanked by ICPSR to protect respondent confidentiality. Data users should consult the codebook for more specific information about blanked variables. (4) Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Fall 2005 Agricultural Crime Survey

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 818)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
2.0% (4 of 200 variables)	have 0% Missing Values	
1.5% (3 of 200 variables)	have 0% - 1% Missing Values	
3.0% (6 of 200 variables)	have 1% - 3% Missing Values	
12.5% (25 of 200 variables)	have 3% - 5% Missing Values	
28.0% (56 of 200 variables)	have 5% - 10% Missing Values	
T11FUEL	CONCERN W/ CHALLENGE: FUEL COSTS	5.4%
T11SUPP	CONCERN W/ CHALLENGE: AVAILABILITY OF NECESSARY SUPPLIES	5.3%
T11TAX	CONCERN W/ CHALLENGE: TAXES	6.5%
T11STAF	CONCERN W/ CHALLENGE: STAFF RETENTION	6.4%
T11CRIM	CONCERN W/ CHALLENGE: CRIME VICTIMIZATION	5.3%
T11ECON	CONCERN W/ CHALLENGE: ECONOMY	6.2%
T11DISE	CONCERN W/ CHALLENGE: DISEASE LIVESTOCK/POULTRY	7.2%
T12QU04	QUALITY OF LE PROTECTION 2004	5.6%
T14HL05	EXTENT OF SHERIFF'S OFFICE HELP 2005	7.9%
T16OAN	PRIORITY OF LE RATING: ASSIST WITH OAN	5.1%
T16MEET	PRIORITY OF LE RATING: MEET WITH FARMERS	5.4%
T16SHAR	PRIORITY OF LE RATING: ENCOURAGE SURVEILLANCE SHARING	6.8%
T16PATR	PRIORITY OF LE RATING: INCREASED PATROLLING	5.3%
T16EMAIL	PRIORITY OF LE RATING: MAINTAIN EMAIL LIST	7.6%
T16RESP	PRIORITY OF LE RATING: GREATER RESPONSIVENESS	6.7%
NT17KNOW	LE HAVE ENOUGH KNOWLEDGE	6.6%
NT18SKILL	LE NEED SPECIAL SKILLS	5.4%
NT19VAC05	QOL: NO VACATIONS 2005	5.4%
NT19SEC05	QOL: HIRED SECURITY 2005	6.2%
NT19ROU05	QOL: CHANGED ROUTINES 2005	7.9%
NT19VIS05	QOL: DAYTIME VISITS ONLY 2005	6.8%
NT19LEA05	QOL: LEAVE FARMING 2005	5.7%
NT19INS05	QOL: INSURANCE 2005	6.0%

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Fall 2005 Agricultural Crime Survey

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 818)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
NT19OP05	QOL: LESS TIME OPERATIONS 2005	6.1%
NT19CR05	QOL: AG CRIME 2005	6.0%
NT19WEA05	QOL: CONCEALED WEAPON 2005	7.1%
T23AG	NO. TIMES VISITED AGCRIME.NET	5.5%
NT24INFO	PREFERRED METHOD TO RECEIVE INFO.	6.8%
NT27SER	NOT REPORTING: NOT SERIOUS	6.5%
NT27LE	NOT REPORTING: LE DO NOTHING	5.0%
NT27PRO	NOT REPORTING: NO PROOF	6.8%
NT27PRI	NOT REPORTING: PRIVATE PROPERTY	6.1%
NT27ILL	NOT REPORTING: ILLEGAL ACTIVITY	7.5%
NT32DEP05	LE DEPLOY SURV., 2005	6.5%
NT32DEP04	LE DEPLOY SURV., 2004	6.6%
NT35NEI05	PROTECT PROPERTY: NIEGHBORS WATCH, 2005	5.0%
NT35NEI04	PROTECT PROPERTY: NIEGHBORS WATCH, 2004	7.9%
NT35INS05	PROTECT PROPERTY: INSURANCE 2005	5.5%
NT35INS04	PROTECT PROPERTY: INSURANCE 2004	8.4%
NT35LIT05	PROTECT PROPERTY: LIGHTS ON 2005	6.5%
NT35LIT04	PROTECT PROPERTY: LIGHTS ON 2004	9.4%
NT35DOG05	PROTECT PROPERTY: WATCHDOG 2005	6.0%
NT35DOG04	PROTECT PROPERTY: WATCHDOG 2004	8.8%
NT35GUN05	PROTECT PROPERTY: GUN 2005	5.7%
NT35GUN04	PROTECT PROPERTY: GUN 2004	8.3%
NT35DOR04	PROTECT PROPERTY: DOORS LOCKED 2004	7.2%
NT35PES04	PROTECT PROPERTY: PESTICIDES 2004	6.8%
NT35WIN04	PROTECT PROPERTY: LOCK WINDOWS 2004	7.3%
NT35FUE05	PROTECT PROPERTY: LOCK FUEL 2005	7.5%
NT35FUE04	PROTECT PROPERTY: LOCK FUEL 2004	9.8%
NT35OUT05	PROTECT PROPERTY: LIGHTS OUTSIDE 2005	5.0%
NT35OUT04	PROTECT PROPERTY: LIGHTS OUTSIDE 2004	7.5%
T41HWY	% PROPERTY BORDER HWY	5.0%
NT45THO	AT LEAST \$1,000 REVENUE	5.5%
T48WKR	NUMBER OF WORKERS	9.9%
T49DOB	YEAR OF BIRTH	6.0%
8.5% (17 of 200 variables) have 10% - 20% Missing Values		
T9FFV05	NO. FRIEND/FAMILY VICT 2005	16.3%
T14HL04	EXTENT OF SHERIFF'S OFFICE HELP 2004	10.6%
T15INV04	LE INVESTIGATES AG CRIME 2004	13.7%

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Fall 2005 Agricultural Crime Survey

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 818)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
T15INV05	LE INVESTIGATES AG CRIME 2005	11.4%
NT19VAC04	QOL: NO VACATIONS 2004	12.1%
NT19SEC04	QOL: HIRED SECURITY 2004	12.5%
NT19ROU04	QOL: CHANGED ROUTINES 2004	14.4%
NT19VIS04	QOL: DAYTIME VISITS ONLY 2004	13.3%
NT19LEA04	QOL: LEAVE FARMING 2004	12.5%
NT19INS04	QOL: INSURANCE 2004	12.3%
NT19OP04	QOL: LESS TIME OPERATIONS 2004	12.7%
NT19CR04	QOL: AG CRIME 2004	12.5%
NT19WEA04	QOL: CONCEALED WEAPON 2004	13.7%
T25CON05	NO. PEOPLE CONVICTED IN COUNTY, 2005	18.8%
T35AHR05	NO. HRS SPENT ON PREVENTION, 2005	13.6%
T35AHR04	NO. HRS SPENT ON PREVENTION, 2004	13.9%
T46MKT	MKT VALUE (\$) OF MACHINERY	14.8%
36.0% (72 of 200 variables)	have 20% - 40% Missing Values	
T9FFV04	NO. FRIEND/FAMILY VICT 2004	20.0%
T10TL05	# TOOL/SM EQUIP THEFTS 2005	30.7%
T10TL04	# TOOL/SM EQUIP THEFTS 2004	34.4%
T10TLP05	# TOOL/SM EQUIP REPORTED TO PD 2005	25.8%
T10TLP04	# TOOL/SM EQUIP REPORTED TO PD 2004	28.2%
T10TLR05	# TOOL/SM EQUIP RECOVERED 2005	26.9%
T10TLR04	# TOOL/SM EQUIP RECOVERED 2004	29.2%
T10TLV05	VALUE (\$) OF TOOL/SM EQUIP LOSS 2005	22.5%
T10TLV04	VALUE (\$) OF TOOL/SM EQUIP LOSS 2004	25.3%
T10TRP05	# TRACTOR REPORTED TO PD 2005	35.8%
T10TRP04	# TRACTOR REPORTED TO PD 2004	39.1%
T10TRR05	# TRACTOR RECOVERED 2005	35.8%
T10TRR04	# TRACTOR RECOVERED 2004	39.1%
T10TRV05	VALUE (\$) OF TRACTOR LOSS 2005	30.1%
T10TRV04	VALUE (\$) OF TRACTOR LOSS 2004	33.1%
T10LGP05	# LRG EQUIP REPORTED TO PD 2005	33.9%
T10LGP04	# LRG EQUIP REPORTED TO PD 2004	37.0%
T10LGR05	# LRG EQUIP RECOVERED 2005	34.0%
T10LGR04	# LRG EQUIP RECOVERED 2004	37.0%
T10LGV05	VALUE (\$) OF LRG EQUIP LOSS 2005	28.2%
T10LGV04	VALUE (\$) OF LRG EQUIP LOSS 2004	31.8%
T10LVP05	# LIVESTOCK REPORTED TO PD 2005	37.0%

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Fall 2005 Agricultural Crime Survey

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 818)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
T10LVP04	# LIVESTOCK REPORTED TO PD 2004	39.4%
T10LVR05	# LIVESTOCK RECOVERED 2005	37.2%
T10LVR04	# LIVESTOCK RECOVERED 2004	39.5%
T10LVV05	VALUE (\$) OF LIVESTOCK LOSS 2005	31.1%
T10LVV04	VALUE (\$) OF LIVESTOCK LOSS 2004	33.1%
T10CH05	# CHEM/FUEL THEFTS 2005	39.2%
T10CHP05	# CHEM/FUEL REPORTED TO PD 2005	31.4%
T10CHP04	# CHEM/FUEL REPORTED TO PD 2004	36.7%
T10CHR05	# CHEM/FUEL RECOVERED 2005	32.3%
T10CHR04	# CHEM/FUEL RECOVERED 2004	36.9%
T10CHV05	VALUE (\$) OF CHEM/FUEL LOSS 2005	27.3%
T10CHV04	VALUE (\$) OF CHEM/FUEL LOSS 2004	31.2%
T10COP05	# COMMODITY REPORTED TO PD 2005	36.1%
T10COP04	# COMMODITY REPORTED TO PD 2004	38.8%
T10COR05	# COMMODITY RECOVERED 2005	35.9%
T10COR04	# COMMODITY RECOVERED 2004	38.8%
T10COV05	VALUE (\$) OF COMMODITY LOSS 2005	30.3%
T10COV04	VALUE (\$) OF COMMODITY LOSS 2004	32.8%
T10BR05	# BURGLARIES 2005	38.4%
T10BRP05	# BURGLARIES REPORTED TO PD 2005	32.0%
T10BRP04	# BURGLARIES REPORTED TO PD 2004	36.3%
T10BRR05	# BURGLARIES RECOVERED 2005	33.3%
T10BRR04	# BURGLARIES RECOVERED 2004	37.2%
T10BRV05	VALUE (\$) OF BURGLARIES LOSS 2005	28.0%
T10BRV04	VALUE (\$) OF BURGLARIES LOSS 2004	30.8%
T10VD05	# VANDALISM 2005	37.3%
T10VDP05	# VANDALISM REPORTED TO PD 2005	31.2%
T10VDP04	# VANDALISM REPORTED TO PD 2004	34.8%
T10VDV05	VALUE (\$) OF VANDALISM LOSS 2005	28.2%
T10VDV04	VALUE (\$) OF VANDALISM LOSS 2004	31.3%
T20DOL05	COMPENSATION (\$ A YEAR) FOR QOL CHANGE, 2005	28.6%
T20DOL04	COMPENSATION (\$ A YEAR) FOR QOL CHANGE, 2004	29.7%
T25CON04	NO. PEOPLE CONVICTED IN COUNTY, 2004	20.8%
NT26COU05	AGGRESSION OF COURTS, 2005	29.1%
NT26COU04	AGGRESSION OF COURTS, 2004	30.6%
T33INS05	VALUE (\$ PER YEAR) OF INSURANCE, 2005	23.7%
T33INS04	VALUE (\$ PER YEAR) OF INSURANCE , 2004	24.6%

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values--Fall 2005 Agricultural Crime Survey

Variable Name and Label (Total Cases = 818)		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
T34SUR05	SECURITY COSTS(\$ PER YEAR): SURVEILLANCE, 2005	28.6%
T34SUR04	SECURITY COSTS(\$ PER YEAR): SURVEILLANCE, 2004	30.9%
T34ALA05	SECURITY COSTS(\$ PER YEAR): ALARM SYSTEMS, 2005	24.7%
T34ALA04	SECURITY COSTS(\$ PER YEAR): ALARM SYSTEMS, 2004	27.3%
T34LK05	SECURITY COSTS(\$ PER YEAR): LOCKS, 2005	20.8%
T34LK04	SECURITY COSTS(\$ PER YEAR): LOCKS, 2004	23.2%
T34FN05	SECURITY COSTS(\$ PER YEAR): FENCES, 2005	26.3%
T34FN04	SECURITY COSTS(\$ PER YEAR): FENCES, 2004	28.4%
T35BDO05	\$ PER WEEK COMPENSATED FOR PREVENTION 2005	27.1%
T35BDO04	\$ PER WEEK COMPENSATED FOR PREVENTION 2004	27.4%
T45REV	APPROXIMATE REVENUE IF OVER \$1,000	24.0%
T47RE	MKT VALUE (\$) OF REAL ESTATE	23.8%
T48WGE	AVG WAGE (\$ DAILY) OF WORKERS	35.2%
8.5% (17 of 200 variables) have 40% - 99% Missing Values		
T10TR05	# TRACTOR THEFTS 2005	44.5%
T10TR04	# TRACTOR THEFTS 2004	49.3%
T10LG05	# LRG EQUIP THEFTS 2005	42.7%
T10LG04	# LRG EQUIP THEFTS 2004	47.1%
T10LV05	# LIVESTOCK THEFTS 2005	47.3%
T10LV04	# LIVESTOCK THEFTS 2004	50.7%
T10CH04	# CHEM/FUEL THEFTS 2004	44.5%
T10CO05	# COMMODITY THEFTS 2005	45.0%
T10CO04	# COMMODITY THEFTS 2004	48.3%
T10BR04	# BURGLARIES 2004	44.0%
T10VD04	# VANDALISM 2004	42.9%
T11OTH	CONCERN W/ CHALLENGE: OTHER	75.9%
T16OTH	PRIORITY OF LE RATING: OTHER	94.1%
NT23USE	USEFULLNESS OF AGCRIME.NET	95.4%
T29ENC	OAN USE ENCOURAGED BY L.E.	45.5%
T34OTH05	SECURITY COSTS(\$ PER YEAR): OTHER, 2005	70.2%
T34OTH04	SECURITY COSTS(\$ PER YEAR): OTHER, 2004	71.8%
0.0% (0 of 200 variables) have 100% missing values		