

# Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Reports

---

Volume 0  
Issue 1 *Cattleman's Day (1993-2014)*

Article 131

---

2007

## Attitudes of cow-calf producers toward NAIS are guarded

S.J. Breiner

S.A. Grau

B.B. Barnhardt

*See next page for additional authors*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://newprairiepress.org/kaesrr>



Part of the [Other Animal Sciences Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Breiner, S.J.; Grau, S.A.; Barnhardt, B.B.; Bryant, A.M.; Boone, Kris; Blasi, Dale A.; Schroeder, Ted C.; and Breiner, Ryan M. (2007) "Attitudes of cow-calf producers toward NAIS are guarded," *Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Reports*: Vol. 0: Iss. 1. <https://doi.org/10.4148/2378-5977.1534>

This report is brought to you for free and open access by New Prairie Press. It has been accepted for inclusion in Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Reports by an authorized administrator of New Prairie Press. Copyright 2007 the Author(s). Contents of this publication may be freely reproduced for educational purposes. All other rights reserved. Brand names appearing in this publication are for product identification purposes only. No endorsement is intended, nor is criticism implied of similar products not mentioned. K-State Research and Extension is an equal opportunity provider and employer.



---

## Attitudes of cow-calf producers toward NAIS are guarded

### Authors

S.J. Breiner, S.A. Grau, B.B. Barnhardt, A.M. Bryant, Kris Boone, Dale A. Blasi, Ted C. Schroeder, and Ryan M. Breiner

## ATTITUDES OF COW-CALF PRODUCERS TOWARD NAIS ARE GUARDED

*S. J. Breiner, K. M. Boone, D. A. Blasi, S. A. Grau, T. C. Schroeder,  
B. B. Barnhardt, R. M. Breiner and A. M. Bryant*

### Introduction

The introduction of a National Animal Identification System (NAIS) into the United States has generated much confusion and controversy. The goal of the NAIS is to utilize 48-hour traceback in the event of an animal disease outbreak, identify all animals that have had contact with the diseased animal, and link animals to their premises of origin. The NAIS has led to new technology and guidelines with the potential to change the production and marketing landscape of the beef industry. Moreover, these advances have led to public policy issues that have changed the rhetoric of the industry. The objective of this study was to examine perceptions and attitudes of cow-calf producers toward emerging beef technologies and policy issues through a nationwide mail survey. By understanding the demographics of today's producers in addition to their current practices, the industry can work toward better educating and understanding the concerns of these producers.

### Experimental Procedures

A panel of experts at Kansas State University completed content validity testing of the prepared survey instrument. Participants were selected in the spring of 2006, from a mailing list of cow-calf producers with more than 100 cows. *BEEF®* Magazine provided the mailing list and a random sample of 1,000 producers was selected. Three mailings were sent to each participant over a two-month time pe-

riod. Non-respondents received a fourth mailing to further encourage response. Mailings included: 1) pre-notice letter, 2) survey packet and cover letter, 3) postcard thank you/reminder, and 4) replacement questionnaire with monetary incentive. Data were collected by Prism Business Media, Inc., and analyzed by both Prism Business Media, Inc. and Kansas State University.

### Results and Discussion

A total effective mailing of 972 surveys resulted in 522 responses for an effective response rate of 53.7%. Producers from 41 states responded to the survey, and 77.8% of respondents were over the age of 45 with an average herd size of 160.

The first step in implementing the proposed NAIS is to obtain a premise registration number. Of those surveyed, almost one-third had received a premise ID number (Table 1).

**Table 1: Have You Received or Registered Your Operation for a Premise Identification Number?**

|           | Number Reporting | Percent Reporting |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------|
| Yes       | 171              | 32.8%             |
| No        | 341              | 65.3%             |
| No answer | 10               | 1.9%              |

N = 522.

Producers were asked to rate their concerns regarding four issues surrounding the implementation of a national ID plan. Liability to producer was the greatest concern of producers. It was followed by cost to the producer, reliability of technology, and confidentiality of information, respectively (Table 2).

**Table 2: Please Rate Your Concerns Regarding the Following Issues Surrounding the Implementation of a National Animal Identification Plan:**

(1 = not concerned, 2 = somewhat concerned, 3 = concerned and 4 = very concerned)

|                                | N<br>Valid | Mean | Std.<br>Deviation |
|--------------------------------|------------|------|-------------------|
| Cost to producer               | 513        | 3.02 | 0.976             |
| Confidentiality of information | 487        | 2.94 | 1.050             |
| Reliability of technology      | 489        | 2.95 | 0.943             |
| Liability to producer          | 496        | 3.12 | 0.965             |

Participants also evaluated the importance of a national animal identification system. Disease monitoring and regaining foreign markets were the most frequently perceived benefits of a national animal identification system. The majority of producers did not feel such a system was important to increase profitability in their operations (Table 3).

**Table 3: How Important Do You Feel a National Animal Identification System is to the Following:**

(1 = not important and 6 = critical)

|                                | N<br>Valid | Mean | Std.<br>Deviation |
|--------------------------------|------------|------|-------------------|
| Monitoring disease             | 498        | 4.13 | 1.627             |
| Increasing consumer confidence | 495        | 3.95 | 1.709             |
| Increased profitability        | 490        | 3.03 | 1.674             |
| Regaining foreign markets      | 493        | 4.09 | 1.680             |
| Managing the supply chain      | 481        | 3.23 | 1.711             |
| Enhancing food safety          | 493        | 3.71 | 1.731             |

Producers were asked to rate their level of agreement with several statements on a scale of 1 to 6, with 1 being strongly disagree and 6 being strongly agree. Forty-one percent of producers agreed to some degree that the NAIS is necessary. Almost 30% felt the implementation of such a program was overdue. More than 59%, however, felt the implementation timeline was not practical (Table 4).

**Table 4: Please Rate the Following Statements About the National Animal Identification System (NAIS) In Order of Agreement:**

(1 = strongly disagree and 6 = strongly agree)

|                                           | N<br>Valid | Mean | Std.<br>Deviation |
|-------------------------------------------|------------|------|-------------------|
| NAIS is necessary                         | 495        | 3.35 | 1.683             |
| NAIS implementation timeline is practical | 466        | 2.97 | 1.492             |
| The implementation of NAIS is overdue     | 471        | 2.97 | 1.723             |

Respondents also were asked to rate their level of understanding regarding the proposed NAIS, also on a scale of 1 to 6, with 1 being no understanding and 6 being complete understanding. The majority of producers showed some degree of understanding of the program. Similarly, they were asked to rate their familiarity with electronic ID systems available to producers (Table 5). While most producers felt they were aware of available systems and technology, the margin was small, with a mean of 3.29. The capability of these producers to implement and adopt the NAIS was also evaluated on a scale of 1 to 6, with 1 being incapable and 6 being completely capable. The majority of producers felt they were capable of adopting the program (Table 5).

**Table 5: Familiarity With and Capability to Adopt NAIS**

*(1 = no understanding and 6 = complete understanding)*

|                                        | N<br>Valid | Mean | Std.<br>Deviation |
|----------------------------------------|------------|------|-------------------|
| Familiarity with NAIS                  | 512        | 3.63 | 1.302             |
| Familiarity with electronic ID systems | 511        | 3.29 | 1.419             |
| Capability to adopt NAIS               | 504        | 3.87 | 1.649             |

Support of a national identification system for cattle was evaluated on a 1 to 6 scale, with 1 being strongly supportive and 6 being strongly opposed. This question showed the most variation within the group, with about 49% supportive and about 48% opposed to some degree. Data showed a mean of 3.53 with a standard deviation of 1.672. Also important to note is the even distribution of producers across all possible responses (Table 6).

**Table 6: Generally Speaking, Are You in Favor of a National Identification System for Cattle?**

*(1 = strongly supportive and 6 = strongly opposed)*

|                         | Number<br>Reporting | Percent<br>Reporting |
|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| 1 - Strongly supportive | 78                  | 14.9%                |
| 2 - Supportive          | 74                  | 14.2%                |
| 3 - Somewhat supportive | 106                 | 20.3%                |
| 4 - Somewhat opposed    | 85                  | 16.3%                |
| 5 - Opposed             | 77                  | 14.8%                |
| 6 - Strongly opposed    | 86                  | 16.5%                |

N = 506. \*Mean = 3.53, s.d. = 1.672

### Implications

The data ultimately indicates that there is no strong support for or opposition to a national animal ID system. This shows the controversial nature of the issue and a need for further education.