

Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Reports

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

Article 1183

1981

Four ear tags evaluated

L.R. Sprott

L.R. Corah

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



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

Recommended Citation

Sprott, L.R. and Corah, L.R. (1981) "Four ear tags evaluated," *Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Reports*: Vol. 0: Iss. 1. <https://doi.org/10.4148/2378-5977.2586>

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 1981 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.



K

Four Ear Tags Evaluated

S

L. R. Sprott and L. R. Corah

USummary

Four types of ear tags were evaluated for retention over 2 years. Retention was low for one type, and high for the other three types.

Introduction

Individual identification in beef herds is essential for efficient record keeping. Hot iron brands, freeze brands and ear tattoos are the only permanent identification, but they are hard to read. Most producers prefer large, easy-to-read tags that remain in the animals' ears at least 2 years.

We studied retention of four types of tags for a 2 year period.

Procedure

Beef replacement heifers from several trials at Kansas State University were held in a drylot over a 2 year period. Upon arrival, 100 head were identified with a Taylored¹ tag in the right ear and a Temple² tag in the left. Eighty-five head were identified with an Allflex³ tag in the right ear and a Ritchey⁴ tag in the left. All tags were the "jumbo" or "maxi" size.

Results and Discussion

Table .1 shows that only 65% ($P < .05$) of the Taylored tags were still in place after one month. Taylored tags were lost throughout the trial, but losses in the other three were minimal. Temple and Allflex tags tended to remain in the ear longer than Ritchey tags. Taylored tags, those with highest losses, were the easiest to read, especially in winter, because they hung below the base of the ear, out of the hair. Losses may have stemmed from that design. Their design has since been changed.

¹Taylored Tags Inc.; Taylor, Nebraska

²Temple Tag. Co.; Temple, Texas

³Allflex Tag Co.; Santa Monica, California

⁴Ritchey Mfg. Co.; Brighton, Colorado

Table 15.1. Percent tags retained over time.

	Tags			
	Taylor	Allflex	Ritchey	Temple
No. of Animals	100	85	85	100
Percent tags retained after:				
Months indicated				
1	65 ^a	100 ^b	100 ^b	100 ^b
3	46 ^a	100 ^b	100 ^b	99 ^b
5	43 ^a	98 ^b	98 ^b	98 ^b
14	11 ^a	98 ^b	93 ^b	98 ^b
23*	3 ^a	96 ^{bc}	90 ^c	98 ^b

* No. of animals = 76, 59, 59, 76, respectively.

a,b,c Values in same row followed by different superscripts differ significantly (P<.05).

What to Look for in Ear Tags

Lost ear tags are worthless, so durability and retainability are the chief criteria. How are the tags held in place and how durable they are, especially at their attachment point? How well does the tag fit your record-keeping system? Can you get different colors to identify different groups? Can you specify numbers, or can you apply your own? Will the tag be easy to read? Some tags curl or get covered with hair especially in the winter. No matter how economical or how easy a tag is to apply, if it's lost, or you have to run cattle through a chute to read it, it's a poor investment.