## THE EFFECT OF SOY PROTEIN CONCENTRATE OF PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES OF HUNGARIAN STYLE DRY SALAMI BECK, L. H., MESZAROS, F. and REYNOLDS, J. M., Central Soya Food Research, Inc., P.O. Box 1400, Fort Wayne, Indiana 46801-1400, U.S.A., Meat Processing <sup>0</sup>, <sup>of</sup> Baranya County Mail, P.O. Box 152, Pecs, Hungary 7601 MIRODUCTION The effect of soy proteins on fermented or dry sausages has been studied in the past (Ambrosiadis et al 1982, Bern, past (Ambrosiadis et al 1978, Berry et al 1979, Joseph et al 1978, Modic Radane 1979, Modic et al 1978, Modic 1970 - 1979, Modic et al 1978, Modic 1979, Modic et al 1979, Modic et al 1970, india Rao et al 1984). Research has indicated that 8-10% of the meat can be replaced with hydrated textured Soy protein without changing the <sup>appearance</sup> or taste of the finished <sup>Sausace</sup> Modic Sausage (Modic et al 1978, Modic 1979) 1979) Meat processors using a Combination of isolated soy protein and textured soy protein concentrate (ISPC) in fermented sausage found With in fermented sausage for and weight losses reduced, With improved firmness and slicability (Kadane 1979). Research Conducted at the Central Soya Meat Laboratory, U.S.A., was designed to determine y, U.S.A., was designed to determine the effect of replacing 8% to 14.9% of the meat with various forms of soy protein concentrate

(SPC) and the method of incorporating the soy with the meat Table 1--Soy Protein Concentrate

Specifications

| bize   | SPCG      | TSPC        | FSPC   |
|--|-----------|-------------|--------|
| 0.   | 24-0.83mm | 3mm (flake) | Powder |
| Min. % Protein<br>Dry Basis<br>Max. % Moisture<br>Max. % Fat | 70.0      | 70.0        | 70.0   |
| Max. % Moisture  | 10.0      | 10.0        | 10.0   |
| Max. % Fat<br>Fiber  | 1.5       | 1.5         | 2.0    |
| Spree Sde  | 4.5       | 6.0         | 5.0    |

CG - Soy Protein Concentrate Granule; TSPC Soy Protein Concentrate unsure FSPC Textured Soy Protein Concentrate; FSPC Textured Soy Protein Concentrate.

on chemical and physical properties of Hungarian Style dry salami. Three forms of SPC were tested (table 1), soy protein concentrate granules (SPCG), textured soy protein concentrate (TSPC), and functional soy protein concentrate (FSPC). The methods of incorporating the soy included hydrating the soy prior to chopping with the meat, dry addition, and injecting the soy into whole boneless pork shoulder. Previous unpublished Central Soya research demonstrated that dry salami made by dry addition of FSPC had objectionable visual pockets of dry soy in the finished salami. To eliminate this problem a portion of the FSPC was pre-hydrated with water (1 protein: 6.8 water; w/w) and injected into whole boneless pork shoulder.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Six treatments (TRT) of dry salami were formulated as shown in table 2. The SPC for TRT 2 and 3 was prehydrated with the water (1 protein: 1 water; w/w) prior to chopping. FSPC for TRT 4 was added to the chopper dry ie. not pre-hydrated. A portion of the SPC and all the water for TRT 5 and 6 was injected into the pork shoulder using a Koch P1-10 pickle injector. All TRT were formulated to 23+1.5% fat in batch sizes of 10kg/TRT. The meat, SPC (Procon 20/60 = SPCG, Textured Procon 7180 = TSPC, and PROMINE DS = FSPC), salt, cure, spices, and starter culture (Diversitech LP low temperature pediococcus) were added while chopping. The mixure was chopped to 3-5mm sized pieces and 10-11 C. then stuffed into 41mm clear fibrous casings, placed in the smokehouse (Drying Systems Co. Thermal Processing oven) smoked and dried per a typical Hungarian Dry Salami schedule (table 3).

Water activity (Aw) was measured daily in triplicate using a Decagon CX-1 water activity system. pH was also measured daily in triplicate using an Orion SA 250 pH meter. The percent fat, moisture and protein

|   | Treatment |  |  |  |   |   |  |
|---|-----------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
|   |           | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5   | 6   |  |
| Ingredients   | All Meat  | SPCG   | TSPC                                       | FSPC   | sol/dry   | SPCG  |  |
| Pork Shoulder<br>Pork Backfat<br>SPCG<br>TSPC<br>FSPC<br>Water<br>SAP<br>Spices/Salt/<br>Cure | 95.900%   | 85.600<br>2.300<br>4.000<br><br>4.000<br><br>3.583 | 85.600<br>2.300<br>4.000<br>4.000<br>3.583 | 85.600<br>2.300<br><br>4.000<br>4.000<br>3.583 | $76.540 \\ 4.300 \\ \\ 4.000^{2} \\ 10.900 \\ 0.160 \\ 3.583$ | 76.5<br>4.3<br>2.4<br>1.6<br>10.9<br>0.1<br>3.5 |  |
| Starter<br>Culture  | 0.517     | 0.517  | 0.517                                      | 0.517  | 0.517   | 0.5   |  |

## Table 2--Formulations for Hungarian Style Dry Salami

<sup>1</sup>SAP - Sodium Acid Pyrophosphate

<sup>2</sup>1.6% FSPC, 10.9% water and 0.16% SAP solution injected into the pork shoulder. The rest of the FSPC (test 5) or SPCG (test 6) was added to the chopper dry.

| l'able 3       | -Smoke and dry sched | ule for Hungarian | Style Dry Salami   |          |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------|
| Day            | Dry Bulb             | Wet Bulb          | R. H. <sup>1</sup> | Smok     |
| 1              | 22.0 <sup>°</sup> C  | 20.5°C            | 93%                | 30<br>60 |
| 2 3            | 20.0                 | 18.3              | 90                 | 60       |
|                | 20.0                 | 18.3              | 90                 | 60       |
| 4              | 17.8                 | 16.1              | 86                 | 120      |
| 5              | 16.7                 | 15.0              | 81                 | 180      |
| 6 <b>-</b> 9   | 15.6                 | 13.3              | 80                 | 60       |
| 10 <b>-</b> 14 | 15.6                 | 13.3              | 80                 |          |

<sup>1</sup>R. H. - Relative Humidity was not measured. These are calculated values based on wet and dry bulb temperatures.

were measured in triplicate on day 0 (initial) 3, 6, 9, 12 and 14 per AOAC procedures (AOAC 1984). Yield (weight loss) was calculated for these same time frames. Dry salami texture was evaluated on day 14 by shearing a 2.5 cm core of salami with the Instron Universal testing machine. All data, except yield, was statistically analyzed using analysis of variance followed by Student-Newman-Keuls mean separation procedure (Snedecor et al 1967).

The Aw for the dry salami was not significantly different (P < .05)between TRT's on day 0 or 14 (table 4). As dry time increased, Aw decreased with final Aw on day ranging from 0.00 ranging from 0.92 to 0.90. The use of SPC in dry and the dry of th of SPC in dry salami did not effect Aw initially Aw initially nor after 14 days. This agrees with the work of (Ambrosiadis et al 1982)

Where there was no difference in Aw after 28 days drying between all Meat salami and salami containing textured soy protein.

ry

0 0

02

3

1

/

The Hungarian dry salami smoke/dry Schedule used was designed to yield Salami with a finished pH of 4.6-4.8. Dry Salami pH after 14 days drying Canged from 4.6-4.7 (table 4). The Use of open in the offect the final Use of SPC did not effect the final pH of Hungarian Style dry salami. Researchers using structured soy protein fiber (Joseph et al 1978), also found pH was not effected by the use of soy protein. These results of soy protein the findings results conflict with the findings And Androsiadis et al 1982, Modic et al 1978) where the use of soy protein lowered to all meat lowered the pH compared to all meat Salami. They attribute the

 $T_{able}$  4--Water Activity (Aw) and pH for  $H_{\text{Munop}}$ Hungarian Style Dry Salami

| T  | Av   | N   | pł   | Н  |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| Treatment  | Day O  | 14  | Day O  | 14   |
| All Meat<br>SPCG<br>TSPC<br>FSPC<br>FSPC sol/dry<br>SPCG dry | 0.98 <sup>a</sup><br>0.98 <sup>a</sup><br>0.98 <sup>a</sup><br>0.98 <sup>a</sup><br>0.99 <sup>a</sup><br>0.99 <sup>a</sup> | 0.91 <sup>b</sup><br>0.92 <sup>b</sup><br>0.90 <sup>b</sup><br>0.90 <sup>b</sup><br>0.92 <sup>b</sup><br>0.92 <sup>b</sup><br>0.92 <sup>b</sup> | 6.3 <sup>a</sup><br>6.2 <sup>b</sup><br>6.3 <sup>a</sup><br>6.3 <sup>a</sup><br>6.3 <sup>a</sup> | 4.7 <sup>c</sup><br>4.7 <sup>c</sup><br>4.7 <sup>c</sup><br>4.6 <sup>d</sup><br>4.6 <sup>d</sup><br>4.6 <sup>d</sup> |

Means in the same column with the same letter P < .05. are not significantly different (P <.05).

lower pH to the higher carbohydrate content of soy protein. It is suspected that the soy protein used by (Ambrosiadis et al 1982, Modic et al 1978) was soy flour which has a higher carbohydrate content than SPC.

All TRT were formulated to 23+1.5% fat (table 5). As dry time increased, the percent fat also increased. TSPC dry salami and FSPC sol/SPCG dry had a significantly greater percent fat than the other dry salami tested on day 14. The amount of fat and the amount of moisture are inversely related. Therefore, it is logical that TSPC and FSPC sol/SPCG dry would have significantly (P < .05) less moisture day 14 than the other dry salami as shown in table 6.

The percent total protein and meat protein varied slightly throughout the study, with the percent of both meat and total protein increasing as dry time increased (table 7). By day 14, there was no significant difference between TRT, except SPCG had more total protein than the other TRT.

In the U.S.A. meat regulations require that dry fermented salami attain a moisture to meat protein ratio of 1.9:1 prior to packaging and sale. On day 12, all dry salami except TSPC met the required 1.9:1

| Table 5Percent fa  |  | difui beyte  | Day  |   |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| All  | 0  | 6  | 9  | 12  | 14  |
| All Meat<br>SPCG<br>PSPC<br>SPC sol/dry<br>SPC sol/sPCG dry<br>Statistic | 22.01<br>21.12<br>24.32<br>22.95<br>21.74<br>21.51 | 29.39 <sup>bc</sup><br>29.28 <sup>bc</sup><br>33.34 <sup>a</sup><br>30.71 <sup>b</sup><br>28.42 <sup>c</sup><br>31.23 <sup>b</sup> | 31.19 <sup>b</sup><br>30.75 <sup>b</sup><br>33.87 <sup>a</sup><br>31.60 <sup>b</sup><br>30.29 <sup>b</sup><br>33.64 <sup>a</sup> | 33.02 <sup>ab</sup><br>29.70 <sup>c</sup><br>34.02 <sup>ab</sup><br>32.98 <sup>ab</sup><br>31.90 <sup>b</sup><br>35.08 <sup>a</sup> | 34.45 <sup>b</sup><br>31.42 <sup>c</sup><br>37.62 <sup>a</sup><br>33.80 <sup>b</sup><br>32.48 <sup>bc</sup><br>36.13 <sup>a</sup> |

14

ł

ical analysis was not done on day 0 (P <.05)

 $\frac{1}{p}$  in the same column with the same letter are not significantly different  $\frac{p}{1}$ 

|                   |       |                    | Day                |                    |        |
|-------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Treatment         | 0     | 6                  | 9                  | 12                 | 14     |
|                   |       |                    |                    |                    | 2      |
| All Meat          | 56.62 | 43.88 <sup>d</sup> | 41.88 <sup>d</sup> | 36.51 <sup>d</sup> | 36.59  |
| SPCG              | 57.39 | 45.05 <sup>a</sup> | 41.74 <sup>a</sup> | 36.48 <sup>a</sup> | 35.53h |
| TSPC              | 54.43 | 41.06 <sup>D</sup> | 40.38 <sup>a</sup> | 36.87 <sup>a</sup> | 32.70  |
| FSPC              | 53.22 | 44.51 <sup>a</sup> | 41.15 <sup>a</sup> | 37.94 <sup>a</sup> | 36.69  |
| FSPC sol/dry      | 55.70 | 44.66 <sup>a</sup> | 41.42 <sup>a</sup> | 37.73 <sup>a</sup> | 36.38h |
| FSPC sol/SPCG dry | 56.04 | 42.88 <sup>a</sup> | 37.53 <sup>b</sup> | 34.81 <sup>b</sup> | 32.11  |
| -                 |       |                    |                    |                    |        |

Table 6--Percent moisture for Hungarian Style Dry Salami

Statistical analysis was not done on day 0 Means in the same column with the same letter are not significantly different (P  $^{<}.05)$ .

Table 7--Percent total protein and percent meat protein for Hungarian Style <sup>DV</sup> Salami

|   |   |  |  | Day   | ·  |  | -                                   | 1                        |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
|   |   | 6  |  | 9   | 12   |  | 1                                   | 14 MP                    |
| Treatment   | TP  | MP                                       | TP   | MP  | TP   | MP   | TP                                  | a                        |
| All Meat<br>SPCG<br>TSPC<br>FSPC<br>FSPC sol/<br>dry<br>FSPC sol/<br>SPCG dry | 23.00 <sup>a</sup><br>20.67 <sup>ab</sup> | 19.67 <sup>a</sup><br>18.68 <sup>a</sup> | 23.98 <sup>a</sup><br>21.71 <sup>a</sup><br>21.20 <sup>a</sup><br>22.06 <sup>a</sup> | 23.24 <sup>a</sup><br>21.26 <sup>ab</sup><br>18.99 <sup>a</sup><br>18.48 <sup>b</sup><br>19.34 <sup>b</sup><br>18.67 <sup>b</sup> | 23.99 <sup>ab</sup><br>25.20 <sup>a</sup><br>21.79 <sup>b</sup><br>23.21 <sup>ab</sup><br>22.72 <sup>ab</sup><br>24.23 <sup>ab</sup> | 23.99 <sup>a</sup><br>22.48 <sup>ab</sup><br>19.07 <sup>c</sup><br>20.49 <sup>bc</sup><br>20.00 <sup>bc</sup><br>21.51 <sup>bc</sup> | 26.32b<br>24.75b<br>23.02b<br>23.84 | 21.1/<br>23 <sup>b</sup> |

TP = total protein; MP = meat protein Means in the same column with the same letter are not significantly different (P < .05).

moisture to meat protein ratio (table 8). However, all salami except FSPC would be ready for sale day 9 based on moisture to total protein. The replacement of meat with hydrated soy protein did not decrease the dry time based on moisture to meat protein ratio. Work by (Modic et al 1978, Modic 1979) indicated that dry sausage with textured soy protein can be sent to market one to two days earlier than all meat sausage. Preliminary work by Central Soya at an U.S.A. commercial meat company also indicated that dry salami with SPCG or TSPC was ready for market 5-7 days prior to the all

meat salami. The drying times obtained in this study may perhaps have been influenced by the efficiency of the pilot scale smoking and drying equipment and actual processing schedule used.

Instron shear force data from a 2.5 cm core of salami revealed no significant difference (P < .05) between TRT (table 9).

This data implies that the replace ment of meat with hydrated SPC did not effect the firmness of the dry salami. Firmness measured by compressing dry salami (Ambrosiadis et al 1982) also

Table 8--Moisture to total protein and moisture to meat protein ratios for Aungarian Style Dry Salami

|   |   |  |  | Da   | ау  |  |  | 76.5   |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| Treatment   |   | 6  |  | 9  | 12  |  | 14   |  |
| uient   | M/TP  | M/MP   | M/TP   | M/MP   | M/TP  | M/MP   | M/TP   | M/MP   |
| All Meat<br>SPCG<br>TSPC<br>FSPC<br>FSPC sol/<br>dry<br>FSPC sol/<br>SPCG dry | 2.22 <sup>a</sup><br>1.95 <sup>a</sup><br>1.99 <sup>a</sup><br>2.09 <sup>a</sup><br>2.01 <sup>a</sup> | 2.22 <sup>a</sup><br>2.22 <sup>a</sup><br>2.30 <sup>a</sup><br>2.26 <sup>a</sup><br>2.39 <sup>a</sup><br>2.31 <sup>a</sup> | 1.81 <sup>a</sup><br>1.74 <sup>a</sup><br>1.86 <sup>a</sup><br>1.94 <sup>a</sup><br>1.88 <sup>a</sup><br>1.75 <sup>a</sup> | 1.81 <sup>b</sup><br>1.96 <sup>ab</sup><br>2.12 <sup>ab</sup><br>2.23 <sup>a</sup><br>2.14 <sup>ab</sup><br>2.01 <sup>ab</sup> | 1.52 <sup>ab</sup><br>1.44 <sup>b</sup><br>1.69 <sup>a</sup><br>1.63 <sup>a</sup><br>1.66 <sup>a</sup><br>1.43 <sup>b</sup> | 1.52 <sup>b</sup><br>1.62 <sup>b</sup><br>1.94 <sup>a</sup><br>1.85 <sup>a</sup><br>1.89 <sup>a</sup><br>1.62 <sup>b</sup> | 1.53 <sup>a</sup><br>1.35 <sup>b</sup><br>1.32 <sup>b</sup><br>1.59 <sup>a</sup><br>1.52 <sup>a</sup><br>1.33 <sup>b</sup> | 1.53 <sup>b</sup><br>1.50 <sup>b</sup><br>1.49 <sup>b</sup><br>1.81 <sup>a</sup><br>1.72 <sup>a</sup><br>1.50 <sup>b</sup> |

M/TP = moisture/total protein; moisture/meat protein Means : letter are not Means in the same column with the same letter are not significantly different  $p_{1}$  or

 $T_{able 9--Instron sheer force for Hungarian <math display="inline">S_{tyle D}$ Style Dry Salami

| Treatment   | Day 14   |
|---|--|
| All   | Sheer Force (kg)   |
| All Meat<br>Spcc<br>TSpc<br>FSpc<br>FSpc sol/dry<br>Spcc sol/<br>Spcc dry | 1.44 <sup>a</sup><br>1.42 <sup>a</sup><br>1.65 <sup>a</sup><br>1.60 <sup>a</sup><br>1.33 <sup>a</sup><br>1.72 <sup>a</sup> |

hs with the same letter are not significantly different (P < .05).

Showed no significant differences between all meat dry salami and dry Salami Containing textured soy

# CONCLUSION

t

DI

e

86a

60p 33p 30p

17

33<sup>b</sup>

5

the

The replacement of meat with 8% or 14.9° his adverse 14.9% hydrated SPC did not adversely effect the quality of Hungarian style dry salami based on the data from thought that t this study. It was thought that the Replacement of meat with hydrated Spc would decrease dry time as shown (Modic 1979) by (Modic et al 1978, Modic 1979) and Upper et al 2005, Modic 1979 and Unpublished Central

Soya research at a commercial processor. The use of hydrated soy protein concentrate did reduce the cost per kg of Hungarian style dry salami (table 10). FSPC sol/dry and FSPC sol/SPCG dry were the least expensive salami to manufacture based on ingredient cost. The TRT using FSPC sol require additional equipment, namely a pickle injector, and due to the volume of water injected, tend to wrinkle during drying creating a visually unacceptable product. The best alternative based on the processing and appearance negatives of FSPC sol is the FSPC dry salami. Complete dispersion of dry FSPC is critical to avoid past problems of visable dry soy pockets in the salami.

Table 10--Cost analysis of Hungarian Style Dry Salami

|              | Raw Cost | 14 day  | Finished   |
|--------------|----------|---------|------------|
| Treatment    | \$/Kg    | Yield % | Cost \$/Kg |
| All Meat     | 1.44     | 61.80   | 2.33       |
| SPCG         | 1.33     | 61.64   | 2.16       |
| TSPC         | 1.34     | 64.05   | 2.09       |
| FSPC         | 1.34     | 66.47   | 2.01       |
| FSPC sol/dry | 1.22     | 62.26   | 1.96       |
| FSPC sol/    | 1.22     | 61.10   | 1.99       |
| SPCG dry     |          |         |            |

The ingredient cost for FSPC is \$0.32/kg less than all meat and no additional equipment is required for manufacture. Further research needs to be done to determine the ideal smoke/dry cycle to maximize yields and minimize total dry time for dry salami with SPC, as well as the effect of SPC on organoleptic and microbiological properties of Hungarian Style Dry Salami.

### REFERENCES

Ambrosiadis, I., Wirth, F., & Sinell, H. J. (1982): Application of Textured Soy Protein in Un-cooked Sausage. 28th European Meeting of Meat Research Workers.

## AOAC (1984): 14th ed.

Berry B. W., Cross, H. R., Joseph, A. L., Wagner S. B., Maga, J. A. (1979): Sensory and Physical Measurements of Dry Fermented Salami Prepared with Mechanically Processed Beef Product and Structured Soy Protein Fiber. J. of Food Science 1979 Vol. 44.

Joseph, A. L., Berry, B. W., Wagner, S. B., Davis, L. A. (1978): Lactic Acid, pH and Bacterial Values of Dry Fermented Salami Containing Mechanically Deboned Beef and Structured Soy Protein Fiber. J. of Food Protection 1978 Vol. 41, No. 11.

Kadane, V. V. (1979): Vegetable Proteins in Cooked and/or Fermented Sausages. J. of Am. Oil Chem. Soc. Proceedings - World Conference on Vegetable Food Proteins March 1979 Vol. 56.

Modic, P., Trumic, Z., Polic, M., & Turubatovic, L. (1978): Influence of the Addition of Textured Soy Proteins on Some Physicochemical and Sensory Properties of Dry Sausages. European Meeting of Meat Research Workers. Modic, P. (1979): From Concept to Market with a

Meat-Soy Protein in Dry Sausage. J. of Am. Oil Chem. Soc. 1979 Vol. 56.

Rao, L. O., Draughon, F. A., Melton, C. C., (1984): Sensory Characters of Thuringer Sausage Extended with Textured <sup>50'</sup> Protein. J. of Food Science 19<sup>84</sup> Vol. 49.

Snedecor, G. W., Cochran W. G., U.S.D.A. (1967): Statistical Methods, Iowa State University Press Ames Iowa,