1:11

The influence of the genotype of the sire and dam on beef tenderness

J F DE BRUYN, R T NAUDÉ, J H HOFMEYR, H H MEISSNER* AND C Z ROUX*

Animal and Dairy Science Research Institute, Private Bag X2, Irene, 1675 Republic of South Africa *Faculty of Agriculture, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, 0002 Republic of South Africa

<u>SUMMARY</u>: The meat tenderness of certain sire (Afrikaner-A, Brahman-B, Charolais-C, Hereford-H & Simmentaler-S) and Carner (A & Bonsmara-Bo and BA, CA, HA & SA two-way crosses) genotypes were evaluated. Weaner steers of the genotypes were slaughtered immediately post weaning (\pm 210 kg) and, after intensive feeding, at 340, 380 and the live masses respectively. Meat tenderness evaluations included shear force determinations on meat samples subject to a moist (one hour at 60, 70 and 80 °C respectively) and dry cooking method (160 °C to internal temperature 70 °C) respectively. The latter oven-roasted sample was also evaluated by a sensory panel (five point scale) for tenderness of tenderness differences were only due to sire effect. These sire differences were primarily the result of the less tender meat of S- and B-sired genotypes. When including the B and S respectively the A-sire (ABA-25 % B) and SA two-way cross (50 % S) respectively.

°C thr

tha

°C)

the

Or

nor

With

COL

B.C

Was

ten

for

ten 60

2.5

res

favo CA

che Ho vie

two

On

2).

TAF

INTRODUCTION: Meat tenderness is the characteristic that the consumer in South Africa (NEL et al., 1989) as we internationally (LAWRIE, 1985) considers to be the most important for the palatability of beef. It is therefore important to note that meat tenderness is also the quality characteristic that reveals the largest within-population variation, prime due to the influence of the genotype, sex and age of the animal. In studies on the influence of genotype near tenderness, it became evident that the largest between-genotype variation in meat tenderness was due to the influence of the Brahman (RAMSEY et al., 1963; MCKEITH et al., 1985). In a consumer survey, MARCHELLO of the Influence of tenderness and other acceptance.

According to CUNDIFF *et al.* (1987), adverse effects, e.g. the lack of tenderness in meat, could be reduced in a large extent by means of crossbreeding through the utilization of, *inter alia*, heterosis. Considering the important of the Brahman in the South African beef industry, it was therefore inevitable that the meat tenderness characteristics of this genotype together with those of other major genotypes such as the Afrikaner, Charolais, Bonsmara, Herefore of crossbreeding as a possible means of overcoming any undesirable characteristics (e.g. less tender meat) which anticipated in certain genotypes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS: Six purebreds, eight two-way crosses and 20 three-way crosses were evaluated with " Afrikaner (A) as the predominant dam genotype and the A, Brahman (B), Charolais (C), Hereford (H) and Simmetric (S) as the respective sire genotypes. The Bonsmara (Bo) was also included, both as a purebred and a dam genotype in combination with the above-mentioned sire genotypes (except with A). From each sire genotype between a dam genotype bulls were used. Weaner steers of these genotypes (34) were intensively fed (average: ME = 10,50 MJ/kg & 40 k 11,86 %) in individual feeding pens and slaughtered immediately post weaning (±210 kg) and at 340, 380 and live masses respectively for further analysis. Meat tenderness evaluations included the following:

- a) Three equal portions of the left *M. longissimus thoracis* (LT: 8, 9 & 10th ribcut seven days cold storage at ^{0.5} were cooked in a plastic bag in waterbaths for one hour at 60, 70 and 80 °C respectively. A 25,4 ^{mm} were cylindrical core from each sample was tested for tenderness with the aid of an Instron Universal Testing Mod Model 1140 (shear force: Newton/25,4 mm), fitted with a Warner Bratzler shearing device.
- b) After a 7-day ageing period (0-5 °C) the bone-in wingrib (11, 12 & 13th rib cut left side) of each carcast oven-roasted (160 °C) to an internal temperature of 70 °C. Cubes (15x15x15 mm) of the LT in this cut were sequently evaluated by a sensory panel, using a five point measuring scale (1 = least and 5 = most favour for tenderness, *inter alia*. Shear force determinations (LT) were also carried out on this meat sample (25,4) core).

Meat tenderness results were analysed by least-square analysis of variance (HARVEY, 1988), with significant (^{p_CUP} group and genotypic differences separated by the Student's t-test. For the purpose of this presentation, the 34 genotypic were combined in common sire (A, B, C, H & S) and dam groups (A & Bo and BA, CA, HA & SA) and and The degrees of heterosis were determined for the two-way and backcrosses when combining the A respectively the B, C, H and S in crossbreeding. The degrees of heterosis were also calculated for the Bo two-way crosses sired by the B, C, H and S respectively.

<u>RESULTS</u>: The analysis of variance and least-square means of the different meat tenderness characteristics in respective sire/dam groups are presented in Table 1. A significant (P<0,05 & P<0,01) sire effect was e^{vident} is sensory tenderness score and the four shear force determinations respectively (Table 1). Shear force re^{sults} (T

¹C and sensory sample) highlight especially the less tender meat of B- and S-sired genotypes (Table 1). For these three shear force determinations, the A-, C- and H-sired genotypes had significantly (P < 0,05) more tender meat (LT) than the B- and S-sired genotypes. The shear force determination on the lowest waterbath cooking temperature (60 ¹C) again favoured the H-, A- and especially the C-sired genotypes (Table 1). In the sensory tenderness evaluation, ¹The A- and C-sired genotypes gave significantly (P < 0,05) higher scores than the B- & S- and B-sired genotypes respectively. ¹The sensor the that the most favourable tenderness results were obtained from genotypes sired by either an A-, C-¹The B- and S-sire were responsible for the least tender meat to approximately the same extent. ¹The B- and S-sire were responsible for the least tender meat to approximately the same extent.

When considering the effect of the respective dam groups, both the A/Bo- and two-way cross dams had a ^{non-significant} effect on all meat tenderness characteristics (Table 1), with the result that meat tenderness differences ^{could} be utilized for an improvement in meat tenderness is illustrated in Table 2 and discussed as follows:

^{A De} utilized for an improvement in meat tenderness is illustrated in Table 2 and the BA-dam to the A-sire (ABA) ^{Was} the only cross that consistently showed positive heterosis for these characteristics. When considering all meat ^{Inderness} characteristics, only the ABA (25 % B) compared favourably with the A. When the A- or Bo-dam was used ^{Inderness} score and the BA showed a consistently positive heterosis response for the shear force determinations at ^{Inderness} and 70 °C (Table 2).

^{and} 70 °C (Table 2). ^{resulted} in high degrees of heterosis for the different tenderness determinations. The CA two-way cross showed a ^{resulted} in high degrees of heterosis for the different tenderness determinations. The CA two-way cross showed a ^{resulted} in high degrees of heterosis for the sensory determinations only. In contrast to the inconsistent heterosis effect of the ^{characteristics} (Table 2).

thuctoristics (Table 2). ^t

TABLE 1:

S) and

these

140 Kg

jecte.

Urel

rness

Were

vely

ing

vell at

ortal

imani

1 bee

gal

;ed

nt rob

refor

We

th the

otypi

40

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AND LEAST-SQUARE SIRE/DAM MEANS AND STANDARD ERRORS OF THE MEAT TENDERNESS

GNOUP	SHEAR FORCE (N/25,4 mm)			SENSORY TENDER-	SENSORY SHEAR
E-VALUE:	60 °C	70 °C	80 °C	NESS SCORE	FORCE (N/25,4 mm)
SIRES	1. 1	No. of the second second	a second a second as		
A/BO-DAM	6,98**	7,27**	12,3**	3,21*	10,2**
WO-WAY DAV	0,10	0,38	0,44	0,23	0,13
URE: DAM	1,14	1,61	0,46	0,67	1,29
3	51,4 ± 1,47 ^{ab}	82,6 ± 2,94 ^a	$91,9 \pm 3,47^{a}$	$3,02 \pm 0,10^{a}$	130 ± 5,29 ^a
•	55,1 ± 1,50 ^{bd}	$92,5 \pm 2,92^{b}$	$109 \pm 3,52^{b}$	$2,59 \pm 0,10^{b}$	$155 \pm 5,26^{b}$
1	47,0 ± 1,60 ^c	$79,0 \pm 3,17^{a}$	$87,8 \pm 3,75^{a}$	$2,91 \pm 0,11^{ac}$	$132 \pm 5,67^{a}$
3	49,3 ± 1,56 ^{ac}	$78,0 \pm 3,17^{a}$	$90,5 \pm 3,54^{a}$	$2,81 \pm 0,10^{abc}$	$136 \pm 5,33^{a}$
VERALL ME	$56,6 \pm 1,44^{d}$	95,9 ± 2,87 ^b	$115 \pm 3,38^{b}$	2,66 ± 0,09 ^{cb}	$168 \pm 5,08^{b}$
VBO DAM:	51,9 ± 0,68	85,7 ± 1,34	98,9 ± 1,58	2,78 ± 0,04	144 ± 2,38
30	52,0 ± 1,62	84,9 ± 3,12	98,3 ± 3,84	2,88 ± 0,11	145 ± 6,05
VERALL MARY	51,3 ± 1,57	87,5 ± 2,95	102 ± 3,81	2,81 ± 0,10	148 ± 5,94
WO-WAY DAMA	51,7 ± 1,13	86,2 ± 2,15	$100 \pm 2,70$	2,84 ± 0,08	147 ± 4,24
A	54,7 ± 1.61	92.4 + 3.23	104 + 3.96	279 + 010	139 + 5.98
IA	51,9 ± 1,51	84,0 ± 2,99	100 ± 3.70	$2,71 \pm 0.10$	144 + 5.42
A	50,7 ± 1,78	83,4 ± 3,51	97,1 ± 4,34	2.88 ± 0.11	143 ± 6.40
VERALL ME	51,3 ± 1,49	86,2 ± 2,97	99,4 ± 3,67	$2,69 \pm 0,10$	$154 \pm 5,42$
Mean-Mean	52,1 ± 0,80	86,5 ± 1,59	100 ± 1,96	2,77 ± 0,05	145 ± 2,91

61

	SHEAR FORCE (N/25,4 mm)			SENSORY TENDER-	SENSORY S
	60 °C	70 °C	80 °C	NESS SCORE	FORCE (N/25
B-CROSSES:					
A (0 % B)	51,7 ^a	82,5 ^a	89,4 ^a	3,09 ^a	140
ABA (25 % B)	52,9 ^a (+7,1)	88,0 ^{ab} (+2,6)	93,7 ^{ab} (+5,5)	2,74 ^{ab} (-2,8)	129(+11,
BA (50 % B)	54,0 ^a (+13,1)	91,2 ^{ab} (+7,2)	109 ^{bc} (-0,2)	2,50 ^{bc} (-2,1)	158 (-3,6)
BBA (75 % B)	59,6 ^{a(} +11,6)	$104^{bc}(+2,4)$	127 ^c (-7,2)	2,22 ^{bc} (-2,7)	161 (-1,0)
B (100 % B)	72,6 ^b	114 ^c	129 ^c	2,01 ^c	166
C-CROSSES:					
A (0 % C)	51,7	82,5	89,4	3,09 ^a	140 ^{ab}
ACA (25 % C)	52,5 (-3,1)	80,2 (+2,0)	89,0 (+2,4)	3,22 ^a (+11,4)	125 ^a (+1
CA (50 % C)	53,0 (-5,4)	84,5 (-4,1)	93,7 (-0,9)	3,05 ^a (+13,4)	136 ^{ab} (+
CCA (75 % C)	43,8(+11,6)	76,0 (+5,5)	87,1 (+8,0)	2,65 ^{ab} (+6,4)	138 ^{ab} (+1
C (100 % C)	48,9	79,7	96,4	2,30 ^b	158 ^b
H-CROSSES:					
A (0 % H)	51,7	82,5	89,4	3,09	140
AHA (25 % H)	46,0 (+8,3)	75,4 (+5,5)	90,2 (-2,1)	2,86 (-8,0)	120(+12,0
HA (50 % H)	49,1 (-0,7)	76,8 (+0,4)	86,9 (+0,3)	3,07 (-1,8)	127 (+5,
HHA (75 % H)	49,1 (-3,7)	68,7 (+7,6)	75,6(+12,1)	3,20 (+1,8)	120(+10,
H (100 % H)	45,9	71,6	84,9	3,17	131

LEAST-SQUARE GENOTYPIC MEANS AND ESTIMATED HETEROSIS EFFECT (%) OF THE DIFFERENT MEAT TENDERINES TABLE 2:

of th

and

the r incre espec

lende The f Work Drake Friesi Sanga

of the for s S (e.

impor obtair is sur the S of her

2 D D A ALLER A BOC

Th CUNC

Ca HARV KELL EXT nm) KOCH bio LAWP MARC as 1) MAY. Ang trai MCKE anc MILLE COP NEL, RAMS

dai

by RILEY

and URICI

bee VON

bre WILLI

cha

-Means within columns of each genetic group with different superscripts differ significantly (P < 0,05) -Positive sign indicates an improved effect, e.g. a decrease in shear force and an increase in sensory tenderness score. Neg +/-

tive sign indicates an opposite effect.

TABLE 2 CONT.:LEAST-SQUARE GENOTYPIC MEANS AND ESTIMATED HETEROSIS EFFECT (%) OF THE DIFFERENT MEAT TENDERIVES

	SHEAR FORCE (N/25,4 mm)			SENSORY TENDER-	SENSO
	60 °C	70 °C	80 °C	NESS SCORE	FORCE
S-CROSSES:					
A (0 % S)	51,7 ^a	82,5 ^a	89,4 ^a	3,09 ^a	140
ASA (25 % S)	52,3 ^a (+4,3)	85,4 ^a (+4,8)	93,4 ^a (+6,2)	3,10 ^a (+8,2)	130
SA (50 % S)	51,8 ^a (+9,9)	86,4 ^a (+11,0)	102 ^{ab} (+7,0)	2,97 ^{ab} (+12,7)	156
SSA (75 % S)	53,5 ^a (+11,5)	93,8 ^a (+11,5)	113 ^{bc} (+5,4)	2,46 ^{bc} (+2,0)	180
S (100 % S)	63,4 ^b	112 ^b	130 ^c	2,19 ^c	190
Bo TWO-WAY:					
BBo (50 % B)	+7,3	-3,3	-0,7	+ 12,3	-3,9
CBo (50 % C)	+9,5	+6,7	+6,9	+22,3	+9,
HBo (50 % H)	+9,1	+4,8	+4,8	-14,9	-3,0
SBo (50 % S)	+ 12,3	+3,4	+5,3	+4,9	+ 12

-Positive sign indicates an improved effect, e.g. a decrease in shear force and an increase in sensory tenderness score +/tive sign indicates an opposite effect.

S-crosses: Shear force (60, 70 & 80 °C) showed a positive heterosis response for all three crosses. The SA and all the ASA (A-sire) showed higher positive responses for the evaluations on the same set of th the ASA (A-sire) showed higher positive responses for the evaluations on the sensory sample. Similar to the SA (A-sire) between the SBO (Bo-dam) demonstrated a positive heterosis response for all the SBo (Bo-dam) demonstrated a positive responses for the evaluations on the sensory sample. Similar to the SA (Automotion of the sensory sample. Similar to the SA (Automotion of the sensory sample. Similar to the SA (Automotion of the sensory sample. Similar to the sensory sensory sample. Similar to the sen heterosis effect in the SA especially, resulted in this cross (50 % S blood) comparing favourably in meat tender a general meat tender. with the purebred A. Thus, in order to ensure a general meat tenderness similar to the purebred A, the B- and 50 % S blood DISCUSSION: A general consideration of meat tenderness characteristics in this study points primarily towards a significant sine effect on meat tenderness (Table 1), with these size differences matching and a significant size of the points primarily towards a size of the points primarily towards a significant size of the points primarily towards a size of th sire effect on meat tenderness (Table 1), with these sire differences mainly due to the comparatively less tender

the B- and S-sired genotypes (Table 1). This specific effect of the B has been investigated intensively world-wide and Conce and S-sired genotypes (Table 1). This specific effect of the B has been investigated intensively world-wide $h_{0} \xrightarrow{V_{10}} B_{-}$ and S-sired genotypes (Table 1). This specific effect of the B has been investigated intervention $h_{0} \xrightarrow{V_{10}} B_{-}$ and S-sired genotypes (Table 1). This specific effect of the B has been investigated intervention h_{0} as being less tender (KELLAWAY, 1973; RILEY *et al.*, 1986). WILLIAMS *et al.* (1988) further emphasized herease in tenderness existed with a concomitant he meat toughening effect of the B by indicating that a gradual decrease in tenderness existed with a concomitant ^{Ineat} toughening effect of the B by indicating that a gradual decrease in tenderness existed with a content of the B by indicating that a gradual decrease in tenderness existed with a content effect evident specially in the percentage B-genes. A similar response was observed in this study with a prominent effect evident ^{especially} in shear force (80 °C) and the sensory tenderness score (Table 2).

Athough these results could point towards a general Bos indicus effect on meat tenderness (less tender), meat dernes Although these results could point towards a general Bos indicus effect on meat tenderness (note tenderness), he favore results of the alternative Bos indicus genotype, viz. the A, were amongst the most favourable (Table 1). he favore favore to alternative Bos indicus genotype, viz. the A, were amongst the most favourable (Table 1). he favourable results of the A were confirmed by VON LA CHEVALLERIE (1964) and BOCCARD et al. (1979). In the work of the A were confirmed by VON LA CHEVALLERIE (1964) and BOCCARD et al. (1979). In the Work of VON LA CHEVALLERIE (1964) the A did not differ significantly in meat tenderness from the Brown Swiss, Drakensberger, Friesian and H, while BOCCARD et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat than the Biggin residue to the second tender meat than the Biggin residue to the second tender meat that the Boccard et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat than the Biggin residue tender meat that the Boccard et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat that the Boccard et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat that the Boccard et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat that the Boccard et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat that the Boccard et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat that the Boccard et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat that the Boccard et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat than the Boccard et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat than the Boccard et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat than the Boccard et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat than the Boccard et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat than the Boccard et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat than the Boccard et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat than the Boccard et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat than the Boccard et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat than the Boccard et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat than the Boccard et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat tender meat tender et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender meat tender meat tender et al. (1979) found tender et ^{Mensber}ger, Friesian and H, while BOCCARD et al. (1979) found that the A produced more tender in the A is Bos indicus ^{Menga} (prior tender) and the A is Bos indicus zebu (origin India) and the A is Bos indicus Sanga (origin Africa).

Contrary to the general consensus in the literature regarding the less tender meat of the B, the less tender meat Contrary to the general consensus in the literature regarding the less tender meat of the b, the loss tender meat $\delta_{\rm r}$ solves and genotypes (Table 1) is not supported to the same extent. A few studies only reported less tender meat $\delta_{\rm r}$ solves as the same extent. A few studies only reported less tender meat tenderness for the same extent indicated favourable meat tenderness for the $\delta_{s} = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{s} = \frac{1}$ ⁶(e.g. MAY et al., 1977; MILLER et al., 1987).

The Use of the A (dam or sire) and the Bo-dam in crossbreeding programmes with the B and S proved to be The use of the A (dam or sire) and the Bo-dam in crossbreeding programmes with the B and C protection thportant aids in reducing the less favourable effects of the latter genotypes. A sufficient degree of heterosis was, however, thained and an area of the less favourable effects of the latter genotypes. A sufficient degree of heterosis was, however, thained and an area of the less favourable effects of the latter genotypes. A sufficient degree of heterosis was, however, thained and an area of the less favourable effects of the latter genotypes. A sufficient degree of heterosis was, however, thained and the less favourable effects of the latter genotypes. A sufficient degree of heterosis was, however, thained and the less favourable effects of the latter genotypes. A sufficient degree of heterosis was, however, thained and the less favourable effects of the latter genotypes. A sufficient degree of heterosis was, however, thained and the less favourable effects of the latter genotypes. A sufficient degree of heterosis was, however, thained and the less favourable effects of the latter genotypes. A sufficient degree of heterosis was, however, thained and the less favourable effects of the latter genotypes. A sufficient degree of heterosis was, however, thained and the less favourable effects of the latter genotypes. A sufficient degree of heterosis was, however, thained and the less favourable effects of the latter genotypes. A sufficient degree of heterosis was, however, thained and the less favourable effects of the latter genotypes. A sufficient degree of heterosis was, however, thained and the less favourable effects of the latter genotypes. A sufficient degree of heterosis was, however, thained and the less favourable effects of the latter genotypes. A sufficient degree of heterosis was, however, thained and the less favourable effects of the latter genotypes. A sufficient degree of heterosis was, however, thained and the latter genotypes. A ^{blained} only when the B two-way cross was crossed back to the alternative genotype (A) (Table 2). This deduction ^{blained} only when the B two-way cross was crossed back to the alternative genotype (A) (Table 2). This deduction ^{Supported only} when the B two-way cross was crossed back to the alternative genotype (A) (Table 2). The decrease in ^{Supported} by WILLIAMS et al. (1988) in a crossbreeding study with the B and Angus. High degrees of heterosis in ^{upported} by WILLIAMS et al. (1988) in a crossbreeding study with the B and Angus. Fight degrees the by WILLIAMS et al. (1988) in a crossbreeding study with the B and Angus. Fight degrees the by WILLIAMS et al. (1988) in a crossbreeding study with the B and Angus. Fight degrees the study with the B angus. Fight degrees the study with the study with the B angus. Fight degrees the study with the B angus. Fight degrees the study with the study with the B th heterosis observed when utilizing the indigenous A (preferably as sire) and Bo in crossbreeding programmes (Table ^{ontrasted} with the general finding in the literature that meat quality characteristics (including tenderness) showed by positive or negative degrees of heterosis (URICK et al., 1974). REFERENCES:

MENCES: CCARD, R.L., NAUDÉ, R.T., CRONJÉ, D.E., SMIT, MARIA, C., VENTER, H.J. and ROSSOUW, ELLENOR, J. (1979): The influence of authorized breed of cattle on their muscle characteristics. Meat Sci. <u>3</u>: 261-280. The influence of age, sex and breed of cattle on their muscle characteristics. Meat Sci. <u>3</u>: 261-280.

^{11e} Influence of age, sex and breed of cattle on their muscle characteristics. Meat Sci. <u>3</u>: 201-200. ^{Cattle Science Handbook <u>21</u>: 358-367 (L.S. Pope, eds.). Spilman Press, Sacramento, California.} MANUER Science Handbook 21: 358-367 (L.S. Pope, eas.). Spinnes. MANUER, W.R. (1988): "User's guide for LSMLMV". PC-1 version. January 1988.

WEY, W.R. (1988): "User's guide for LSMLMV". PC-1 version. January 1988. Exp. Agric A. (1973): Growth and carcase characteristics of young Friesian and Brahman x Friesian bulls. Aust. J. ^{Agric, Agric, Anim, Husb. <u>13</u>: 221-224. ^{biological} types of cattle. III. Carcass composition, quality and palatability. J. Anim. Sci. <u>43</u>: 48-62.}

Wagical types of cattle. III. Carcass composition, quant, WARLE, R.A. (1985): "Meat Science". Fourth edition. Peragon Press.

NESS

AR

nm)

^{ARCHELLO, J.A.,} ARCHER, T.F., BENNETT, J.A., GORMAN, W.D., RIBAL, J. and URQUHART, S. (1979): Beef acceptability ^{As influenced}, ARCHER, T.F., BENNETT, J.A., GORMAN, W.D., RIBAL, J. and URQUHART, S. (1979): Beef acceptability ¹⁾ And URQUHART, S. (1979): Beef acceptability ¹⁾ And URQUHART, S. (1979): Beef acceptability as influenced by diet concentrate level, management and breed type III. Consumer acceptance. J. Anim. Sci. (Supl.

¹ 49. ^{sericed} by diet concentrate level, management and store Angus, Hereford x Angus and Limousin x Angus crossbred steers as related to carcass composition and meat palatability

^{alts}, J. Anim. Sci. <u>44</u>: 571-580. ^{and} palatability observations of muscles from three breed-types of cattle at different times-on-feed. Meat Sci. <u>15</u>:37-50. And palatability characteristics of muscles from three breed-types of cattle at different times-on-feed. Meat Sci. <u>15</u>:37-50. And palatability characteristics of muscles from three breed-types of cattle at different times-on-reco. Most composition and food officiency. Meat Sci. 20: 39-50.

^{Vomposition} and feed efficiency. Meat Sci. 20: 39-50. ^{RAMSEY, C.D.} ASWEGEN, M. (1989): Meat Board - Grading System, August 1989. Business and Marketing Inteligence. ^{RAMSEY, C.D.} ^{A, B, and teed efficiency. Meat Sci. <u>EQ</u>. ^{AMSEY, C.B., COLE, J.W., MEYER, B.H. and TEMPLE, R.S. (1963): Effects of type and breed of British, Zebu and ^{by labortie} on production relatability and composition. II. Palatability differences and cooking losses as determined}} dairy cattle on Production, palatability and composition. II. Palatability differences and cooking losses as determined by laboratory and function, palatability and composition. II. Palatability differences and cooking losses as determined by laboratory and function, palatability and composition. II. Palatability differences and cooking losses as determined by laboratory and function. by laboratory and family panels. J. Anim. Sci. <u>22</u>: 1001-1008. and breed-type efforts on percass characteristics and palatability of bull beef. Meat Sci. <u>17</u>: 187-198.

And breed-type effects on carcass characteristics and palatability of bull beef. Meat Sci. <u>17</u>: 187-198.

and breed-type effects on carcass characteristics and palatability of bull beef. Meat Sci. <u>17</u>: 187-190. beef x beef and beef x Brown Swiss: Carcass quantity and quality traits. J. Anim. Sci. <u>39</u>: 292-302. Weef X beef and beef X Brown Swiss: Carcass quantity and quality traits. J. Anim. Sci. 39. 292-302. breeds. CHEVALLERIE, M.K.S.L. (1964): A comparative study of the growth, development and carcass quality of five MILLIN. M.Sc. April Theorem University of Pretoria, RSA.

^{vireeds} M.Sc. Agric. Thesis, University of Pretoria, RSA. ^{characteristics} Of Approximated Approx Brahman cross-bred steers. J. Anim. Sci. (Supl. 1) <u>66</u>: 304-305.

characteristics of Angus and Angus Brahman cross-bred steers. J. Anim. Sci. (Supl. 1) <u>66</u>: 304-305.