UVER: THE FORGOTTEN VARIETY MEAT IN THE U.S.

MONT-OVERHOLT and J. ROMANS

rugsfors

VPS of

rs (SE);

Fema

113.8

2.1

46.2 0.2 63

26

State of the second

Part (DA

220 240

^{Uakota} State University, Department of Animal and Range Sciences, Brookings, South Dakota 57007-0392

Summary

Itained taste panelists (n=6) preferred liver with caramelized onions in balsamic vinegar sauce over raspberry $^{\text{taste panelists (n=6) preferred fiver scale significant (P<.01)}$. Two consumer groups (n=48 and n=23) (P<.05). The variation among panelists was significant and 5-highly unfavorable manufactured from the samples on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1-highly favorable and 5-highly unfavorable manufactured from from control hogs and hogs fed 15% ground flaxseed. Means of 2.4, 2.5, and 2.8 for control, 28 days (d) and ^{vent}rol hogs and hogs fed 15% ground flaxseed. House the sectively (n=23), did not ^{Nax, respectively} (n=48), and 2.3 and 2.2 for control and 28 d flax treatment, respectively (n=23), did not (P. 05). This research indicates consumers found pork liver and Braunsweiger from flax-fed hogs and control fully favorable. With proper marketing, consumers may allocate more of their food dollars toward the ^{the of} Nutritionally enriched variety meats and products manufactured from variety meats.

Consumption of variety meats is low in the U.S. as reflected in prices paid for variety meats. Pork livers ^{ther} ²⁰ cents/kg. The low demand for variety meats (pork liver) is an indication of consumer preferences. ^{cents}/kg. The low demand for variety meats (poin first) hogs (Cunnane et al. 1990, Romans et al. 1991). Pork livers from hogs fed diets containing 15% flaxseed ^{last 28} d of finishing were higher (P<.0001) for 18:2, 18:3 and 20:5 and lower (P<.0001) for 20:4 than ⁴⁸ d of finishing were higher (P<.0001) for 10.2, 10.0 m. ^{aes}irable n-3/n-6 fatty acid ratio is needed. This research was conducted to determine 1. consumer ^{trable} n-3/n-6 fatty acid ratio is needed. Inis research and the second for the final 28 d and 42 d of ^{toward} preparation method for fresh pork liver and 2. Consumer and 2. The final 28 d and 42 d of ^{Versus} Pork livers from hogs fed a finishing diet containing 15% flaxseed for the final 28 d and 42 d of

Materials and Methods

Por the preparation method test, the preparation means Bredients in addition to pork liver in ^{hitane}lized onion in balsamic vinegar (COBV) Were bacon, onions, chicken ^{and balsamic vinegar.} In the raspberry ^{Asamic} vinegar. In ... ^{Recipe} (RSL), the key ingredients were ^(RSL), the key 105-^{Vinegar} and red current jelly. Were evaluated by experienced $(h \in 6)$ using a 9-point hedonic scale much, We extremely, 2 = 11xc We Moderately, 4 = like slightly, 5 = clight eaely.



American near Anor dislike, 6 = dislike slightly, 7 = dislike moderately, 8 = dislike very much, and 9 = dislike American near A In addition, panelists were asked to report flavor, texture, palatability and aroma differences. In addition, panelists were asked to report flavor, texture, parallel lighting. The test was repeated th onducted in individual partitioned taste panel booths with controlled lighting. The test was repeated second day.

For the Braunsweiger test, two consumer groups (n=48 and n=23) used a 5-point facial hedonic question acted (Figure 1) where 1 = highly favorable and 5 = highly unfavorable. Braunsweiger was served on unsalted cracker Testing of three samples (control, 28 d and 42 d) by the larger group was conducted under the same conditions described above, while testing of two samples (control and 28 days) was conducted by the smaller group in a set in a stuation.

tal

Ptal

1

has Va

1Ca

42 dele R

The free response comments from the liver preparation method test are listed in Table 1. The comments we have ally more favorable for convert generally more favorable for COBV than for RSL, although none of the comments were seriously critical. substantiated by the numerical scores. COBV scored 2.2 \pm .65 on the 9-point hedonic scale, preferred (PC.01) of the RSL at 4.2 \pm .65 methods. the RSL at 4.2 \pm .65. Both methods of preparation yielded product in the acceptable range.

Although tasters differed (P<.01) in the portion of the 9-point hedonic scale they used as shown in Table they all used the upper half of the scale. The second day scores did not differ (P>.05) from day 1 scores yes

Only three out of 48 consumers commented on the Braunsweiger and the comments were all favorable. 15^{6} 2.4 ± .16, 2.5 ± .16 and 2.8 ± .16. SE of 2.4 \pm .16, 2.5 \pm .16, and 2.8 \pm .16 for control, 28 d and 42 d flax, respectively (n=48), and 2.3 \pm .16 2.2 \pm .18 for control and 28 d flax treatment, respectively (n=23), did not differ (P>.05).

Table 1. Panelists Response to COBV vs RSL for Flavor, Texture, Palatability and Aroma

	COBV	RUL
Flavor	Was very good, better than 1A, just because I	Good, but I don't like raspberry.
	don't really enjoy raspberry.	Raspberry Havor Seems
	A little more liver flavor than 1A.	more than onion.
	Not real dramatic in flavor, but I tend to	Good for the first 6 bites the
	prefer blander foods in general.	began to come through.
	Fine.	I can't stand the flavor.
	Nice, very appropriate.	It was ok, but I would rather
	Flavor is pleasant at first then becomes	that tastes like liver.
	unpleasant.	It was ok.
		I liked the raspberry taste.
Texture	Smooth, tastes like liver. Taste more of liver	Smooth.
	than bacon.	Liver texture.
	Liver texture.	Texture was very much a live
	Texture was good, more solid meaty like liver.	Fine, Fine.
	Better than 1A.	
	Ok.	

Table 1 Continued	1
СОВЛ	RSL
Rich taste in mouth, I really liked it.	Tangy taste in mouth.
Good very palatable.	Good, very palatable.
Could eat this on a large portion basis.	Ok, on a small serving snack basis.
Good.	Fine.
Very good.	Not to my preference.
Smelled appealing to eat.	It was a very good smelling thing.
Onion was distinct.	No distinctive aroma.
Slightly cold, unable to effectively evaluate.	Slight cold, unable to effectively evaluate
Fine.	Just fine.
Very good.	Very good.
Smells.	Is pleasant.

^{lramelized} onion in balsamic vinegar. RSL = raspberry sauted liver.

^{koudele} et al. (1988) found that ethnic origin weighed most heavily on consumer decisions to consume variety ^{including} pork liver. In this study, several different groups found pork liver and Braunsweiger to be very

stionn cracke litions a seni

nents W This <.01) 0

n Table

res. Mean + .18

r flavo

r flaro

iver

This research indicates consumers found pork liver and Braunsweiger ^{llax-fed} hogs and control hogs equally favorable. With proper of nutritionally enriched variety meats and products manufactured variety meats.

References References Svaluation Association, 1978. Guidelines for Cookery and Sensory Children (AP 5785), American Meat Science Association, ^{Meat} Science Association, 1978. Guidelines for Cookery and Sensor, ^{Chicago}, JI of Meat (AP 5785). American Meat Science Association, Chicago, IL. p. 18.

^{Adgo}, IL. P. 18. ^{S.C.} ^{Stitt} P.A., Ganguli S., Armstrong J. K., 1990. Raised omega-3 ^{Advity acid} levels in pigs fed flax. Can. J. Anim. Sci. 70:251-252. y acid levels in pigs fed flax. Can. J. Annu. Ne. J. W., Feyerhere A.M., Schafer D.E., 1988. Beef/pork variety meats: by Consumer effective attitudes toward product usage. Kansas Agr.

⁴ Consumer Preferences, attitudes toward product usage. Kansas Agr. ⁵ Sta. Res. Rpt. 8.

^VJ.R. ^{Nork}, Wulf D., Johnson, R.C., 1991. Improving the nutritional value of ^{Council Res.} Investment Rpt. p. 51. Council Res. Investment Rpt. p. 51.

PersonMean score \pm SE3 4.5^a 6 4.0^{ab} 5 3.9^{abc} 1 2.8^{bcd}
3 4.5^{a} 6 4.0^{ab} 5 3.9^{abc} 1 2 8 ^{bcd}
6 4.0 ^{ab} 5 3.9 ^{abc}
5 3.9 ^{abc}
1 2 gbcd
1 2.0
4 2.5 ^{cd}
2 1.5 ^d

Means not having a common superscript differ (P<.01) using Duncan's Multiple Range. Means \pm SE = .56.