

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**INFLUENCE OF PRE-SLAUGHTER
HOLDING TIME, GROWTH PATH AND
CASTRATION ON MEAT QUALITY
CHARACTERISTICS OF BEEF *M.*
*LONGISSIMUS THORACIS***

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Applied Science
in
Animal Science
at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Bridget M. Peachey

1999

ABSTRACT

Peachey, B.M. 1999. Influence of pre-slaughter holding time, growth path and castration on meat quality characteristics of beef *M. longissimus thoracis*. M.Appl.Sc Thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand. 85 pp.

The New Zealand Beef Industry has included among its research goals the need to enhance product consistency and consumer satisfaction. Identifying on-farm and post-slaughter techniques for producing quality meat will permit the delivery of a more consistent product. The objectives of this study were to examine the influence of castration, pre-slaughter holding time, and growth path on meat quality characteristics with emphasis on meat tenderness. Sixty male Hereford x Angus cattle were used, half of which were castrated at weaning. They were then ranked within their castration groups on their growth performance during a 100-day pre-trial period. Of the 40 faster-growing animals, 20 were randomly selected to be slaughtered at 16-18 months of age at approximately 550 kg liveweight (the fast group; F) and the remaining 20 were managed in such a way that they reached the same liveweight as the slower-growing 20 animals (S) at 25 months of age (restricted group; R). Once at the abattoir half the animals were randomly selected within castration and growth path groups to be held for either 4 or 28 hours pre-slaughter. Measures of meat quality characteristics were made on a sample of the *M. longissimus thoracis*, of each animal that was removed soon after slaughter. The bulls produced meat with higher ultimate pH values (5.64 vs 5.46, $P < 0.001$) and meat that was significantly tougher than steers as evaluated by MIRINZ peak force (6.6 vs 4.6 kg, $P < 0.001$), and sensory toughness (6.10 vs 4.50, $P < 0.001$), both before and after adjustment for differences in pH. Animals held for 4h pre-slaughter had tougher meat as measured by Instron compression maximum load (92.8 vs 82.0, $P < 0.05$). Cattle in Group F produced meat that had a higher ultimate pH ($P < 0.001$), however, meat from animals in Group F was significantly more tender as measured by sensory analysis ($P < 0.001$). There were few differences between cattle in Groups R and S suggesting that differences in tenderness in this and other studies between animals on fast and slow growth rates were a result of differences in animal age rather than in inherent growth potential of the animals. Results suggest that holding cattle under appropriate welfare standards and allowing them enough time to recover from trucking and environmental stress should result in acceptable meat. Results from this trial have practical implications for producers and processors, and for the production of beef for the New Zealand Quality Mark. In this trial beef was tougher when it was from bulls or from older groups of cattle, with these two effects appearing to be additive. It is therefore suggested that cattle age and gender criteria should be considered for inclusion in the Quality Mark system.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people during this Masters thesis have offered me a great deal of support, encouragement and assistance and I would like to extend my gratitude and thanks to the following:

- My supervisors, Roger Purchas and Steve Morris, for their guidance and assistance throughout the study and their constructive criticism of my work.
- Lisa Duizer, for making my time spent in Albany most enjoyable and for introducing me to the fascinating world of sensory evaluation.
- The sensory panelists for giving up their precious summer evenings to chew on cubes of meat.
- Pauline Penketh for keeping me sane by allowing me to complain often and for offering me an excellent office and free rein of the stationery cupboard.
- Other students and staff of the College of Sciences for their assistance and support including Dean Burnham and Steve Glasgow.
- The personnel at Manawatu Beef Packers for their co-operation and assistance.
- and, I would especially like to recognise Meat New Zealand and the C. Alma Baker Trust for their much appreciated financial support.

ERRATA

Page	Paragraph	Line	Correct item	Item to be replaced
27	2	7	(Purchas & Grant 1995)	(Purchas & Grant 1997)
42	1	1	Figure 3.2	Figure 3.1
46	3	2	Figures 3.3 and 3.4	Figures 3.2 and 3.3
47	1	2	Figure 3.3	Figure 3.2
48	1	4	Figure 3.4	Figure 3.3
49	1	7	Purchas & Grant (1995)	Purchas & Grant (1997)
50	4	3	Purchas & Grant 1995	Purchas & Grant 1997
51	1	1	Purchas & Grant (1995)	Purchas & Grant (1997)
52	4	1	Purchas & Grant (1995)	Purchas & Grant (1997)
56	3	8	Purchas & Grant 1995	Purchas & Grant 1990
58	2	6	it is	it s
66	8	1	G.P. 1989:	G.P.:

References:

Add;

Hood, D.E.; Tarrant, P.V. 1981: The problem of dark cutting in beef. Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	ix
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER TWO.....	2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE REGARDING FACTORS AFFECTING MEAT QUALITY	2
2.1 INTRODUCTION	2
2.2 EFFECT OF ANIMAL AGE ON MEAT QUALITY	2
2.2.1 Introduction	2
2.2.2 Connective tissue.....	5
Collagen	5
2.2.3 Animal condition and age effects.....	7
2.2.4 Muscle type.....	8
2.2.5 Sex condition.....	8
2.2.6 Post-mortem conditions.....	9
Sarcomere length.....	9
Cooking Conditions.....	9
2.2.7 Summary	11
2.3 EFFECT OF GROWTH PATH ON MEAT QUALITY	12
2.4 EFFECT OF PRE-SLAUGHTER HOLDING TIME ON MEAT QUALITY.....	17
2.4.1 Introduction	17
2.4.2 Effect of Pre-Slaughter Holding Time on Meat Quality Characteristics	17
2.4.3 Effect of Ultimate pH on Tenderness of Beef	20
2.5 EFFECT OF CASTRATION ON MEAT QUALITY	21
2.5.1 Introduction	21
2.5.2 Fat Thickness	22
2.5.3 Ultimate pH.....	22
2.5.4 Collagen	23
2.5.5 Calpastatin Activity.....	24
2.5.6 Muscle fibre types.....	24
2.2.7 Minimising Differences in Meat Tenderness between Bulls and Steers	25

CHAPTER THREE	26
INFLUENCE OF PRE-SLAUGHTER HOLDING TIME, GROWTH PATH AND CASTRATION ON MEAT QUALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF BEEF <i>M. LONGISSIMUS THORACIS</i>	26
3.1 INTRODUCTION	26
3.2 MATERIALS AND METHODS	28
3.2.1 Experimental Design	28
3.2.2 Animals and their management	28
3.2.3 On-farm measurements	29
3.2.4 Pre-slaughter Procedures	30
3.2.5 Post-mortem Procedures	30
Carcass measurements	30
Muscle sampling	30
Measurements of meat quality	31
3.2.4 Sensory Evaluation	33
Panel Selection and Training	33
Sample Preparation	35
3.2.5 Statistical Analysis	36
3.3 RESULTS	37
3.3.1 Carcass Characteristics	37
Castration effects	37
Pre-slaughter holding time effects	38
Growth path effects	38
Interactions for carcass quality characteristics between the main effects	38
3.3.2 Meat Quality Characteristics	39
Castration effects	39
Pre-slaughter holding time effects	40
Growth path effects	40
Interactions between treatments for meat quality measurements	44
3.3.3 Relationships between measures of meat quality	45
Correlations between measurements of meat quality	45
Relationships between quality characteristics and ultimate pH	46
3.4 DISCUSSION	48
3.4.1 Castration	48
Carcass quality characteristics	48
Meat quality characteristics	49
3.4.2 Pre-slaughter holding time effect	51
Carcass quality characteristics	51
Meat quality characteristics	51
3.4.3 Growth path effect	52
Carcass quality characteristics	52
Meat quality characteristics	53
3.4.4 Correlations between measures of meat quality	53
3.5 CONCLUSION	55

CHAPTER FOUR.....	56
GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	56
4.1 GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	56
Effect of castration on meat quality	56
Effect of pre-slaughter holding time on meat quality	57
Effect of growth path of the animal on meat quality	58
Encouragement of farmers to produce tender meat.....	58
4.2 CONCLUSION	60
REFERENCES.....	61
APPENDIX 1.....	72
MEASURES OF MEAT QUALITY	72
A1.1 Measurements of sarcomere length	72
A1.2 Measurements of MFI	73
A1.3 Example of line scales used to evaluate sensory characteristics	74
A1.4 Preliminary Studies with the Silex Cooker.....	75
Introduction	75
Materials & Methods	75
Results	76
Conclusions.....	78
APPENDIX 2.....	79
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF RESULTS.....	79
A2.1 SAS program for stage 1 analysis of all data produced from sensory evaluation.	79
A2.2 SAS program for stage 2 analysis of all data produced from sensory evaluation.	81
APPENDIX 3.....	82
MEASURES OF MEAT QUALITY OF THE <i>M. LONGISSIMUS THORACIS</i> (UNADJUSTED FOR pH)	82
APPENDIX 4.....	84
RESULTS OF SENSORY EVALUATION ON SAMPLES OF <i>M.</i> <i>LONGISSIMUS THORACIS</i>	84

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 A summary of results from a sample of selected trials showing the effect of animal age on beef tenderness.	3
Table 2.2 Findings from selected papers on nutritional influences on changes in composition and tenderness during growth with particular reference to beef cattle	13
Table 3.1 Definitions of the attributes and their references measured in the sensory analysis of steaks from <i>M. longissimus thoracis</i>	34
Table 3.2 Consistency of results from panelists during training using beef cuts of contrasting quality.....	35
Table 3.3 Least-squares means for pre-slaughter liveweight, carcass weight and carcass characteristics (adjusted for Cwt). Animal numbers are in brackets. Interactions between the main effects are explained in the text. Interactions between the main effects are explained in the text.	37
Table 3.4 Number of permanent incisors erupted by slaughter in bulls and steers at different ages.	38
Table 3.5 Least-squares means for measures of meat quality of the <i>M. longissimus thoracis</i> (adjusted for pH). Interactions between the main effects are explained in the text.	39
Table 3.6 Least-squares means of measures of tenderness performed on <i>M. longissimus thoracis</i> of the 60 animals (adjusted for pH). Interactions between the main effects are explained in the text.	40
Table 3.7 Least-squares means of sensory panel-tested attributes of the <i>M. longissimus thoracis</i> (pH adjusted). Interactions between the main effects are explained in the text.	42
Table 3.8 Correlations between objective methods of measuring tenderness in <i>M. longissimus thoracis</i>	45
Table 3.9 Correlations between the sensory measures of meat quality of <i>M. longissimus thoracis</i>	45
Table 3.10 Correlations between sensory and objective measurements of meat quality of the <i>M. longissimus thoracis</i>	46
Table 3.11 Regression relationships between measures of meat quality characteristics of the <i>M. longissimus thoracis</i> and ultimate pH.	47
Table A1.1 Time taken for the steaks to reach an internal temperature of 70°C and 75°C and the difference in cooking loss between the two different weights of the steaks.....	76
Table A1.2 Sensory differences between samples cooked at either 180°C, 200°C or 250°C.....	78
Table A3.1 Least-squares means of measures of meat quality of the <i>M. longissimus thoracis</i> of the 60 animals without adjustment for pH. Interactions between the main effects are explained in the text.	82
Table A3.2 Least-squares means of the measures of meat tenderness performed on the <i>M. longissimus thoracis</i> of the 60 animals without adjustment for pH. Interactions between the main effects are explained in the text.	83

Table A4.1 Least-squares means for sensory-panel tested attributes of the *M. longissimus thoracis* for the absolute values. (adjusted for order and panelist). 84

Table A4.2 Least-squares means of the deviations from means for sensory-panel tested attributes of the *M. longissimus thoracis* for the absolute values (adjusted for order and panelist)..... 85

Table A4.3 Least-squares means of the sensory-panel tested attributes of *M. longissimus thoracis* for the 60 animals without adjustment for pH. 85

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 Effects of degree of doneness and cut on taste panel tenderness ratings of cooked steaks (RSD = 0.39). *8 = extremely tender; 1 = extremely tough.....	5
Figure 2.2 Cooking temperature effect on age-related tenderness changes.....	10
Figure 2.3 Effect of increasing animal age on some of the factors that influence tenderness of meat ('-' = decrease in tenderness; '+' = increase in tenderness).....	11
Figure 2.4 Effect of time in lairage, with feed and water, at an abattoir on the mean ultimate pH of the <i>M. longissimus dorsi</i>	18
Figure 2.5 Average ultimate pH values of bulls, steers and heifers held for either 4 or 28 hours at the abattoir prior to slaughter. Bars with different letter above them differ significantly (P<0.05). The number of animals is shown in brackets.....	19
Figure 2.6 Changes in Warner-Bratzler peak shear-force values with increasing pH _u for samples of <i>M. longissimus thoracis</i> aged for either 1 or 20 days at 0-3°C. Polynomial regression lines with linear, quadratic, and cubic components are shown, along with 99% confidence intervals.....	20
Figure 3.1 Increases in liveweight over time from birth till slaughter of the 60 animals in the three different growth path treatments.....	29
Figure 3.2 Mean (±SE) sensory toughness (upper graph), Warner-Bratzler peak force (middle graph) and MIRINZ peak force (lower graph) values for <i>M. longissimus thoracis</i> samples from cattle assigned different treatments (^a Columns within a treatment without a common letter are significantly different (P<0.05))......	43
Figure 3.3 Changes in Warner-Bratzler peak shear force with increasing ultimate pH for samples of the <i>M. longissimus thoracis</i>	47
Figure 3.4 Changes in sarcomere length with increasing ultimate pH for samples of the <i>M. longissimus thoracis</i>	48
Figure 4.1 Mid-month price (c/kg carcass weight) quotations for manufacturing bulls and prime steers for 1998/99.....	59
Figure A1.1 Effect of weight of steak from the beef eye of roll on pattern of temperature increase of steaks cooked on the Silex cooker.....	76
Figure A1.2 Pattern of internal temperature increase of four steaks from the beef eye of the round cooked on the Silex to reach an internal temperature of at least 75°C.....	77

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

*	P<0.05
**	P<0.01
***	P<0.001
+	P<0.1
NS	P>0.1
%	percent
°C	degrees Celsius
µm	micrometre
c/kg	cents per kilogram
cm ²	centimetre squared
cm ² /g	centimetre squared per gram
g	gram
g/kg	gram per kilogram
kg	kilogram
kg/day	kilogram per day
kgf	kilogram force
kPa	kiloPascals
mg	milligram
ml	millilitre
mm	millimetre
mm/min	millimetre per minute
mm ³	millimetre cubed
mW	milli Watts
nm	nanometres
&	and
28h	28 hour pre-slaughter holding period
3Cut Wt	joint weight of 3 muscle cuts – knuckle, outside and inside
4h	4 hour pre-slaughter holding period
c.	about
CC Length	carcass length
CL	cooking loss
Cohes	cohesiveness
Cwt	carcass weight
Dchew	deviations from mean for chewiness
Dcohes	deviations from mean for cohesiveness
Dhardness	deviations from mean for hardness
Dinijuic	deviations from mean for initial juiciness
Dovjuice	deviations from mean for overall juiciness
Dr%	dressing-out percentage
Dtoughness	deviations from mean for toughness
EMA	eye muscle area
EXJ	expressed juice
F group	fast growth path group
FD	fibre diameter
hr	hour
Inijuic	initial juiciness

IY	initial yield
KCl	potassium chloride
KP Fat	kidney and pelvic fat
LD	<i>longissimus dorsi</i>
LD2	load at 20 mm
LD8	load at 80 mm
LSMeans	least square means
Lwt	liveweight
Max	maximum
MFI	myofibrillar fragmentation index
mo	months of age
NaCl	sodium chloride
n	number
Ovjuice	overall juiciness
PF	peak force
PF-IY	peak force minus initial yield
pH _u	ultimate pH
R group	restricted growth path group
r	correlation coefficient
R ² %	coefficient of determination
RMSE	residual means standard error
RSD	residual standard deviation
S group	slow growth path group
Sarco	sarcomere length
SE	standard error
Sig	significance
TotalWD	total work done
vs	versus
WB	Warner-Bratzler
Wt	weight