

**NUTRITIONAL AND FUNCTIONAL QUALITY OF SOUTH
AFRICAN DRY-BASED SOYA PROTEIN FOODS**

BY

RAJENDRAN ARUNAGHARY PADAYACHI

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

MSc (Agric) Food Science and Technology

IN THE
DEPARTMENT OF FOOD SCIENCE
FACULTY OF BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
PRETORIA
SOUTH AFRICA

JUNE 1999

I declare that the dissertation herewith submitted for the degree of MSc (Agric) Food Science and Technology at the University of Pretoria, has not previously been submitted by me for a degree at any other university or institution of higher education.

NUTRITIONAL AND FUNCTIONAL QUALITY OF SOUTH AFRICAN DRY-BASED TEXTURISED SOYA PROTEIN FOODS

ABSTRACT

Rajendran Arunaghary Padayachi

Leader: Prof JRN Taylor

Department: Food Science

Degree: MSc (Agric) Food Science and Technology

As 780 million people in developing countries still do not have access to enough food to meet their basic daily requirements for nutritional well being the provision of affordable and nutritional foods is an on-going challenge. Animal protein resources, e.g., meat, poultry, fish and eggs, are increasingly becoming unaffordable by the disadvantaged masses and their storage is problematic. Alternative protein sources, e.g., seaweed, plankton, single cell protein, fishmeal and legumes are being researched. Soya beans, having a high protein content of 40% is consequently an ideal vehicle for the supply of protein to consumers that cannot afford conventional sources of protein.

In South Africa, soya beans are processed into flavoured dry-based products and marketed extensively as a meat substitute. This is prepared at home as part of a main meal to be consumed with rice or bread. Their affordability and shelf-stability characteristics make them appealing to South Africans constituting the low-income sector and vegetarians.

The quality of mutton and savoury flavoured dry-based soya products manufactured by three Kwa-Zulu Natal companies were investigated and these three manufacturers were designated A, B and C. Proximate analyses and mineral analyses determined the nutritional components. The protein quality in these products was determined by performing Protein Efficiency Ratio (PER) and Net Protein Utilisation (NPU) studies on chickens as biological models. The functionality of these proteins was determined by Nitrogen Solubility Index (NSI) and Protein Dispersibility Index (PDI) studies. The presence of bacteria, yeast, moulds, and mycotoxic fungi were determined by microbiological assay. Consumer acceptability surveys were also undertaken to ascertain appearance, flavour, texture and overall acceptability profiles. The consumer also ranked the products in order of preference. Finally, economic value of these dry-based soya products was determined by comparing the retail price of these products with beef and chicken on a protein basis.

The carbohydrate content of these products was elevated as a consequence of dilution with starch and/ or maize flour. The polysaccharides, raffinose and stachyose which are regarded as causing flatulence in soya products apparently were eliminated during processing as the soya products investigated were devoid of them.

The negative consequence of the manufacturers adding starch and/ or maize flour was that the protein was diluted. The protein content of 25% was significantly lower than the normal protein content of 40% of soya beans.

A diluting effect occurred in the mineral content of iron, zinc and manganese. Calcium, magnesium and phosphorus was also decreased as a consequence of being lost with the soya oil which was removed in the processing of defatted soya flour. In spite of these reductions, soya products are still a good source of calcium, phosphorus and magnesium. The bioavailability of iron may be constrained by phytic acid, which occurs in soya beans.

Amongst the three manufacturers researched, dietary fibre content was least in products from manufacturer C. Flavour also had a significant influence on dietary fibre content as mutton flavoured products had a higher dietary fibre content compared to savoury flavoured products.

These soya products were a good source of polyunsaturated fatty acids with products from manufacturers A and B having the higher fatty acid level content. Savoury flavoured products had a significantly higher fatty acid content compared to mutton flavoured products.

Protein quality differed significantly amongst the three manufacturers. Products from manufacturer A had very low PER and NPU values. Products manufacturers B and C had acceptable PER/ NPU values, similar to peanuts.

Protein functionality values of products indicated that products from manufacturer A were not exposed to severe heat treatment and consequently their anti-nutritional factors were not denatured or inactivated. Consequently their PER/ NPU was depressed. Protein functionality values of products from manufacturers B and C were low indicating extensive heat treatment of TVP. This treatment denatured the anti-nutritional factors thus producing acceptable PER/ NPU values.

Bacterial loads were minimal in these dehydrated products. Some moulds were found indicating fungal contamination, presumably from the air during processing. An absence of mycotoxins confirmed that mycotoxic fungi are not endemic to dry-based soya products. The processing applied to the ingredients used by manufacturers B and C yielded Salmonella/ Shigella free products.

There was no significant difference in the consumer response to mutton flavoured products from all three manufacturers and savoury products from manufacturers B and C were ranked highest by consumers. With respect to products from manufacturer C this could be linked to them having the least moisture, protein and fat content and the highest soluble carbohydrate and ash contents.

Economically, soya protein is far cheaper than beef and chicken protein. Beef protein was calculated to be 140% of the retail price of soya protein and chicken protein was calculated to be 192% of the retail price of soya protein.

While dry-based soya products seems to be nutritionally acceptable and affordable with an extended shelf life, their protein availability and functionality is dependent on processing parameters. These soya products also received an above average acceptance rating by consumers, although textural and appearance qualities could be improved.

This dissertation is dedicated to my late father,

Arunaghary Padayachi,

who passed away on the 19 February 1999.

He laid the foundation for my education and encouraged me further in this direction. For this I will be eternally grateful.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My heartfelt gratitude and appreciation go to the following individuals and organisations for their help and assistance with this project:

Prof JRN Taylor, my supervisor, for his leadership, encouragement and constructive, critical review of this dissertation.

Dr. Amanda Minnaar for the guidance in designing and interpretation of the consumer survey.

Prof BH Bester for the initial assistance in microbiological aspects of this project.

Prof MF Dutton and the Physiology Department of the University of Natal (Durban Campus) for assisting me and allowing me to use their laboratories for the aflatoxin assay.

Prof RM Gous and the Department of Animal Science and Poultry Science of the University of Natal (Pietermaritzburg Campus) for assisting me with the animal model determinations.

Mr. H. Narismulu of the Technikon Natal Chemistry Department for assisting me with the HPLC tests.

Mr. Dale Gove of Robertsons (Pty) Limited for assistance with student registration fees and with supplies of soya product samples.

Imana Foods SA (Pty) Limited and Unifoods (Pty) Limited for supplies of soya product samples.

The FRD for financial assistance relevant to the project.

Prof KD Bhoola, Research Director: ML Sultan Technikon-FRD Research Programme, for ensuring that quality research is taken to completion.

The ML Sultan Technikon management and staff for allowing me the use of the technikon infrastructure for the completion of this project.

My wife Shyamala and children Thanishiya, Shalendra and Yerdashin for giving me the opportunity of pursuing my post-graduate aspirations and for their patience in allowing me in reaching my goals.

My initial head of department, Mr. DH Goodes, previous head of department, Mrs. DR Naidoo and present acting head of department and chairperson of the FRD-Mycotoxin Research Group, Dr. B. Odhav for their co-operation in facilitating the fulfilment of my personal post-graduate objectives.

Prof R Bharuthram, Research Director, ML Sultan Technikon for supporting research by academic staff.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	-iv-
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1 Economic importance	5
2.2 History of soya products	6
2.3 Processing of soya bean	7
2.4 Nutritional properties of cereals and legumes	13
2.4.1 Soya protein in relation to human protein and amino acid nutrition	16
2.5 Factors influencing soya nutritional quality	16
2.6 Soya proteins	19
2.7 Functional properties of soya storage proteins	20
2.8 Microbiological quality and shelf life of soya based products	23
2.9 Methodologies in determining protein quality	23
2.10 Sensoric evaluation of soya based products	25
2.11 Overview of the literature	25
CHAPTER 3: OBJECTIVES	26
CHAPTER 4: MATERIALS AND METHODS	27
4.1 Materials	27
4.2 Methods	27
4.2.1 Chemical composition	27
4.2.1.1 Moisture content	27
4.2.1.2 Protein content	28
4.2.1.3 Fat content	28
4.2.1.4 Fatty acid profile (FAME) analysis	29
4.2.1.5 Dietary fibre	30
4.2.1.6 Soluble carbohydrates	30
4.2.1.7 Carbohydrate content	31
4.2.1.8 Ash content	31
4.2.1.9 Mineral content	32
4.2.1.10 Caloric value	34
4.2.2 Microbiological assessment	34
4.2.2.1 Petrifilm <i>E. coli</i> count plates	34
4.2.2.2 MPN Technique for the identification of bacteria belonging to <i>Enterobacteriaceae</i>	35
4.2.2.3 Analysis of mycotoxins	35
4.2.3 Protein quality	37
4.2.4 Protein functionality	38
4.2.4.1 Protein dispersibility index (PDI)	38
4.2.4.2 Nitrogen solubility index (NSI)	38

4.2.5	Consumer evaluation	39
	4.2.5.1 <i>Statistical analysis of order of preference for savoury flavoured dry-based soya products</i>	40
	4.2.5.2 <i>Statistical analysis of order of preference for mutton flavoured dry-based soya products</i>	41
4.2.6	Statistic	41
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS		42
5.1 Chemical composition		42
5.1.1	Moisture content	42
5.1.2	Protein content	43
5.1.3	Fat content	44
5.1.4	Fatty acid profile	45
	5.1.4.1 <i>Palmitic acid (C 16: 0) content</i>	45
	5.1.4.2 <i>Stearic acid (C 18: 0) content</i>	46
	5.1.4.3 <i>Oleic acid (C 18: 1) content</i>	47
	5.1.4.4 <i>Linoleic acid (C 18: 2) content</i>	48
	5.1.4.5 <i>Linolenic acid (C 18: 3) content</i>	49
5.1.5	Dietary fibre	50
5.1.6	Soluble carbohydrates	51
5.1.7	Carbohydrate content	52
5.1.8	Ash content	53
5.1.9	Mineral content	54
	5.1.9.1 <i>Calcium</i>	54
	5.1.9.2 <i>Magnesium</i>	55
	5.1.9.3 <i>Sodium</i>	56
	5.1.9.4 <i>Zinc</i>	57
	5.1.9.5 <i>Manganese</i>	58
	5.1.9.6 <i>Potassium</i>	59
	5.1.9.7 <i>Phosphorus</i>	60
	5.1.9.8 <i>Iron</i>	61
5.1.10	Caloric value	62
5.1.11	Summary proximate composition	63
5.2 Microbiological assessment		64
5.2.1	Petrifilm <i>E. coli</i> plate count	64
5.2.2	<i>Enterobacteriaceae</i> organisms observed on eosin methylene blue (EMB) agar and chromocult plates	65
5.2.3	Other culture media to test for moulds, yeasts, <i>Shigella</i> , <i>Salmonella</i> and <i>Staphylococcus</i>	66
5.2.4	Analysis for aflatoxin, moniliformin and fumonisin	67
5.3 Protein quality		68
5.3.1	Protein efficiency ratio (PER)	68
5.3.2	Net protein utilisation (NPU)	69

5.4 Protein functionality	70
5.4.1 Protein dispersibility index (PDI)	70
5.4.2 Nitrogen solubility index (NSI)	71
5.5 Consumer evaluation	72
5.5.1 Consumer evaluation of savoury flavoured soya products	72
5.5.1.1 <i>The influence of manufacturer on order of preference of savoury flavoured soya products</i>	73
5.5.2 Consumer evaluation of mutton flavoured soya products	74
5.5.2.1 <i>The influence of manufacturer on order of preference of mutton flavoured soya products</i>	75
5.6 Overview of the nutrient content per serving of the dry-based soya products and contribution to the recommended daily dietary allowance (RDA)	76
5.7 Economic comparison of soya protein with beef/ chicken protein	77
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION	78
6.1 Chemical composition	78
6.2 Protein quality	86
6.3 Protein functionality	88
6.4 Microbiological assessment	90
6.5 Consumer acceptability	91
6.6 Economic comparison with alternative protein foods	93
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	94
CHAPTER 8: REFERENCES	97

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Composition of some cereals and legume (Utsumi, 1992)	14
Table 2	Suggested patterns of amino acid requirements and amino acid (Utsumi, 1992)	15
Table 3	Functional properties of seed proteins of importance in food applications (Kinsella, 1979)	21
Table 4	Typical properties conferred by seed proteins to food systems(Kinsella, 1979)	22
Table 5	Composition of soya products (Wolf and Cowan, 1971)	23
Table 6	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the moisture content of dry-based soya products (g/100 g) on an "as is" basis	42
Table 7	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the protein content of dry-based soya products (g/100 g) on an "as is" basis	43
Table 8	Influence of manufacturer and savoury on the fat content of dry-based soya products (g/100 g) on an "as is" basis	44
Table 9	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the palmitic acid (C 16: 0) content of dry-based soya products (g/100 g) on an "as is" basis	45
Table 10	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the stearic acid (C 18: 0)content of dry-based soya products (g/100 g) on an "as is" basis	46
Table 11	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the oleic acid (C 18: 1) content of dry-based soya products on an "as is" basis	47
Table 12	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the linoleic acid (C 18: 2)content of dry-based soya products (g/100 g) on an "as is" basis	48
Table 13	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the linolenic acid (C 18: 3) content of dry-based soya products (g/100 g) on an "as is" basis	49
Table 14	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the dietary fibre content of dry-based soya products (g/100 g) on an "as is" basis	50
Table 15	Soluble carbohydrates in mutton and savoury flavoured soya products from different manufacturers (g/100 g) on an "as is " basis	51
Table 16	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the carbohydrate content of dry-based soya products (g/100 g) on an "as is" basis	52

Table 17	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the ash content of dry-based soya products (g/100 g) on an "as is" basis	53
Table 18	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the calcium content of dry-based soya products (mg/100 g) on an "as is" basis	54
Table 19	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the magnesium content of dry-based soya products (mg/100 g) on an "as is" basis	55
Table 20	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the sodium chloride content of dry-based soya products (mg/100 g) on an "as is" basis	56
Table 21	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the zinc content of dry-based soya products (mg/100 g) on an "as is" basis	57
Table 22	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the manganese content of dry-based soya products (mg/100 g) on an "as is" basis	58
Table 23	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the potassium content of dry-based soya products (mg/100 g) on an "as is" basis	59
Table 24	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the phosphorus content of dry-based soya products (mg/100 g) on an "as is" basis	60
Table 25	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the iron content of dry-based soya products (mg/100 g) on an "as is" basis	61
Table 26	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the caloric content of dry-based soya products (kJ/100 g) on an "as is" basis	62
Table 27	Summary proximate composition of the six dry-based soya products compared to beef (g/100 g) on an "as is" basis	63
Table 28	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the <i>E. coli</i> plate count of dry-based soya products (cfu/ g)	64
Table 29	<i>Enterobacteriaceae</i> organisms observed on eosin methylene blue (EMB) agar and chromocult plates	65
Table 30	Growth on malt extract agar (ME), <i>Shigella-Salmonella</i> agar and Baird-Parker medium (BP) plated with 10^{-1} , 10^{-2} and 10^{-3} dilutions of dry-based soya products	66
Table 31	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the presence of aflatoxin, moniliformin and fumonisin in dry-based soya products	67
Table 32	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the PER of dry-based soya products	68

Table 33	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the NPU of dry-based soya products on an “as is” basis	69
Table 34	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the PDI of dry-based soya products on an “as is” basis	70
Table 35	Influence of manufacturer and flavour on the NSI of dry-based soya products on an “as is” basis	71
Table 36	Influence of manufacturer on the appearance, flavour, texture and overall acceptance of savoury flavoured dry-based soya products	72
Table 37	Influence of manufacturer on order of preference of savoury flavoured soya products	73
Table 38	Influence of manufacturer on the appearance, flavour, texture and overall acceptance of mutton flavoured dry-based soya products	74
Table 39	Influence of manufacturer on order of preference of mutton flavoured soya products	75
Table 40	Nutrient content per 33.3 g serving of the dry-based soya products and % contribution to the recommended daily dietary allowance (RDA)	76
Table 41	Economic comparison of soya protein with beef/ chicken protein on an “as is” basis	77