Studies on textural profile of gulabjamun blended with wheat bran

M. R. Nalawade, A. T. Shinde, R. L. Korake and N. T. Lingayat

Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairy Science, College of Agriculture, Vasantrao Naik Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parbhani-431402 Email: dr_ravindrakorake@yahoo.in

Objective

To study the textural profile of gulabjamun blended with wheat bran

Methodology

Buffalo milk was procured, filtered through muslin cloth and standardized to 6% fat and 9% SNF. The milk was heated in a pan on low fire with stirring to obtain *khoa*. All the ingredients viz., *khoa* (70%), *maida* (30%), baking powder (0.2%) and wheat bran (T₀ - 0, T₁ - 0.2, T₂ - 0.4 and T₃ -0.6%) by weight of milk were weighed and mixed thoroughly in small quantity of water to make dough and thereafter 10 g spherical/ round shape balls were prepared and these were deep fried in fat using the electrical fryer at 130°C/15 min to get a light brown coloured surface (Rangi *et al.*, 1985). Deep fried *gulabjamuns* were soaked in hot sugar syrup having 50° Brix TSS (Total Soluble Sugar) at 70°C for 4 h (Rangi et al., 1985). The textural property was evaluated using the Instron Texture analyzer of Stable Micro System equipped with 50 kg load cell. The textural properties of *gulabjamun* were determined by using textural parameters such as hardness, cohesiveness, adhesiveness, springiness, gumminess and chewiness.

Result and Discussion

The textural profile of *gulabjamun* revealed that there were wide range (1.843-2.157) in hardness values in *gulabjamun* blended with 0.2, 0.4 and 0.6 per cent wheat bran. The highest value of hardness was observed in control *gulabjamun*, whereas lowest hardness value in *gulabjamun* prepared with 0.6 per cent wheat bran. This indicates that addition of wheat bran reduces the hardness of *gulabjamun*. The highest hardness value in control *gulabjamun* might be due to higher content of *khoa*. The results are in accordance with those of Yawale and Rao (2012). The superior results in terms of cohesiveness were observed in *gulabjamun* blended with 0.2 per cent wheat bran than rest of the treatments. The results are comparable with those of Adhikari (1993) who reported cohesiveness values of laboratory and market *gulabjamun* as 0.35 and 0.39, respectively. The adhesiveness values were highest for *gulabjamun* without blend of wheat bran and lowest for *gulabjamun* prepared with 0.6% wheat bran. The springiness values were observed in wide range among treatments groups. However, *gulabjamun* without blend of wheat bran showed highest score for springiness compared to *gulabjamun* blended with 0.2, 0.4 and 0.6 per cent wheat bran. The addition of wheat bran significantly affected the chewiness of *gulabjamun*. Among all treatments, *gulabjamun* blended with 0.6 per cent wheat bran showed lowest chewiness while highest values of chewiness were observed in case of control *gulabjamun*.

Conclusion

The textural quality of *gulabjamun* blended with 0.2 per cent wheat bran was comparable to control *gulabjamun* but *gulabjamun* blended with 0.4 (T_2) and 0.6 (T_3) per cent wheat bran significantly affected the textural quality of *gulabjamun*.



