Index

A
abstract concepts, 28
accuracy, 90
acuity, 28–29, 85–86
adaptations, 20, 42–46, 72–73, 95–96, 143
advanced applications, 96
all sample descriptions, 106–107
analysis. See also specific analyses
with ANOVA techniques, 58
assessors
assessment and, 37
CCSWA, 101
data, 35–36, 93, 111–113, 120, 122
DDA, 52, 67, 70
descriptive analysis technical
texture evaluations, 43–44
of Flavor Profile Method, 14
GCA, 103
GPA, 100–103, 111–112
maps, 40, 41 (figure)
PANOVA, 111–112, 122–123, 122
(table)
PCA, 67
proprietary, 66
of results, 73
Skinfeel Profile Descriptive
Analysis, 44
Standard Guide for Two Sensory
Descriptive Analysis
Approaches, 83
statistical, 35–36, 102–103
for temporal methods, 143 (table)
animal-behavior studies, 105
anosmias, 15
ANOVA techniques, 4, 36, 38
analysis with, 58
data collection and, 63
with FCP, 102
for product discrimination, 66
for sensitivity ranges, 90
appearance lexicons, 45
aromatics, 79 (table)
arrangement test, 6
artificulation, 54
assessors
assessment, 37
background of, 27–29
of beer, 118–119, 119 (table), 120
(table), 121 (table), 122
characteristics of, 27–29
consensus between, 13–14
in Consensus Profiling Methods, 4–5
discussion with, 3, 3 (figure)
evaluation for, 11
expert, 114
FCP for, 99
Flavor Profile Method for, 11
individual assessor terms,
129 (figure)
performance, 109–110, 113, 130,
131 (table), 132, 132 (table),
133 (table)
plots for, 128
of products, 1–2
of QDA, 53–55
qualifications of, 5–7
scaling for, 15
scores of, 130, 131 (table), 132
screening for, 5–7, 29, 104–105
statistical treatment and, 15
subjects and, 140–141
in Texture Profile Method, 27–30
training, 108–109
validation of, 109–110
attitude, 28
attributes
attribute panels, 43
correlation matrix with, 75 (table)
data and, 142
definitions of, 21, 32–33, 63, 65
(figure)
for descriptions, 59–60
details of, 11–12
development of, 46
evaluation of, 22
examples of, 81, 81 (table)
intensity of, 120 (table), 121 (table)
key driver, 76 (figure), 96
of products, 102
psychology of, 60
quantitative references for, 79
of samples, 4
scores for, 14, 16
selection of, 29
technical, 61
in training, 33
understanding of, 62
availability, 27

balance, 61–62, 95
basic concepts, 31
basic instruction course, 8
basic perpetual test, 6
basic principles, 31–32
beer. See also free choice profiling
assessors of, 118–119, 119 (table),
120 (table), 121 (table), 122
PANOVA results for, 122–123, 122
(table)
behavior, 62, 65, 105
behavioral approaches, 53
beverage industry, 16, 105
biscuits, 105
blank-sheet method, 11
blank spots, 15
blend, 95
brand protection, 74
breakdown, 24 (table)
budgeting suggestions, 42–44
C
calculations, 65
calibration, 26–27, 37
caramels, 24 (table), 38–39, 39 (figure)
case studies. See temporal methods
categories, 10–11, 30, 34, 63
characteristics, of assessors, 27–29
check-all-that-apply (CATA) method, 117
chewdown, 24 (table)
Civille, Gail Vance, 77
classifications, 20, 139, 140 (table)
CLT data, 75 (table)
Common Components and Specific
Weights Analysis (CCSWA), 101
comparisons, 8, 10, 12–13, 37, 107
complex consumer data, 73
comprehensive texture evaluation,
22, 23 (table), 24, 24 (table), 25–26
(table), 26
conducting, 104–114
confidence, 9–10
consensus, 1–2, 9, 13–14, 112–113
agreement, 62
in data collection, 92
data collection and, 35
interpretation of, 123–128,
124–125 (figure), 125 (table),
126–127 (table), 129 (figure),
129 (table), 130 (figure)
test results, 123 (figure)
Consensus Profiling Methods
assessors in, 4–5
data collection for, 10–12
Flavor Profile Method and, 1–2, 10
overall method of, 2–3, 3 (figure)
panels in, 5–7
panel training for, 7–10
practical considerations in, 13–15
situational adaptations for, 15–16
consistency, 6, 58, 91 (figure)
consumers
complex consumer data, 73
consumer-based language, 56
consumer goods, 53
consumer liking, 74 (figure)
consumer-oriented perceptions, 51–52
consumer ratings, 73–74, 74 (figure), 75 (table), 76 (figure)
consumer results, 37
naive consumer panels, 105–106, 108–111
products for, 72, 77
subjects and, 71–72
conventional descriptive methods, 116
core characteristics, 20
core elements, 32–33
core philosophy. See philosophy
correlation matrix, 75 (table)
criticism, 15

data
analysis, 35–36, 93, 111–113, 120, 122
from ANOVA techniques, 4
attributes and, 142
CLT, 75 (table)
collection, 10–12, 35–36, 63, 65, 92, 141, 142 (table)
complex consumer data, 73
descriptive, 74
direct-data entry, 73
FCP, 102–103
GCA for, 103
GPA for, 100, 102–103
as means tables, 67, 68–69 (table)
preparation, 118–119, 119 (table), 120 (table), 121 (table)
QDA, 74 (figure)
for sensory analysts, 12
sources, 118
in spider plots, 67, 70 (figure), 71 (figure)
texture, 40, 41 (figure)
decision-making, 14, 72–73
definitions, 21, 32–33, 57, 63, 65 (figure), 77
degree of difference (DOD), 95
derivative methods, 43
descriptions. See also specific topics
all sample, 106–107
articulation in, 54
attributes for, 59–60
comments and, 59
conventional descriptive methods, 116
DDA, 52, 67, 70
descriptive analysis technical
texture evaluations, 43–44
descriptive data, 74
descriptive lexicons, 45
descriptive methods, 19
descriptor terms, 126–127 (table), 126–128, 129 (figure)
details in, 8
ISD, 106
by panels, 51
product descriptors, 112–113
profile-based descriptive
approach, 22, 23 (table)
Standard Guide for Two Sensory
Descriptive Analysis Approaches, 83
technical descriptive method, 21–22
texture terms, 25–26 (table)
details, 8–9, 11–12
development. See also language development
of attributes, 46
of evaluation protocols, 34
lexicon, 79–83, 79 (table),
80 (figure), 80 (table), 81
(table), 82 (table), 84–85 (table),
86, 86 (figure)
of methods, 42–44
product developers, 67
protocol, 92
of Texture Profile Method, 19–21
vocabulary, 106–107
diagnostic descriptive analysis (DDA), 52, 67, 70
differentiation, 60, 95
dimensions test results, 124–125
(figure), 124–128, 125 (table),
126–127 (table), 129 (figure),
129 (table), 130 (figure)
direct-data entry, 73
disagreements, 56
discrimination tests, 55, 90–91,
91 (figure)
discussion, 3, 3 (figure), 11–12, 14, 60
distractions, 14
dry dog food products, 41 (figure)

E
emotional benefits, 96
end users, 10–11
environmental studies, 105
error, 92
evaluation
for assessors, 11
of attributes, 22
complete product evaluations,
34

F
feedback, 62, 91–92
fidelity, 95
first bite phase, 23 (table)
first chew, 24 (table)
five steps of lexicon development, 79,
80 (figure)
flash profile (FP) method, 117
Flavor Profile Method, 1–2, 4–7,
10–11, 14–15, 19
flavors. See specific topics
focus, of subjects, 62–63
formats, of scores, 12
formula, for products, 59
free choice profiling (FCP)
advantages of, 115
for assessors, 99
INDEX

background of, 100–102
case study of, 118–119, 119
table), 120–121 (table),
122–128, 122 (table), 123 (figure),
124–125 (figure), 125 (table),
126–127 (table), 129 (figure),
129 (table), 130, 130 (figure),
131 (table), 132, 132 (table),
133 (table)
conducting, 104–114
data, 102–103
disadvantages of, 115–116
panels for, 104–105, 108–110
philosophy of, 100
practical considerations for, 114
sensory methods compared to,
116–118
fundamental principles, 20

G
General Foods researchers, 19–20
Generalized Canonical Analysis (GCA), 103
Generalized Procrustes Analysis (GPA), 100–103, 111–112
graphic representations, 38–39,
39 (figure), 40, 41 (figure), 58,
58 (figure)
graphs, 67, 74 (figure), 130 (figure)
grouping, 95

H
handfeel evaluations, 44–45
health, 28
herbal gel samples, 41 (figure)
histograms, 124–125 (figure)

I
individual assessor terms, 129 (figure)
individual evaluation, 35–36
individual panelists, 89–90
individual sample description (ISD), 106
information, 13, 15–16, 21, 60
instructions, 64 (figure)
intensity
of attributes, 120 (table),
121 (table)
comparisons of, 8
of core characteristics, 20
of flavor, 6
references, 26–27, 33
interpretation, 10
of assessor performance, 130,
131 (table), 132, 132 (table),
133 (table)
of consensus, 123–128,
124–125 (figure), 125 (table),
126–127 (table), 129 (figure),
129 (table), 130 (figure)
interviews, 5, 7, 55, 86
introductions, 57

J
jargon, 60–61

K
Kelly’s Repertory Grid Method (RGM),
107
key driver attributes, 76 (figure), 96
key parameters, for temporal methods,
143 (table)

L
laboratory procedures, 72
language development
panel training and, 141
process, 73
for QDA, 56–63, 58 (figure)
sensory language, 52
terminology, 38
for Texture Profile Method, 30–34
leaders, 86–87, 141. See panels
learning, 32–33
legal disputes, 71–72
lexicon development. See development life, of panels, 87
line scale, 58, 58 (figure)
liquid pharmaceutical industry, 16

M
macaroni and cheese, 79–82,
79 (table), 80 (figure), 80 (table),
81 (table), 82 (table)
maps, 40, 41 (figure), 93, 94 (figure),
94 (table)
marketing, 73
masticatory phase, 23 (table)
matrix, 120 (table), 121 (table)
means tables, 67, 68–69 (table)
measurement, 1, 13, 37–38, 65–66, 142
meats, 40, 40 (table)
methods. See also specific methods
adaptations of, 46
blank-sheet method, 11
CATA, 117
comparative products method,
107
consensus and, 9
conventional descriptive, 116
derivative, 43
descriptive, 19
development of, 42–44
FP, 117
modifications of, 22
practice exercises with, 36
products and, 7–8
profile methodology, 32
for QDA, 53
rapid, 67, 68–69 (table), 70–71,
70 (figure), 71 (figure),
116–118
mock panel sessions, 86
moderators, 29–30, 56, 73, 141
modifications, 22
motivation, 91–92
multidimensional sorting, 117–118

N
naive consumer panels, 105–106,
108–111
napping, 95
nonfoods, 21, 26, 44–45

O
objectives, 11
objective settings, 77, 140
observations, 12
oiliness, 13
opinions, 61–62
organization, 56–58
orientation, 54–55, 57, 88
OVERALS procedure, 103

P
pairings, 57, 95–96
panels
attribute, 43
categories for, 10–11
in Consensus Profiling Methods,
5–7
consumer results and, 37
descriptions by, 51
discrimination tests for, 90–91,
91 (figure)
discussion in, 11–12, 60
evaluation for, 42
experience for, 93, 95
expert assessor, 114
for FCP, 104–105, 108–110
leaders of, 10, 56, 62–63, 86–87,
141
location of, 16
mock panel sessions, 86
motivation for, 91–92
naïve consumer, 105–106, 108–111
objective settings for, 77
panelist confidence, 9–10
panel performance measures, 13,
37–38, 65–66, 142
personal care products for, 89
qualitative references for, 78–79
recognition for, 91–92
recruitment of, 3, 3 (figure), 83, 86 (figure)
target panel size, 27
team decisions by, 14
training of, 4, 7–10, 13–14, 30–34, 56–63, 58 (figure), 86 (figure), 87–89, 87 (table), 141
validation of, 89–91, 91 (figure)
paperwork, 57
partial consensus profiling, 1–2
participation, 54
PCA maps, 40, 41 (figure)
perceptions, 6–8, 51–53
perceptual mapping, 93, 94 (figure), 94 (table)
texture perception, 28, 31–32
performance
assessor, 109–110, 113, 130, 131 (table), 132, 132 (table), 133 (table)
consistency and, 91 (figure)
measures, 37
panel performance measures, 13, 37–38, 65–66, 142
trials, 3, 3 (figure)
personal care products, 83, 84–85 (table), 85–86, 86 (figure), 89, 105
personal interviews, 7, 86
philosophy
of Consensus Profiling Method, 2–3
in evaluation, 31
of FCP, 100
of QDA, 52
of spectrum descriptive analysis, 77–78
of temporal methods, 139–140
of Texture Profile Method, 19–22
pilot tests, 12, 36–37, 63–65, 64 (figure), 65 (figure), 141–142
plot of consistency, 91 (figure)
practical considerations
in Consensus Profiling Methods, 13–15
for FCP, 114
in QDA, 67
for spectrum descriptive analysis, 93, 94 (figure), 94 (table), 95
for temporal methods, 142
Practical Guide for Comparative Advertising, 72
practice, 10, 31, 33–34, 36
precision, 90
predicted liking, 96
preference segment plot, 76 (figure)
preinterviews, 55
preparation, of data, 118–119, 119 (table), 120 (table), 121 (table)
pre-recruiting, 141
prescreening, 83, 86 (figure)
presentation, of profile results, 38–40, 39 (figure), 40 (table), 41 (figure)
principal component analysis (PCA), 67, 112
for FCP, 125–126, 125 (table)
maps, 40, 41 (figure)
results, 128, 129 (table)
procedure, 23, 32–33, 72–73, 89, 103
process. See specific topics
Procrustes Analysis of Variance (PANOVA), 111–112, 122–123, 122 (table)
products
assessors of, 1–2
attributes of, 102
brand protection for, 74
budgeting suggestions for, 42–44
categories of, 30, 63
comparative products method, 107
comparisons of, 10
complete product evaluations, 34
complexity of, 56
for consumers, 72, 77
descriptors, 112–113
developers of, 67
differentiation of, 60
dry dog food, 41 (figure)
evaluation of, 8
formula for, 59
in graphs, 130 (figure)
grouping of, 95
marketing of, 73
methods and, 7–8
oiliness in, 13
pairings of, 57
personal care, 83, 84–85 (table),
85–86, 86 (figure)
product-adapted universal scaling,
95
product discrimination, 66
QDA for, 51–52, 73–74, 74
(figure), 75 (table), 76 (figure)
screening and, 55
profiling, 9, 12, 15–16, 44. See also
specific topics
for partial consensus profiling, 1–2
profile-based descriptive
approach, 22, 23 (table)
profile results, 38–40, 39 (figure),
40 (table), 41 (figure)
tabular Texture Profile, 40,
40 (table)
proprietary analysis, 66
protocol, 34, 83, 84–85 (table), 92
psychology, 5, 52, 60

Q
QC/QA sensory programs, 43
qualifications
of assessors, 5–7
in FCP, 104–105
of panel leaders, 10, 56, 86–87
screening for, 53–55
for temporal methods, 141
qualitative references, 59, 78–79
quality, 95
quantitative descriptive analysis
(QDA), 99, 116
adaptations for, 72–73
language development for, 56–63,
58 (figure)
practical considerations in, 67
for products, 51–52, 73–74, 74
(figure), 75 (table), 76 (figure)
rapid methods for, 67, 68–69
(table), 70–71, 70 (figure), 71
(figure)
research from, 71–72
results reporting for, 66–67
subjects for, 53–55
testing with, 63–65, 64 (figure),
65 (figure)
quantitative references, 79
questions, in orientation, 54–55

R
ranking tests, 6
rapid approaches, 51–52
rapid methods, 67, 68–69 (table),
70–71, 70 (figure), 71 (figure),
116–118
ratings, 58, 73–74, 74 (figure), 75
(table), 76 (figure)
R&D projects, 43
recognition, for panels, 91–92
recruitment, 3, 3 (figure), 83, 104, 141
references
acuity and, 28–29
intensity, 26–27, 33
qualitative references, 59, 78–79
use of, 80, 80 (table)
refinement, of lexicon, 81, 81 (table)
Repertory Grid Method (RGM), 107
replications, 35, 63–64
reporting
  of results, 13, 66–67, 93, 113–114, 142, 143 (table)
  for spectrum descriptive analysis, 93
  for Texture Profile Method, 38–40, 39 (figure), 40 (table), 41 (figure)
research, 36, 52, 71–72
residual phase, 23 (table), 24 (table)
residuals by configuration, 132, 132 (table)
resource constraints, 67
responses, 53
responsibility, 5
results
  analysis of, 73
  consensus test, 123 (figure)
  consumer, 37
  dimensions test, 124–125 (figure), 124–128, 125 (table), 126–127 (table), 129 (figure), 129 (table), 130 (figure)
  from panels, 37
  PANOV A, 122–123, 122 (table)
  PCA, 128, 129 (table)
reporting of, 13, 66–67, 93, 113–114, 142, 143 (table)
  for spectrum descriptive analysis, 93
  for Texture Profile Method, 38–40, 39 (figure), 40 (table), 41 (figure)
review, 32–33
rheology, 19–22, 31–32
routine feedback, 91–92

S
samples, 4, 36, 92, 106–107, 110–111
scales, 1, 9, 15, 32–33, 35
  classifications and, 20
  definitions and, 77
for FCP, 107–108
  line scale, 58, 58 (figure)
  product-adapted universal scaling, 95
  scaling factors, 113, 132, 133 (table)
  universal scales, 78–79, 79 (table), 95
  unstructured graphic rating scale, 58, 58 (figure)
science, 14, 29–30, 54, 70–71, 72–73
scope, of FCP, 100–102
scores, 7–8, 11–12, 33, 61–63, 64 (figure)
  of assessors, 130, 131 (table), 132
  for attributes, 14, 16
  matrix for, 120 (table), 121 (table)
screening
  acuity, 85–86
  for assessors, 5–7, 29, 104–105
  of candidates, 30
  DDA and, 67, 70
  prescreening, 83, 86 (figure)
  products and, 55
  for qualifications, 53–55
  in temporal methods, 141
  tools, 5
sensations, 59
sensitivity ranges, 61, 90
sensory acuity testing, 85–86
sensory analysts, 12
sensory claims substantiation, 71–72
sensory drivers, 96
sensory language, 52
sensory perceptions, 7–8
sensory procedural decisions, 72–73
sensory professionals, 114
sensory science, 54, 72–73
sensory skills, 54
sensory tests, 15
sensory texture evaluations, 25–26 (table)
Sidel, Joel L., 52
signature curves, 142
single correlation graph, 74 (figure)
situational adaptations, 15–16, 95–96, 143
skills, 54, 70
Skinfeel Profile Descriptive Analysis, 44
snacks, 23 (table)
sorting, 95, 117–118
spectrum descriptive analysis, 116
advanced applications for, 96
lexicon development in, 79–83, 79 (table), 80 (figure), 80 (table), 81 (table), 82 (table), 84–85 (table), 85–86, 86 (figure)
for panel leaders, 86–87
panel recognition in, 91–92
panel training for, 87–89, 87 (table)
panel validation in, 89–91, 91 (figure)
philosophy of, 77–78
practical considerations for, 93, 94 (figure), 94 (table), 95
results reporting for, 93
situational adaptations for, 95–96
spider graphs, 67
spider plots, 67, 70 (figure), 71 (figure)
standard evaluation protocol, 83, 84–85 (table)
Standard Guide for Sensory Claim Substantiation (ASTM), 72
Standard Guide for Two Sensory Descriptive Analysis Approaches (ASTM), 83
standard hardness scale, 82, 82 (table)
Stanford Research Institute (SRI), 52
statistics, 15, 35–36, 102–103
Stone, Herbert, 52
structured training, 8–10
studies, 14, 101–102, 105
subjects
assessors and, 140–141
behavior of, 62, 65
comments by, 59
consumers and, 71–72
evaluation for, 60
focus of, 62–63
jargon for, 60–61
problems for, 62
for QDA, 53–55
training for, 66
surface properties phase, 23 (table)

T
tabular Texture Profile, 40, 40 (table)
target panel size, 27
tasks, 61
tasting, 6
teaching values, 8–9, 26–27
team decisions, 14
technical attributes, 61
technical descriptive method, 21–22
temporal methods, 43, 139–143, 140 (table), 142 (table), 143 (table)
terminology, 38, 45, 80, 126–127 (table), 126–128, 129 (figure)
testing
aptitude for, 5
arrangement test, 6
basic perpetual test, 6
consensus test results, 123 (figure)
dimensions test results,
124–125 (figure), 124–128, 125 (table), 126–127 (table), 129 (figure), 129 (table), 130 (figure)
discrimination tests, 55, 90–91, 91 (figure)
for partial consensus profiling, 1–2
perceptual recognition series, 6–7
personal interviews for, 7
pilot tests, 12, 36–37, 63–65, 64 (figure), 65 (figure)
protocol, 92
with QDA, 63–65, 64 (figure),
65 (figure)
ranking tests, 6
in science, 70–71
scores from, 7
sensory acuity, 85–86
sensory tests, 15
time for, 63
validation and, 141–142
texture, 81–82, 81 (table), 82 (table), 88
Texture Profile Method, 1
adaptations in, 42–45
assessors in, 27–30
core philosophy of, 19–22
data collection in, 35–36
language development for, 30–34
overview of, 22, 23 (table), 24,
24 (table), 25–26 (table), 26–27
panel performance measures for,
37–38
pilot tests for, 36–37
results reporting for, 38–40, 39
(figure), 40 (table), 41 (figure)
summary of, 45–46
thresholds, 15
time, 56–58, 63. See also temporal
methods
tools, 5, 71–72
Traditional Flavor Profiles, 13
training, 86 (figure)
assessors, 108–109
attributes in, 33
calibration and, 37
in Flavor Profile Method, 4–5
length of, 87, 87 (table)
observations in, 12
of panels, 4, 7–10, 13–14, 30–34,
56–63, 58 (figure), 86 (figure),
87–89, 87 (table), 141
responsibility and, 5
structured, 8–10
for subjects, 66
tasks and, 66
texture, 88

U
unconditional positive regard, 8–9
universal scales, 78–79, 79 (table),
95
unstructured graphic rating scale, 58,
58 (figure)

V
validation
of assessors, 109–110
of panels, 89–91, 91 (figure)
pilot tests and, 12, 36–37,
63–65, 64 (figure),
65 (figure)
testing and, 141–142
viewpoints, 70
vocabulary development, 106–107
voluntary participation, 54
X Y graph, 74 (figure)