

10. REFERENCES

ACEBRON, L. & DOPICA, D.C., 1999. The importance of intrinsic and extrinsic cues to expected and experienced quality: an imperial application for beef. Food Quality and Preference 11(3), 229-238.

AMERINE, M. A., PANGBORN, R. M. & ROESSLER, E.B. 1965. *In:* Principles of Sensory Evaluation of Food. Chichester, A. C. O., Mark, E. M., Stewart, G. F. (Eds.) New York: Academic Press. 250.

ANDERSON, R. E., 1973. Consumer dissatisfaction: the effect of disconfirmed expectancy on perceived product performance. *Journal of Marketing Research* 10(2), 38-44.

Annual Book of ASTM Standards, 1991, American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Committee E-18.1968. *Manual on Sensory testing methods*. STD 434. American Society for testing and materials. Philadelphia, Pa.

Annual Book of ASTM Standards, 1991, American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Committee E - 679. Practice for Determination of Odour and Taste Thresholds by a forced-choice ascending concentration series method of limits. Philadelphia, Pa.

ARDITTI, S., 1997. Preference mapping: a case study. Food Quality and Preference 8, 23-327.

ASSOCIATION OF ANALYTICAL CHEMISTS INTERNATIONAL (AOAC INTERNATIONAL). 1995. *In:* Cunniff, P. (Ed.) Official methods of analysis 920.95.

AUCAMP, J. P., HARA, Y., & APOSTOLIDES, Z., 2000. Simultaneous analysis of tea catechins, caffeine, gallic acid, theanine and ascorbic acid by micellar electrokinetic capillary chromatography. *Journal of Chromatography A* 876, 235-242.

BARTLETT, P. N., ELLIOTT, J. M. & GARDNER, J. W., 1997. Electronic Noses and their Application in the Food Industry. *Food Technology* 51(12), 44-48.

BEILKEN, S. L., EADIE, L. M., GRIFFITHS, I., JONES, P. N. & HARRIS, P. V., 1991. Assessment of the sensory characteristics of meat patties. *Journal of Food Science* 56, 1470-1475.

BERNHARDT, W. O., 1969. Color and turbidity in solutions. Food Technology 23(1), 30-31.

BORONE, J. J. & ROBERTS, H. R., 1996. Caffeine consumption. Fundamental Chemistry and Toxicology 34, 119-129.

BRIANDET, R., KEMSLEY, E. K. & WILSON, R. H., 1996. Discrimination of Arabic and Robusta in instant coffee by Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy and chemometrics. Journal of Agricultural Food Chemistry 44, 170-174.

BRYAN, M. & LOWENBERG, M., 1958. The Father's influence on young children's food preference. *Journal of the American Dietetics Association* 34, 30-35.

CALVINO, A. M., ZAMORA, M. C.& SARCHI, M. I. 1996. Principal components and cluster analysis for descriptive sensory assessment of instant coffee. *Journal of Sensory Studies 11*, 191-210.

CARDELLO, A. V., MALLER, O., MASOR, H. B., DUBOSE, C. & EDELMAN, B., 1985. Role of consumer expectancies in the acceptance of novel foods. *Journal of Food Science* 50, 1707-1714.

CARDELLO, A.V., 1993. What the Consumer expect from Low-cal, Low-fat, lite foods? Cereal Foods World 38(2), 96-99.

CARDELLO, A.V., 1996. The role of the human senses in food acceptance. *In:* Meiselman H.L., MacFie, H.J.H. (Ed.) *Food choice acceptance and consumption*. Blackie Academic & professional: London. 1-64.

CAUL, J. F., 1957. The profile method of flavor analysis. Advanced Food Research 7, 1.



CHASSEVENT, F., 1971. Methods to measure moisture (French). Proc. 5th Coll. ASIC, 162-174.

CLARKE, R. J., 1989. Water and mineral contents. *In:* Macrae, R., Clarke, R. J. (Ed.). Coffee - chemistry (volume 1). Elsevier Applied Science: London. pp. 57-60.

CLIFFORD, M. N., 1975. Coffee Compositions. Processing Biochemistry, May, 13-16,19.

CLIFFORD, M. N., 1985. Chlorogenic Acids. In: Macrae, R., Clarke, R. J. (Ed.) Coffee - chemistry (volume 1). Elsevier Applied Science: London. pp. 153-197.

COFFEE SCIENCE SOURCE, 2001, http://www.coffeescience.org. Accessed May 2001

CRISTOVAM, E., RUSSELL, C., PATERSON, A. & REID, E., 2000. Gender preference in hedonic rating for espresso and espresso-milk coffees. *Food Quality and Preference* 11, 437-444.

DAILLANT-SPINNLER B., MACFIE, H. J. H., BEYTS, P. K. & HEDDERLEY, D., 1995. Relationship Between Perceived Sensory Properties and Major Preference Directions of 12 Varieties of Apples from the Southern Hemisphere. *Food Quality and Preference* 6(4), 1-14.

DAMASIO, M. H., COSTELL, E. & DURAN, L., 1999. Optimising acceptability of low-sugar strawberry gels segmenting consumers by internal preference mapping. *Journal of Food Agriculture* 79, 626-632.

DART, S. K. & NURSTEN, H. E., 1985. Volatile Components. *In:* Macrae, R., Clarke, R. J. (Ed.) *Coffee - chemistry (volume 1)*. Elsevier Applied Science: London. 256.

DE KOCK, H.L. & MINNAAR, A., 1998. Study material: Sensory Principles of Sensory Analysis. University of Pretoria.

EINSTEIN, M.A., 1991. Descriptive Techniques and their Hybridization. *In:* Lawless, H. T., Klein, B. P., (eds.). *Sensory Science Theory and Applications in Foods*. Marcel Dekker, Inc.: New York. 317-330.



ELMORE, J. R., HEYMANN, H., JOHNSON, J. & HEWITTE, J. E., 1999. Preference mapping: relating acceptance of "creaminess" to a descriptive sensory map of a semi-solid. *Food Quality and Preference* 10, 465-475.

ENGEL, J. F., BLACKWELL, R. D. & MINIARD, P. W., 1998. Consumer behavior, 8th edition, Dryden Press: Forth Worth.

GREENHOFF, K. & MACFIE, H.J.H., 1994. Preference mapping in practice. *In.* MacFie, H.J.H., Thomson D.M.H. (Ed.). *Measurement of food preferences*. Blackie academic and professional: London. 137-166.

GROSCH, W, 1998. Flavour of Coffee. A review. Nahrung 42, 344-350.

HAWKINS, D. I., BEST, R. J. & CONEY, K. A., 1992. Consumer behavior. Implications for marketing strategy 5th edition. Irwin: Boston.

HEIDEMA, J. & DE JONG, S., 1998. Consumer preference of coffees in relation to sensory parameters as studied by analysis of covariance. Food Quality and Preference, 9, 115-118.

HELGESEN, H., SOLHEIM, R. & NAES, T., 1997. Consumer preference mapping of dry fermented lamb sausages. Food Quality and Preference 8, 97-109.

HELLRIEGEL, D. & SLOACUM, J.W. 1979. Organizational behaviour. West Publishing Co: Minnesota, 44.

HEYD, B. & DANZART, M., 1998. Modelling Consumers' Preferences of Coffees: Evaluation of Different Methods. Lebensm Wiss Technology 31, 607-611.

HODGINS, D., 1997. The Electronic Nose: Sensor Array-Based Instruments that Emulate the Human Nose. *In:* Marsili, R. (Ed.), *Techniques to Analyse Food aroma*. Marcel-Dekker: New York. 331-371.



HOUGH, G. & SANCHEZ, R., 1998. Descriptive analysis and external preference mapping of powdered chocolate milk. Food Quality and Preference 9 (4), 197-204.

HUNTER, E.A., 1996. Experimental design. *In:* Naes, T. & Risvik, E. (Ed.). *Multivariate* analysis of data in sensory science. Elsevier Applied Science: Amsterdam. 37.

INSTITUTE OF FOOD TECHNOLOGISTS, 1981. Sensory evaluation guide for testing food and beverage products. Food Technology 37 (11), 50-59.

INTERNATIONAL COFFEE ORGANISATION, 2001. http://www.ico.org. Accessed May 2001

IRWIN, R. J., STILLMAN, J. A., HAUTUS, M. J. & HUDDLESTON, L. M., 1993. The measurement of taste discrimination with the same-different task: a detection theory analysis. *Journal of Sensory Studies 8 (3)*, 227-240.

ISSANCHOU, S., 1996. Consumer expectations and perceptions of meat and meat product quality. *Meat Science* 43 (S). S5-S19.

JAEGER, S. R., WAKELING, I. N. & MACFIE, H. J. H., 2000. Behavioural extensions to preference mapping: the role of synthesis. *Food Quality and Preference 11*, 349-359.

JELLINEK, G., 1985. Sensory Evaluation of Food. Ellis Horwood Publishers: England.

JONES, P. N., MACFIE, H. J. H. & BEILKEN, S. L., 1989. Use of preference mapping to relate consumer preference to the sensory properties of a processed meat product (tinned cat food). *Journal of the Science of Food Agriculture 47*, 113-123.

KEANE, P., 1992. The flavor profile. In: Hootman, R. C. (Ed.) Manual on Descriptive Analysis Testing for Sensory Evaluation. ASTM Manual series: Philadelphia. 5-14.

KHAN, M. A., 1981. Evaluation of food selection patterns and preferences. Food science and mutrition 15, 129-153.



LAWLESS, H. T. & HEYMANN, H., 1999. Sensory Evaluation of Food (Principles and practices). Gaithersburg, Maryland: Aspen Publishers. 176, 217, 254, 499-500, 629.

LIARDON, R., OTT, U. & DAGET, N., 1987. Analysis of coffee headspace profiles by multivariant statistics. Nestle Research News, 183-186.

MACFIE, H.J. & THOMSON, D. M. H., 1988. Preference mapping and multidimensional scaling. *In:* Pigott, J. R. (Ed.). *Sensory Analysis of Food.* Elsevier: New York. 381-409.

MACRAE, R., 1985. Nitrogenous Compounds. In: Macrae, R., Clarke, R. J. (Ed.). Coffee - chemistry (volume 1). Elsevier Applied Science: London. 115-127.

MAIER, H. G., 1987. Introduction. In: Macrae, R., Clarke, R. J. (Ed.). Coffee – Related Beverages (volume 5). Elsevier Applied Science: London. 1-5.

McEWAN, J. A., 1996a. A European sensory and consumer study. A case study on coffee. Chipping Campden, Gloustershire, UK: European Sensory Network. Campden & Chorleywood Food Research Association. 1-16.

McEWAN, J. A., 1996b. Preference Mapping for Product Optimization. *In:* Naes, T., & Risvik, E. (Ed.). *Multivariate analysis of data in sensory science*. Elsevier Applied Science: Amsterdam. 71-80.

McEWAN, J. A., 1998. Harmonizing Sensory Evaluation Internationally. *Food Technology* 52 April, 52-56.

McEWAN, J. A., EARTHY, P.J. & DUCHER, C., 1998. Preference Mapping: A Review 6. Campden & Chorleywood Food Research Association: United Kingdom. 2.

McEWAN, J. A., MOORE, J. D. & COLWILL, J.S., 1989. The sensory characteristics of Cheddar cheese and their relationship with acceptability. *Journal of the Society of Dairy Technology* 42, 112-117.



McEWAN, J. A. & THOMSON, D. M. H., 1989. The repertory grid method and preference mapping in market research: a case study on chocolate confectionery. *Food Quality and Preference 1*, 59-68.

MCGUIRE, W. J., 1976. Some internal psychological factors influencing consumer choice. Journal of Consumer Research 2 (March), 302-319.

MEILGAARD, M., CIVILLE, G. & CARR, B. T., 1987. Sensory evaluation techniques (volumes 1 & 2). CRC Press: Boca Raton, Florida, 140-143

MEILGAARD, M., CIVILLE, G. V. & CARR, B. T., 1999. Sensory Evaluation Techniques (3rd Edition). New York: CRC Press. 238-239

MIELLE, P., 1996. 'Electronic noses': Towards the objective instrumental characterization of food aroma. Trends in Food Science & Technology Volume 7, 432-438.

MEISELMAN H.L., 1996. The contextual basis for food acceptance, food choice and food intake: the food, the situation and the individual. *In*: Meiselman H.L., MacFie, H.J.H. (Ed.) *Food choice acceptance and consumption*. Blackie. Academic & professional: London. 239-260.

MOSKOWITZ, H. R., 1985. New Directions for Product Testing and Sensory Analysis of Foods. Food and Nutrition Press Inc., Westport, Connecticut.

MOSKOWITZ, H. R., 1993. Sensory analysis procedures and viewpoints: intellectual history, current debates, future outlooks. *Journal of Sensory Studies* 8, 241-256.

NATIONAL DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE – SOUTH AFRICA, 2001. Abstract of Agricultural Statistic, 106.

NUTE, G. R., MACFIE, H. J. H. & GREENHOFF, K., 1988. Practical Application of Preference Mapping. *In:* Thomson, D. M. H. (Ed.) *Food acceptability*. Elsevier Applied Science: London. 377-386.



PAARDEKOOPER, E. J. C., DRIESEN, J. & CORNELISSEN, J., 1969. Determining the moisture content by means of an infrared reflectance meter. *Proc.* 4th Coll. ASIC. 131-139.

PILGRIM, F., 1957. The components of food acceptance and their measurement. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 5, 171-175.

PITT, L., 1991. Attitudes and Learning. In: du Plessis, P.J.(ed.). Consumer behaviour. A South African perspective. Sigma press: Pretoria, 95.

POMERANZ, Y. & MELOAN, C. E., 1994. Food analysis theory and practice (3rd edition). Chapman & Hall: New York. 87-92.

POWERS, J. J., 1988. Current practices and application of descriptive methods. *In:* Piggott, J.R. (Ed.) *Sensory analysis of foods*. Elsevier applied science: London. 187-266.

PANGBORN, R. M., 1981. Individuality in Response to Sensory Stimuli. *In:* Solms, J., Hall, R. L. (Eds.). *Criteria of Food Acceptance: How Man Chooses What He Eats.* Foster-Verlag: Zurich. 117-219.

QUINLAN, P. T., LANE, J., MOORE, K. L., ASPEN, J., RYCROFT, J. & O'BRIEN, D. C., 2000. The acute physiological and mood effects of tea and coffee: The role of caffeine level. *Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behaviour 66(1)*, 19-28.

RANDALL, E. & SANJUR, D., 1981. Food preference – Their conceptualization and relationship to consumption. *Ecological Food Nutrition 11*, 151-161.

RESURRECCION, A. V. A., 1988. Application of multivariate methods in food quality evaluation. Food Technology 42, 128-136.

RESURRECCION, A. V. A., 1998. Consumer Sensory Testing for Product Development. Gaithersburg, Maryland: Aspen Publishers. 30-31, 144.

ROZIN, P. & TUORILA, H. 1993. Simultaneous and temporal contextual influences on food acceptance. Food quality and preference 4, 11-20.



SADECKA, J. & POLONSKY, J., 2000. Electrophoretic methods in the analysis of beverages. *Journal of Chromatography A* 880. 243-279.

SCHIFFMAN, L.G. & KANUK, L. L., 1983. Consumer Behavior (2nd edition). Prentice Hall Inc.: New Jersey. 136.

SCHUTZ, H. G., 1988. *In:* Thomson, D. M. H. (Ed.) *Food acceptability*. Elsevier Applied Science: London. 115.

SHEPHERD, R. & SPARKS, P., 1994, Modelling food choice. *In:* MacFie, H.J.H, Thomson, D.M.H. (Ed.) *Measurement of food preferences*. Blackie Academic & professional: London. 202-223.

SHETH, J.N., MITTAL, B. & NEWMAN, B.I., 1999. Consumer behavior - consumer behavior and beyond. The Dryden Press: Fortworth.

SIVETZ, M. & DESROSIER, N. W., 1979. Coffee Technology. Avi Publishing inc.: Westport. 527-540.

SMITH, A. W., 1989. Introduction. *In:* Macrae, R., Clarke, R. J. (Ed.). *Coffee - chemistry* (volume 1). Elsevier Applied Science: London. 1-41.

SOLHEIM, R. & LAWLESS, H. T., 1996. Consumer purchase probability affected by attitude towards low fat foods, liking, private body consciousness and information on fat and price. Food Quality and Preference 7(2), 137-143.

SOUTH AFRICAN RESERVE BANK. 2001. Quarterly bulletin. March.

SPOELTRA, M., 1991. Consumer Perceptions and motives. *In:* du Plessis, P. J. (ed.). Consumer behaviour - A South African Perspective. Sigma Press: Pretoria. 67.

STATISTICAL BUREAU OF SOUTH AFRICA, 2000. http://statssa.gov.za. Accessed May 2001.



STEENKAMP, J. E. M., VAN TRIJP, H. C. M. & TEN BERGE, J. M. F., 1994. Perceptual mapping based on idiosyneratic sets of attributes. *Journal of Marketing Research* 31 (1), 15-27.

STONE, H. & SIDEL, J. L., 1993. Sensory Evaluation Practices (2nd Edition). San Diego: Acadmic Press.

TUNALEY, A., THOMSON, D. M. H. & McEWAN, J. A., 1988. An Investigation of the relationship between preference and the sensory characteristics of nine sweeteners. *In:* Thomson, D. M. H. (Ed.) *Food acceptability*. Elsevier Applied Science: London. 387-399.

UKERS, W. H., 1935. All about Coffee 2nd edition. New York: The Tea and Coffee Trade Journal Company.

VAN RITER, I., 1956. Acceptance of 26 vegetables. *Journal of Home Economics* 48, 771-773.

VUATAZ, L. 1977. Some points of methodology in multidimensional data analysis as applied to sensory evaluation. *Nestle Research News.* 57-71.

WALL, M. M. & BOSLAND, P. W., 1998. Analytical methods for color and pungency of chillies (capsicums). *In:* Wetzel, D., Charalambous, G. (Ed.) *Instrumental Methods in Food and Beverage Analysis*. Elsevier: Amsterdam. 349.

WESTENHOEFER, J. & PUDEL, V., 1993. Pleasure from food: Importance for food choice and consequences of deliberate restriction. *Appetite 20*, 246-249.

WILKIE, W. L., 1994. Consumer behavior 3rd edition. John Wiley & Sons inc.: New York. 441pp.

WILLIAMS, A. A. & LONGRON, S. P., 1984. The use of free-choice profiling for the evaluation of commercial ports. *Journal of Science of Food and Agriculture 35*, 558-568.



WOLTERS, C, J. & GEMERT, L. J., 1990. Towards an integrated model of sensory attributes, instrumental data and consumer perception of tomatoes: relation between consumer perception and sensory attributes. *Acta Horticulturae* 259, 91-98.

YACKINOUS, C., WEE, C. & GUINARD, J., 1999. Internal preference mapping of hedonic rating for Ranch salad dressings varying in fat and garlic flavor. Food Quality and Preference 10, 401-409.

ZAMORA, M. C. & CALVINO, A. M. 1996. A comparison of methodology applied to the selection of a panel for sensory evaluation of instant coffee. *Journal of Sensory Studies 11*. 211-226.



APPENDIX 1: Advert in local university newspaper to recruit sensory panellists for descriptive analysis.

Earning easy money is your aim?

"The coffee project" is the name of the game!

You are good with words, Love drinking coffee and Have a few hours free in the afternoons...

Call us NOW!

Find out more

012 420 3238

If you snooze you loose!

APPENDIX 2: Telephone questionnaire to recruit potential sensory panellists for descriptive analysis

Good Morning/Afternoon	
I am	FROM DEPT OF FOOD SCIENCE
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA.	

You're phoning in connection with the coffee project [YES][NO]?

We are recruiting participants for a coffee tasting project at the University of Pretoria.

Payment is at R21.19/h thus giving you a minimum of R630 for 2 hours work per day for 20 days.

Do you drink coffee? [YES][NO]

Coffee Questionnaire:

Are you willing to drink black coffee? [YES][NO]

What type of coffee do you drink? [INSTANT]

How often do you drink coffee? [AT LEAST ONCE A DAY]

Are you available from 14:00 to 16:00 every weekday from 23 August to 30 September (exception public holiday 25 Sept)? [YES][NO]

Invite him/her to an information session the 18th Aug 2000 from 14:00 - 15:00 at the Department of Food Science room 2-35 (Old agriculture building – Main Campus – cnr of Roper and Prospect Road, Brooklyn)

APPENDIX 3: Basic taste recognition test for the identification of potential panellists for descriptive analysis

(ASTM Committee E-18 (1968) sensitivity for basic taste sensations)

Panellist number:		
Name:	Contact number:	
Date:	Age: (15-19/25-29/30+)	Sex: (M/F)
On your tray you have 5 sa You may <u>NOT</u> go back and		sample the taste you are recognizing.

TEST TRAY NUMBER:

PANEL SCREENING TEST 1

Test 1

Sweet	Sour	Salty	Bitter	Nothing detected
	-			
	Sweet	Sweet Sour	Sweet Sour Salty	Sweet Sour Salty Bitter

Test 2

Sample	Sweet	Sour	Salty	Bitter	Nothing detected

APPENDIX 4: Forced choice threshold test for the identification of potential panellists for descriptive analysis (ASTM Committee. E 679 (1991) sensitivity for specifically bitter and sour)

	SCREENI number: _	NG TEST	2			
		7 sets tasti ple is diffe			Taste the samples.	In each set,
TEST TI	RAY NUM	IBER:				
1			2			
3			4			
5			6			
7		,	1			



APPENDIX 5: Duo-trio test for the identification and training of potential panelists for descriptive analysis

(1) Coffee vs. chicory blend, (2) coffee caffeinated vs. decaffeinated, (3) pure coffee vs. coffee blend

PANEL SCREENING TEST 3		
Panellist number:		
On your tray you have a marked control identical to R and the other different. W	ol sample (R) and to hich of the coded sa	wo coded samples. One sample is amples is DIFFERENT from R?
TEST TRAY NUMBER:		
Test 1		
Sample number different from R:	347	982_
*********	******	******
Test 2		
Sample number different from R:	_687_	417_
*********	*****	*******
Test 3		
Sample number different from R:	329	541_
*****************	*****	******

APPENDIX 6: Odour identification and description test identification and training of potential panellists for descriptive analysis

PANEL SCREENING TEST 4 Panellist number: You are receiving smelling strips, each with a specific odour. Wave the strip a few centimetres away from your nose and write down short words (less than 10) or descriptives to indicate what you smell. After three minutes, we will indicate that you must move on to the next sample. e.g. Sample A: sweet, fruity, berry-like, strawberry Sample 578: Apple Sample 276: _Black Pepper_____ Sample 903: Vanilla Sample 154: Lemon_____ Sample 427: Cinnamon Sample 289: Caramel Sample 175: Mushroom

Sample 371: Orange	
Sample 648: Hazelnut	
Sample 025: Grassy Green	
,	
Sample 473: Chocolate	
Sample 728: Woody	
Sample 728: Woody	
Sample 213: Mint	
Sample 558: Herbal	
Sample 306: Buttery	
Sample 470: Melon	
Sample 596: Coffee	

Sample 432: Lime		
Sample 729: Smoky		
	***************************************	 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Sample 658: Cherry		



APPENDIX 7: Descriptive analysis scoring of coffee by the trained sensory panel

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS SCORING OF COFFEE Panellist number: Please evaluate the following attributes of these samples of coffees. Make vertical lines on the horizontal line to indicate your rating of the attribute of each sample. Label each vertical line with the code number of the sample it represents. You may have water and biscuits in between samples Your sample numbers: 1. Colour: Light brown 2. Coarseness: 3. Symmetry: Asymmetric

Perforated Compact/Dense

Density:

Fishy smell:

4.

5.

No fishiness Strong fishy aroma

6.	Solubility:	
	Insoluble	Rapidly soluble
7.	Roasted smell:	
	Lightly roasted	Burnt
8.	Sweet smell:	
	Very bland	Intensely sweet
9.	Sour /acidic smell:	
	Bland	Strongly acidic
10.	Malty smell:	
	No maltiness	Intensely malty
1	1. "Meaty" (Fenugreek) smell:	
	No Fenugreek	High Fenugreek
12.	Spicy smell:	
	No spiciness	Intensely spicy



Earthy smell:	
No earthy aroma	Strong earthy aroma
14. Mushroom smell:	
No mushroom aroma	Strong Mushroom arom
15. "Cacao" (dark chocolate smell)	
Light toffee/caramel notes	Dark chocolate
16. Toasted cereal smell:	
No toasted cereal	Intense toasted cereal
17. Nutty smell:	
No nuttiness	Intense nuttiness
18. Leather/animal smell:	
No animal/leather smell	Intense animal/leather smell
19. "Root" (cooked sweet potato smell):	
No root smell	Intense root smell
20. Cloudiness:	
Clear	Cloudy (opaque)



21	1. Bitter taste:	
	Not bitter	Intense bitter
22.	Roasted taste:	
	Lightly roasted	Burnt
23.	Acidic taste:	
	No acidic taste	Intensely acidic
24.	Sweetness:	1
	No sweet taste	Molasses sweet
2	5. Malty taste:	
	No maltiness	Intense malty
2	6. Nutty taste:	
	No nuttiness	Intense nuttiness
2	27. Earthy taste:	
	Least earthy	Most earthy
2	28. Astringency:	
	Not astringent	Strong astringency
29.	Body:	1
	Watery	Full bodied

PLEASE MAKE SURE \underline{ALL} THE SAMPLES ARE EVALUATED FOR \underline{ALL} THE ATTRIBUTES!!!!

APPENDIX 8: Consumer coffee survey and scoring sheet

COFFEE SURVEY

Dear Sir/Madam

We appreciate you volunteering to participate in this survey. As your field worker should have explained to you, you received 11 samples of coffee to test and evaluate over the next 14 days (at least one coffee a day, but feel free to evaluate more samples).

You may evaluate the coffee samples in any order, but please make sure you evaluate on the form supplied with the samples.

Make your coffee as you would normally in a mug/coffee cup, add milk and/or sugar if desired (sugar sachets and milk measurement cup are supplied).

PLEASE KEEP THE AMOUNT OF MILK AND SUGAR CONSTANT OVER THIS TRIAL PERIOD (thus if you drink 2 sachets of sugar and no milk today, please continue to drink it that way for all the samples).

Evaluate the coffee sample immediately after consuming it to ensure freshness of evaluation.

Name:	Contact number.	
Date:	Age: (15-19/20-24/25-29/30-39/ 40+)	Sex: (M / F)
Income: (optional) [<24000 / 24000 –4799	9 / 48000 – 71999 / 72000 – 95999 />	96000]
Occupation/Job description	n:	
Nationality: (optional) Black White	Coloured Asian	
City:	Suburb:	
How do you drink you cof black black black black with suga	fee? ar milk/cream milk & sugar artificial	sweetener
How many curs of coffee	do you drink per day? 1 2 3 4	5+



When do you dr	ank co	ttee?
----------------	--------	-------

Breakfast	Morning	Noon	Dinner	Evening	Bedtime
-----------	---------	------	--------	---------	---------

What other drinks do you drink more or just as much as coffee (may mark more than one)?

MILO	HOT CHOCOLATE	HORLICKS
TEA	BEER	WINE
DISTILLED SPIRITS	BAR MIXES (e.g. gin & tonic)	LIQUORS
ENERGY DRINKS		FRUIT JUICES
COKE COLA	OTHERCARBONATED SOFT DRINKS	OTHER (specify)

Where do	o you	drink	coffee	most	often?
----------	-------	-------	--------	------	--------

Home	
Work	[]
Friends	
Shopping	
Coffee shop/Restaurant	

How often do you drink any of the following coffee types?

Instant coffee	regularly	sometimes	never
Filter coffee	regularly	sometimes	never
Flavoured coffee	regularly	sometimes	never
Iced coffee	regularly	sometimes	never
Instant coffee blends	regularly	sometimes	never

What	coffee	brand	are	you	currently	purchasing	for	you	home'

Why? Taste Price Image Tradition Other reason:

Which of the following descriptions do you think suit you the best?

Group A	Competitive individualist, desire to stand out and excel, seek power and
	admiration from others, stubborn, venturesome, driven
Group C	Wants to be loved and appreciated by others, seek friendship and accepted place within a group, warm-hearted, affected by feeling, easily led, sensitive,
Group D	Desire freedom from obligation, independent and little interest in either influencing others or being influenced, critical, calm, realistic, down to earth, resourceful

Taste each of the samples of coffee and indicate [X] how much you like or dislike each one:

Sample number	
Like extremely	
Like very much	
Like moderately	
Like slightly	
Neither like nor dislike	
Dislike slightly	
Dislike moderately	
Dislike very much	
Dislike extremely	

Strapis nomber	
	المنجوب المستمنية أسابات بيميد تبريب مستناه سينا
Like extensive	
Marine and the second s	
	i
	i
Life moissingly	
Secretaria de la companya de la comp	
Neither River and Bulker	1
And the second of the second o	ľ
Chillies all pludy	1
participated in the experience of the entire and an experience of the experience of	
Didito sectionally.	
Manufacture de la compaction de la compactica de la compactica de la compactica de la compactica de la compact	
	1

Sample number	
Like extremely	
Like very much	
Like moderately	
Like slightly	
Neither like nor dislike	
Dislike slightly	
Dislike moderately	
Dislike very much	
Dislike extremely	

PART AND	
Sample manber	
Lite estagnery	
Lake very much	
Like materially	
SERVICE A TELESCOPE CONTROL CONTROL CONTROL CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PRO	
Like shealty	
Madierlie na delle	
and the first care of the control of	
Duties signly	
Lisi Connectately	
Distille very much	
AND THE STREET OF THE PROPERTY	
Charles extremely the second	
Therefore we was a second seco	

Sample number	
Like extremely	
Like very much	
Like moderately	
Like slightly	
Neither like nor dislike	
Dislike slightly	
Dislike moderately	
Dislike very much	
Dislike extremely	

Sample namber	
Lake attenday	
Chickery merch	
PARCENTAL PROPERTY.	
Like digaty	
Distribution of the state of th	
Patthamerica	
Distille very mode	
Distiller-citement (Sec.	

Sample number	
Like extremely	
Like very much	
Like moderately	
Like slightly	
Neither like nor dislike	
Dislike slightly	
Dislike moderately	
Dislike very much	
Dislike extremely	

Sample minister	
Like of Karlon	tanii tanii aa a
Tille way said	
Likeron Americky (1997)	
Oddicianado:	

Sample number	
Like extremely	
Like very much	
Like moderately	
Like slightly	
Neither like nor dislike	
Dislike slightly	
Dislike moderately	
Dislike very much	
Dislike extremely	

Sample patrices	
Life residency	
Like very much	<u> </u>
April 100 miles of the control of th	
Like digida	
*Dishis diphriy	
Data Charles College	
Builterannutt	
POR CHARLES	

Sample number	
Like extremely	
Like very much	
Like moderately	
Like slightly	
Neither like nor dislike	
Dislike slightly	
Dislike moderately	
Dislike very much	
Dislike extremely	