



Standard Test Method for Directional Difference Test¹

This standard is issued under the fixed designation E2164; the number immediately following the designation indicates the year of original adoption or, in the case of revision, the year of last revision. A number in parentheses indicates the year of last reapproval. A superscript epsilon (ϵ) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

1. Scope

1.1 This test method covers a procedure for comparing two products using a two-alternative forced-choice task.

1.2 This method is sometimes referred to as a paired comparison test or as a 2-AFC (alternative forced choice) test.

1.3 A directional difference test determines whether a difference exists in the perceived intensity of a specified sensory attribute between two samples.

1.4 Directional difference testing is limited in its application to a specified sensory attribute and does not directly determine the magnitude of the difference for that specific attribute. Assessors must be able to recognize and understand the specified attribute. A lack of difference in the specified attribute does not imply that no overall difference exists.

1.5 This test method does not address preference.

1.6 A directional difference test is a simple task for assessors, and is used when sensory fatigue or carryover is a concern. The directional difference test does not exhibit the same level of fatigue, carryover, or adaptation as multiple sample tests such as triangle or duo-trio tests. For detail on comparisons among the various difference tests, see Ennis (**1**), MacRae (**2**), and O'Mahony and Odber (**3**).²

1.7 The procedure of the test described in this document consists of presenting a single pair of samples to the assessors.

1.8 *This standard does not purport to address all of the safety concerns, if any, associated with its use. It is the responsibility of the user of this standard to establish appropriate safety and health practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to use.*

¹ This test method is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee E18 on Sensory Evaluation and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee E18.04 on Fundamentals of Sensory.

Current edition approved Oct. 1, 2016. Published October 2016. Originally approved in 2001. Last previous edition approved in 2008 as E2164 – 08. DOI: 10.1520/E2164-16.

² The boldface numbers in parentheses refer to the list of references at the end of this standard.

2. Referenced Documents

2.1 *ASTM Standards*:³

E253 Terminology Relating to Sensory Evaluation of Materials and Products

E456 Terminology Relating to Quality and Statistics

E1871 Guide for Serving Protocol for Sensory Evaluation of Foods and Beverages

2.2 *ISO Standard*:

ISO 5495 Sensory Analysis—Methodology—Paired Comparison

3. Terminology

3.1 For definition of terms relating to sensory analysis, see Terminology E253, and for terms relating to statistics, see Terminology E456.

3.2 *Definitions of Terms Specific to This Standard*:

3.2.1 *α (alpha) risk*—the probability of concluding that a perceptible difference exists when, in reality, one does not (also known as type I error or significance level).

3.2.2 *β (beta) risk*—the probability of concluding that no perceptible difference exists when, in reality, one does (also known as type II error).

3.2.3 *one-sided test*—a test in which the researcher has an a priori expectation concerning the direction of the difference. In this case, the alternative hypothesis will express that the perceived intensity of the specified sensory attribute is greater (that is, $A > B$) (or lower (that is, $A < B$)) for a product relative to the other.

3.2.4 *two-sided test*—a test in which the researcher does not have any a priori expectation concerning the direction of the difference. In this case, the alternative hypothesis will express that the perceived intensity of the specified sensory attribute is different from one product to the other (that is, $A \neq B$).

³ For referenced ASTM standards, visit the ASTM website, www.astm.org, or contact ASTM Customer Service at service@astm.org. For *Annual Book of ASTM Standards* volume information, refer to the standard's Document Summary page on the ASTM website.

3.2.5 *common responses*—for a one-sided test, the number of assessors selecting the sample expected to have a higher intensity of the specified sensory attribute. Common responses could also be defined in terms of lower intensity of the attribute if it is more relevant. For a two-sided test, the larger number of assessors selecting sample A or B.

3.2.6 P_{max} —A test sensitivity parameter established prior to testing and used along with the selected values of α and β to determine the number of assessors needed in a study. P_{max} is the proportion of common responses that the researcher wants the test to be able to detect with a probability of $1 - \beta$. For example, if a researcher wants to be 90 % confident of detecting a 60:40 split in a directional difference test, then $P_{max} = 60\%$ and $\beta = 0.10$. P_{max} is relative to a population of judges that has to be defined based on the characteristics of the panel used for the test. For instance, if the panel consists of trained assessors, P_{max} will be representative of a population of trained assessors, but not of consumers.

3.2.7 P_c —the proportion of common responses that is calculated from the test data.

3.2.8 *product*—the material to be evaluated.

3.2.9 *sample*—the unit of product prepared, presented, and evaluated in the test.

3.2.10 *sensitivity*—a general term used to summarize the performance characteristics of the test. The sensitivity of the test is rigorously defined, in statistical terms, by the values selected for α , β , and P_{max} .

4. Summary of Test Method

4.1 Clearly define the test objective in writing.

4.2 Choose the number of assessors based on the sensitivity desired for the test. The sensitivity of the test is, in part, a function of two competing risks—the risk of declaring a difference in the attribute when there is none (that is, α -risk) and the risk of not declaring a difference in the attribute when there is one (that is, β -risk). Acceptable values of α and β vary depending on the test objective. The values should be agreed upon by all parties affected by the results of the test.

4.3 In directional difference testing, assessors receive a pair of coded samples and are informed of the attribute to be evaluated. The assessors report which they believe to be higher or lower in intensity of the specified attribute, even if the selection is based only on a guess.

4.4 Results are tallied and significance determined by direct calculation or reference to a statistical table.

5. Significance and Use

5.1 The directional difference test determines with a given confidence level whether or not there is a perceivable difference in the intensity of a specified attribute between two samples, for example, when a change is made in an ingredient, a process, packaging, handling, or storage.

5.2 The directional difference test is inappropriate when evaluating products with sensory characteristics that are not easily specified, not commonly understood, or not known in

advance. Other difference test methods such as the same-different test should be used.

5.3 A result of no significant difference in a specific attribute does not ensure that there are no differences between the two samples in other attributes or characteristics, nor does it indicate that the attribute is the same for both samples. It may merely indicate that the degree of difference is too low to be detected with the sensitivity (α , β , and P_{max}) chosen for the test.

5.3.1 The method itself does not change whether the purpose of the test is to determine that two samples are perceptibly different versus that the samples are not perceptibly different. Only the selected values of P_{max} , α , and β change. If the objective of the test is to determine if the two samples are perceptibly different, then the value selected for α is typically smaller than the value selected for β . If the objective is to determine if no perceivable difference exists, then the value selected for β is typically smaller than the value selected for α and the value of P_{max} needs to be stated explicitly.

6. Apparatus

6.1 Carry out the test under conditions that prevent contact between assessors until the evaluations have been completed, for example, booths that comply with MNL 60 (4).

6.2 Sample preparation and serving sizes should comply with Guide E1871, or see Herz and Cupchik (5) or Todrank et al (6).

7. Assessors

7.1 All assessors must be familiar with the mechanics of the directional difference test (format, task, and procedure of evaluation). For directional difference testing, assessors must be able to recognize and quantify the specified attribute.

7.2 The characteristics of the assessors used define the scope of the conclusions. Experience and familiarity with the product or the attribute may increase the sensitivity of an assessor and may therefore increase the likelihood of finding a significant difference. Monitoring the performance of assessors over time may be useful for selecting assessors with increased sensitivity. Consumers can be used, as long as they are familiar with the format of the directional difference test. If a sufficient number of employees are available for this test, they too can serve as assessors. If trained descriptive assessors are used, there should be sufficient numbers of them to meet the agreed-upon risks appropriate to the project. Mixing the types of assessors is not recommended, given the potential differences in sensitivity of each type of assessor.

7.3 The degree of training for directional difference testing should be addressed prior to test execution. Attribute-specific training may include a preliminary presentation of differing levels of the attribute, either shown external to the product or shown within the product, for example, as a solution or within a product formulation. If the test concerns the detection of a particular taint, consider the inclusion of samples during training that demonstrate its presence and absence. Such demonstration will increase the assessors' acuity for the taint (see STP 758 (7) for details). Allow adequate time between the exposure to the training samples and the actual test to avoid carryover or fatigue.

7.4 During the test sessions, avoid giving information about product identity, expected treatment effects, or individual performance until all testing is complete.

8. Number of Assessors

8.1 Choose the number of assessors to yield the sensitivity called for by the test objectives. The sensitivity of the test is a function of four factors: α -risk, β -risk, maximum allowable proportion of common responses (P_{\max}), and whether the test is one-sided or two-sided.

8.2 Prior to conducting the test, decide if the test is one-sided or two-sided and select values for α , β , and P_{\max} . The following can be considered as general guidelines:

8.2.1 One-sided versus two-sided: The test is one-sided if only one direction of difference is critical to the findings. For example, the test is one-sided if the objective is to confirm that the sample with more sugar is sweeter than the sample with less sugar. The test is two-sided if both possible directions of difference are important. For example, the test is two-sided if the objective of the test is to determine which of two samples is sweeter.

8.2.2 When testing for a difference, for example, when the researcher wants to take only a small chance of concluding that a difference exists when it does not, the most commonly used values for α -risk and β -risk are $\alpha = 0.05$ and $\beta = 0.20$. These values can be adjusted on a case-by-case basis to reflect the sensitivity desired versus the number of assessors available. When testing for a difference with a limited number of assessors, hold the α -risk at a relatively small value and allow the β -risk to increase to control the risk of falsely concluding that a difference is present.

8.2.3 When testing for similarity, for example, when the researcher wants to take only a small chance of missing a difference that is there, the most commonly used values for α -risk and β -risk are $\alpha = 0.20$ and $\beta = 0.05$. These values can be adjusted on a case-by-case basis to reflect the sensitivity desired vs. the number of assessors available. When testing for similarity with a limited number of assessors, hold the β -risk at a relatively small value and allow the α -risk to increase in order to control the risk of missing a difference that is present.

8.2.4 For P_{\max} , the proportion of common responses falls into three ranges:

$P_{\max} < 55\%$ represents “small” values;
 $55\% \leq P_{\max} \leq 65\%$ represents “medium-sized” values; and
 $P_{\max} > 65\%$ represents “large” values.

8.3 Having defined the required sensitivity for the test using 8.2, use [Table 1](#) or [Table 2](#) to determine the number of assessors necessary. Enter the table in the section corresponding to the selected value of P_{\max} and the column corresponding to the selected value of β . The minimum required number of assessors is found in the row corresponding to the selected value of α . Alternatively, [Table 1](#) or [Table 2](#) can be used to develop a set of values for P_{\max} , α , and β that provide acceptable sensitivity while maintaining the number of assessors within practical limits.

8.4 Often in practice, the number of assessors is determined by material conditions (e.g., duration of the experiment, number of available assessors, quantity of sample). However,

increasing the number of assessors increases the likelihood of detecting small differences. Thus, one should expect to use larger numbers of assessors when trying to demonstrate that samples are similar compared to when one is trying to show they are different.

9. Procedure

9.1 Prepare serving order worksheet and ballot in advance of the test to ensure a balanced order of sample presentation of the two samples, A and B. Balance the serving sequences AB and BA across all assessors. Serving order worksheets should also include complete sample identification information. See [Appendix X1](#).

9.2 It is critical to the validity of the test that assessors cannot identify the samples from the way in which they are presented. For example, in a test evaluating flavor differences, one should avoid any subtle differences in temperature or appearance caused by factors such as the time sequence of preparation. It may be possible to mask color differences using light filters, subdued illumination or colored vessels. Code the vessels containing the samples in a uniform manner using 3-digit numbers chosen at random for each test. Prepare samples out of sight and in an identical manner: same apparatus, same vessels, same quantities of sample (see [Guide E1871-91](#)).

9.3 Present each pair of samples simultaneously whenever possible, following the same spatial arrangement for each assessor (on a line to be sampled always from left to right, or from front to back, etc.). Within the pair, assessors are typically allowed to make repeated evaluations of each sample as desired. If the conditions of the test require the prevention of repeat evaluations, for example, if samples are bulky, leave an aftertaste, or show slight differences in appearance that cannot be masked, present the samples monadically (or sequential monadic) and do not allow repeated evaluations.

9.4 Ask only one question about the samples. The selection the assessor has made on the initial question may bias the reply to subsequent questions about the samples. Responses to additional questions may be obtained through separate tests for preference, acceptance, degree of difference, etc. See [Chambers and Baker Wolf \(9\)](#). A section soliciting comments may be included following the initial forced-choice question.

9.5 The directional difference test is a forced-choice procedure; assessors are not allowed the option of reporting “no difference.” An assessor who detects no difference between the samples should be instructed to make a guess and select one of the samples, and can indicate in the comments section that the selection was only a guess.

10. Analysis and Interpretation of Results

10.1 The procedure used to analyze the results of a directional difference test depends on the number of assessors.

10.1.1 If the number of assessors is equal to or greater than the value given in [Table 1](#) (for a one-sided alternative) or [Table 2](#) (for a two-sided alternative) for the chosen values of α , β , and P_{\max} , then use [Table 3](#) to analyze the data obtained from a one-sided test and [Table 4](#) to analyze the data from a two-sided

TABLE 1 Number of Assessors Needed for a Directional Difference Test One-Sided Alternative

NOTE 1—The values recorded in this table have been rounded to the nearest whole number evenly divisible by two to allow for equal presentation of both pair combinations (AB and BA).

NOTE 2—Adapted from Meilgaard et al (8).

α		β							
		0.50	0.40	0.30	0.20	0.10	0.05	0.01	0.001
0.50	$P_{\max}=75\%$	2	4	4	4	8	12	20	34
0.40		2	4	4	6	10	14	28	42
0.30		2	6	8	10	14	20	30	48
0.20		6	6	10	12	20	26	40	58
0.10		10	10	14	20	26	34	48	70
0.05		114	16	18	24	34	42	58	82
0.01	22	28	34	40	50	60	80	108	
0.001	38	44	52	62	72	84	108	140	
0.50	$P_{\max}=70\%$	4	4	4	8	12	18	32	60
0.40		4	4	6	8	14	26	42	70
0.30		6	8	10	14	22	28	50	78
0.20		6	10	12	20	30	40	60	94
0.10		14	20	22	28	40	54	80	114
0.05		18	24	30	38	54	68	94	132
0.01	36	42	52	64	80	96	130	174	
0.001	62	72	82	96	118	136	176	228	
0.50	$P_{\max}=65\%$	4	4	4	8	18	32	62	102
0.40		4	6	8	14	30	42	76	120
0.30		8	10	14	24	40	54	88	144
0.20		10	18	22	32	50	68	110	166
0.10		22	28	38	54	72	96	146	208
0.05		30	42	54	70	94	120	174	244
0.01	64	78	90	112	144	174	236	320	
0.001	108	126	144	172	210	246	318	412	
0.50	$P_{\max}=60\%$	4	4	8	18	42	68	134	238
0.40		6	10	24	36	60	94	172	282
0.30		12	22	30	50	84	120	206	328
0.20		22	32	50	78	112	158	254	384
0.10		46	66	86	116	168	214	322	472
0.05		72	94	120	158	214	268	392	554
0.01	142	168	208	252	326	392	536	726	
0.001	242	282	328	386	480	556	732	944	
0.50	$P_{\max}=55\%$	4	8	28	74	164	272	542	952
0.40		10	36	62	124	238	362	672	1124
0.30		30	72	118	200	334	480	810	1302
0.20		82	130	194	294	452	618	1006	1556
0.10		170	240	338	462	658	862	1310	1906
0.05		282	370	476	620	866	1092	1584	2238
0.01	550	666	820	1008	1302	1582	2170	2928	
0.001	962	1126	1310	1552	1908	2248	2938	3812	

test. If the number of common responses is equal to or greater than the number given in the table, conclude that a perceptible attribute difference exists between the samples. If the number of common responses is less than the number given in the table, conclude that the samples are similar in attribute intensity and that no more than P_{\max} of the population would perceive the difference at a confidence level equal to $1-\beta$. Again, the conclusions are based on the risks accepted when the sensitivity (that is, P_{\max} , α , and β) was selected in determining the number of assessors.

10.1.2 If the number of assessors is less than the value given in **Table 1** or **Table 2** for the chosen values of α , β , and P_{\max} and the researcher is primarily interested in testing for a difference, then use **Table 3** to analyze the data obtained from a one-sided

test or **Table 4** to analyze the data obtained from a two-sided test. If the number of common responses is equal to or greater than the number given in the table, conclude that a perceptible attribute difference exists between the samples at the α -level of significance.

10.1.3 If the number of assessors is less than the value given in **Table 1** or **Table 2** for the chosen values of α , β , and P_{\max} and the researcher is primarily interested in testing for similarity, then a one-sided confidence interval is used to analyze the data obtained from the test. The calculations are as follows:

$$P_c = c/n$$

$$S_c \text{ (standard error of } P_c) = \sqrt{P_c(1 - P_c)/n}$$

$$\text{confidence limit} = P_c + z_\beta S_c$$

TABLE 2 Number of Assessors Needed for a Directional Difference Test Two-Sided Alternative

NOTE 1—The values recorded in this table have been rounded to the nearest whole number evenly divisible by two to allow for equal presentation of both pair combinations (AB and BA).

NOTE 2—Adapted from Meilgaard et al (8).

α		β							
		0.50	0.40	0.30	0.20	0.10	0.05	0.01	0.001
0.50	$P_{\max}=75\%$	2	6	8	12	16	24	34	52
0.40		6	6	10	12	20	26	40	58
0.30		6	8	12	16	22	30	42	64
0.20		10	10	14	20	26	34	48	70
0.10		14	16	18	24	34	42	58	82
0.05		18	20	26	30	42	50	68	92
0.01		26	34	40	44	58	66	88	118
0.001		42	50	58	66	78	90	118	150
0.50	$P_{\max}=70\%$	6	8	12	16	26	34	54	86
0.40		6	10	12	20	30	40	60	94
0.30		8	14	18	22	34	44	68	102
0.20		14	20	22	28	40	54	80	114
0.10		18	24	30	38	54	68	94	132
0.05		26	36	40	50	66	80	110	150
0.01		44	50	60	74	92	108	144	192
0.001		68	78	90	102	126	148	188	240
0.50	$P_{\max}=65\%$	8	14	18	30	44	64	98	156
0.40		10	18	22	32	50	68	110	166
0.30		14	20	30	42	60	82	126	188
0.20		22	28	38	54	72	96	146	208
0.10		30	42	54	70	94	120	174	244
0.05		44	56	68	90	114	146	200	276
0.01		74	92	108	132	164	196	262	346
0.001		122	140	162	188	230	268	342	440
0.50	$P_{\max}=60\%$	16	28	36	64	98	136	230	352
0.40		22	32	50	78	112	158	254	384
0.30		32	44	66	90	134	180	284	426
0.20		46	66	86	116	168	214	322	472
0.10		72	120	158	214	268	392	554	
0.05		102	126	158	200	264	328	456	636
0.01		172	204	242	292	374	446	596	796
0.001		276	318	364	426	520	604	782	1010
0.50	$P_{\max}=55\%$	50	96	156	240	394	544	910	1424
0.40		82	130	194	294	452	618	1006	1556
0.30		110	174	254	360	550	722	1130	1702
0.20		170	240	338	462	658	862	1310	1906
0.10		282	370	476	620	866	1092	1584	2238
0.05		390	498	620	786	1056	1302	1834	2544
0.01		670	802	964	1168	1494	1782	2408	3204
0.001		1090	1260	1462	1708	2094	2440	3152	4064

where:

z_{β} = the one-sided critical value of the standard normal distribution, and

c = the number of common responses.

Values of z_{β} for some commonly used values of β -risk are:

β -risk	z_{β}
0.50	0.000
0.40	0.253
0.30	0.524
0.20	0.842
0.10	1.282
0.05	1.645
0.01	2.326
0.001	3.090

If the confidence limit is less than P_{\max} , then conclude that the samples are similar in attribute intensity (that is, no more than P_{\max} of the population would perceive a difference at the β -level of significance). If the confidence limit is greater than P_{\max} , then similarity has not been demonstrated.

10.2 If desired, calculate a two-sided confidence interval on the proportion of common responses. The method is described in [Appendix X4](#).

11. Report

11.1 Report the test objective, the results, and the conclusions. The following additional information is highly recommended:

11.1.1 The purpose of the test and the nature of the treatment studied;

11.1.2 Full identification of the samples: origin, method of preparation, quantity, shape, storage prior to testing, serving size, and temperature. (Sample information should communicate that all storage, handling, and preparation was done in such a way as to yield samples that differed only in the variable of interest, if at all);

TABLE 3 Number of Selected Responses Needed For Significance in a Directional Difference Test, One-Sided Alternative

NOTE 1—Entries are the minimum number of common responses required for significance at the stated significance level (column) for the corresponding number of assessors *n* (row). Reject the assumption of “no difference” if the number of correct responses is greater than or equal to the tabled value.

NOTE 2—For values of *n* not in the table, compute the missing entry as follows: Minimum number of responses (*x*) = nearest whole number greater than $x = (n/2) + z \sqrt{n/4}$, where *z* varies with the significance level as follows: 0.84 for $\alpha=0.20$; 1.28 for $\alpha = 0.10$; 1.64 for $\alpha = 0.05$; 2.33 for $\alpha = 0.01$; 3.10 for $\alpha = 0.001$. This calculation is an approximation. The value obtained may differ from the exact value as presented in the table, but the difference never exceeds one response. Exact values can be obtained from binomial distribution functions widely available in statistical computer packages.

NOTE 3—Adapted from Meilgaard et al (8).

<i>n</i>	Significance level (%)					
	.50	.20	.10	.05	.01	.001
4	3	4	4
5	4	4	5	5
6	4	5	6	6
7	4	6	6	7	7	...
8	5	6	7	7	8	...
9	6	7	7	8	9	...
10	6	7	8	9	10	10
11	6	8	9	9	10	11
12	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	7	9	10	10	12	13
14	8	10	10	11	12	13
15	9	10	11	12	13	14
16	9	11	12	12	14	15
17	9	11	12	13	14	16
18	10	12	13	13	15	16
19	10	12	13	14	15	17
20	11	13	14	15	16	18
21	12	13	14	15	17	18
22	12	14	15	16	17	19
23	12	15	16	16	18	20
24	13	15	16	17	19	20
25	13	16	17	18	19	21
26	14	16	17	18	20	22
27	14	17	18	19	20	22
28	15	17	18	19	21	23
29	16	18	19	20	22	24
30	16	18	20	20	22	24
31	16	19	20	21	23	25
32	17	19	21	22	24	26
33	17	20	21	22	24	26
34	18	20	22	23	25	27
35	19	21	22	23	25	27
36	19	22	23	24	26	28
40	21	24	25	26	28	31
44	23	26	27	28	31	33
48	25	28	29	31	33	36
52	27	30	32	33	35	38
56	29	32	34	35	38	40
60	31	34	36	37	40	43
64	33	36	38	40	42	45
68	35	38	40	42	45	48
72	37	41	42	44	47	50
76	39	43	45	46	49	52
80	41	45	47	48	51	55
84	43	47	49	51	54	57
88	45	49	51	53	56	59
92	47	51	53	55	58	62
96	49	53	55	57	60	64
100	51	55	57	59	63	66

11.1.3 The number of assessors, the number of selections of each sample, and the result of the statistical analysis;

TABLE 4 Number of Selected Responses Needed for Significance in a Directional Difference Test, Two-Sided Alternative

NOTE 1—Entries are the minimum number of common responses required for significance at the stated significance level (column) for the corresponding number of assessors *n* (row). Reject the assumption of “no difference” if the number of correct responses is greater than or equal to the tabled value.

NOTE 2—For values of *n* not in the table, compute the missing entry as follows: Minimum number of responses (*x*) = nearest whole number greater than $x = (n/2) + z \sqrt{n/4}$, where *z* varies with the significance level as follows: 1.28 for $\alpha = 0.20$; 1.64 for $\alpha = 0.10$; 1.96 for $\alpha = 0.05$; 2.58 for $\alpha = 0.01$; 3.29 for $\alpha = 0.001$. This calculation is an approximation. The value obtained may differ from the exact value as presented in the table, but the difference never exceeds one response. Exact values can be obtained from binomial distribution functions widely available in statistical computer packages.

NOTE 3—Adapted from Meilgaard et al (8).

<i>n</i>	Significance level (%)					
	.50	.20	.10	.05	.01	.001
5	4	5	5
6	5	6	6	6
7	5	6	7	7
8	6	7	7	8	8	...
9	7	7	8	8	9	...
10	7	8	9	9	10	...
11	8	9	9	10	11	11
12	8	9	10	10	11	12
13	9	10	10	11	12	13
14	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	10	11	12	12	13	14
16	10	12	12	13	14	15
17	11	12	13	13	15	16
18	11	13	13	14	15	17
19	12	13	14	15	16	17
20	13	14	15	15	17	18
21	13	14	15	16	17	19
22	14	15	16	17	18	19
23	14	16	16	17	19	20
24	15	16	17	18	19	21
25	15	17	18	18	20	21
26	16	17	18	19	20	22
27	16	18	19	20	21	23
28	17	18	19	20	22	23
29	17	19	20	21	22	24
30	18	20	20	21	23	25
31	18	20	21	22	24	25
32	19	21	22	23	24	26
33	19	21	22	23	25	27
34	20	22	23	24	25	27
35	20	22	23	24	26	28
36	21	23	24	25	27	29
40	23	25	26	27	29	31
44	25	27	28	29	31	34
48	27	29	31	32	34	36
52	29	32	33	34	36	39
56	32	34	35	36	39	41
60	34	36	37	39	41	44
64	36	38	40	41	43	46
68	38	40	42	43	46	48
72	40	42	44	45	48	51
76	42	45	46	48	50	53
80	44	47	48	50	52	56
84	46	49	51	52	55	58
88	48	51	53	54	57	60
92	50	53	55	56	59	63
96	52	55	57	59	62	65
100	54	57	59	61	64	67

11.1.4 Assessors: age, gender, experience in sensory testing with the product, and experience with the samples in the test;

11.1.5 Any information or instructions given to the assessor in connection with the test;

11.1.6 The test environment: use of booths, simultaneous or sequential presentation, light conditions, whether the identity of samples was disclosed after the test and the manner in which this was done;

11.1.7 The location and date of the test and name of the panel leader.

12. Precision and Bias

12.1 Because results of directional difference tests are functions of individual sensitivities, a general statement regarding the precision of results that is applicable to all populations of assessors cannot be made. However, adherence to the recommendations stated in this standard should increase the reproducibility of results and minimize bias.

APPENDIXES

(Nonmandatory Information)

X1. EXAMPLE: DIRECTIONAL DIFFERENCE TEST: CRISPER CEREAL FORMULATION ONE-SIDED ALTERNATIVE

X1.1 *Background*—Product reformulation efforts have focused on developing a crisper cereal in milk. Before proceeding to a preference test involving consumers, the product developer wants to confirm that the reformulated cereal is perceptibly more crisp than the current cereal.

X1.2 *Test Objective*—To confirm that the reformulated cereal is crisper than the current cereal in order to justify testing with consumers. The development team agrees that they are only concerned with ensuring that the test is crisper than the current cereal, so a one-sided alternative analysis will be conducted.

X1.3 *Number of Assessors*—To protect the product developer from falsely concluding that a crispness difference exists, the sensory analyst proposes $\alpha = 0.05$, and a P_{\max} of 60 % with $\beta = 0.50$. The analyst enters [Table 1](#) in the section corresponding to $P_{\max} = .60$ and the column corresponding to $\beta = 0.50$. Then, reading from the row corresponding to $\alpha = 0.05$, she finds that a minimum of 72 assessors is needed for the test.

X1.4 *Conducting the Test*—72 bowls of “A” and 72 bowls of “B” are coded with unique random numbers. Each sequence, AB and BA, is presented 36 times so as to cover the 72 assessors in a balanced random order. An example of the worksheet and scoresheet is shown in [Figs. X1.1 and X1.2](#) below.

X1.5 *Analysis and Interpretation of Results*—48 assessors select the reformulated cereal “B” as crisper than cereal “A”. In [Table 3](#), the row corresponding to 72 assessors and the column corresponding to $\alpha = 0.05$, the sensory analyst finds that 44 correct responses is sufficient to conclude that the reformulated cereal is crisper than the current cereal.

X1.6 *Report and Conclusions*—The sensory analyst reports that the reformulated cereal could, in fact, be distinguished as more crisp than the current cereal given the sensitivity chosen for the test ($P_{\max} = 60\%$, $\alpha = 0.05$, $\beta = 0.50$). Evaluation of the reformulated cereal can proceed to testing with consumers.

Directional Difference Test Worksheet					
Project Name: <u>Crisper Cereal Formula XYZ</u>			Date of Test: <u>01/01/99</u>		
Sample "A": <u>Current formula</u>					
Sample "B": <u>Test formula</u>					
Serving Order:					
Set #	1st	2nd	Set #	1st	2nd
01	A - 417	B - 293	37	A - 637	B - 423
02	B - 582	A - 605	38	B - 182	A - 675
03	A - 867	B - 324	39	A - 367	B - 824
04	B - 129	A - 772	40	B - 029	A - 722
05	A - 238	B - 679	41	A - 138	B - 689
06	B - 386	A - 405	42	B - 306	A - 805
07	A - 181	B - 976	43	A - 381	B - 676
08	B - 392	A - 447	44	B - 292	A - 747
09	A - 462	B - 800	45	A - 562	B - 821
10	B - 189	A - 391	46	B - 889	A - 291
11	A - 492	B - 264	47	A - 232	B - 334
12	B - 572	A - 469	48	B - 172	A - 349
13	A - 168	B - 342	49	A - 568	B - 942
14	B - 607	A - 358	50	B - 697	A - 258
15	A - 455	B - 594	51	A - 515	B - 924
16	B - 255	A - 486	52	B - 465	A - 736
17	A - 645	B - 532	53	A - 345	B - 832
18	B - 175	A - 922	54	B - 275	A - 948
19	A - 613	B - 783	55	A - 316	B - 533
20	B - 217	A - 441	56	B - 917	A - 541
21	A - 609	B - 513	57	A - 619	B - 713
22	B - 763	A - 089	58	B - 463	A - 289
23	A - 290	B - 187	59	A - 295	B - 347
24	B - 476	A - 733	60	B - 486	A - 723
25	A - 133	B - 610	61	A - 453	B - 616
26	B - 992	A - 530	62	B - 991	A - 550
27	A - 624	B - 491	63	A - 612	B - 449
28	B - 935	A - 171	64	B - 765	A - 170
29	A - 864	B - 680	65	A - 964	B - 340
30	B - 156	A - 577	66	B - 956	A - 570
31	A - 307	B - 549	67	A - 977	B - 149
32	B - 611	A - 327	68	B - 601	A - 312
33	A - 715	B - 907	69	A - 725	B - 897
34	B - 682	A - 834	70	B - 542	A - 774
35	A - 539	B - 817	71	A - 329	B - 142
36	B - 946	A - 147	72	B - 742	A - 396

FIG. X1.1 Worksheet Example for Directional Difference Test: Example X1

Name: _____ Date: 01/01/99 Set: 01

INSTRUCTIONS:

- You have received 2 coded samples.
- Please evaluate these samples from left to right. Answer the following question by circling the code number which corresponds to the sample you select.

Which sample is MORE CRISP? (Circle ONE)

417
293

Thank you.

FIG. X1.2 Scoresheet Example for Directional Difference Test: Example X1

X2. EXAMPLE: DIRECTIONAL DIFFERENCE TEST FOR SIMILARITY: MANUFACTURING SPECIFICATION FOR A SWEETENER PACKET ONE-SIDED ALTERNATIVE

X2.1 *Background*—A sweetener packet manufacturer wants to ensure that adequate levels are included within each packet to deliver consistent sweet taste to the consumer. Because of the variability of the packet filling machine, the manufacturer needs to establish a lower limit of sweetener content that only a small proportion of the population will detect as less sweet than the target product.

X2.2 *Test Objective*—To determine a minimum content of sweetener within a packet that provides the same sweet taste as the target sweetener concentration. As the content of sweetener will be manipulated in only one direction (lower), with less sweet taste being the only correct response, a one-sided alternative analysis will be conducted.

X2.3 *Number of Assessors*—The manufacturer wants to be reasonably sure the specifications around sweetener content will deliver the sweetness claimed on the packet. Thus, in this test, the risk of failing to detect a difference in sweetness (β -risk) needs to be kept as low as possible. The α -risk, the risk of falsely concluding that the samples are different in sweetness, is of less concern, as this would only result in a narrower, or more conservative, specification. β is set at 0.05 and α at 0.20. For the same reasoning, a lower P_{max} value of 65 % is chosen. As only the lower limit in sweet taste is being tested, this is a

one-sided difference test, and Table 1 is consulted. A minimum of 68 assessors is required to meet these criteria. The current panel of 70 experienced sweet taste assessors is sufficient.

X2.4 *Conducting the Test*—Given previous experience and informal tasting of various lower levels of sweetener, a concentration (A) is selected for directional difference testing versus the target concentration (T). Filtered water is chosen as the diluent, as this medium has been shown in previous testing to allow for the most sensitivity to sweet taste differences among the assessors. Solutions of sweetener at concentration A and concentration T are prepared and portioned into cups coded with unique random numbers. Each sequence, AT and TA, is served 35 times to the 70 assessors in a balanced, random order.

X2.5 *Analysis and Interpretation of Results*—Only 68 assessors were able to participate in this test, of which 36 correctly identified T as the sweeter sample within the pair. Referring to Table 3, in the row corresponding to $n = 68$ and the column corresponding to $\alpha = .20$, one finds that the minimum number of common responses required for significance is 38. Therefore, with 36 common responses, it can be concluded that the samples are similar in sweetness.

X2.6 Report and Conclusions—The sensory analyst reports that sweetener concentration A is sufficiently similar to the target concentration in sweet taste intensity to be used as the lower specification limit.

X3. EXAMPLE: DIRECTIONAL DIFFERENCE TEST: SALTINESS OF SODIUM-SPARING INGREDIENT SYSTEMS TWO-SIDED ALTERNATIVE

X3.1 Background—A soup manufacturer wishes to determine which of two sodium-sparing ingredient systems delivers more of a salty flavor perception. The ingredient system that delivers more of a salty taste will be selected for inclusion in the formulation of a new line of soups because it can be used at lower levels and therefore will be more cost effective. If no significant difference is found between the two systems, additional systems will need to be pursued.

X3.2 Test Objective—To determine which of two sodium-sparing ingredient systems delivers more of a salty flavor perception (that is, is “saltier”). As there is no prior knowledge of the effectiveness of these ingredients and thus no preconceived correct response, a two-sided alternative analysis will be conducted.

X3.3 Number of Assessors—The selection of the more effective sodium-sparing ingredient is critical at this stage of the project since it will be used for all future formulation work. The sensory analyst is willing to take only a 5 % chance selecting a sodium sparing ingredient that is not actually be perceived as saltier by the assessors, so she sets $\alpha = 0.05$. However, the sensory analyst knows that if she falsely concludes that there is no difference between the two ingredients, additional costs will be incurred, as submissions from alternate suppliers will need to be obtained and tested. Therefore, the analyst decides to accept only a 10 % risk of missing the situation where 75 % or more of the assessors can perceive a difference in saltiness between the two samples, so she sets β

$= 0.10$ and $P_{\max} = 0.75$. The analyst enters **Table 2** in the section corresponding to $P_{\max} = 0.75$ and the column corresponding to $\beta = 0.10$, and then, reading from the row corresponding to $\alpha = 0.05$, finds that a minimum of 42 assessors is needed for the test. Company employees who have been prescreened for basic taste acuity and who are familiar with sensory discrimination tests will be recruited for the test.

X3.4 Conducting the Test—200 ounces of soup containing sodium-sparing ingredient A and 200 ounces of soup containing sodium-sparing ingredient B are heated and served in 3-oz. portions in 5-oz. ceramic cups labeled with unique three-digit random numbers. The serving order is balanced and randomized, such that half of the assessors receive the serving order AB and the other half receive BA. To ensure that the minimum number of assessors is achieved, 50 are recruited for the test.

X3.5 Analysis and Interpretation of the Results—Forty-eight assessors were actually available to participate in the test. Of the 48 assessors, 32 selected sample A as more salty and 16 selected sample B as more salty. Referring to **Table 4**, for $n = 48$ and significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), the analyst finds that the minimum number of responses needed for significance is 32.

X3.6 Report and Conclusions—The analyst concludes that sample A, which received 32 selections of “saltier,” is significantly more salty than sample B. Accordingly, ingredient system A is selected for further product formulation.

X4. EXAMPLE: CONFIDENCE INTERVAL CALCULATION FOR EXAMPLE X3, DIRECTIONAL DIFFERENCE TEST: TWO-SIDED ALTERNATIVE

X4.1 Background—If desired, analysts can calculate a confidence interval on the proportion of common responses. The calculations are as follows, where c = the number of common responses and n = the total number of assessors:

$$P_c = c/n$$

$$S_c \text{ (standard error of } P_c) = \sqrt{P_c(1 - P_c)/n}$$

$$\text{upper confidence limit} = P_c + z_{\alpha/2} S_c$$

$$\text{lower confidence limit} = P_c - z_{\alpha/2} S_c$$

X4.1.1 z_α and z_β are critical values of the standard normal distribution. For two-sided alternatives and 90 % confidence, $z = 1.645$; for 95 % confidence, $z = 1.960$; and for 99 % confidence, $z = 2.576$.

X4.2 Analysis and Interpretation of Results—Consider the data from Example X3, where $c = 32$ and $n = 48$. It follows that:

$$P_c = 32/48 = 0.67$$

$$S_c \text{ (standard error of } P_c) = \sqrt{(0.67)(1 - 0.67)/48} = 0.07$$

$$\text{upper confidence limit} = 0.67 + 1.96(0.07) = 0.80$$

$$\text{lower confidence limit} = 0.67 - 1.96(0.07) = 0.53$$

X4.2.1 The analyst can conclude with 95 % confidence that the actual proportion of common responses lies somewhere between 53 % and 80 % (0.53 and 0.80). This agrees with the conclusion reached in Example X3 that sample A is saltier, because no less than 53 % of assessors would select it as saltier, and as much as 80 % may perceive it as saltier.

REFERENCES

- (1) Ennis, D.M., “The Power of Sensory Discrimination Methods,” *Journal of Sensory Studies*, Vol 8, 1993, pp. 353-370.
- (2) MacRae, S., “The Interplay of Theory and Practice in Sensory Testing,” *Chem. & Ind.*, Jan. 5, 1987, pp. 7-12.
- (3) O’Mahony, M.A.P.D.E. and Odbert, N., “A Comparison of Sensory Difference Testing Procedures: Sequential Sensitivity Analysis and Aspects of Taste Adaptation,” *Journal of Food Science*, Vol 50, 1985, pp. 1055-1058.
- (4) *Physical Requirement Guidelines for Sensory Evaluation Laboratories*: 2nd Edition, MNL 60, ASTM International, 2008.
- (5) Herz, R.S., and Cupchik, G.C., “An Experimental Characterization of Odor-evoked Memories in Humans,” *Chemical Senses*, Vol 17, No. 5, 1992, pp. 519-528.
- (6) Todrank, J., Wysocki, C.J., and Beauchamp, G.K., “The Effects of Adaptation on the Perception of Similar and Dissimilar Odors,” *Chemical Senses*, Vol 16, No. 5, 1991, pp. 476-482.
- (7) *Guidelines for the Selection and Training of Sensory Panel Members*, STP 758, ASTM International.
- (8) Meilgaard, M., Civille, G. V., Carr, B. T., *Sensory Evaluation Techniques*, 5th Edition, Taylor & Francis, 2015.
- (9) Chambers, E. and Baker Wolf, M., Eds., *Sensory Testing Methods*, Second Edition, MNL 26, ASTM International, 1996.

ASTM International takes no position respecting the validity of any patent rights asserted in connection with any item mentioned in this standard. Users of this standard are expressly advised that determination of the validity of any such patent rights, and the risk of infringement of such rights, are entirely their own responsibility.

This standard is subject to revision at any time by the responsible technical committee and must be reviewed every five years and if not revised, either reapproved or withdrawn. Your comments are invited either for revision of this standard or for additional standards and should be addressed to ASTM International Headquarters. Your comments will receive careful consideration at a meeting of the responsible technical committee, which you may attend. If you feel that your comments have not received a fair hearing you should make your views known to the ASTM Committee on Standards, at the address shown below.

This standard is copyrighted by ASTM International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, PO Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959, United States. Individual reprints (single or multiple copies) of this standard may be obtained by contacting ASTM at the above address or at 610-832-9585 (phone), 610-832-9555 (fax), or service@astm.org (e-mail); or through the ASTM website (www.astm.org). Permission rights to photocopy the standard may also be secured from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, Tel: (978) 646-2600; http://www.copyright.com/