# EVALUATION OF ACTUAL DIFFERENCE IN ORGANOLEPTIC QUALITIES OF ORGANIC AND CONVENTIONAL GROUNDNUTS AMONGST B SCHOOL STUDENTS OF MUMBAI – AN EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH

<sup>1</sup>Brijesh R. Sharma <sup>2</sup> Dr. Srini R. Srinivasan <sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor <sup>2</sup> Associate Professor <sup>1</sup>Marketing Department

<sup>1</sup> Vivekanand Education Society's Institute of Management Studies and Research (VESIMSR) Mumbai, India

Abstract: Consumption of organic food is following a secular rising trend. The reason for this consumption may be for self benefit (egoistic) and/or for benefits of others (altruistic). The egoistic reason may again either for health, nutrition or sensory benefits (organoleptic). There are contradictory findings as to many aspects of organic food consumption and the organoleptic qualities are one of the dimension on which there is contradictory finding. A blind taste appearance and smell experiment was conducted to find out whether there is difference in organic and conventional groundnuts. 90 B school graduates were invited to a blind taste experiment using organic and conventional groundnut. The results showed there is no significant difference in the taste appearance and smell between organic and conventional groundnuts.

IndexTerms: Sensory variables, Taste, Smell, Appearance, Organic fruits and vegetables, Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test, Normality testing, Mann-Whitney test

### I. INTRODUCTION

Presently, organic food consumers seem to pay more attention to "egoistic" motives for purchasing organic food, such as health, taste, and wellness, rather than to "altruistic" purchasing motives, such as environmental protection and animal welfare. Organic practitioners are starting to take into account sensory properties, such as taste, smell, appearance, touch, odor, etc. as important elements to be considered in food product development and marketing communication strategies in order to quickly respond to the new consumers' needs and to shifted expectations. Organic groundnut has been taken as proxy for organic food and a blind taste, appearance and smell experiment is conducted to evaluate whether there is significant difference. Belief may override actual organoleptic qualities if it is known that the food is organic. This effect may be established with a controlled experiment. Organoleptic experiment may be done by letting the respondents know that they are sensing organic food and also a similar kind of group should do a blind sensory test. This research evaluates the organoleptic qualities of conventional and organic groundnuts.

# II SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY:

India has a strong tradition and strength in organic farming. The traditional knowledge on sustainable farming practices still exists. In remote areas of the country, chemical-free agriculture is still being practiced by default. While higher revenues are currently achieved by exporting certified organic produce, the future growth of the organic segment will be influenced most significantly by developments in domestic markets within India. Effective marketing of organic products in local, regional and national markets could make a major contribution to securing the livelihoods of smallholder producers, and sustainable development of the country's organic food sector. A true finding of whether there is actual difference in the organoleptic qualities of organic groundnut will help the industry in promoting the true value of organic food to the consumer.

## III LITERATURE REVIEW:

Sensory attributes are gaining importance in food choices (Shepherd, Magnusson, and Sjoden 2005). Research on organic consumers' sensory analysis has not been explored widely in the literature. Some studies showed that taste and other sensory attributes represent important product features for specific consumers segments who approach the purchase of organic food products pragmatically (Pellegrini and Farinello 2009) and tend to evaluate them according to the same parameters applied to conventional products (Berardini et al. 2006). Other studies revealed that taste and appearance are among the most important criteria in organic food purchase (Castellini et al. 2008; Kuhar and Juvancic 2010; Magnusson et al. 2001; Roddy, Cowan, and Hutchinson 1994). These findings were confrmed by Luth and Spiller (2005), who reported that consumers are willing to pay higher prices for organic products solely if they feature aspects beyond the fact of being organically produced, such as a unique taste or smell. Finally, some scientists pointed out that sensory attributes are important elements that should be taken into account in the marketing strategies by organic food operators (Brennan and Kuri 2002; Padel and Foster 2005).

To our knowledge, few studies focused specifically on consumers' sensory experiences and preferences for organic food have been conducted in Italy (Stolz et al. 2010). Some authors explored consumers' sensory experiences and preferences concerning organic extra-virgin olive oil (Bracco et al. 2009; Midmore et al. 2005), while other contributions focused on Pecorino cheese (Napolitano et al. 2009) and organic vegetable baby food (Vairo and Zanoli 2009).

# Organic fruits and vegetables look superior to non- organic fruits and vegetables:

People shop with their eyes. There is a clear relationship between willingness to accept blemishes and organic purchasing behavior (Goldman & Clancy, 1991). Eighteen percent of shoppers who are concerned about pesticides would be willing to buy blemished produce whereas only 6 percent of shoppers who are unconcerned about pesticides would be willing to buy blemished produce. (Ott, 1990) However, when it is made known that the blemished produce is "organic," consumers are more likely buy blemished organic produce. Other studies show the negative effect on consumer demand of blemished produce is only slight (Goldman & Clancy, 1991; Sparling and McKenzie, 1992; Estes et al., 1994; Tregear et al., 1994). Bad looking or poor appearance compared to conventional products can be reason not to buy organic food. If appearance of an organic product is not satisfying for consumers, they can feel cheated and additionally they can think that also has low quality (Radman, 2005; Zanoli et al., 2004). Some studies show that consumers have a strong resistance to blemishes. Ott (1990) found that sixty two percent of consumers would be unwilling to accept any decrease in appearance quality when purchasing organic produce and 88 percent would be unwilling to accept insect-damage on pesticide residue-free produce. A previous review of literature (Beharrell & MacFiem, 1991) found that people estimate a food's quality by appearance. The degree to which blemishes cause people, who would otherwise buy organic produce to choose not to, is ambiguous, but it is important that organic foods be as visually appealing as possible or people are less likely to buy them.

Lin et al. (1986) shows that the more organic or pesticide-free produce is preferred, the less appearance is important. Jolly & Norris (1991) found that eleven out of twelve supermarket chains surveyed rated organic produce appearance as worse than non-organic produce and believed that their customers held the same view. Anecdotal evidence indicates that, while the appearance of organic produce was inferior to conventional produce in the 1980's, the quality of what is for sale now has improved greatly. In one study, Conklin et al. (1991) actually found that organic apples had fewer defects than non-organic apples.

# Organic fruits and vegetables are tastier than non-organic fruits and vegetables.

Eating tasty food is a general motive for everybody to satisfy your needs. Most organic consumers think that organic products taste more natural, intense and rich in flavor. German occasional buyers are mostly affected from the taste of the organic products. (Zanoli et al.,2004) On the other side, frequent buyers and elder people find organic products tastier and this is the one of the main reason for Croatians to purchase organic food. Also Croatian women find organic products tastier than men. (Radman, 2005) However, some western European studies showed that, taste is one of the main buying motives for men. (Hofmann, 2006). Taste is another basic attribute of organic food that affects food purchasing decisions. Jolly & Dhesi (1989), Jolly & Norris (1991), and Sparling et al. (1992) found consumers perceived no difference in taste between conventionally grown and organic produce. Morgan et al. (1990), Estes et al. (1994), and The Packer (1996) found that consumers believed that organic produce tastes better than conventional produce. Sparling et al. (1992) found that non-organic produce consumers do not view organic produce as tasting better than conventional produce, but organic produce consumers do believe organic produce taste better than conventional. Estes et al. (1994) found that survey respondents cite "better taste" as the primary reason for buying organic produce. In only one reviewed study consumers rate the taste of conventionally-grown produce as superior to organic produce.

## Organic fruits and vegetables look fresher than non-organic fruits and vegetables.

Freshness is another factor that influences consumers' produce decisions. Consumers rate in-store freshness as the same between conventional and organic produce (Sparling et al., 1992). Retail produce buyers say organic produce tend to have a shorter shelf life than conventional produce and that this characteristic decreases consumers' demand for organic produce. However, the frequency of this response was very weak. Estes et al. (1994) found that the third most frequently mentioned reason for purchasing organic produce is freshness. The Packer (1996) found that 17 percent of organic produce consumers cite increased freshness as a major reason for purchasing organic produce.

A characteristic related to freshness is shelf life, i.e., how long organic fruit and vegetables will keep. Jolly & Norris (1991) and Morgan et al. (1990) find the majority of produce managers rate organic produce's keeping qualities as worse than that of conventionally-grown produce. Sparling et al. (1992) finds that consumers see no difference in the keeping quality of organic produce versus conventional produce. Other consumers cited organic produce's longer shelf life as a reason for purchasing organic produce (Morgan et al. 1990). There seems to be no consensus regarding organic produce's keeping qualities as compared to the keeping qualities of conventionally-grown produce.

# Organic fruits and vegetables smell goods as compared to non organic fruits and vegetables.

The first defined group of sensory attributes involves the physical features such as taste, smell, color and appearance (Wierenga, 1983; Peattie, 1995). Several studies have found that sensory aspects of foods like taste, smell, look and texture to be among the important criteria in organic food purchases (Roddy et al,1996; Schifferstein and Ophuis, 1998; Magnusson et al, 2001; McEachern (2002). Krystallis and Chryssohoidis (2005) stated that taste, nutritional value, environmental benefit had also influenced the purchase of organic food.

### IV OBJECTIVE

- To find out whether there is difference in the taste of organic and conventional groundnut
- To find out whether there is difference in the appearance of organic and conventional groundnut
- To find out whether there is difference in the smell of organic and conventional groundnut
- Use gender as variable in the above studies.

#### V HYPOTHESIS

- 1. There is a significant difference in the taste of organic and conventional groundnut
- 2. There is a significant difference in the appearance of organic and conventional groundnut

- 3. There is a significant difference in the smell of organic and conventional groundnut
- 4. There is a significant difference among male and female in the above organoleptic qualities

**VI METHODOLOGY:** The research design is quantitative in nature. Sample size, methodology of experiment and data analysis is narrated below.

#### VII DATA COLLECTION:

A blind taste experiment was done using the two types of groundnuts amongst B School graduates in Mumbai. The experiment was conducted with 90 student's s participants. Organic groundnut and conventional groundnut were kept in two bowls marked as Bowl A and Bowl B. The participants did not know about the type of the groundnuts type. The participants were invited to taste smell and observe the appearance of both type of the groundnuts and then were asked to indicate their choice on the attributes on Likert type questions.

#### VIII DATA ANALYSIS:

Data analysis was carried out on SPSS 23. The variables were subjected to normality testing using Shapiro- Wilk test and Kilmogorov\_Smirnov test. The P value is less than 0.05 hence the alternative gets accepted which states that data is not normally distributed. Since the data is not normally distributed non parametric equivalent of Paired and Independent t test is used to do the coamparison.

**IX INTERPRETATION:** Based on the test done for hypothesis testing the null hypothesis is getting accepted

Test used	Status
lann-Whitney test	Accepted
	Null
lann-Whitney test	Accepted
	Null
lann–Whitney test	Accepted
	Null
Wilcoxon Signed	Accepted
Ranks Test	Null
Wilcoxon Signed	Accepted
Ranks Test	Null
Wilcoxon Signed	Accepted
Ranks Test	Null
[a	unn-Whitney test unn-Whitney test unn-Whitney test Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Wilcoxon Signed

## X CONCLUSION

From the above table it is clear that nonparametric equality-of-medians test implied no significant difference between gender for either organic or conventional groundnuts and across all respondents between organic and conventional groundnuts

## REFERENCES

- [1] Banumathi, M. (2011). A study on the environmental awareness and the changing attitude of the students and public in Coimbatore towards green products. Research Journal of Social Science and Management, 7(1), 75-84.
- [2] Banumathi, M. (2011). A study on the environmental awareness and the changing attitude of the students and public in Coimbatore towards green products. Research Journal of Social Science and Management, 7(1), 75-84.
- [3] Beharrell, B. and MacFie, J.H. 1991. Consumer attitudes to organic foods. British Food journal 93(2):25-30.
- [4] Berardini, L., F. Ciannavei, D. Marino, and F. Spagnuolo. 2006. "Lo scenario dell'agricoltura biologica in Italia (Working Paper)." Rome, Italy: INEA Istituto Nazionale di Economia Agraria.
- [5] Bracco, C., E. Caniglia, M. D'Amico, G. Di Vita, and G. Pappalardo, G. 2009. "Analisi del consumo e percezione della qualità dell'olio extravergine d'oliva biologico in Italia." In M. Criscimanno and G. Schifani, eds., Agricoltura Biologica: sistemi produttivi e modelli di com- mercializzazione e consumo. Palermo: Univer- sità degli Studi di Palermo, Dipartimento di Economia dei Sistemi Agro Forestali.
- [6] Brennan, C. S. and V. Kuri. 2002. "Relationship between Sensory Attributes, Hidden Attributes and Price in Infuencing Consumer Perception of Organic Foods." In J. Powell et al., eds., UK Organic Research 2002: Proceedings of the COR Conference. Aberystwyth, Wales, UK. pp. 65–68.
- [7] Canavari M, Bazzani GM, Spadoni R, Regazzi D. (2002). Food safety and organic fruit demand in Italy: a survey. British Food Journal 104(3/4/5): 220-232.
- [8] Chakrabarti, S. (2010). Factors influencing organic food purchase in India expert survey insights. British Food Journal, 112(8), 902–915.
- [9] Chakrabarti, S., & Baisya, R. K. (2007). Purchase Motivations and Attitudes of Organic Food Buyers. Decision, 34(1),1-22.
- [10] Chen, M.F. (2007). Consumer attitudes and purchase intentions in relation to organic foods in Taiwan: Moderating effects of food related personality traits. Food Quality and Preference, 18, 1008 -1021.

- [11] Castellini, C., C. Berri, C., E. Le Bihan-Duval, and G. Martino. 2008. "Qualitative Attributes and Consumer Perception of Organic and Free- Range Poultry Meat." World's Poultry Science Journal 64(4):500–512.
- [12] Conklin, N.C. and Thompson, G. 1991. Product quality in organic and conventional produce: is there a difference? Agribusiness. 9: 295-307.
- [13] Cook, Roberta L. 1992. Consumer Demand for Food Safety-Oriented Marketing Labels: Implications for Sustainable Agriculture. San Jose, CA: Proceedings from the California Weed Conference
- [14] Davies, a., Titterington, A. J. & Cochrane, c. 1995. Who buys organic food? A profile of the purchasers of organic food in Northern Ireland. Consumers who claim to be green are not always the purchasers of organic food. British Food Journal, 97, 17-23.
- [15] Estes, E.A., Herrera, J.E., and Bender, M. 1994. Organic produce sales within North Carolina: a survey of buyer options. Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.
- [16] Fotopoulos C, Krystallis A. (2002). Organic product avoidance: reasons for rejection and potential buyers' identification in a country wide survey. British Food Journal 104(3/4/5): 233-260
- [17] Goldman B.J. and Clancy, K.L 1991. A survey of organic produce purchases and related attitudes of food cooperative shoppers. American Journal of Alternative Agriculture. 6(2): 89-96.
- [18] Hofmann, W., Rauch, W., & Gawronski, B. (2006). And deplete us not into temptation: Automatic attitudes, dietary restraint, and self-regulatory resources as determinants of eating behavior. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 43, 497-504.
- [19] Jolly, D.A. and Norris, K. 1991. Marketing prospects for organic and pesticide-free produce. American Journal of Alternative Agriculture. 6(4): 174-179.
- [20] Jolly, D.A., Schutz, G.H., Diaz-Knauf, K.V. and Johal, J. 1989. Organic foods: Consumer attitudes and use. Food Technology. November: 60-66.
- [21] Krystallis, A. & Chryssohoidis, G. 2005. Consumers' willingness to pay for organic food: factors that affect it and variation per organic product type. British Food Journal, 107, 320-343.
- [22] Kuhar, A. and L. Juvancic. 2010. "What Determines Purchasing Behaviour for Organic and Integrated Fruits and Vegetables?" Bulgarian Journal of Agricultural Science 16(2):111–122.
- [23] Luth, M. and A. Spiller, A. 2005. "New Consumer Segments for Organic Food Results from a Brand Choice Experiment." Paper presented at the 15th Annual World Symposium of the Inter- national Food and Agribusiness Management Association. Chicago, IL.
- [24] Lin, B.H., Payson, S., and Wertz, J. 1986. Opinions of professional buyers toward organic produce: a case study of Mid-Atlantic market for fresh tomatoes. Agribusiness 12(1):89-97.
- [25] Magnusson, M. K., A. Arvola, U. Hursti, L. Aberg, and P.-O. Sjoden. 2001. "Attitudes Towards Organic Foods among Swedish Consumers." British Food Journal 103(3):209–227.
- [26] Magnusson, M.K., Avrola, A., Hursti Koivisto, U.K., Aberg, L. &Sjoden, P.O. (2001) Attitudes towards organic foods among Swedish consumers. British Food Journal, 103, 209–226.
- [27] McEachern, M. G., & Mc Clean, P. (2002) Organic purchasing motivations and attitudes: are they ethical? International Journal of Consumer Studies, 26 (2), 85-92.24
- [28] Morgan, J., B. Barbour, and C. Greene. 1990, "Expanding the Organic Produce Niche: Issues and Obstacles." Vegetables and Specialties Situation and Outlook Yearbook. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, ERS TVS252,
- [29] Naspetti, Simona and Raffaele Zanoli. 2004. Do Consumers' Care about Where They Buy Organic Products? A Means-End Study with Evidence from Italian Data. In Marketing Trends for Organic Food in the 21st Century, edited by George Baourakis (239–252). Singapore: World Scientific Publishing.
- [30] Napolitano, F., A. Braghieri, E. Piasentier, S. Fa- votto, S. Naspetti, and R. Zanoli. 2009. "Effetto delle informazioni relative al sistema di alleva- mento biologico sull'accettabilità del formaggio pecorino." In M. Criscimanno and G. Schifani, eds., Agricoltura Biologica: sistemi produttivi e modelli di commercializzazione e consumo Palermo: Università degli Studi di Palermo, Dipartimento di Economia dei Sistemi Agro Forestali. pp. 389–391.
- [31] Ott, S. L. (1990). Supermarkets shoppers' pesticide concerns and willingness to purchase certified pesticide residue-free fresh produce. Agribusiness, 6(6), 593-602.
- [32] Peattie, 1995 Environmental Marketing Management, Pitman Publishing London.
- [33] Padel, S. and Foster, C. (2005), "Exploring the gap between attitudes and behavior: understanding why consumers buy or do not buy organic food", British Food Journal, Vol. 107 No. 8, pp. 606-625.
- [34] Padel, S. and C, Foster. 2005. "Exploring The Gap Between Attitudes And Behaviour: Under-standing Why Consumers Buy Or Do Not Buy Organic Food." British Food Journal 107(8): 606–625.
- [35] Padel, S., D. Schaak, and H. Willer. 2009. "Development of the Organic Market in Europe." In H. Willer and L. Kilcher, eds., The World of Organic Agriculture. Statistics and Emerging Trends 2009. FIBL-IFOAM Report. Bonn, Frick, Geneva.: IFOAM, FiBL, ICT. pp. 155–163.
- [36] Pellegrini, G. and F. Farinello. 2009. "Organic Consumers and New Lifestyles. An Italian Country Survey on Consumption Patterns." British Food Journal 111(9):948–974.
- [37] Roddy, G., Cowan, C. and Hutchinson, G. 1996. Consumer attitudes and behaviour to Organic foods in Ireland. Journal of International Consumer Marketing. 9(2): 1-19.
- [38] Radman, Marija. "Consumer consumption and perception of Organic products in Croatia." British Food Journal 107 (2005): 263-273.
- [39] Roddy, G., C. Cowan, and G. Hutchinson. 1994. "Organic Food-A Description of the Irish Market." British Food Journal 96(4):3–10.
- [40] Schaak, D. and H. Willer. 2010. "Development of the Organic Market in Europe." In World of Organic Agriculture. Statistics and Emerging Trends 2010. Bonn, Germany; Frick, Switzer- land: IFOAM; FIBL.

- [41] Schifferstein, H. N. J. and P. A. M. Oude Ophuis. 1998. "Health-Related Determinants of Organic Food Consumption in The Netherlands." Food Quality and Preference 9(3):119–133.
- [42] Shepherd, R., M. K. Magnusson, and P.-O. Sjödén. 2005. "Determinants of Consumer Behavior Related to Organic Foods." AMBIO: A Journal of the Human Environment 34(4):352–359.
- [43] Sparling, E., Wilken, K., and McKenzie, J. 1992. Marketing fresh produce in Colorado supermarkets. Report to Colorado Department of Agriculture and USDA Federate State Marketing Improvement Program, Fort Collins, Colorado, USA
- [44] Schifferstein, H.N.J. and P.A.M. Oude Ophuis. 1998. Health-related determinants of organic food consumption in the Netherlands. Food Quality and Preference. 9(3): 119-133.
- [45] Stolz, H., I. Jahrl, L. Baumgart, and F. Schneider. 2010. "Sensory Experiences and Expectations of Organic Food. Results of Focus Group Discussions." Deliverable No. 4.2 of ECROPOLIS Project. Frick, Switzerland.
- [46] Tregear, A., Dent, J.B. and McGregor, M.J. 1994. The demand for organically grown produce. British Food Journal. 96(4): 21-25.
- [47] The Packer. 1996. Fresh Trends A 1996 Profile of the Fresh Produce Consumer. Vance Publishing Co.: Overland Park, KS.
- [48] Vairo, D. and R. Zanoli. 2009. "Le caratteris- tiche qualitative degli alimenti dei bambini: un'indagine esplorativa." In M. Crescimanno and G. Schifani, eds., Agricoltura Biologica: sistemi produttivi e modelli di commercializza- zione e di consumo. Palermo, Italy: Università degli Studi di Palermo, Dipartimento di Econo- mia dei Sistemi Agro Forestali. pp. 139–144.
- [49] Vairo, M. Wier, and R. Zanoli. 2005. Consumer Attitudes to Quality and Safety of Organic and Low Input Foods: A Review. Aberystwyth, Wales, UK: University of Wales.
- [50] Wier, Mette, and Carmen Calverley. "Market potential for organic foods in Europe." British Food Journal 104, no. 1 (2002): 45.
- [51] Wierenga B 1983. Model and Measurement Methodology for the analysis of Consumer choice of food Products Ernahrungs –Umschau, 30 21-28

Annexure

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The median of differences between V5 The groundnut from the bowl A was very good in appearance and V6 The groundnut from the bowl B was very good in appearance equals 0.	Related- Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.398	Retain the null hypothesis.

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The median of differences between V7 The groundnut from the bowl A was smelling very good and V8 The groundnut from the bowl B was smelling very good equals 0.	Related- Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.282	Retain the null hypothesis.

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision	
1	The distribution of V1 How much did you like or dislike the groundnut from Bowl A? is the same across categories of Gender .	Independent- Samples Mann- Whitney U Test	.132	Retain the null hypothesis.	
2	The distribution of V2 How much did you like or dislike the groundnut from Bowl B? is the same across categories of Gender .	Independent- Samples Mann- Whitney U Test	.791	Retain the null hypothesis.	
3	The distribution of V3 The groundnut from the bowl A was very tasty is the same across categories of Gender .	Independent- Samples Mann- Whitney U Test	.705	Retain the null hypothesis.	
4	The distribution of V4 The groundnut from the bowl B was very tasty is the same across categories of Gender .	Independent- Samples Mann- Whitney U Test	.398	Retain the null hypothesis.	
5	The distribution of V5 The groundnut from the bowl A was very good in appearance is the same across categories of Gender .	Independent- Samples Mann- Whitney U Test	.099	Retain the null hypothesis.	
6	The distribution of V6 The groundnut from the bowl B was very good in appearance is the same across categories of Gender .	Independent- Samples Mann- Whitney U Test	.832	Retain the null hypothesis.	
7	The distribution of V7 The groundnut from the bowl A was smelling very good is the same across categories of Gender .	Independent- Samples Mann- Whitney U Test	.629	Retain the null hypothesis.	
The distribution of V8 The groundnut from the bowl B was smelling very good is the same across categories of Gender .		Independent- Samples Mann- Whitney U Test	.122	Retain the null hypothesis.	

Tests of Normality								
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>							
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.		
V1 How much did you like or dislike the groundnut from Bowl A?	.176	89	.000	.914	89	.000		
V2 How much did you like or dislike the groundnut from Bowl B?	.190	89	.000	.898	89	.000		
V3 The groundnut from the bowl A was very tasty	.240	89	.000	.881	89	.000		
V4 The groundnut from the bowl B was very tasty	.234	89	.000	.882	89	.000		
V5 The groundnut from the bowl A was very good in appearance	.163	89	.000	.914	89	.000		
V6 The groundnut from the bowl B was very good in appearance	.275	89	.000	.866	89	.000		
V7 The groundnut from the bowl A was smelling very good	.258	89	.000	.883	89	.000		
V8 The groundnut from the bowl B was smelling very good	.243	89	.000	.894	89	.000		
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction								