

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

RELATING SENSORY PERCEPTION TO CHEWING DYNAMICS

**A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
Food Technology
at Massey University, Auckland
New Zealand**

JEAN NE CHEONG

2014

ABSTRACT

Understanding the mechanism behind the dynamic changes of food structure during oral processing is the key area for food texture studies. Food texture is a sensory perception derived from the structure of food, and oral processing plays an important role in this perception. This research aimed to establish a method to explore the relationships between oral processing and sensory perception, using biscuits of varying compositional and structural properties as a model food system.

The initial study verified the capability of the Temporal Dominance of Sensations (TDS) technique to describe the textural aspects of a model food system whose structural properties change throughout oral processing. By standardizing the time-axis of the TDS curves from first bite to swallow, the technique was able to discriminate the textural properties of the samples of different sugar to fat ratios over the consumption period. The key differences of this type of standardization method were the attribute dominance rates and range in times to select the first dominant attribute. Moderate training of panellists on the definitions of the attributes showed performance improvement; clearer TDS curves (higher dominance rates) and reduced times to make the first dominant attribute selection (at least 10% faster). It was observed that subjects used a greater number of chewing cycles to process a food sample when they were also performing a sensory task such as TDS. The observation holds regardless of the level of training.

When the TDS task was performed initially (the first sample), subjects need time to explore and learn the task hence slower chew frequency. This effect can be eliminated by introducing warm up samples before each session to ensure familiarity to samples and task. Overall, the samples were discriminated in their textural properties throughout chewing. The TDS technique appeared to be relevant to relate to the changing food properties in the mouth. The hardness levels of the sample marked an influence at the early stage of a chewing sequence, influencing the first dominant attributed selected and the oral processing. As food evolves during oral processing, other associated attributes become dominant in response to changing structural properties in the mouth. All samples undergo various structural changes in the mouth before reaching a definite state

before swallowing. Two types of masticatory adaptations were present; adaptation to the task performed and adaptation to the altered textural properties in the mouth.

The reproducibility of the TDS curves was also performed. This study demonstrated that for a food sample with five attributes to be evaluated in triplicate, at least 10 subjects were needed (i.e. 30 observations). This is true as the TDS technique is based on food evolution in the mouth. Further exploration of the TDS technique was performed using Discrete Point TDS. The technique offered new information that the typical TDS technique could not. The method was capable of differentiating the dominant attribute at each specific stage during mastication. This is not measurable with the conventional TDS technique and is less time consuming. In addition, intensity scores were found to complement the standard TDS data.

The present study also showed the need to combine the TDS technique with masticatory recordings to investigate the dynamic mechanisms of the food behaviours throughout food oral processing. The simultaneous recording of the TDS technique, electromyography (EMG), and electromagnetic articulograph (EMA) confirmed that human masticatory apparatus adapted (chew frequency) to the altered textural properties caused by changing food sample composition and structure which also continued to evolve in the mouth. Evaluation of dynamic changes in sensory perception at various mastication stages helped in explaining the food evolution in the mouth and its responding oral processing strategies. The early chewing stage was dedicated to the fracture mechanism of the food where attributes such as *hard* and *crunchy/crispy* were most dominant. Mid chewing was dedicated to effort used to masticate food into a bolus which was suitable for swallowing; this included effort to reduce food particle sizes and incorporate saliva and the attributes *crumbly* and *dry* were most dominant. The end of chewing was dedicated to removing food materials from around the mouth for swallow, where *sticky* was most dominant. These associations supported the hypothesis that masticatory parameters are controlled by the sensory input and are linked to food properties, where a range of different food structure is responsible for the changes in the chewing strategies.

Findings from this research demonstrated the strong correlation between the TDS profiles and chewing dynamics provided a new and improved technique for the food

industry, in particular for designing foods with desired sensory properties. Moreover, the study confirmed that a complete understanding of texture can only be obtained through collaboration among different disciplines.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I wish to extend my heartfelt gratitude to my main supervisor, Dr. Kylie Foster for her continuous support and guidance throughout the course of my research. Without her outstanding leadership, invaluable suggestions and constructive criticism, this work would not be made possible. My sincere appreciation also goes to the members of my supervisory committee, Dr. John Grigor, Professor John Bronlund and Mr. Marco Morgenstern for their concrete advice, understanding, patience and constant encouragement throughout this study.

I would also like to express my gratitude to all faculty, staff, and students in the Institute of Food, Nutrition and Human Health, Massey University for their support, kind assistance and friendship throughout the tenure of my study. Very special thanks to all friends in the PhD room and other students at the Albany campus who helped maintain my sanity over a busy few years.

Last but not least, my deepest appreciation to my beloved family for their love, understanding, and enormous support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF APPENDICES	xiii
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS	xiv
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	4
2.1 The Importance of Texture	4
2.1.1 Definition of Food Texture	5
2.1.2 Food Texture Perception	6
2.1.3 Texture Perception Measurement	7
2.1.4 Physiological Measurement of Eating Behaviours	8
2.2 Influence of Food Texture on Oral Processing	18
2.2.1 Prior to Ingestion	18
2.2.2 The First Bite	19
2.2.3 Masticatory Sequence	21
2.2.4 Clearance and Swallowing	28
2.3 Influence of Food Properties and Oral Processing on Sensory Perception	30
2.3.1 Selection of Appropriate Dynamic Sensory Method	35
2.4 Conclusion From Literature	47
3 MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGY	48
3.1 Materials	48
3.1.1 Model Food System	48
3.1.2 Formulation of Samples	49
3.1.3 Instrumental Testing	50
3.1.4 Serving Method	50
3.2 General Methodology	51
3.2.1 Recruitment of Subjects	51
3.2.2 Experimental Procedures	52
3.3 Data Acquisition	53
3.3.1 Recording the Sequence of Dominant Attributes with Temporal Dominance of Sensations (TDS)	53
3.3.2 Measurements of Oral Processing Behaviours	55
3.4 Data Analysis	56
3.4.1 Computing TDS Curves	56
3.4.2 Oral Processing Behaviours	58

4	THE EFFECT OF PERFORMING A TEMPORAL DOMINANCE OF SENSATIONS SENSORY EVALUATION ON ORAL PROCESSING BEHAVIOURS	59
4.1	Introduction	59
4.2	Materials and Methods	60
4.2.1	Model Food System	60
4.2.2	Subjects	60
4.2.3	Experimental Procedures	60
4.2.4	Data Collection	61
4.2.5	Data Analysis	62
4.3	Results	63
4.3.1	Effect of Session Order and Sample Order during Evaluation of Samples with and without Performing the TDS Task on Oral Processing Behaviours	63
4.3.2	Evaluation of Samples without Performing the TDS Task	64
4.3.3	Evaluation of Samples whilst Performing the TDS Task	64
4.3.4	Effect of Evaluating Samples with and without Performing the TDS Task on Oral Processing Behaviours	65
4.4	Discussion	67
4.4.1	Influence of Session Order and Sample Order on Oral Processing Behaviours	67
4.4.2	Influence of Tasks on Oral Processing Behaviours	68
4.5	Conclusion	69
5	EVALUATION OF MODEL FOOD SYSTEM WITH SMALL STRUCTURAL DIFFERENCES USING TEMPORAL DOMINANCE OF SENSATIONS TECHNIQUE	70
5.1	Introduction	70
5.2	Materials and Methods	71
5.2.1	Model Food System	71
5.2.2	Subjects	71
5.2.3	Experimental Procedures	71
5.2.4	Data Collection	72
5.2.5	Data Analysis	72
5.3	Results	73
5.3.1	Variations in Mastication Durations	73
5.3.2	Characterizing Model Food System of Different Structural Differences with Temporal Dominance of Sensations Technique	74
5.3.3	Characterizing TDS Curves with Different Numbers of Subjects	78
5.4	Discussion	79
5.5	Conclusion	83

6	THE EFFECT OF SENSORY ATTRIBUTE TRAINING ON TEMPORAL DOMINANCE OF SENSATIONS SENSORY EVALUATION AND ORAL PROCESSING BEHAVIOURS	85
6.1	Introduction	85
6.2	Materials and Methods	86
6.2.1	Model Food System	86
6.2.2	Subjects	86
6.2.3	Experimental Procedures	87
6.2.4	Data Collection	89
6.2.5	Data Analysis	89
6.3	Results	90
6.3.1	Evaluation of Samples with the TDS Technique	90
6.3.2	Comparing the Effect of Sensory Attribute Training for Sample SP1 (n=10)	96
6.4	Discussion	100
6.4.1	General Effect of Sensory Attribute Training on TDS Performance and Oral Processing Behaviours (n=20)	100
6.4.2	Effect of Sensory Attribute Training on TDS Performance and Oral Processing Behaviours using Sample SP1 (n=10)	101
6.5	Conclusion	102
7	DEVELOPMENT OF CONVENTIONAL TEMPORAL DOMINANCE OF SENSATIONS TECHNIQUE	104
7.1	Introduction	104
7.2	Materials and Methods	105
7.2.1	Model Food System	105
7.2.2	Subjects	105
7.2.3	Experimental Procedures	105
7.2.4	Data Collection	105
7.2.4	Data Analysis	107
7.3	Results	108
7.3.1	Discrete Point TDS Curves	108
7.3.2	Intensity Score	111
7.4	Discussion	114
7.5	Conclusion	115

8	SIMULTANEOUS RECORDINGS OF SENSORY PERCEPTION AND ORAL PROCESSING BEHAVIOURS FROM FIRST BITE TO SWALLOWING	116
8.1	Introduction	116
8.2	Materials and Methods	118
8.2.1	Model Food System	118
8.2.2	Subjects	118
8.2.3	Experimental Procedures	119
8.2.4	Data Collection	121
8.2.5	Data Analysis	122
8.3	Results	124
8.3.1	Temporal Dominance of Sensations (TDS)	124
8.3.2	Oral Processing Behaviours	124
8.3.3	Effect of Simultaneous Recordings on Sensory Perception and Oral Processing Behaviours (n=7)	126
8.3.4	The Mastication Sequence	129
8.4	Discussion	134
8.4.1	The Combined Recording of TDS, EMG, and EMA: Interaction between Changes in Structural Aspects of Food with Sensory Perception and Oral Processing Strategies	134
8.5	Conclusion	136
9	GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	138
	REFERENCES	140

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page	
2.1	Examples of oral processing data extracted from EMA and EMG for the purpose of studying food properties	17
2.2	Recent sensory researches using TDS technique (from 2008)	40
2.3	Comparison between Temporal Dominance of Sensations (TDS) and Time Intensity (TI)	45
3.1	Ingredients used to formulate model food systems	49
3.2	Definitions of attributes used for TDS task	53
4.1	Results from single-edge notched bend (SENB) of each recipe (mean \pm SD)	60
4.2	Effect of session order and sample order on oral processing behaviours (mean \pm SD) (n=24)	63
4.3	Effect of samples with different hardness levels on oral processing behaviours without performing the TDS task (mean \pm SD) (n=24)	64
4.4	Effect of samples with different levels of hardness on oral processing behaviours whilst performing the TDS task (mean \pm SD) (n=24)	64
5.1	Results from single-edge notched bend (SENB) of each recipe (mean \pm SD)	71
5.2	Time to first dominant attribute selection for different sample compositions (mean \pm SD and range of values) (n=24)	77
6.1	Results from single-edge notched bend (SENB) of each recipe (mean \pm SD)	86
6.2	Food used for sensory attribute training	87
6.3	Commercial biscuits used with its related attributes	88
6.4	Time to first dominant attribute selection for different sample compositions (mean \pm SD and range of values) (n=20)	95
6.5	Effect of sensory attribute training on oral processing behaviours for samples of different sugar to fat ratios (mean \pm SD) (n=20)	96
6.6	Time to first dominant attribute selection for sample SP1 (n=10)	99
8.1	Results from single-edge notched bend (SENB) of each recipe (mean \pm SD)	118
8.2	Mastication parameters extracted from the simultaneous recording of samples SP1, SP7, and SP9 (mean \pm SD) (n=10)	124
8.3	Effect of simultaneous recording on oral processing behaviours on sample SP1 (mean \pm SD and range of values) (n=7)	128
8.4	Effect of simultaneous recording on TDS performance on sample SP1 (mean \pm SD and range of values) (n=7)	129

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
2.1	Typical tooth trajectory of a point on the mandible (such as the incisor) throughout a chewing sequence	10
2.2	Common chewing parameters derived from articulograph data (Source: Peyron et al., 1996)	11
2.3	Parts of the Electromagnetic Articulograph (EMA): (a) EMA cube (b) carrier (c) transmitter	12
2.4	The large muscles of mastication (temporalis and masseter) that contribute to the mandibular movements (Source: Vinyard, Wall, Williams, & Hylander, 2008)	13
2.5	A typical EMG records (rectified) during mastication for the right masseter from first chew to first swallow	14
2.6	Example of a simultaneous recording of electromyographic activities of chewing muscles and jaw movements obtained during chewing of a food sample. The top three traces are anterior-posterior, lateral, and vertical mandibular movements and the bottom traces are the total electromyographic (EMG) activities of right-left masseters muscles	15
2.7	Recoded pattern of bite-force on (a) elastic products, (b) plastic products, (c & d) brittle products (Source: Mioche & Peyron, 1995)	20
2.8	Overview of interaction between food property, oral processing, and sensory sensation (modified from Source: Foster et al., 2011)	31
2.9	Example of how data is registered through a sliding bar	36
2.10	An example of TDS procedure	43
2.11	An example of TDS procedure with intensity scale	43
2.12	Methods to compute TDS curves (Source: Pineau et al., 2009)	46
3.1	Model food system used in this study	51
3.2	TDS layout on computer screen	54
3.3	Example of raw TDS data	56
4.1	Oral processing parameters (chewing durations, number of cycles, and chewing frequency) for different samples averaged across 24 subjects (different letters indicate significant difference between tasks)	66
5.1	Mastication durations for all subjects (n=24) chewing on samples SP1, SP3, and SP5 in triplicate	73
5.2	TDS curves for samples SP1, SP3, and SP5 (dominance rate versus different method of standardizing time-axis for mastication period). Figures A-C defined time-axis from t=0 (first bite) to t=100 (swallow) and D-F defined time-axis from t=0 (first dominant attribute selection) to t=100 (swallow). Chance level is represented with dotted line and significance level is represented with solid line (n=24)	76
5.3	Calculated sum of square from combinations of subjects for total number if subjects n ranging between 1 and 23 (mean \pm SD)	78

6.1	TDS curves for sample SP1, SP7, and SP9 after sensory attribute training (n=20). Chance level is represented with dotted line and significance level is represented with solid line	91
6.2	TDS curves computed for sample SP1 for both TDS evaluation before training (in dotted coloured lines) and after training (in solid coloured lines) (n=10). Chance level is represented with dotted line and significant level is represented with solid line	97
6.3	Effect of sensory attribute training on oral processing behaviours for sample SP1 (n=10). Different letters (a,b,c) indicate a significant difference between tasks ($p < 0.05$)	98
7.1	Page layout of the Discrete Point TDS evaluation	106
7.2	(A) TDS curves against mastication period (%) as described in Section 6.3.1; (B) Discrete Point TDS curves, (C) mean intensity scores at four main mastication points for samples SP1, SP7, and SP9	110
7.3	Biplot representing the intensity scores of three samples of different sugar to fat ratios over four main mastication stages	113
8.1	TDS curves computed for samples SP1, SP7, and SP9 during simultaneous recording of TDS, EMG and EMA. Chance level is represented with dotted line and significant level is represented with solid line (n=10)	125
8.2	TDS curves computed when subjects chewed on sample SP1 while performing TDS task (minimal training, moderate training, and during simultaneous recording) (n=7)	127
8.3	Example chosen to show results from simultaneous recording of TDS, EMG (LM: Left Masseter; RM: Right Masseter) and EMA (x: anterior-posterior; y: horizontal; z: vertical) for sample SP1. Arrows indicating swallows	131
8.4	Example chosen to show results from simultaneous recording of TDS, EMG (LM: Left Masseter; RM: Right Masseter) and EMA (x: anterior-posterior; y: horizontal; z: vertical) for sample SP7. Arrow indicating swallows	132
8.5	Example chosen to show results from simultaneous recording of TDS, EMG (LM: Left Masseter; RM: Right Masseter) and EMA (x: anterior-posterior; y: horizontal; z: vertical) for sample SP9. Arrow indicating swallows	133

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
A	Screening Questionnaire	151
B	Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern A (Application 10/13)	153

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Peer-Reviewed Publications

1. Ashley K. Young, Jean Ne Cheong, Duncan I. Hedderley, Marco P. Morgenstern and Bryony J. James. (2013). Understanding the Link between Bolus Properties and Perceived Texture. *Journal of Texture Studies*. 44, 376-386.
2. Foster KD, Grigor JM, Cheong JN, Yoo MJ, Bronlund JE and Morgenstern MP. (2011) The Role of Oral Processing in Dynamic Sensory Perception. *Journal of Food Science*. 76(2), R49-R69.

Conference Presentations

1. Jean Ne Cheong, Kylie D. Foster, John M.V. Grigor, John. E. Bronlund and Marco P. Morgenstern. *Development of a Dynamic Sensory Technique for Relating Texture Perception to Oral Processing Behaviour*. 2nd International Conference on Food Oral Processing - Physics, Physiology, and Psychology of Eating. Beaune, France. 1st - 5th July 2012 (*Oral Presentation*).
2. Jean Ne Cheong, Kylie D. Foster, John M.V. Grigor, John. E. Bronlund and Marco P. Morgenstern. *The Effect of Sensory Training on Dynamic Sensory Perception and Chewing Behaviour*. Biomouth 2011. Palmerston North, New Zealand. 28th - 29th November 2011 (*Oral Presentation*).
3. Jean Ne Cheong, Kylie D. Foster, John M.V. Grigor, John. E. Bronlund and Marco P. Morgenstern. *Dynamic Texture Perception of Solid Foods*. The NZIFST Conference - Science to Reality: New Zealand and Beyond. Rotorua, New Zealand. 27th June - 1st July 2011 (*Oral Presentation*).
4. Jean Ne Cheong, Kylie D. Foster, John M.V. Grigor, John. E. Bronlund and Marco P. Morgenstern. *The Use of Temporal Dominance of Sensation (TDS) for Dynamically Evaluating Biscuits with Small Structural Variations*. 5th Annual New Zealand and Australia Sensory Symposium, The New Zealand Institute of Food Science and Technology. Christchurch, New Zealand. 8th - 9th February 2011 (*Oral Presentation*).
5. Jean Ne Cheong, Kylie D. Foster, John M.V. Grigor, John. E. Bronlund and Marco P. Morgenstern. *A Multidisciplinary Approach to Investigate Dynamic Sensory Perception*. 10th Annual Functional Foods Symposium - Brains, Bounce & Baby Boomers. University Of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand. 16th November 2010. P13 (*Poster Presentation*).
6. Jean Ne Cheong, Kylie D. Foster, John M.V. Grigor, John. E. Bronlund and Marco P. Morgenstern. *An Improved Approach to Investigate Human Masticatory Behavior and Sensory Perception*. International Conference On Food Oral Processing - Physics, Physiology And Psychology Of Eating 2010. University Of Leeds, Leeds, United Kingdom. 5th -7th July 2010. P74 (*Poster Presentation*).