REFERENCES

- Ahmad, S., Rizawi, J., & Srivastava, P. (2010). Effect of soy protein isolate incorporation on quality characteristics and shelf-life of buffalo meat emulsion sausage. *Journal of Food Science And Technology*, 47(3), 290-294.
- Arora, B., Kamal, S., & Sharma, V. (2016). Effect of Binding Agents on Quality Characteristics of Mushroom Based Sausage Analogue. *Journal of Food Processing And Preservation*, *41*(5).
- Baek, K., Utama, D., Lee, S., An, B., & Lee, S. (2016). Effects of Replacing Pork Back Fat with Canola and Flaxseed Oils on Physicochemical Properties of Emulsion Sausages from Spent Layer Meat. *Asian-Australasian Journal of Animal Sciences*, *29*(6), 865-871.
- Bakhsh, A.; Lee, S.-J.; Lee, E.-Y.; Sabikun, N.; Hwang, Y.-H.; Joo, S.-T. A novel approach for tuning the physicochemical, textural, and sensory characteristics of plant-based meat analogues with different levels of methylcellulose concentration. *Foods*, (10), 560.
- Bohrer, B. (2019). An investigation of the formulation and nutritional composition of modern meat analogue products. *Food Science And Human Wellness*, 8(4), 320-329.

Bourne, M. (2002). Food texture and viscosity: concept and measurement. Elsevier.

- Bouvard, V., Loomis, D., Guyton, K., Grosse, Y., Ghissassi, F., & Benbrahim-Tallaa, L. et al. (2015). Carcinogenicity of consumption of red and processed meat. *The Lancet Oncology*, *16*(16), 1599-1600.
- Brewer, M. (2012). Reducing the fat content in ground beef without sacrificing quality: A review. *Meat Science*, *91*(4), 385-395.
- Bryant, C., Szejda, K., Parekh, N., Deshpande, V., & Tse, B. (2019). A survey of consumer perceptions of plant-based and clean meat in the USA, India, and China. *Frontiers In Sustainable Food Systems*,
 3.

37

- Carvalho, G., Milani, T., Trinca, N., Nagai, L., & Barretto, A. (2017). Textured soy protein, collagen, and maltodextrin as extenders to improve the physicochemical and sensory properties of beef burger. *Food Science And Technology*, *37*(1), 10-16.
- Cheng, W., Cheng, J.-H., Sun, D.-W. and Pu, H. (2015), Marbling Analysis for Evaluating Meat Quality: Methods and Techniques. *Comprehensive Reviews In Food Science And Food Safety*, (14), 523-535.
- Chrysan, M. M., & Hwang, H. S. (2005). Margarines and spreads. *Bailey's industrial oil and fat products*, 1-41.
- Coombs, C. E. O., Holman, B. W. B., Friend, M. A., & Hopkins, D. L. (2017). Long-term red meat preservation using chilled and frozen storage combinations: A review. *Meat Science*, (125), 84–94.
- Devi, A., & Khatkar, B. (2016). Physicochemical, rheological, and functional properties of fats and oils in relation to cookie quality: a review. *Journal Of Food Science And Technology*, *53*(10), 3633-3641.
- Dreher, J., Blach, C., Terjung, N., Gibis, M., & Weiss, J. (2020). Formation and characterization of plantbased emulsified and crosslinked fat crystal networks to mimic animal fat tissue. *Journal of Food Science*, *85*(2), 421-431.
- Egbert, R., & Borders, C. (2006). Achieving success with meat analogues. *Food Technology (Chicago)*, 60(1), 28-34.
- Ergun, R., Guo, J., & Huebner-Keese, B. (2016). Cellulose. Encyclopaedia of Food And Health, 694-702.
- He, J., Evans, N., Liu, H., & Shao, S. (2020). A review of research on plant-based meat alternatives:
 Driving forces, history, manufacturing, and consumer attitudes. *Comprehensive Reviews In Food Science And Food Safety*, 19(5), 2639-2656.
- Henchion, M., Hayes, M., Mullen, A., Fenelon, M., & Tiwari, B. (2017). Future protein supply and demand: strategies and factors influencing a sustainable equilibrium. *Foods*, 6(7), 53.

- Hwang, J., Kim, Y., & Pyun, Y. (1991). Comparison of the effect of soy protein isolate concentration on emulsion stability in the absence or presence of monoglyceride. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 5(3), 313-317.
- Gawad IA, A., Hamed, E., Zidan, M., & Shain, A. (2015). Fatty acid composition and quality characteristic of some vegetable oils used in making commercial imitation cheese in Egypt. *Journal of Nutrition* & Food Sciences, 05(04).
- Godfray, H., Aveyard, P., Garnett, T., Hall, J., Key, T., & Lorimer, J. et al. (2018). Meat consumption, health, and the environment. *Science*, 361(6399).
- Goodarzi, F., & Zendehboudi, S. (2018). A comprehensive review on emulsions and emulsion stability in chemical and energy industries. *The Canadian Journal of Chemical Engineering*, *97*(1), 281– 309.
- Gullapalli, R., & Sheth, B. (1996). Effect of methylcellulose on the stability of oil-in-water emulsions. International Journal Of Pharmaceutics, 140(1), 97-109.
- Gunstone, F. D., & Martini, S. (2010). Chemical and physical deterioration of bulk oils and shortenings, spreads and frying oils. *Chemical Deterioration And Physical Instability of Food And Beverages* (pp. 413-438). Woodhead Publishing.
- Ismail, I., Hwang, Y., & Joo, S. (2020). Meat analog as future food: a review. *Journal of Animal Science And Technology*, 62(2), 111-120.
- Joshi, V., & Kumar, S. (2015). Meat Analogues: Plant based alternatives to meat products- A review. International Journal of Food And Fermentation Technology, 5(2), 107.
- Keerati-u-rai, M., & Corredig, M. (2011). Soy protein functionality. *Comprehensive Biotechnology, 543–551.*
- Küçüközet, A., & Uslu, M. (2018). Cooking loss, tenderness, and sensory evaluation of chicken meat roasted after wrapping with edible films. *Food Science And Technology International*, 24(7), 576-584.

- Kyriakopoulou, K., Dekkers, B., & van der Goot, A. J. (2018). Plant-based meat analogues. Sustainable Meat Production and Processing. *Elsevier*.
- Kyriakopoulou, K., Keppler, J. K., & van der Goot, A. J. (2021). Functionality of Ingredients and Additives in Plant-Based Meat Analogues. *Foods*, *10*(3), 600.
- López-López, I., Cofrades, S., Yakan, A., Solas, M. T., & Jiménez-Colmenero, F. (2010). Frozen storage characteristics of low-salt and low-fat beef patties as affected by Wakame addition and replacing pork backfat with olive oil-in-water emulsion. *Food Research International, 43*(5), 1244–1254.
- Malav, O., Talukder, S., Gokulakrishnan, P., & Chand, S. (2013). Meat Analog: A Review. *Critical Reviews In Food Science And Nutrition*, 55(9), 1241-1245.
- Marcus, J. B. (2013). Food science basics: healthy cooking and baking demystified: the science behind healthy foods, cooking and baking. *Academic Press: San Diego, CA, USA*, 51-97.
- Margolis, G. (2011). GOFIT FOODS LLC. US20160037801A1. United States.
- Nasatto, P., Pignon, F., Silveira, J., Duarte, M., Noseda, M., & Rinaudo, M. (2015). Methylcellulose, a cellulose derivative with original physical properties and extended applications. *Polymers*, *7*(5), 777-803.
- Nielsen, S.S. (2009). Food Analysis. Food Science Texts Series, 101.
- Paulina, O. A., & Hammed, A. K. (2018). Comparative evaluation of the nutritional, physical and sensory properties of beef, chicken, and soy burgers. *Agriculture and Food Sciences Research*, 5(2), 57-63.
- Plant-based Meat Market by Source, Product, Type, Process And Region Global Forecast to 2025. GlobeNewswire Newsroom. (2021). Retrieved 5 August 2021, from <u>https://www.globenewswire.com/news-release/2020/01/29/1977123/0/en/Plant-based-Meat-</u> Market-by-Source-Product-Type-Process-And-Region-Global-Forecast-to-2025.html.
- Pertanian, Setjen. (2020). Buletin Konsumsi Pangan Semester I 2018.
- Philp, K. (2018). Polysaccharide Ingredients. *Reference Module In Food Science*.

- Restu, W. K., Sampora, Y., Meliana, Y., & Haryono, A. (2015). Effect of accelerated stability test on characteristics of emulsion systems with chitosan as a stabilizer. *Procedia Chemistry*, *16*, 171-176.
- Samard, S., & Ryu, G. (2019). A comparison of physicochemical characteristics, texture, and structure of meat analogue and meats. *Journal Of The Science of Food And Agriculture*, *99*(6), 2708-2715.
- Serdaroğlu, M., Nacak, B., & Karabıyıkoğlu, M. (2017). Effects of beef fat replacement with gelled emulsion prepared with olive oil on quality parameters of chicken patties. *Korean Journal For Food Science of Animal Resources*, *37*(3), 376–384.
- Singh, P., Kumar, R., Sabapathy, S., & Bawa, A. (2008). Functional and edible uses of soy protein products. *Comprehensive Reviews In Food Science And Food Safety*, 7(1), 14-28.
- Utama, D., Jeong, H., Kim, J., Barido, F., & Lee, S. (2019). Fatty acid composition and quality properties of chicken sausage formulated with pre-emulsified perilla-canola oil as an animal fat replacer. *Poultry Science*, *98*(7), 3059-3066.
- Wang, Z., Liang, J., Jiang, L., Li, Y., Wang, J., Zhang, H., Li, D., Han, F., Li, Q., Wang, R., Qi, B., & Sui, X. (2015). Effect of the interaction between myofibrillar protein and heat-induced soy protein isolates on gel properties. *CyTA Journal of Food*, 1–8.
- Wi, G., Bae, J., Kim, H., Cho, Y., & Choi, M. (2020). Evaluation of the physicochemical and structural properties and the sensory characteristics of meat analogues prepared with various non-animal-based liquid additives. *Foods*, *9*(4), 461.

Wunsch, N., (2021). Meat substitutes market in the U.S. - Statistics and Facts. Statista.

Zambrano, V. M., Dutta, B., Mercer, D., MacLean, H., & Touchie, M. (2019). Assessment of moisture content measurement methods of dried food products in small-scale operations in developing countries: A review. *Trends In Food Science & Technology*, *88*.

APPENDICES

						E-II				žě	5.00	
							Each node s	hows the sa	mple ave	rage rank of	name.	
						Samp	le1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic	Sig.	Adj.Sig
						C0-E3	3	-3.333	6.466	516	.606	1.00
Hypothes	is Test Summar	rv.				CO-EI	1	-5.667	6.466	876	.381	1.00
Null Hypothesis	➡ Test ⇒	y Sig. ⇒	Decision			C0-E2	2	-9.000	6.466	-1.392	.164	1.00
1 The medians of wac are the same across categories of name	Independent- Samples Median Test	.006 n	Reject the Jull Typothesis.			C0-E4	4	-13.000	6.466	-2.011	.044	1.00
The distribution of wac is the	Independent- Samples	R	Reject the			C0-E2	7	-14.000	6.466	-2.165	.030	1.00
same across categories of name	. Kruskal-Wallis Test	.001 h	hypothesis.	-		C0-E5	5	-18.667	6.466	-2.887	.004	.14
3 The medians of stability are the same across categories of name	Independent- Samples Median Test	.006 n	Reject the null nypothesis.			C0-E6	6	-20.333	6.466	-3.145	.002	.06
The distribution of stability is	Independent- Samples	R	Reject the			C0-E8	8	-24.000	6.466	-3.712	.000	.00
4 the same across categories of name.	Kruskal-Wallis Test	.002 h	hypothesis.			E3-E1	L	2.333	6.466	.361	.718	1.00
Asymptotic significances are displ	ayed. The significant	ice level is .0	05.			E3-E2	2	5.667	6.466	.876	.381	1.00
						E3-E4	1	-9.667	6.466	-1.495	.135	1.00
						E3-E7	7	-10.667	6.466	-1.650	.099	1.00
						E3-E5	5	-15.333	6.466	-2.371	.018	.63
					Field(s):	wac * name(Test 2) [)				
sld Filter:SHOW ALL 😏	View: Hypothesi	is Summary '	View 😌	Reset	Field(s):	wac * name(Pairwise Com	Test 2) 🤇	0	Test:	Kruskal-W	allis 📀	Lay
ald Filter:SHOW ALL 😏	View: Hypothesi	is Summary '	View ᅌ	Reset	Field(s):	wac * name(Pairwise Com	Test 2) parisons Each noo	e shows th	Test:	Kruskal-W e average ra I. △ Std. T	allis 🕑 ank of n	ame.
sid Filter:SHOW ALL 🕤	View: Hypothesi	is Summary	View 😒 [Reset	Field(s):	wac * name(Pairwise Com	Test 2) (parisons Each noc ple1-Sample	e shows th Test Statist	Test: ne sampl ic Sta	Kruskal-W e average ra l. \Leftrightarrow Std. T Statis	allis ⊙ ank of n stic	ame. Sig. 🔶
ald Filter:SHOW ALL 😮	View: Hypothesi	is Summary '	View 🕤	Reset	Field(s):	wac * name(Pairwise Com Sam C0-	Test 2) (parisons Each noc ple1-Sample E1 E2	e shows the show	Test: Test: C Stro 33 6.	Kruskal-W e average ra I. ⇔ Std. T Statis 470	allis ⊙ ank of n stic ∽ 670	ame. Sig. ⊕ .503
sid Filter:SHOW ALL 🕤	View: Hypothesi	is Summary '	View 🕑 🛛	Reset	Field(s): View:	wac * name(Pairwise Com CO- CO-	Test 2) C parisons Each noc ple1-Sample E1 E2 E3	le shows the sho	Test: Test: te sampl tc Stor 33 6. 33 6.	Kruskal-W e average ra I. ⇔ Std. T rr → Statis 470	allis ⊙ ank of n stic 670 824	ame. Sig. 🗇 . .503 .410
Id Filter:SHOW ALL 🕤 Hypothesis T	View: Hypothesi	is Summary	View 😏 🛛	Reset	Field(s):	wac * name(Painvise Com CO- CO-	Each noc pleise stand	e shows th 2 Test -4.3 -5.3 -8.3	Test: Test: Test: Test: State S	Kruskal–W e average rr I. \Rightarrow Std. T 470 470 470 -	allis ⓒ ank of n est stic ↔ 670 824	ame. Sig. ⇔ .503 .410 .198
Id Filter:SHOW ALL C	View: Hypothesi ast Summary Test ⊖ S tependent-	is Summary Sig. ⊜ D	View ② [Decision ⊕ ect the	Reset	Field(s):	wac * name(Pairwise Com CO- CO- CO- CO-	Each noc parisons Each noc ple 1 - Sample E1 E2 E3 E5	Image: Second state -4.3 -5.3 -8.3 -13.5 -13.5	Test: ne sampl ic ← Sta Sta 33 6. 33 6. 33 6. 33 6. 00 6.	Kruskal-W e average ra I. ◆ Std. T or ◆ Std. T 470 -1 470 -1 470 -2	allis 😒 ank of n. stic 670 824 1.288 2.087	ame. Sig. 🔶 . .503 .410 .198 .037
Hypothesis T Null Hypothesis ©	View: Hypothesi est Summary Test @ S lependent- mples Median st	is Summary ' Sig. ⊖ D .006 Reje	View 🕑 🗍	Reset	Field(s):	wac * name(Pairwise Com CO- CO- CO- CO- CO-	Test 2) Each noc Each noc ple 1 - Sample E1 E2 E3 E5 E6	 e shows the s	Test: ic ⇒ Sta ic ⇒ Err 33 6. 33 6. 33 6. 33 6. 67 6.	Kruskal-W e average rd I. \Rightarrow Std. T 470 470 470 470 470 470	allis 😧	ame. Sig. 🗇 . .503 .410 .198 .037 .015
Hypothesis T Null Hypothesis T Null Hypothesis re medians of wac are the me across categories of name. In e distribution of wac is the me across categories of name. Te Hypothesis the Hypothesis t	View: Hypothesi est Summary Test \Leftrightarrow S dependent- mples Median st Lependent- mples Median st	is Summary ' Sig. ⇔ D .006 Reje hyp hyp	View ② □ Decision ⊕ ect the pothesis. ect the	Reset	Field(s):	wac * name(Pairwise Com Co- Co- Co- Co- Co- Co-	Test 2) Each noc Each noc ple1-Sample E1 E2 E3 E5 E6 E4	Comparison 2 Test Statistic -4.3 -5.3 -8.3 -13.5 -13.6 -16.3	Test: Test: te sampl te § Err 33 6. 33 6. 34 6. 35 6. 35 6. 36 6. 37 7. 37	Kruskal-W e average rr I. → Std. T 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470	ank of n. iest 	ame. Sig. 🔶 . .503 .410 .198 .037 .015 .012
Hypothesis Tr Null Hypothesis T Null Hypothesis \Rightarrow ne medians of wac are the me across categories of name. The distribution of wac is the me across categories of name. The set of the set	View: Hypothesi est Summary Test \Leftrightarrow S sependent- mples Median st tependent- mples st tependent- mples tependent- mples test Augustational test Augustat	is Summary ' Sig.	View 😒 🗍	Reset	Field(s): View:	wac * name(Pairwise Com Co- Co- Co- Co- Co- Co- Co-	Test 2) Each noc Each noc ple 1 - Sample E1 E2 E3 E5 E6 E6 E4 E8	Comparison 2 Test Statistic -4.3 -5.3 -8.3 -13.5 -15.6 -16.3 -20.8 -20.8	■ Test: ne sampl ce Strice	Kruskal-W e average rr I. ⇒ Std. T 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470	allis 😧	ame. Sig. 🖨 . .503 .410 .198 .037 .015 .012 .001
Hypothesis Tr Null Hypothesis e medians of wac are the me across categories of name. te distribution of wac is the me across categories of name. te medians of stability are the me across categories of name. te medians of stability are the me across categories of name.	View: Hypothesi est Summary Test ⊕ S dependent- mples Median st tependent- mples Median st tependent- mples Median	is Summary Sig. <	View S Decision S ect the jothesis. ect the jothesis. ect the jothesis.	Reset	Field(s):	wac * name(Pairwise Com CO- CO- CO- CO- CO- CO- CO- CO-	Test 2) Each noo Each noo Iple 1 – Sample E1 E2 E3 E5 E6 E6 E6 E8 E7	Image: Second system Image: Se	Test: he sampl c	Kruskal-W e average rr l. ⇒ Std. T 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470 470	allis ② ank of n icest of c.670 c.824 c.087 c.421 c.525 a.220 a.658	ame. Sig. \$.503 .410 .198 .037 .015 .012 .001 .001
Hypothesis T Null Hypothesis T Null Hypothesis $ \overset{()}{=} \\ \overset{()}{=} \overset{()}{=} \\ \overset{()}{=}$	View: Hypothesi est Summary Test © S dependent- mples Median st tependent- mples Median st tependent- mples Median st tependent- mples Median st	is Summary Sig. D .006 Reje .001 Reje .006 Reje .006 Reje .006 Reje .006 Reje .006 Reje .006 Reje	View S	Reset	Field(s):	wac * name(Pairwise Com CO- CO- CO- CO- CO- CO- CO- E1-	Test 2) Each noc parisons ple 1 – Sample E1 E2 E3 E5 E6 E6 E6 E7 E2 E2	Ite shows th 2 Test Statist -4.3 -5.3 -8.3 -13.5 -15.6 -16.3 -20.8 -23.6 -1.0 -10	Test: c ← Store 33 6. 33 6. 33 6. 67 6. 33 6. 33 6. 67 6. 67 6. 00 6. 60 6. 60 6. 60 6. 60 6. 61 6. 62 6. 63 6. 63 6. 64 7. 64 7. 6	Kruskal-W e average rr i, \rightarrow Std. T 470	ank of n. est 	ame. Sig. @ .503 .410 .198 .037 .015 .012 .001 .000 .877
Hypothesis Tr Null Hypothesis T Null Hypothesis \Rightarrow me medians of wac are the me across categories of name. In the distribution of wac is the me across categories of name. In the distribution of stability are the me across categories of name. In the distribution of stability are the e distribution of stability are the e distribution of stability are the e same across categories of name. In the distribution of stability is e same across categories of In Sa Sa Sa Sa Sa Sa Sa Sa Sa Sa	View: Hypothesi est Summary Test @ S dependent- mples Median st dependent- while st dependent- mples Median st dependent- mples visual st	Is Summary Sig. ♦ D .006 Rejei .001 Rejei .006 Rejei Nyp .006 Rejei Nyp .002 Rejei .002 Rejei .002 Rejei .002 Rejei .002 Rejei .002 Rejei .002 Rejei .003 Rejei .003 Rejei .004 Rejei .005 Rejei	View 😒 🖡	Reset	Field(s):	wac * name(Pairwise Com Pairwise Com Co- Co- Co- Co- Co- E1- E1-	Test 2) Each noc parisons Each noc ple 1 – Sample E1 E2 E3 E5 E6 E6 E6 E6 E7 E2 E2 E2 E2 E3	Image: Constraint of the second sec	te sampli c	Kruskal-W e average rr I_r ⊕ Std. T 470	ank of n. stic stic 824 .288 .288 .288 .288 .288 .285 .3.220 .3.220 .555 155 155	ame. Sig. \Leftrightarrow .503 .410 .198 .037 .015 .012 .001 .000 .877 .536
Hypothesis T Null Hypothesis T Null Hypothesis e medians of vac are the me across categories of name. In endians of stability are the me across categories of name. Te the medians of stability are the me across categories of name. Te the distribution of stability is e distribution of stability is e distribution of stability is e distribution of stability is e ame across categories of stability is e medians of stability is e distribution of stability is e medians of stability is e ame across categories of stability e the same across categories of stability e the same across categories of stability is e medians of stability is e same across categories of stability is e same across categ	View: Hypothesi est Summary Test © S dependent- mples Median st dependent- mples Median st tiskal-Vallis st tependent- mples St time Stational St tependent- mples St tependent- st tependent- mples St tependent- mples St tependent- mples St tependent- mples St tependent- st tependent- mples St tependent- st tependent- st tependent- st tependent- st tependent- tependent	sig. ♦ D D. .006 Rejeinal .001 Rejeinal .001 Rejeinal .002 Rejeinal .002 Rejeinal .002 Rejeinal	View S Decision ect the pothesis. ect the pothesis. ect the pothesis. ect the pothesis.	Reset	Field(s):	wac * name(Pairwise Com Pairwise Com Co- Co- Co- Co- Co- Co- Co- E1- E1- E1-	Test 2) Each noc parisons Each noc ple1-Sample E1 E2 E3 E5 E6 E6 E4 E8 E8 E7 E2 E2 E2 E3 E5 E5	Image: color Image: color<	te sampling te sa	Kruskal-W e average r.r. L ⇒ Stati 470	ank of n n est 670 824 .288 2.087 2.525 3.220 3.658 155 618 4.417	ame. Sig. \Leftrightarrow .503 .410 .198 .037 .015 .012 .001 .000 .877 .536 .157
Hypothesis Tr Null Hypothesis © e medians of wac are the me across categories of name. e distribution of wac is the me across categories of name. e distribution of wac is the me across categories of name. e distribution of stability are the me across categories of name. f same across categories of name. e distribution of stability is same across categories of name. f same acros	View: Hypothesi est Summary Test ⊕ s dependent- mples Median st t dependent mples Median st t dependent mples Median st t t t t t t t t t t t t t	Sig. D .006 Rejender .001 Rejender .002 Rejender .003 Rejender .004 Rejender .005 Rejender .006 Rejender .007 Rejender .008 Rejender .009 Rejender .002 Rejender level is .05. .05.	View S Decision S ect the pothesis. ect th	Reset	Field(s):	wac * name(Pairwise Com CO- CO- CO- CO- CO- CO- E1- E1- E1- E1- E1-	Test 2) Each noo Each noo Iple 1 - Sample E1 E2 E3 E5 E6 E6 E7 E2 E3 E5 E5 E5 E5 E5 E5 E5 E5 E5 E5 E5 E5	Image: Second system Image: Se	te sample c	Kruskal-W e average rr ir Stati 470 -1 470 -1 470 -2 470 -2 470 -2 470 -2 470 -2 470 -2 470 -2 470 -2 470 -3 470 -3 470 -3 470 -3 470 -3 470 -3	allis () ank of n. () 670 824 2.421 2.421 2.525 3.220 3.658 618 1.417 1.752	ame. Sig. \Rightarrow .503 .410 .198 .037 .015 .012 .001 .000 .536 .157 .080
Id Filter:SHOW ALL	View: Hypothesi est Summary Test \Leftrightarrow S dependent- mples Median st dependent- mples Median st dependent- mples Median st t terendent- mples Median st terendent- mples Median st terendententententententententententententente	is Summary Sig. ⊜ D .006 Reje .001 Reje .001 Reje .001 Reje .001 Reje .000 Reje .002 Reje .002 Reje .002 Reje .003 Reje	View ♀ Decision ♦ ect the jobthesis. ect the jobthesis. ect the jobthesis. ect the jobthesis. ect the jobthesis.	Reset	Field(s):	wac * name(Pairwise Com CO- CO- CO- CO- CO- CO- E1- E1- E1- E1- E1- E1- E1-	Test 2) Each noc parisons Each noc ple 1 – Sample E1 E2 E3 E5 E6 E6 E7 E2 E5 E5 E5 E5 E6 E6 E6 E6 E6	Ite shows th 2 Test Statist -4.3 -5.3 -8.3 -13.5 -15.6 -16.3 -20.8 -23.6 -1.0 -4.0 -9.1 -11.3 -11.3 -12.0	Test: te sampl 33 6. 33 6. 33 6. 67 6. 67 6. 60 6. 67 6. 33 6. 33 6. 67 6. 60 6. 67 6. 33 6. 60 6. 60 6. 60 6. 60 6. 60 6. 60 6. 60 6.	Kruskal-W e average rr in \$ \$5d, T 470 -1 470 -2 470 -2 470 -2 470 -2 470 -2 470 -2 470 -2 470 -3	anlis () ank of n. () () () () () () () () () ()	ame. Sig. \$ 503 .037 .015 .012 .001 .001 .001 .536 .157 .080 .064

Statistical analysis of emulsion properties.

42

Field(s): stability * name(Test 4) 😣

The emulsion stability of 8% SPI & 1.5% MC emulsion.





The emulsion stability of 8% SPI & 3% MC emulsion.





Water absorbing capacity of emulsions.





Cooking loss of plant-based burger statistical analysis.

	' Test 🗢	Sig. 🗟	Decision
The distribution of Cookingloss is the same across categories of Group.	Independent- Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.016	Reject the null hypothesis.

		-			
Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std. Error	Std. Test⊜ Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-3.000	2.944	-1.019	.308	1.000
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 3% MC	-6.000	2.944	-2.038	.042	.249
4% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	9.000	2.944	3.057	.002	.013
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-8% SPI & 3% MC	-3.000	2.944	-1.019	.308	1.000
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-Burger with suspension	6.000	2.944	2.038	.042	.249
8% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	3.000	2.944	1.019	.308	1.000
		• •			

Hypothesis Test Summary									
Null Hypothesis $ riangleq$	Test	₿	Sig. 🔤	Decision					
The distribution of Cookingloss is the same across categories of Group.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test		.031	Reject the null hypothesis.					

Hypothesis Test Summary Null Hypothesis ⇔ Test ⇔ Sig.⇔ Decision ⇔

 The distribution of Cookingloss is the same across categories of Group.
 Independent-Samples Truskal-Wallis Test
 .016
 Reject the null hypothesis.

 Asymptotic significances are displayed.
 The significance level is .05.

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic	Std. Error	Std. Test⊜ Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.≑
Burger with suspension–8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-1.333	2.944	453	.651	1.000
Burger with suspension-8% SPI & 3% MC	-4.667	2.944	-1.585	.113	.678
Burger with suspension–4% SPI & 3% MC	-8.000	2.944	-2.717	.007	.039
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-8% SPI & 3% MC	-3.333	2.944	-1.132	.258	1.000
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-4% SPI & 3% MC	6.667	2.944	2.265	.024	.141
8% SPI & 3% MC-4% SPI & 3% MC	3.333	2.944	1.132	.258	1.000

cach noue snows the sample average rank of Group.

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic	Sig. 🍣	Adj.Sig.
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 3% MC	-3.000	2.944	-1.019	.308	1.000
4% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	6.000	2.944	2.038	.042	.249
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-9.000	2.944	-3.057	.002	.013
8% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	3.000	2.944	1.019	.308	1.000
8% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	6.000	2.944	2.038	.042	.249
Burger with suspension-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-3.000	2.944	-1.019	.308	1.000

Hypothesis Test Summary

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of Cookingloss is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent- Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.051	Retain the null hypothesis.

Cooking loss of plant-based burger statistical analysis.

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
Fresh-Frozen	-3.000	2.236	-1.342	.180	.539
Fresh-Chill	6.000	2.236	2.683	.007	.022
Frozen-Chill	3.000	2.236	1.342	.180	.539
					-

Hypothesis Test Summary

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of Cookingloss is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.061	Retain the null hypothesis.

			-		
Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	$\underset{\textbf{Error}}{\overset{\textbf{Std.}}{\ominus}} \doteqdot$	Std. Test⊜ Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
Frozen-Chill	3.000	2.236	1.342	.180	.539
Frozen-Fresh	6.000	2.236	2.683	.007	.022
Chill-Fresh	-3.000	2.236	-1.342	.180	.539

	//								
	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision					
1	The distribution of Springiness is the same across categories of Group.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.200	Retain the null hypothesis.					
2	The distribution of Hardness is the same across categories of Group.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.016	Reject the null hypothesis.					
3	The distribution of Moisture is the same across categories of Group.	Independent- Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.018	Reject the null hypothesis.					

Hypothesis Test Summary

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic	$\underset{\textbf{Error}}{\overset{\textbf{Std.}}{\ominus}} \doteqdot$	Std. Test Statistic ⇒	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.⊜
8% SPI & 3% MC-4% SPI & 3% MC	3.000	2.944	1.019	.308	1.000
8% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	6.000	2.944	2.038	.042	.249
8% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	9.000	2.944	3.057	.002	.013
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-3.000	2.944	-1.019	.308	1.000
4% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	6.000	2.944	2.038	.042	.249
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-Burger with suspension	3.000	2.944	1.019	.308	1.000

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the

Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests.

Hardness * Group(Test 2) ٢

	-	-	-		
Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	$\underset{\text{Error}}{\overset{\text{Std.}}{\Rightarrow}} \doteqdot$	Std. Test Statistic ⊖	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
8% SPI & 3% MC-4% SPI & 3% MC	3.333	2.939	1.134	.257	1.000
8% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	5.667	2.939	1.928	.054	.323
8% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	9.000	2.939	3.063	.002	.013
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-2.333	2.939	794	.427	1.000
4% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	5.667	2.939	1.928	.054	.323
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-Burger with suspension	3.333	2.939	1.134	.257	1.000

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same. Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests.

Moisture * Group(Test 3) 0

Hypothesis Test Summary

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of Springiness is the same across categories of Group.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.030	Reject the null hypothesis.
2	The distribution of Hardness is the same across categories of Group.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.024	Reject the null hypothesis.
3	The distribution of Moisture is the same across categories of Group.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.033	Reject the null hypothesis.

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
4% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	4.000	2.944	1.359	.174	1.000
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-5.000	2.944	-1.698	.089	.537
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 3% MC	-9.000	2.944	-3.057	.002	.013
Burger with suspension–8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-1.000	2.944	340	.734	1.000
Burger with suspension–8% SPI & 3% MC	-5.000	2.944	-1.698	.089	.537
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-8% SPI & 3% MC	-4.000	2.944	-1.359	.174	1.000

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same. Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests.

Hardness * Group(Test 2)

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic	$\underset{\textbf{Error}}{\overset{\textbf{Std.}}{\ominus}} \doteqdot$	Std. Test Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig. 😂
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 3% MC	-2.167	2.939	737	.461	1.000
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-4.833	2.939	-1.645	.100	.600
4% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	8.333	2.939	2.836	.005	.027
8% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	2.667	2.939	.907	.364	1.000
8% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	6.167	2.939	2.098	.036	.215
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-Burger with suspension	3.500	2.939	1.191	.234	1.000

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the

same. Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests.

Springiness * Group(Test 1) 📀

		-			
Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	$\underset{\text{Error}}{\overset{\text{Std.}}{\ominus}} \doteqdot$	Std. Test Statistic ⊖	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.⊜
Burger with suspension–8% SPI & 3% MC	-3.667	2.944	-1.246	.213	1.000
Burger with suspension–4% SPI & 3% MC	-6.000	2.944	-2.038	.042	.249
Burger with suspension-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-8.333	2.944	-2.831	.005	.028
8% SPI & 3% MC-4% SPI & 3% MC	2.333	2.944	.793	.428	1.000
8% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	4.667	2.944	1.585	.113	.678
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-2.333	2.944	793	.428	1.000

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same. Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests.

Moisture * Group(Test 3) 0

Hypothesis Test Summary

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of Springiness is the same across categories of Group.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.043	Reject the null hypothesis.
2	The distribution of Hardness is the same across categories of Group.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.024	Reject the null hypothesis.
3	The distribution of Moisture is the same across categories of Group.	Independent- Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.172	Retain the null hypothesis.

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 3% MC	-4.167	2.939	-1.418	.156	.937
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-4.833	2.939	-1.645	.100	.600
4% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	9.000	2.939	3.063	.002	.013
8% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	.667	2.939	.227	.821	1.000
8% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	4.833	2.939	1.645	.100	.600
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-Burger with suspension	4.167	2.939	1.418	.156	.937

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same. Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests.

Hardness * Group(Test 2) 0

	-	-			
Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic	$\underset{\text{Error}}{\overset{\text{Std.}}{\Rightarrow}} \doteqdot$	Std. Test Statistic ⇒	Sig. \doteqdot	Adj.Sig.
Burger with suspension–8% SPI & 3% MC	-3.333	2.944	-1.132	.258	1.000
Burger with suspension–8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-3.667	2.944	-1.246	.213	1.000
Burger with suspension–4% SPI & 3% MC	-8.333	2.944	-2.831	.005	.028
8% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	.333	2.944	.113	.910	1.000
8% SPI & 3% MC-4% SPI & 3% MC	5.000	2.944	1.698	.089	.537
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-4% SPI & 3% MC	4.667	2.944	1.585	.113	.678

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same. Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests.

Springiness * Group(Test 1) 😣

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of Springiness is the same across categories of Group.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.024	Reject the null hypothesis.
2	The distribution of Hardness is the same across categories of Group.	Independent– Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.016	Reject the null hypothesis.
3	The distribution of Moisture is the same across categories of Group.	Independent– Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.024	Reject the null hypothesis.

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
8% SPI & 3% MC-4% SPI & 3% MC	3.000	2.944	1.019	.308	1.000
8% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	6.000	2.944	2.038	.042	.249
8% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	9.000	2.944	3.057	.002	.013
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-3.000	2.944	-1.019	.308	1.000
4% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	6.000	2.944	2.038	.042	.249
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-Burger with suspension	3.000	2.944	1.019	.308	1.000

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same. Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests.

Hardness * Group(Test 2)

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
8% SPI & 3% MC-4% SPI & 3% MC	1.000	2.944	.340	.734	1.000
8% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	5.000	2.944	1.698	.089	.537
8% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	8.000	2.944	2.717	.007	.039
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-4.000	2.944	-1.359	.174	1.000
4% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	7.000	2.944	2.378	.017	.105
8% SPI & 1.5% MC–Burger with suspension	3.000	2.944	1.019	.308	1.000

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same.

Springiness * Group(Test 1) 😣

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic ⊖	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-3.000	2.939	-1.021	.307	1.000
4% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	7.167	2.939	2.439	.015	.088
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 3% MC	-7.833	2.939	-2.666	.008	.046
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-Burger with suspension	4.167	2.939	1.418	.156	.937
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-8% SPI & 3% MC	-4.833	2.939	-1.645	.100	.600
Burger with suspension-8% SPI & 3% MC	667	2.939	227	.821	1.000

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same.

Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests.

Moisture * Group(Test 3) 🛛 😣

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of Springiness is the same across categories of Group.	Independent- Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.022	Reject the null hypothesis.
2	The distribution of Hardness is the same across categories of Group.	Independent- Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	ndependent– Samples .016 Kruskal–Wallis .016 Fest	
3	The distribution of Moisture is the same across categories of Group.	Independent- Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.038	Reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis Test Summary

	-	-			
Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std. Error	Std. Test⊜ Statistic	Sig. \doteqdot	Adj.Sig.⊜
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 3% MC	-3.000	2.944	-1.019	.308	1.000
4% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	6.000	2.944	2.038	.042	.249
4% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-9.000	2.944	-3.057	.002	.013
8% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	3.000	2.944	1.019	.308	1.000
8% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	6.000	2.944	2.038	.042	.249
Burger with suspension–8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-3.000	2.944	-1.019	.308	1.000

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the

Hardness * Group(Test 2) 0

	-	-	-		
Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic ⊖	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-8% SPI & 3% MC	-1.667	2.944	566	.571	1.000
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-4% SPI & 3% MC	5.333	2.944	1.812	.070	.420
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-Burger with suspension	8.333	2.944	2.831	.005	.028
8% SPI & 3% MC-4% SPI & 3% MC	3.667	2.944	1.246	.213	1.000
8% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	6.667	2.944	2.265	.024	.141
4% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	3.000	2.944	1.019	.308	1.000

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the

Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests.

Springiness * Group(Test 1) 📀

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic ⇒	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.⊜
8% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	3.667	2.944	1.246	.213	1.000
8% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	6.333	2.944	2.151	.031	.189
8% SPI & 3% MC-4% SPI & 3% MC	8.000	2.944	2.717	.007	.039
Burger with suspension-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	-2.667	2.944	906	.365	1.000
Burger with suspension–4% SPI & 3% MC	-4.333	2.944	-1.472	.141	.846
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-4% SPI & 3% MC	1.667	2.944	.566	.571	1.000

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same.

Moisture * Group(Test 3)

	,		,	
	Null Hypothesis 🛛 🖨	Test 🚔	Sig. 🍣	Decision \Leftrightarrow
1	The distribution of Springiness is the same across categories of Group.	Independent- Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.019	Reject the null hypothesis.
2	The distribution of Hardness is the same across categories of Group.	Independent- Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.016	Reject the null hypothesis.
3	The distribution of Moisture is the same across categories of Group.	Independent- Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.053	Retain the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis Test Summary

		-			
Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic	$\underset{\textbf{Error}}{\overset{\textbf{Std.}}{\ominus}} \doteqdot$	Std. Test⊜ Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.⊜
8% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	3.000	2.944	1.019	.308	1.000
8% SPI & 3% MC-4% SPI & 3% MC	6.000	2.944	2.038	.042	.249
8% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	9.000	2.944	3.057	.002	.013
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-4% SPI & 3% MC	3.000	2.944	1.019	.308	1.000
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-Burger with suspension	6.000	2.944	2.038	.042	.249
4% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	3.000	2.944	1.019	.308	1.000

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the

same. Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests.

Hardness * Group(Test 2) 0

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
8% SPI & 3% MC-8% SPI & 1.5% MC	3.333	2.944	1.132	.258	1.000
8% SPI & 3% MC-4% SPI & 3% MC	5.667	2.944	1.925	.054	.325
8% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	9.000	2.944	3.057	.002	.013
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-4% SPI & 3% MC	2.333	2.944	.793	.428	1.000
8% SPI & 1.5% MC-Burger with suspension	5.667	2.944	1.925	.054	.325
4% SPI & 3% MC–Burger with suspension	3.333	2.944	1.132	.258	1.000

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same.

Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests.

Springiness * Group(Test 1) 😣

Hypothesis Test Summary

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of Springiness is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.027	Reject the null hypothesis.
2	The distribution of Hardness is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent- Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.027	Reject the null hypothesis.
3	The distribution of Moisture is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent- Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.039	Reject the null hypothesis.

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊖]	Std. Error	Std. Test⊜ Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.⊜
Fresh-Frozen	-3.000	2.236	-1.342	.180	.539
Fresh-Chill	6.000	2.236	2.683	.007	.022
Frozen-Chill	3.000	2.236	1.342	.180	.539

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same. Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05.

Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for

Hardness * Treatment(Test 2)

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std. Error	Std. Test⊜ Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
Chill-Fresh	-3.000	2.236	-1.342	.180	.539
Chill-Frozen	-6.000	2.236	-2.683	.007	.022
Fresh-Frozen	-3.000	2.236	-1.342	.180	.539

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same. Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05.

Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for

Springiness * Treatment(Test 1) 😣

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std.	Std. Test⊜ Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
Frozen-Chill	2.333	2.236	1.043	.297	.890
Frozen-Fresh	5.667	2.236	2.534	.011	.034
Chill-Fresh	-3.333	2.236	-1.491	.136	.408

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same. Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests

Moisture * Treatment(Test 3)

Hypothesis Test Summary					
	Nu	ll Hypothesis	Test Sig.		Decision
1	The distribution of Springiness is the same across categories of Treatment.		Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.148	Retain the null hypothesis.
2	The distribution of Hardness is the same across categories of Treatment.		Independent– Samples .027 Kruskal–Wallis Test		Reject the null hypothesis.
3	The distrib the same a Treatment.	ution of Moisture is cross categories of	Independent- Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.051	Retain the null hypothesis.

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊖]	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic ⊖	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
Fresh-Frozen	-3.000	2.236	-1.342	.180	.539
Fresh-Chill	6.000	2.236	2.683	.007	.022
Frozen-Chill	3.000	2.236	1.342	.180	.539

	·· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision				
1	The distribution of Springiness is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.039	Reject the null hypothesis.				
2	The distribution of Hardness is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.044	Reject the null hypothesis.				
3	The distribution of Moisture is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent– Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.270	Retain the null hypothesis.				

Hypothesis Test Summary

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic ⊖	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
Fresh-Frozen	-2.333	2.236	-1.043	.297	.890
Fresh-Chill	5.667	2.236	2.534	.011	.034
Frozen-Chill	3.333	2.236	1.491	.136	.408

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
Chill-Fresh	-3.500	2.227	-1.572	.116	.348
Chill-Frozen	-5.500	2.227	-2.470	.014	.041
Fresh-Frozen	-2.000	2.227	898	.369	1.000

_

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same. Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05.

Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for

🛛 Hardness * Treatment(Test 2) 🛛 📀

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of Springiness is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.079	Retain the null hypothesis.
2	The distribution of Hardness is the same across categories of Treatment.		.061	Retain the null hypothesis.
3	The distribution of Moisture is the same across categories of Treatment. Independe Samples Kruskal-W Test		.055	Retain the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis Test Summary

Hypothesis ⁻	Test Summary
-------------------------	--------------

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of Springiness is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent– Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.177	Retain the null hypothesis.
2	The distribution of Hardness is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent– Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.032	Reject the null hypothesis.
3	The distribution of Moisture is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent– Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.430	Retain the null hypothesis.

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	$\underset{\text{Error}}{\overset{\text{Std.}}{\ominus}} \doteqdot$	Std. Test Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
Fresh-Chill	2.667	2.227	1.198	.231	.693
Fresh-Frozen	-5.833	2.227	-2.620	.009	.026
Chill-Frozen	-3.167	2.227	-1.422	.155	.465

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same. Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests

Hardness * Treatment(Test 2) ٢

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of Springiness is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.027	Reject the null hypothesis.
2	The distribution of Hardness is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent– Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.027	Reject the null hypothesis.
3	The distribution of Moisture is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent- Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.039	Reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis Test Summary

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic ⊖	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig. 🖨
Frozen–Fresh	3.000	2.236	1.342	.180	.539
Frozen-Chill	6.000	2.236	2.683	.007	.022
Fresh-Chill	3.000	2.236	1.342	.180	.539

_

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same. Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests

Springiness * Treatment(Test 1) 📀

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	$\underset{\text{Error}}{\overset{\text{Std.}}{\ominus}} \doteqdot$	Std. Test Statistic ⊖	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.		
Frozen-Chill	3.000	2.236	1.342	.180	.539		
Frozen-Fresh	6.000	2.236	2.683	.007	.022		
Chill-Fresh	-3.000	2.236	-1.342	.180	.539		

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same. Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance

level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for

Hardness * Treatment(Test 2) 🛛 😣

multiple ter

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std.	Std. Test⊜ Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig. 🗦
Chill-Frozen	-2.333	2.236	-1.043	.297	.890
Chill-Fresh	-5.667	2.236	-2.534	.011	.034
Frozen-Fresh	3.333	2.236	1.491	.136	.408

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same.

Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05.

Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests

Moisture * Treatment(Test 3) 🛛 [

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of Springiness is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.113	Retain the null hypothesis.
2	The distribution of Hardness is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.039	Reject the null hypothesis.
3	The distribution of Moisture is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent- Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test	.050	Reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis Test Summary

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic ⊖	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
Fresh-Frozen	-3.333	2.236	-1.491	.136	.408
Fresh-Chill	5.667	2.236	2.534	.011	.034
Frozen-Chill	2.333	2.236	1.043	.297	.890

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same.

Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05.

Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for

Hardness * Treatment(Test 2) 🛛 📀

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	Std. Error	Std. Test⊜ Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
Frozen-Fresh	1.667	2.227	.748	.454	1.000
Frozen-Chill	5.333	2.227	2.395	.017	.050
Fresh-Chill	3.667	2.227	1.647	.100	.299

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same. Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance

level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for

Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for

Moisture * Treatment(Test 3)

Hypothesis Test Summary

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of Springiness is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.099	Retain the null hypothesis.
2	The distribution of Hardness is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.039	Reject the null hypothesis.
3	The distribution of Moisture is the same across categories of Treatment.	Independent– Samples Kruskal–Wallis Test	.837	Retain the null hypothesis.

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

Sample1-Sample2	Test Statistic [⊜]	$\underset{\text{Error}}{\overset{\text{Std.}}{\ominus}} \doteqdot$	Std. Test⊜ Statistic	Sig. \Leftrightarrow	Adj.Sig.
Chill-Frozen	-2.333	2.236	-1.043	.297	.890
Chill-Fresh	-5.667	2.236	-2.534	.011	.034
Frozen-Fresh	3.333	2.236	1.491	.136	.408

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same. Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests

Hardness * Treatment(Test 2)