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President's Message

2022 Spring Training

We begin 2022 with two courses this spring. Our first program, Difference Testing and R Training, will be presented in-person and via Zoom at The Greenbrier in White Sulphur Springs, WV on April 5 – 8. The first day will be devoted to the open-source software, R, followed by a 2.5-day course on scientific principles and new developments in difference testing. You can register for the R Training course separately, but for those attending the Difference Testing course the R training is complimentary. In the Difference Testing course you will see how the Thurstonian modeling framework and a consumer relevant action standard offers a more reliable and satisfying approach to establishing a sensory “match.”

Then on May 24 - 26, our 11th annual Advertising Claims Support course will be presented in-person and via Zoom at the Williamsburg Lodge in Colonial Williamsburg, VA. We will teach this course using actual NAD and litigated cases to examine the principles involved in testing product performance and surveys to assess advertising messages. This knowledge base is necessary to provide solid evidentiary support needed in the event of a challenge. We have invited NAD attorneys, litigators, in-house counsel, and an arbitrator as speakers to help present these cases and engage discussion.

We hope to see you this spring, in-person or virtually, as we delve into these important and timely sensory and consumer science topics.

Best regards,
Daniel M. Ennis
President, The Institute for Perception

WHAT WE DO:

- **Client Services**: Provide full-service product and concept testing for product development, market research, and claims support
- **Education**: Conduct internal training, external courses, and online webinars on product testing, advanced analytics, and advertising claims support
- **IFPrograms**: License proprietary software to provide access to new modeling tools
- **Research**: Conduct and publish basic research on human perception in the areas of methodology, measurement, modeling, and prediction

WEBINAR CALENDAR:

**March 17, 2022** ....................................... Thursday at 2:00 PM EST, 75 minutes
- **Sequential Product Testing**: Minimizing Bias and Increasing Data Reliability

EVENT CALENDAR:

**April 5 - 8, 2022** ......................................presented at The Greenbrier and via Zoom
- **Difference Testing and R Training**

**May 24 - 26, 2022** ..................................presented at the Williamsburg Lodge and via Zoom
- **Advertising Claims Support**: Case Histories and Principles

Detailed information and registration for all courses and webinars are available at www.ifpress.com

To Contact Us... mail@ifpress.com www.ifpress.com 804-675-2980
7629 Hull Street Road • Richmond, VA 23235
This webinar is intended for a general audience of sensory professionals, market researchers, and will cover various sequence effects that introduce bias in product testing. If not properly balanced, this bias can cause product means to be inaccurate and product comparisons to be misleading.

In this webinar, we first discuss complete block designs and then extend our overview to more complex situations including multiple-day research and incomplete block designs. Examples from actual consumer investigations will be used to illustrate how ratings for the same product can vary up to a full rating scale unit depending on its position in the design or the nature of the sample that precedes it.

We continue by focusing on three rotation generation approaches: Order randomization within a subject, William Square designs, and the column randomization and search method (CR&S). We compare these methods and show how CR&S is best equipped to minimize position, sequences, and sequence position biases.

This webinar is intended for a general audience of sensory professionals, market researchers, and product developers.

**SOFTWARE**

IFPrograms® is a software package consisting of analytic tools designed specifically for market researchers, sensory scientists and product developers that provides advanced analytical capabilities for a wide variety of sensory and consumer testing procedures.

**INTERESTED IN TRYING IFPROGRAMS® PROFESSIONAL SOFTWARE?**

**SIGN UP FOR A FREE 1-MONTH TRIAL!**

Go to www.ifpress.com/software, scroll to the bottom of the page, and fill in the request form. We will send you the download and installation instructions by email. A PDF of the Software Manual can also be downloaded from this page.
Background: An important example of a paradox in the sensory field is The paradox of discriminatory non-discriminators discussed by Gridgeman in 1970. A paradox is an apparent contradiction where apparent means appears to be as opposed to obvious. This paradox involved a large observed difference between the choice proportions for the triangular method and the three-alternative forced choice (3-AFC) method involving the same stimuli. Gridgeman called this result a paradox because, unlike a contradiction, he thought that reconciliation was possible. He proposed that the triangular method was a “psychosensorily confusing task.” A more insightful resolution was published by Frijters in 1979 and this insight was truly a watershed in the field because it led to an expansion of conventional thinking about the role of perceptual variance in decision making. Frijters explained the result by showing that the two methods agreed extremely well at the level of scaled sensory intensity and that the results from the methods differed because different decision rules were used in the presence of noise. That insight ushered in a whole new vein of research into Thurstonian models that provided a scientific basis for the methodology used in sensory and consumer science. Model predictions could be tested. The now commonly used tetrad method arose out of the implications of that theory.

Equivalence claims are based on a binary choice between two products and involve two bounds set at 45% and 55%. Within these bounds, two products are equivalent. Superiority claims are established when a choice probability (usually preference) exceeds 50%. Unsurpassed claims are made when the choice probability exceeds 45%. An unsurpassed claim combines the concept of equivalence, with a 45% lower bound, and superiority, which has an upper bound of 100%. When an equivalence claim can be supported, there is also support for an unsurpassed claim since equivalence implies that the two products are mutually unsurpassed. The reverse is, however, not true.

The various editions of the Standard Guide for Sensory Claim Substantiation (Claims Guide) have always been replete with paradoxes. In a previous technical report, we discussed a paradox that an advertiser could claim to be equivalent to a competitor and the competitor could claim superiority over the advertiser with the same data. As with Gridgeman’s paradox, this paradox can be explained because different standards are used in the two cases and therefore the two claims are not contradictory. If the Guide were updated to include a consumer-relevant action standard that corresponds to the upper limit for equivalence, then partial or complete elimination of the paradox would occur. It is not necessary, however, to eliminate a paradox, it is just necessary to understand and explain it. In this report, a paradox involving equivalence and unsurpassed claims is explored.

Scenario: You work for a small manufacturer of economy paper towels. Product testing research has shown that the performance of a particular type of your paper towel performs very similarly to a market leader. You believe that a blind preference test among a national sample of loyal users of the market leader’s product would find little or no difference between your towels and those of your competitor. Neither type of towel has distinguishing markings that would interfere with blinding. You conduct a national home use test with 320 loyal consumers of your competitor’s product of which 158 of them prefer your product and 162 prefer the market leader, closely in line with what you expected. Referring to published tables, you find that your data support equivalence since the lower choice count must equal or exceed 158. Since equivalence implies that the two products are mutually unsurpassed, you could also support an unsurpassed claim.

These tables are based on a difference of two binomial functions that exactly corresponds to the hypotheses being tested for equivalence. From this model, you calculate that you have support at the 95% confidence level with a p-value of 0.046 when the null hypothesis of non-equivalence is tested. Checking the recently reissued Claims Guide, you find that, according to the Claims Guide, your claim would have required a choice count of 160, rather than 158 to declare equivalence. You calculate the p-value for this outcome and find it to be 0.009, corresponding to the 99% confidence level. Checking the Claims Guide table of critical values for unsurpassed testing, you find the same critical value of 160 is required which means that you could not support an unsurpassed claim either. Surprisingly, all the table values reported for equivalence claims are identical to those for unsurpassed claims and you wonder what model was used to generate these two identical tables.

Hypothesis Testing for Equivalence and Unsurpassed Claims: Assume that X is a random variable representing a discrete measure of the comparative performance of two products and let μ denote its mean. If there is no difference between the products, then μ = 0.5. Equivalence has been defined to mean that μ falls within 0.45 and 0.55. In other words, the null (H0) and alternative (H1) hypotheses are:

\[ H_0: \mu \leq 0.45 \text{ or } \mu \geq 0.55 \text{ and } H_1: 0.45 < \mu < 0.55. \]

Corresponding to these hypotheses, equivalence tables are then based on the following published equation for the p-value:

\[
p = \sum_{k=0}^{n-m} \binom{n}{k} (0.45)^k (0.55)^{n-k} - \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \binom{n}{k} (0.45)^k (0.55)^{n-k}
\]

where n is the sample size and m is the lower choice count. The critical values of m in the tables are chosen so that p does not exceed 5%.

With n = 320 in an equivalence test, equivalence is established if the advertiser’s choice count is 158, 159, 160, 161, or 162 as shown in Figure 1. Counts below or above this set do not reject the null hypothesis of non-equivalence.
For an unsurpassed test, the following are the null and alternative hypotheses:

\[ H_0: \mu \leq 0.45 \quad \text{and} \quad H_a: \mu > 0.45. \]

From these hypotheses, unsurpassed tables are then based on the following equation for the p-value:

\[ p = \sum_{k=m}^{n} \binom{n}{k} (0.45)^k (0.55)^{n-k} \quad (2) \]

where \( n \) is the sample size and \( m \) is the choice count for the advertiser’s product. The values of \( m \) in the tables are chosen so that \( p \) does not exceed 5%.

With \( n = 320 \) in an unsurpassed test, outcomes of at least 160 are required to reject the null hypothesis as shown in Figure 2. The reason for the larger critical value is that in an unsurpassed test there are more possibilities to be considered than in an equivalence test which has two bounds instead of one. This difference leads to the difference in the equations appropriate to their respective null and alternative hypotheses. Since equivalence between two products implies that two products are mutually unsurpassed, this example illustrates a paradox that, like Gridgeman’s paradox, has an explanation.

The Paper Towel Scenario: A search through the Claims Guide does not reveal the two models just described. Instead, you find identical Excel and R script applied to the minimum choice count for the equivalence table and the advertiser’s choice count for the unsurpassed table. Both refer to equation (2). You wonder why there was not just one table with a note referencing the choice counts and why the correct model for the equivalence case was not disclosed with an explanation for why it was not used. One effect of using the same model for both tests is that you cannot make an equivalence claim in your case using the Claims Guide and you also cannot make an unsurpassed claim. But you should be able to support them both based on the correct equivalence test and also the implication that a supported equivalence claim supports an unsurpassed claim. This brings up again the fact that a paradox is not a contradiction, it is a statement that can be explained. The Claims Guide does not preclude alternative models but requires an explanation if a different conclusion is reached. You decide to conclude from your test that you have correctly supported an equivalence claim, and by implication an unsurpassed claim. Your explanation for obtaining a result different from the Claims Guide is that your analysis uses the correct model for equivalence and the Claims Guide does not.

**Conclusion:** A paradox is not a contradiction but a statement requiring a deeper understanding than what is obvious. A paradox, such as Gridgeman’s paradox, can lead to a cascade of valuable scientific research as its implications are considered. Forcing two different outcomes to agree, as occurs in the current Claims Guide, and obfuscating this fact may discourage valid claims from being made. One such claim could involve a low-cost rival competing with a market leader.

**References**


---

**Figure 1.** Red bars indicate results supporting equivalence for a binomial distribution with \( \mu = 0.45 \).

**Figure 2.** Red bars indicate results supporting unsurpassed for a binomial distribution with \( \mu = 0.45 \).
Difference Testing and R Training

Taught by Dr. Daniel Ennis, Dr. Benoît Rousseau, and William J. Russ

April 5 - 8, 2022

We begin our training program with a special day devoted to the open-source software, R. Due to the extensive capability of the software, made possible by contributions of many open users, R scripting and programming has become an essential tool in data analysis and reporting. We will explain what R is, data structures used in R, how the software can help you compute simple and advanced analyses, how to engage with the numerous graphic tools available in R, and how to interface the software to external tools such as Excel and PowerPoint.

On Wednesday, we will focus on the science of measuring sensory differences. The standard approach to investigating whether sensory differences exist or not is to use appropriately powered discrimination tests and rely on the p-value from a null hypothesis of no-difference. While this might be a suitable approach when trying to demonstrate that a sensory difference exists, it lacks a philosophical and statistical foundation when research needs to establish a sensory “match.” In this course, we will depart from this tradition and describe a more reliable approach supported by decades of research using the Thurstonian modeling framework and a consumer relevant action standard.

Using a scenario that begins with a proposed formulation change, we follow the project’s path starting with the application of Thurstonian theory to resolve conflicting difference test results. We then describe a typical power approach to a risk-management program involving the tetrad method, optimal panel sample sizes, and a consumer-relevant internal action standard. The internal action standard is based on consumer research. We proceed by outlining limitations of the traditional approach to study equivalence and describe a more reliable direct test using the same action standard. The takeaway from the course is that participants will be able to generate superior recommendations for optimal panel sample sizes based on a company’s preferred risk profile. Attendees will participate actively in the journey outlined in this course through a series of exercises and the use of the IFPrograms® software.
Thurstonian structure for sensory measurements
- Application of basic principles to intensity and hedonic rating scales
- Application to ranking and Check-All-That-Apply (CATA) scoring
- Estimating the size of sensory differences – IFPrograms exercises

Back to Project 1 and Project 2
- Data analyses and interpretation; resolution of result inconsistencies – IFPrograms exercises

Why a difference will always be found: The need to estimate consumer relevance
- Preference testing to establish importance/relevance
- Introduction of the beta-binomial model to handle test replications
- Application to Project 1 and Project 2 – IFPrograms exercises

Beyond the traditional triangle and duo-trio tests: The tetrad method
- Illustration of the reason behind the tetrad method’s superior statistical power
- Review of published case studies confirming the tetrad’s superiority
- The importance of giving the proper task instructions

Case Study: A significant consumer preference despite a lack of statistical sensory difference – IFPrograms exercises

Next Step: The limitations of focusing solely on statistical significance
- Illustration of the differences in statistical power of common sensory discrimination methods – IFPrograms exercises
- The need to estimate the importance of a sensory difference: Consumer relevance and δR
- Simulations and estimates of optimal sample sizes – IFPrograms exercises

Establishing the size of a consumer relevant sensory difference: Using the same-different method
- Overview of the same-different method
- Are two samples the same or different? The tau criterion
- Application to Project 1 and Project 2 – IFPrograms exercises
- Research involving linking internal and consumer panel sensory sensitivities – IFPrograms exercises
- Building a successful sensory testing program: Type I and Type II errors, methodology, panelists, sample size, consumer relevance (δR)

Establishing the suitability of a switch to the tetrad method
- Review of experimental variables: Training, retasting, memory
- Beverage research to study the switch from triangle to tetrad – IFPrograms exercises

Latest developments: Difference or equivalence testing
- Contrasting difference and equivalence testing
- Reframing Project 1 and Project 2 in terms of difference (Project 1) and equivalence (Project 2) testing
- Potential issues with traditional power concept for equivalence testing: Varying sample sizes – IFPrograms exercises
- Why the concept of proportion discriminators is also misleading for equivalence testing

Theoretical illustrations of the switching roles of α (incorrectly rejecting no difference) and β (incorrectly accepting no difference)
- Graphical representation – IFPrograms exercises

Practical application of difference and equivalence testing
- Revisiting the previous power and sample size considerations of Project 1 and Project 2
- Why experimental parameters must by modified for equivalence testing (Project 2)
- Development of a broad sensory discrimination testing program for difference and equivalence testing objectives

Review of all covered materials and workshop conclusions – IFPrograms exercises
In-person attendance at The Greenbrier...

A 3-month free trial of®

dinner on Tues. - Thurs. for attendees at The Greenbrier

Food and beverage refreshments each day, plus lunch and

Readings in Advertising Claims Substantiation

Decision Making in the Presence of Noise,

Sensory and Consumer Science

and PDF downloads of

A printed copy of our book

—thurstonian models: Categorical

Decision Making in the Presence of Noise, and

Readings in Advertising Claims Substantiation

Food and beverage refreshments each day, plus lunch and
dinner on Tues. - Thurs. for attendees at The Greenbrier

A 3-month free trial of IFPrograms® Professional version

Register online at www.ifpress.com/courses where payment can be made by credit card. A fee discount is available for students and multiple registrations. If you qualify for a discount or need information about payment by invoice, please contact Susan Longest at mail@ifpress.com or call 804-675-2980 before registering.

Register online at www.ifpress.com/courses or call 804-675-2980. A fee discount is available for students and multiple registrations. If you qualify for a discount or need information about payment by invoice, please contact Susan Longest at mail@ifpress.com or call 804-675-2980 before registering.

Fee includes:

► Printed manuals of slides and software exercises
► A printed copy of our book, Tools and Applications of Sensory and Consumer Science and PDF downloads of the following 2 books: Thurstonian Models: Categorical Decision Making in the Presence of Noise, and Readings in Advertising Claims Substantiation
► Food and beverage refreshments each day, plus lunch and dinner on Tues. - Thurs. for attendees at The Greenbrier
► A 3-month free trial of IFPrograms® Professional version

LOCATION: The course will be presented at The Greenbrier® in White Sulphur Springs, WV. Nestled in the Allegheny Mountains, this gracious hotel is renowned for its hospitality and service.

LODGING: Lodging is not included in the course fee and participants must make their own hotel reservations. A block of rooms is being held at The Greenbrier at a special rate of $235 (plus resort fees & taxes). To make a reservation, please call 1-877-661-0839 and mention you are attending the Institute for Perception course (Note: the special rate is not available through online reservations.) To learn more about The Greenbrier, America’s resort since 1778, visit their website at www.greenbrier.com.

TRANSPORTATION: The Greenbrier Valley Airport (LWB) in Lewisburg is only a 15 min. shuttle ride from the hotel. Direct flights to LWB are available on United Airlines from Chicago O’Hare (ORD) and Washington Dulles (IAD). Other airports include Roanoke, VA (ROA, 1hr. 15 min.), Charleston, WV (CRW, 2 hrs.), and Charlottesville, VA (CHO, 2 hrs. 15 min.).

CANCELLATION POLICY: Registrants who have not cancelled two working days prior to the course will be charged the entire fee. Substitutions are allowed for any reason.
The purpose of this 2.5-day course is to present principles involved in testing product performance and surveys to assess advertising messages. This knowledge base is necessary in order to provide solid evidentiary support needed in the event of a claims dispute. Claims support is a critical business focus for many companies in categories with aggressive competitors.

Invited speakers include NAD attorneys, litigators, in-house counsel, and an arbitrator to help present these cases and engage discussion. The course speakers have decades of experience as instructors, scientific experts, jurors, and litigators in addressing claims with significant survey and product testing components. National Advertising Division® (NAD®) and litigated cases will be used to examine and challenge the information discussed.

The course is held within walking distance of historic Colonial Williamsburg which is a living-history experience of several hundred restored or re-created buildings from the 18th century. Visit www.colonialwilliamsburg.org for detailed information.

This course will also be presented via Zoom.

If you are unable to attend in person, this course will also be live streamed via Zoom. If you attend virtually, you will be sent a link by email to join the meeting with the speakers and other attendees. All supporting materials will be mailed to you before the event, so please register early to allow for sufficient shipping time.
WEDNESDAY (MAY 25, 9am - 5pm ET)

9:00 – 10:00 | **Consumer Relevance**
- Setting action standards for consumer-perceived differences
- Linking expert and consumer data
- Clinical vs. statistical significance
  - Litigated Case: (S.D.N.Y. 2012) Church & Dwight Co., Inc vs. Clorox Co. (cat litter)
- NAD Case #5974 (2010) Comcast Communications, Inc. (Xfinity Internet, Television & Telephone Services)
- NAD Case #6025 (2010) Bausch & Lomb, Inc. (PeroxiClear Contact Lens Peroxide Solution)
- NAD Case #6131 (2017) Too Faced Cosmetics, LLC. (Better Than Sex Mascara)

10:10 – 11:00 | **Survey Principles**
- Answering questions
- Purpose of conducting surveys: Events and behaviors, attitudes and beliefs, subjective experiences
- How respondents answer questions: Optimizing and satisficing
- Filters to avoid acquiescence and no opinion responses
- Survey questions: Biased, open-ended vs. closed-ended
- Steps to improve survey questions

11:10 – Noon | **Consumer Perception Surveys**
- A survey must include: Sample, design, questionnaire, analysis
- Reliability and validity:
  - Ecological, external, internal, face, construct
- Bias: Code, position
- Task instructions – importance and impact
- Data collection methods
- Target universe and size, controls, biased questions, improvements in design and analysis
- Design Issues: Monadic vs sequential monadic (within subject), separating open-ended questions from close-ended
- The stimulus is the label or ad, not the product itself
- Why open-ended questions are not a good basis for quantification
- Common design flaws

12:10 – 1:00 | **How NAD Has Ruled on Perception Surveys**
- Consumer takeaway surveys: NAD perspective, critique of cases
- NAD Case #5849 (2015) T-Mobile USA (More Data Capacity)
- NAD Case #5926 (2016) Comcast Cable Communications (Xfinity Cable TV)
- NAD Case #6009 (2016) Epson America, Inc. (Epson EcoTank Supertank Printers)

1:00 – 2:00 LUNCH

2:10 – 3:00 | **Consumer Takeaway Survey Research**
- Independent research on the Bayer Advanced fertilizer case
- NAD Case #6033 (2016) Bayer CropScience US (Bayer Advanced 3-in-1 Weed and Feed for Southern Lawns)

3:10 – 4:00 | **Analysis - Interpretation and Communication**
- Hypothesis testing
- Determining statistical significance and confidence bounds
- Communicating claim requirements to the business side
- NAD Case #5569 (2013) InterHealth Nutraceuticals (Zychrome Dietary Supplement)
- NAD Case #5755 (2014) The Procter & Gamble Co. (Olay Sensitive Body Wash)
- NAD Case #6236 (2018) Abbott Nutrition (Similac Human Milk Fortifier)
  - Litigated Case: (S.D.N.Y. 1994) Avon Products vs. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc. (Skin-So-Soft)

4:10 – 5:00 | **Test Power**
- The meaning of power
- Planning experiments and reducing cost
- Sample sizes for claims support tests
- Managing Risks: Advertiser claim, competitor challenge
- NAD Case #6065 (2017) Shell Oil Co. (Shell V-Power NiTRO+ Premium Gasoline)
- NAD Case #6164 (2018) The Proctor & Gamble Co. (Finish® Quantum® Max Automatic Dishwasher Detergent)

THURSDAY (MAY 26, 9am - 1pm ET)

9:00 – 10:00 | **Handling No Difference/No Preference Responses**
- No preference option analysis
- Power comparisons: Dropping, equal and proportional distribution
- Statistical models and psychological models
- ASTM recommendation
- NAD Case #5453 (2012) Ocean Spray Cranberries, Inc. (Ocean Spray Cranberry Juice)
- NAD Case #6037 (2016) Mizkan America, Inc. (RAGU Homestyle Traditional Sauce)

10:10 – 11:00 | **Testing for Equivalence and Unsurpassed Claims**
- How the equivalence hypothesis differs from difference testing
- ASTM requirements for an unsurpassed claim
- The paradox of finding support for superiority, unsurpassed, and equivalence; the need for a minimum standard for superiority
- FDA method for qualifying generic drugs: The TOST
- NAD Case #5609 (2013) Starbucks Corp. (Verismo Single-Serve Coffee System)
- NAD Case #5822 (2015) Kimberly-Clark Global Sales, LLC (Huggies® Little Snugglers Diapers)
- NAD Case #5829 and NARB Panel #202 (2015) Bayer HealthCare, LLC (ClarinCeutin and Claritin-D)

11:10 – Noon | **Ratio, Multiplicative, and Count-Based Claims**
- The difference between ratio and multiplicative claims
- Examples of multiplicative claims
- Count-based claims (e.g., “9 out of 10 women found our product reduces wrinkles”)
- NAD Case #5107 (2009) Ciba Vision Corp. (Dailies Aqua Comfort Plus)
- NAD Case #5416 (2012) LG Electronics USA, Inc. (Lg Non-Refills
- NAD Case #5484 (2012) Reynolds Consumer Products (Hefty® Slider Bags)
- NAD Case #5779 (2014) S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc. (Scrubbing Bubbles Heavy Duty Cleaner)
- NAD Case #5934 (2016) Rust-Oleum Corp. (Painter’s Touch Ultra Cover 2X Spray Paint)

12:10 – 1:00 | **“Up To” Claims and Conclusion**
- Definition and support for an “up to” claim
- FTC opinion on windows marketers claim
- “Up to” energy savings claim at the NAD
- NAD Case #5876 (2009) Ciba Vision Corp. (Dailies Aqua Comfort Plus)
- NAD Case #5416 (2012) LG Electronics USA, Inc. (Lg Non-Refills
- NAD Case #5484 (2012) Reynolds Consumer Products (Hefty® Slider Bags)
- NAD Case #5779 (2014) S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc. (Scrubbing Bubbles Heavy Duty Cleaner)
- NAD Case #5934 (2016) Rust-Oleum Corp. (Painter’s Touch Ultra Cover 2X Spray Paint)

This course has been developed for attorneys specializing in advertising law, market research managers, product developers, in-house counsel, sensory and consumer scientists, and packaging/product testing specialists.
In-person attendance at the Williamsburg Lodge ....$1,975*
Live stream attendance via Zoom...............................$1,575*

* The Institute for Perception offers a 10% discount to each additional registration when registered at the same time, from the same company, and reduced or waived course fees to non-profit entities, students, judges, government employees, and others. Continuing Legal Education (CLE) credits will be sought upon request.

This program qualifies for Certified Food Scientist contact hours (CH). CFS Certificants may claim 16 CH for their attendance.

Register online at www.ifpress.com/courses where payment can be made by credit card. If you qualify for a discount or need information about payment by invoice, please contact us at mail@ifpress.com or call 804-675-2980 before registering.

Register Online: www.ifpress.com/may-2022-program

Fee includes:
► Printed slide manual and NAD Case studies
► A printed copy of our book, *Tools and Applications of Sensory and Consumer Science* and PDF downloads of the following 2 books: *Readings in Advertising Claims Substantiation*, and *Thurstonian Models*: *Categorical Decision Making in the Presence of Noise*
► Food and beverage refreshments each day, plus lunch and dinner on Tuesday and Wednesday.

REGISTRATION
Advertising Claims Support course presented Tuesday, May 24 - Thursday, May 26, 2022

COURSE VENUE and LODGING:
The course will be presented at the Williamsburg Lodge
310 South England St.
Williamsburg, VA 23185
Lodging and travel are not included in the course fee and participants must make their own reservations. Reduced room rates are available to attendees.

Williamburg Lodge: Cozy Queen at $189 and Deluxe King at $209 (plus parking fee & taxes)
Williamburg Inn: Superior Room at $439 (plus resort fees & taxes)

Please contact us for online room reservation information. To inquire about 3-day pre and post room availability, please call 1-800-261-9530 and identify yourself as being with the “Institute for Perception” event.

TRANSPORTATION:
Williamsburg, VA is located about 45 minutes from Richmond International (RIC) and Norfolk International (ORF) airports, and about 20 minutes from Newport News/Williamsburg International (PHF).
All airports are served by Uber, Lyft, commercial taxis, and rental car companies.

CANCELLATION POLICY: Registrants who have not cancelled two working days prior to the course will be charged the entire fee. Substitutions are allowed for any reason.

SPEAKERS
For detailed biographical information on the following speakers, please visit www.ifpress.com/courses.

The Scientific Team

Dr. Daniel M. Ennis
President

Dr. Benoît Rousseau
Sr. Vice President

William (Will) Russ
Computational Market Researcher and Lead Programmer

The Legal Team

National Advertising Division (NAD)

Jennifer Santos
Attorney, NAD

La Toya Sutton
Senior Attorney, NAD

Zheng Wang
Attorney, NAD

Litigation and Arbitration

Lauren Aronson
Advertising and Media Counsel, Crowell & Moring

David G. Mallen
Co-Chair, Advertising Disputes, and Retail and Consumer Brands, Loeb & Loeb in NYC

Larry Weinstein
Arbitration Attorney, Lawrence Weinstein Dispute Resolution Services

In-House Counsel

Carrie Kovalerchik
Senior Legal Counsel, Marketing, Unilever USA

Kristin Marchesiello
Senior Marketing Counsel and Deputy Data Protection Office, Unilever USA