## Introduction

$\star$ The smells and sight of real food can direct eating behavior or even further, enhance the desire to eat, to the point of overriding feelings of satiation (Blechert, Meule, Busch \& Ohla, 2014; Cornell, Rodin \& Weingarten, 1989).

* In some studies (e.g., Zellner et al., 2011), participants reported higher liking when food is presented in a neat arrangement and in a more attractive manner on a plate.
*Additionally, eating initiation can be predicted by visual presentation (Marcelino, Adam, Couronne, Köster \& Sieffermann, 2001).
\& Advancing research on the relationship between food presentation and appetite presents several financial and nonfinancial advantages such as marketing ideas and potential treatments for eating disorders.

Objective
$\star$ This study examined the different aspects of visually presented foods such as type of meal, taste profile, plate style, and quality of presentation on individual's desire for this food.

## Methods

$\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{117}$ participants were recruited from introductory psychology classes and social media.
\& Participants completed an online survey viewing different images of food and reported their willingness to consume and purchase, as well as their anticipated enjoyment of, specific foods.
$\star$ Desire for food is measured by averaging participants' response to a series of 9-point Likert-style items about each food picture presented.
$\star$ Procedure: Within-subjects ANOVA, 2 (Food flavor) x 2 (Type of Food) x 2 (Presentation style) x 2 (Plate).

Results

| Factor | M | SD | $\mathbf{M}$ | SD | F <br> $(1,91)$ | $\mathbf{p}$ | $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Taste: | 4.9 | 1.4 | 4.3 | 1.2 | 35.45 | $<.001$ | .28 |
| Sweet - Savory | 4.9 | 1.3 | 4.3 | 1.4 | 21.83 | $<.001$ | .193 |
| Type: <br> Refined - Casual | 4.3 | 1.4 | 4.5 | 1.2 | 6.56 | $=.012$ | .067 |
| Plate: <br> Ceramic - Paper | 4.3 | 1.2 | 4.0 | 1.3 | 29.24 | $<.001$ | .243 |
| Presentation: <br> Artistic - Messy | 5.2 | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |

Mean Ratings for Each Type of Food

Results (Cont.)

$\star$ There is an interaction between type of meal and presentation, $F(1,91)=35.43, p<.001, \eta_{\mathrm{p}}^{2}=.28$
$\otimes$ Participants significantly prefer the "nice" presentation (over messy) in refined foods, but are indifferent to presentation for a casual dish.

*There is an interaction between type of meal and plate style, $F(1,91)=7.57, p=.007, \eta_{p}^{2}=.077$
$\otimes$ Participants significantly prefer the ceramic plate (over paper) in refined foods, but are indifferent to plating tyle/material for a casual dish.

$\star$ There is an interaction between plate style and presentation, $F(1,91)=61.10, p<.001, \eta_{p}^{2}=.40$
$\otimes$ Participants expect consistency between quality of presentation style and plating style: messy foods are preferred on paper (vs. ceramic) and nice plating are preferred on ceramic (vs. paper)

## Discussion

\& In conclusion, artistic presentation, more elegant plates, In conclusion, artistic presentation, more elegant plates,
elicited greater desire for food but only in refined dishes.
$\star$ People are highly responsive to elegant, stylized dishes but do not apply this standard to everyday dishes.

* Future research should investigate how preferences for visual presentation are modulated by eating habits and different dining experience.

