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#### Abstract

Sweetness preference is a complex sensation involving multidisciplinary fields and it has been studied extensively. However, there is still limited information on how the status of the sweet preference of individuals influences their preference for other taste modalities. Thus, this study was conducted to observe the difference in the preference for various types of foods based on the four taste modalities, with sweet taste preference (STP) status. This crosssectional study involved 156 university students in Kelantan, Malaysia. The preference test of tea drink sweetness was determined using the hedonic test. Subjects were grouped into low, medium, and high STP according to their STP level. The preference for the taste modalities of different food groups was determined by using a questionnaire. The results indicated that the majority of subjects were in the medium STP group. Foods categorized under the sweet taste group were mostly correlated with the STP status, followed by salty and sour foods. There was no correlation ( $p>0.05$ ) between STP status and bitter foods. This result agrees with the principal component analysis (PCA). Two factors were extracted from PCA, in which the first factor explained $56.41 \%$ and the second factor explained $20.45 \%$ of the variance. Sweetness is related to foods that are categorized under salty and sour tastes, but not related to bitter tastes. This study shows that sweetness preference status is associated with preference for two other basic tastes. The high STP subject not only prefers sweet foods but also favors foods from salty and sour groups.
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## INTRODUCTION

Preference for sugar has been studied by many researchers due to sugar being an important food to affect the health of the public. Among all tastes, sweet taste can be considered as having the most pleasant appeal and is well-liked by many people (Jayasinghe et al., 2017). Humans are naturally born with a preference for sweetness (Drewnowski et al., 2012). Unfortunately, a liking for sweet tastes might lead to increased consumption of sugar. Excess consumption of sugar has been linked to the increased incidence of health diseases such as dental caries, obesity, and obesity-related disease (Skillings et al., 2014; Divert et al., 2017).

The variance of sweet taste preference status (STP) plays a vital role in dietary intake and preferences for different taste food groups (Asao et al., 2015). Individuals with a high STP may require a high amount of sweet taste to be satisfied with the sweet taste perception they are experiencing compared to an individual with lower or medium STP (Low et al., 2014). There is also an increased possibility that individuals with high STP prefer food with a high amount of sugar and reject others. Thus, this might be a factor in fussy eating, which results in an unhealthy eating pattern (Cheung et al., 2022).

As food preference is associated with dietary intake, human preference for sweet taste has been the subject of studies by many researchers (Ashi et al., 2017; latridi et al., 2019). It is generally expected that a high preference
for sweet taste would lead to a high preference for food and drink with a high sweetness level. However, little is known about the influence of STP on the preference for foods group dominated by different tastes such as sweet, sour, and bitter.

Each of the taste modalities has been associated with specific functions essential for human health and well-being (Tan \& Tucker, 2019). For example, the quality of a sweet taste provides a guide in identifying the type of calorierich food or the source of carbohydrates. Acid balanced is maintained and controlled by a salty and sour detection in the taste bud. Bitter detection is crucial as it warns us of the poison that may contain in foods as poisonous compounds are mainly produced by plants for defense and are bitter.

The preference for sweetness may contribute to excessive consumption of sugary foods and thus increase the prevalence of obesity (Wilk et al., 2022), while the preference for saltiness may contribute to a high intake of salt and thus increase the likeliness of hypertension (Li et al., 2022). However, the preference for taste modalities such as sweetness and saltiness was mostly done separately. Thus, how each taste modality influences the preference for other taste modalities remains unknown. It is worth examining any possible relationship among preferences for all taste modalities as it may assist in the identification of an optimal strategy to tackle issues such as excessive intake of sugar and salt. Understanding the role of each taste preference in STP status will provide insight into interaction among taste modalities. Thus, this study aimed to evaluate the association between STP status, determined by the serial concentration of sucrose in tea beverages, with the taste preference of different taste modalities namely sweet, salty, sour, and bitter, using a self-reported questionnaire.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

## Subjects

This is a cross-sectional study that involved 156 undergraduate students (aged between 19 to 25 years old) in Kelantan state, Malaysia, chosen by a convenience sampling technique. The university students were chosen as they represent the large youth generation in Malaysia. The inclusion criteria were undergraduate students who were free from any disease or condition that can alter taste sensation. Subjects were excluded if they were a smoker or taking long-term medication for chronic disease. The research procedure was approved by the Human Ethical Research Committee, Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM/JEPeM/18070313).

## Sweet taste preference status

The STP status was determined by measuring
the preference for sweetness among subjects in tea beverages, according to the method by Uswatun (2014). Tea beverage was prepared by brewing one bag of tea (Lipton) with boiling water of 300 mL and allowed to stand for 5 min . Before the tea bag was removed, it was further dipped another 5 consecutive times. The tea beverage was divided into six portions and added with different concentrations of sucrose were. The concentrations of sucrose used were 2.5, 5, 7.5, $10,12.5$, and $15 \%(\mathrm{w} / \mathrm{v})$. To reflect the preference for sweet taste in real-life situations, tea beverage was used in this study rather than plain water.

Sensory preference was conducted by using a hedonic test. A 9-point hedonic scale was used to determine the preference level for sweetness in tea drinks. A scale of 1 represents dislike extremely and 9 represents like extremely. A sample of 10 mL of tea was served in a disposable cup, coded randomly with 3-digit numbers. Subjects were instructed to rinse their mouth between samples. After tasting each sample, subjects filled up their preferences based on the sweetness level.

The STP score was determined by multiplying the concentration of the sucrose level with the hedonic score given by the subjects. The total STP score for each subject was determined by adding all the STP scores from all six samples of tea beverages. The STP scores were transformed into categorical data to classify subjects into low, medium, and high STP. Subjects were categorized into low STP if their STP scores fall in the lower percentile ( $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile). The subjects were categorized into the high STP group if their STP scores fall in the higher percentile ( $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile). The remaining subjects were categorized as medium STP.

## Food preference

Food preference based on different taste modalities, namely sweet, salty, sour, and bitter was determined by using a food preference questionnaire, according to Syathirah Hanim et al., (2020). The foods consisted of commonly consumed foods by Malaysians. Subjects were required to indicate their preference towards the foods on a 7-point hedonic scale, from 'dislike extremely' to 'like extremely'.

## Statistical analysis

The Nutritionist Pro ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Diet Analysis Software using the Malaysian food database was used to analyze the nutrient intakes of the participants. All data collected were entered and analyzed using IBM Statistical Package of Social Science (SPSS) version 24.0. One-way ANOVA test was used to carry out significant difference mean for STP scores among low, medium, and high STP. STP score rating was correlated with food preference
by using Spearman's rank correlation. The value of $p<0.05$ was considered statistically significant. Principal component analysis (PCA) was used to study the interaction among the various tastes using XLSTAT software (2019).

## RESULTS

## Sweet taste preference status

The demographic characteristics of the participants in this study are shown in Table 1. This study included a total of 156 undergraduate students. The majority of the subjects were females, which constitutes about $79.5 \%$ and the remainder of $20.5 \%$ were male students. The Malays (78.8\%) constitute the highest number of participants, followed by Chinese (10.9\%), other ethnic minorities (5.8\%), and Indians (4.5\%). Most subjects were in the range of 19 to 22 years old (61.5\%). Subjects with medium STP (59\%) constituted the largest percentage, followed by low STP (22.4\%) and high STP (18.6\%) subjects. The percentage of high STP for males (31.2\%) was more than double the percentage for high STP females (15.3\%).

## Food preference

The food preference based on various taste modalities among low, medium, and high STP is shown in Table 2. Under the sweet taste modality, candy, chocolate cake, chocolate syrup, honey, and muffin were some of the foods which had significant differences ( $p<0.05$ ). There was a significant difference between high STP and low STP in all of the foods studied, with high STP subjects having a significantly higher preference for all of those foods, compared to low STP subjects.

For salty foods, high STP subjects had significantly ( $p<0.05$ ) higher preference for the chicken nugget, dried anchovies, and fried noodles
compared to low and medium STP subjects. In addition, high STP subjects significantly preferred ( $p<0.05$ ) sour food groups such as blueberry, cranberry, and red currant juice, compared to low and medium STP subjects. Unlike other food taste groups, there was no significant difference ( $p>0.05$ ) among subjects in the bitter food group, except for cabbage, in which low STP subject least preferred ( $p<0.05$ ) the vegetable.

Based on the correlation results, there was a significant correlation between STP status and preference for most of the foods under the sweet food category, namely candy ( $r=0.22, p<0.01$ ), chocolate syrup ( $r=0.29, p<0.01$ ), honey ( $r=0.27$, $p<0.01$ ), jelly ( $r=0.17, p<0.05$ ), muffin ( $r=0.19$, $p<0.05$ ), popcorn caramel ( $r=0.23, p<0.01$ ) and popsicles ( $r=0.21, p<0.01$ ). Under the salty foods category, cheddar cheese ( $r=0.20, p<0.05$ ), chicken nuggets ( $r=0.30, p<0.01$ ), dried anchovies ( $r=0.22, p<0.01$ ), fried noodles ( $r=0.20, p<0.05$ ), fried rice ( $r=0.25, p<0.01$ ) and potato chips ( $r=0.16$, $p<0.05$ ) were found to be positively correlated with the STP status. The list of foods under the sour taste category that was correlated with STP status was blueberry ( $r=0.20, p<0.05$ ), cranberry ( $r=0.32, p<0.01$ ), grapefruit ( $r=0.17, p<0.05$ ), red currant juice ( $r=0.19, p<0.05$ ) and sour milk $(r=0.19, p<0.05)$. No correlation ( $p>0.05$ ) was found between STP status and bitter foods.

Figure 1 shows the loading plot of the correlation between the first two components of PCA and food groups based on taste. Two factors were extracted, with the first factor explaining $56.41 \%$ of the variance and $20.45 \%$ explaining the second factor. Sweetness is related to salty and sour tastes, based on the acute angle. However, the sour taste is not as well represented as the other two tastes, given its slightly shorter vector length. The bitter taste is not related to other tastes.

Table 1. General characteristics of participants

|  | Low STP <br> $(n=35)$ | Medium STP <br> $(n=92)$ | High STP <br> $(n=29)$ | Total <br> $(n=156)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |
| Female | $31(25.0)$ | $74(59.7)$ | $19(15.3)$ | 124 |
| Male | $4(12.5)$ | $18(56.3)$ | $10(31.2)$ | 32 |
| Race |  |  |  |  |
| Malay | $27(21.9)$ | $72(58.5)$ | $24(19.5)$ | 123 |
| Chinese | $4(23.5)$ | $12(70.6)$ | $3(5.9)$ | 17 |
| Indians | $0(0.0)$ | $4(57.1)$ | $1(11.1)$ | 7 |
| Others | $4(44.4)$ |  |  | 9 |
| Age |  | $56(58.3)$ | $20(20.8)$ | 96 |
| $19-22$ | $20(20.8)$ | $36(60.0)$ | $9(15.0)$ | 60 |
| $23-26$ | $15(25.0)$ |  |  |  |

Numbers in parentheses indicate the percentage

Table 2. Sweet taste preference (STP) score and correlations of STP status with food preference of various tastes

|  | Mean (SD) Sweet Taste Preference (STP) |  |  |  | Correlations of |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food Groups | Low STP ( $n=35$ ) | Medium STP $(n=92)$ | High STP ( $n=29$ ) | $p$-value | STP status and food preference ( $r$ ) |
| Sweet Food |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chocolate Bar | $5.46 \pm 1.29$ | $5.40 \pm 1.53$ | $6.03 \pm 1.18$ | 0.108 | 0.115 |
| Baby Corn | $4.54 \pm 1.74$ | $4.96 \pm 1.47$ | $4.41 \pm 1.66$ | 0.176 | 0.002 |
| Candy | $4.40 \pm 1.70^{\text {b }}$ | $4.90 \pm 1.35^{\text {ab }}$ | $5.31 \pm 1.34^{\text {a }}$ | 0.041 | 0.222** |
| Chocolate cake | $5.63 \pm 1.40^{\text {b }}$ | $5.59 \pm 1.56{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $6.34 \pm 1.01^{\text {a }}$ | 0.044 | 0.139 |
| Chocolate spread | $5.26 \pm 1.42$ | $5.22 \pm 1.64$ | $5.93 \pm 1.49$ | 0.095 | 0.135 |
| Chocolate syrup | $4.09 \pm 1.79^{\text {b }}$ | $4.99 \pm 1.53{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $5.62 \pm 1.52^{\text {a }}$ | 0.001 | 0.294** |
| Cookies | $5.66 \pm 1.21$ | $5.64 \pm 1.35$ | $5.86 \pm 1.13$ | 0.713 | 0.061 |
| Doughnut | $5.34 \pm 1.35$ | $5.24 \pm 1.43$ | $5.66 \pm 1.14$ | 0.359 | 0.118 |
| Honey | $4.43 \pm 1.54{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $5.03 \pm 1.46{ }^{\text {ab }}$ | $5.55 \pm 1.48^{\text {a }}$ | 0.011 | 0.270** |
| Ice-cream | $5.80 \pm 1.13$ | $5.99 \pm 1.18$ | $5.76 \pm 1.50$ | 0.582 | 0.064 |
| Jam | $4.34 \pm 1.45$ | $4.67 \pm 1.40$ | $4.83 \pm 1.58$ | 0.370 | 0.117 |
| Jelly | $4.54 \pm 1.40$ | $4.97 \pm 1.26$ | $5.07 \pm 1.53$ | 0.211 | 0.169* |
| Marshmallow | $4.20 \pm 1.80$ | $4.42 \pm 1.56$ | $4.55 \pm 1.88$ | 0.687 | 0.100 |
| Milk Chocolate | $5.20 \pm 1.91$ | $5.37 \pm 1.61$ | $6.00 \pm 1.49$ | 0.126 | 0.150 |
| Muffin | $5.06 \pm 1.45^{\text {b }}$ | $5.36 \pm 1.46^{\text {ab }}$ | $5.97 \pm 1.27^{\text {a }}$ | 0.038 | 0.189* |
| Popcorn Caramel | $4.89 \pm 1.53$ | $5.24 \pm 1.52$ | $5.62 \pm 1.05$ | 0.131 | 0.232** |
| Popsicles | $4.26 \pm 1.60$ | $4.93 \pm 1.49$ | $4.93 \pm 1.77$ | 0.083 | 0.207** |
| Salty Food |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cheddar cheese | $5.40 \pm 1.33$ | $5.34 \pm 1.61$ | $6.00 \pm 1.20$ | 0.107 | 0.195* |
| Chicken nugget | $5.43 \pm 1.27^{\text {b }}$ | $5.79 \pm 1.40^{\text {b }}$ | $6.52 \pm 0.51^{\text {a }}$ | 0.003 | 0.298** |
| Corn snacks | $4.49 \pm 1.52$ | $4.66 \pm 1.33$ | $5.03 \pm 1.27$ | 0.266 | 0.088 |
| Dried anchovies | $4.00 \pm 1.57{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $4.35 \pm 1.50{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $5.03 \pm 1.48^{\text {a }}$ | 0.024 | 0.216** |
| Dried cuttlefish | $3.49 \pm 1.84$ | $3.82 \pm 1.74$ | $3.86 \pm 1.68$ | 0.594 | 0.034 |
| Dried prawns | $3.57 \pm 1.72$ | $3.53 \pm 1.66$ | $3.93 \pm 1.56$ | 0.521 | 0.094 |
| Dried salted fish | $3.54 \pm 1.82$ | $3.92 \pm 1.84$ | $3.90 \pm 1.74$ | 0.561 | 0.080 |
| Fried noodles | $5.00 \pm 1.53^{\text {b }}$ | $4.95 \pm 1.63^{\text {b }}$ | $5.76 \pm 1.30^{\text {a }}$ | 0.043 | 0.196* |
| Fried rice | $5.46 \pm 1.07$ | $5.48 \pm 1.31$ | $6.00 \pm 1.40$ | 0.134 | 0.245** |
| Noodles with soup | $5.66 \pm 1.59$ | $5.70 \pm 1.20$ | $6.10 \pm 1.32$ | 0.304 | 0.049 |
| Noodles with soy sauce | $4.97 \pm 1.64$ | $4.90 \pm 1.36$ | $5.48 \pm 1.41$ | 0.162 | 0.127 |
| Potato chips | $5.11 \pm 1.45$ | $5.43 \pm 1.41$ | $5.86 \pm 0.83$ | 0.085 | 0.164* |
| Prawn crackers | $4.51 \pm 1.62$ | $4.55 \pm 1.56$ | $5.24 \pm 1.33$ | 0.089 | 0.152 |
| Salted squids | $3.23 \pm 1.72$ | $3.57 \pm 1.91$ | $3.90 \pm 1.93$ | 0.365 | 0.089 |
| Soup | $5.60 \pm 1.42$ | $5.91 \pm 1.10$ | $6.00 \pm 1.41$ | 0.354 | 0.064 |
| Sour Food |  |  |  |  |  |
| Blueberry | $4.66 \pm 1.45^{\text {b }}$ | $4.78 \pm 1.34^{\text {b }}$ | $5.48 \pm 1.09^{\text {a }}$ | 0.026 | 0.204* |
| Cranberry | $4.06 \pm 1.45^{\text {b }}$ | $4.38 \pm 1.34^{\text {b }}$ | $5.34 \pm 1.08^{\text {a }}$ | 0.000 | $0.324^{* *}$ |
| Grapefruit | $5.29 \pm 1.60$ | $5.76 \pm 1.36$ | $6.10 \pm 1.24$ | 0.063 | 0.170* |
| Lemon | $4.77 \pm 1.66$ | $4.57 \pm 1.45$ | $5.07 \pm 1.41$ | 0.275 | 0.006 |
| Orange | $5.86 \pm 1.35$ | $5.65 \pm 1.31$ | $5.86 \pm 1.13$ | 0.615 | -0.004 |
| Red currant juice | $4.29 \pm 1.45^{\text {b }}$ | $4.45 \pm 1.43^{\text {b }}$ | $5.28 \pm 1.22^{\text {a }}$ | 0.010 | 0.187* |
| Sour milk | $2.91 \pm 1.87$ | $3.37 \pm 1.87$ | $4.00 \pm 1.67$ | 0.072 | 0.190* |
| Strawberry | $5.23 \pm 1.52$ | $5.23 \pm 1.59$ | $5.86 \pm 1.53$ | 0.147 | 0.150 |
| Yogurt | $5.80 \pm 1.57$ | $5.80 \pm 1.36$ | $6.07 \pm 1.00$ | 0.635 | -0.004 |
| Bitter Food |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bitter gourd | $2.66 \pm 1.98$ | $3.13 \pm 1.89$ | $2.76 \pm 1.64$ | 0.367 | 0.025 |
| Broccoli | $5.09 \pm 1.93$ | $5.52 \pm 1.43$ | $4.79 \pm 1.88$ | 0.084 | -0.069 |
| Cabbage | $4.97 \pm 1.72^{\text {b }}$ | $5.68 \pm 1.30^{\text {ab }}$ | $5.55 \pm 1.21^{\text {a }}$ | 0.037 | 0.034 |
| Cauliflower | $5.20 \pm 1.81$ | $5.71 \pm 1.31$ | $5.66 \pm 1.26$ | 0.199 | 0.079 |
| Chinese kale | $4.54 \pm 2.16$ | $5.16 \pm 1.61$ | $5.28 \pm 1.73$ | 0.158 | 0.069 |

Table 1 continued...

| Coffee | $4.71 \pm 1.84$ | $4.71 \pm 1.90$ | $5.03 \pm 1.57$ | 0.689 | -0.001 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Cucumber | $4.60 \pm 1.82$ | $5.12 \pm 1.51$ | $5.41 \pm 1.21$ | 0.094 | 0.091 |
| Dark chocolate | $4.83 \pm 1.82$ | $4.97 \pm 1.78$ | $5.21 \pm 1.40$ | 0.680 | -0.062 |
| Eggplant | $3.91 \pm 2.05$ | $4.18 \pm 1.79$ | $3.83 \pm 1.89$ | 0.585 | -0.016 |
| French bean | $4.51 \pm 1.82$ | $4.73 \pm 1.48$ | $4.72 \pm 1.71$ | 0.788 | 0.030 |
| Lady's fingers | $4.71 \pm 2.26$ | $4.93 \pm 1.79$ | $4.93 \pm 2.10$ | 0.844 | 0.004 |
| Plain tea | $3.83 \pm 1.81$ | $4.39 \pm 1.78$ | $4.38 \pm 1.66$ | 0.234 | 0.085 |
| Values presented are means + SD |  |  |  |  |  |

Values presented are means $\pm$ SD
$p$-value in bold indicates a significant difference ( $p<0.05$ ) with different letters in a row showing significant differences.
$r$-value with (*) indicates significant difference at $p<0.05, r$ value with (**) indicates significant difference at $P<0.01$


Fig. 1. Principal component analysis of various taste preferences.

## DISCUSSION

The present study shows that the majority of subjects in this study were in the medium STP category. Only a small percentage of the subjects were in the high STP. Because the subjects in this study were health campus students, the majority of whom were from the school of health sciences, it is expected that they have a high level of health consciousness and are more concerned about a healthy lifestyle than the general population. This, in turn, may influence and shape their food preferences for the better. Although the majority of both male and female subjects fall under the medium STP, the male subjects in this study, however, had a higher percentage in the high

STP group as compared to female subjects. This finding supported the study by Yang et al. (2020) who reported that males were more likely to be high sweet likers.

In the present study, it was found that the sweet food groups had the most food items being significantly different ( $p<0.05$ ) among subjects, compared to food from the other modalities. Subjects in the high STP category significantly preferred the listed sweet food items compared to low STP subjects. The correlation between sweet preference and liking for sugary foods has been reported in previous studies (Sia et al., 2013, Fernandaz-Carrion et al., 2022). The findings from the present study seem to follow a similar trend.

Nevertheless, not all of the sweet food items listed had significant differences among the subjects. This is supported by Holt et al. (2000) which indicates that the preferred level of sweetness is food-specific. Thus, not all types of sugary foods would be preferred by high STP subjects, as there are inter-individual variations too. In addition, another factor such as emotion also plays a role in determining preference for sweet foods. According to Kim et al. (2017), those who are sweet likers expressed a preference for food such as chocolate not just due to the high sweet content, but because chocolate brings positive emotional effects to them.

The findings from this study also indicate that high STP subjects significantly ( $p<0.05$ ) preferred chicken nuggets, dried anchovies, and fried noodles compared to low and medium STP subjects. These foods were categorized as salty foods and almost half of these foods were found to be positively correlated with STP status. This observation implies that those preferring sweet foods also have a high preference for salty foods. This result was reflected in the loading plot of PCA, whereby the sweet and salty taste seems to have a close relationship. According to FernandezCarrion etal. (2022), the sweet taste was the second most preferred taste while the salty taste was the most preferred taste by the studied population. A study by Menella et al. (2014) found that for both children and adults, the sweetness preference was significantly and positively correlated ( $r=0.25$, $p<0.05$ ) with saltiness preference. This indicates that liking and preference towards sweet taste food could also motivate the liking for salty foods.

In the present study, three out of nine types of foods under the sourness category were significantly different, with high STP subjects preferring more blueberry, cranberry, and red currant juice than the low and medium STP subjects. The STP status was also correlated positively with most sour foods. Not many studies have been done to examine the relationship between sweetness preference and sour taste. Aoyma et al., (2017) found that sweetness sensitivity could be predicted by the preference level of sourness in food. The present study found a positive correlation between STP status and some types of sour foods. This finding could be due to variations in personal choice. The sour taste can be either pleasing or displeasing depending on the intensity and other factors (Frank et al., 2022). For example, sour juice contained some sugar too, thus it may not be perceived as sour as it should be. The final taste depends mostly on the interaction between the sweet and sour tastes. According to a previous study, sugar has a greater impact on reducing sourness than acid has on reducing sweetness (Stampanoni, 1993). Thus the unique sweet-sour
taste interaction can be pleasant and preferred by high STP subjects.

According to a review study of flavor preference in youth versus adults, the sour taste was less preferred in general, compared to sweet and salty tastes (Hoffman, 2016). The present study supported the finding, which is reflected in the PCA loading plot. Based on the PCA plot, sweet and salty taste groups show a very close correlation, while the sour taste group however was slightly distanced from both sweet and salty tastes.

The present study shows that there was no correlation between STP status and preference for bitter taste foods. Only one food, which is cabbage showed a significant difference in the STP status. The loading plot of PCA also shows that the preference for bitter was further away from other tastes, which indicates no relationship between bitter taste and other tastes. The taste of sweet and bitter seems to be contradicted in which sweetness is perceived as pleasant, while bitterness on the other hand is perceived as bad or undesirable (Menella \& Bobowski, 2015). Rather than contributing to pleasantness in eating, bitter taste warns of possible toxicity in food. Previous studies found that children have an innate preference towards sweetness and reject bitterness (Lim et al., 2021) and this is not due to modern-day technology or advertising, but it is a universal phenomenon based on fundamental biology (Ventura \& Menella, 2011).

## CONCLUSION

In general, the finding from this study indicates that the majority of subjects in this study were under the medium STP category. STP status was correlated with preferences for sweetness, saltiness, and sourness, but not bitterness. Low STP subjects had a lower preference for foods listed under the sweetness category as compared to the high STP group. High STP subjects preferred few salty and sour foods over medium or low STP subjects. The principal component analysis indicates that PC1 and PC2 explained $56.4 \%$ and $20.45 \%$ of the total variance.
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