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INTRODUCTION
As companies are faced with compressed timelines and fierce competitive entries into new or existing categories, there is a heightened need for a consumer method to rapidly assess competitive features. Traditional drivers studies are limiting from a time, resource and cost perspective.

This research proposes a rapid assessment approach combining several standard methodologies in a qualitative environment as an alternative to a drivers study.

METHODOLOGY
12 samples were selected from a previous drivers study. This allowed the utility of the approaches to be compared between the two methodologies.

OVERALL LIKING
TERM CREATION
CATA
Panelists rated overall liking for each of the 12 samples
Various activities to facilitate discussion, generate terms
Panelists evaluated the 12 samples using their CATA ballot
Fig. 1. Tasks performed by the panelists (n=24) to obtain overall liking scores and generate terms for the CATA ballot.

ANALYSIS
Generalized Procrustes Analysis (GPA) was applied to the CATA lists, which were developed separately by the three panels.
GPA is a multiple dimension technique which forms consensus among the panelists. This is effective for comparison of different panel languages or terms.
The first 3 GPA dimensions accounted for a good fit with $R^2 = 85%$

RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Rapid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analytical understanding</td>
<td>• Voice of the consumer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attribute intensities (Descriptive)</td>
<td>• Quick to plan and execute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actionable results</td>
<td>• Fewer resources, lower cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clustering</td>
<td>• Adaptive, easy to modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Costly</td>
<td>• Less specific results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less specific results</td>
<td>• Inability to cluster consumers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More routine statistical analysis</td>
<td>• Inherent noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Panelist fatigue</td>
<td>• Less routine statistical analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4. Comparison of advantages and disadvantages of the traditional and rapid methods.

Fig. 5. Illustration of similarities and differences in the research phases for each method.

CONCLUSIONS
• Similar positive and negative drivers between the two methods.
• This first iteration identified areas of opportunity.
• Future use of this research will include modifications to address panelist fatigue and improve data robustness.
• Consider a traditional approach for a new platform or transformation to a category.
• Consider this proposed quicker approach for core category understanding.
• Decision on which method to use may be based on the product category and overall test objective.