



1

2

3

4

5

10

11 12

24 25

26

**Proceedings** Paper

# Ideas generation for new aquaculture products (Sea Bream and Prawns) developing using Focus Group by different participants profiles<sup>+</sup>

Palmira Javier-Pisco 1\*, Marta Igual-Ramo 1, Purificación García-Segovia 1, María Jesús Pagan-Moreno 1

1	i-Food Group, Instituto Universitario de Ingenieria de Alimentos-FoodUPV, Universitat Politècnica de
	Valencia, Camino de Vera s/n, 46022 Valencia, Spain; paljapis@upvnet.upv.es (P.JP.);
	marigra@upvnet.upv.es (M.I.);        pugarse@tal.upv.es (P.GS.);        jpagan@tal.upv.es (J.P.)
*	Correspondence: paljapis@upvnet.upv.es

- + Presented at the 4th International Electronic Conference on Foods. Focus on Sustainable Food Systems: Current Trends and Advances; Available online: https://foods2023.sciforum.net.
- Abstract: The current market requires new fish-based products, in this context, the use of focus groups is a 13 qualitative technique that enables the generation of ideas for the development of new products. The aim of 14 this study is to create a list of ideas of products based on two species from aquaculture: sea bream and prawn. 15 To achieve this, two sessions were conducted, involving 20 individuals from diverse backgrounds. The ses-16 sions included consumer surveys, exploration of new products, brainstorming, and categorization of ideas 17 into product categories. As a result, the frequencies of idea mentions were obtained, with the 'fresh products' 18category being the most frequently mentioned for both species. Furthermore, associations between product 19 categories and participant profiles were established using correspondence analysis (CA). In conclusion, for 20 Sea Bream, consumers showed a preference for fresh product ideas. Conversely, for Prawns, canned and de-21 hydrated products were consistently suggested across all participant profiles. This study lays the foundation 22 for innovative aquaculture product development. 23

Keywords: seafood, generation of new ideas, product categories, consumers.

# 1. Introduction

At present, there is a growing concern among consumers about maintaining a 27 healthy and balanced diet [1]. Fish and seafood are considered the primary dietary sources 28 of fatty acids, offering various health benefits [2]. As a result, there has been an increase 29 in the consumption of fishery products in recent decades, and aquaculture plays a signif-30 icant role in this growth [3]. Aquaculture is considered a complementary alternative to 31 traditional fishing [4]. The development of new aquaculture products presents an oppor-32 tunity to enhance the commercial value and profitability of the Mediterranean aquacul-33 ture value chain [5]. Therefore, it is necessary to offer consumers new aquaculture prod-34 ucts to meet their needs. But what type of products do consumers demand? Exploratory 35 techniques such as focus groups are used to gather ideas from customers about promising 36 new products. These groups typically consist of six to ten people and should be conducted 37 at the beginning of the product development process [6]. To achieve idea generation is 38 crucial to identify the key attributes that influence consumer purchasing decisions, which 39 involves collecting preliminary qualitative data to gain a deeper understanding of con-40 sumer behavior [7,8]. Given this issue, this study aims to employ the focus group tech-41 nique to obtain a list of new product ideas in the field of aquaculture, focusing on two 42 species, sea bream and prawn, for subsequent development at the laboratory level as part 43 of Project THINKINAZUL/2021/011." 44

45

46

**Citation:** To be added by editorial staff during production.

Academic Editor: Firstname Lastname

Published: date



**Copyright:** © 2023 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/license s/by/4.0/).

## 2. Materials and Methods

## 2.1. Participants' Recruiment

Participants were recruited from different databases available at Instituto Universitario de Ingenieria de Alimentos-FoodUPV (Universitat Politècnica de València, Spain). The chefs were recruited from the Association of Chefs of the Valencian Community (Spain). Participation in the study was voluntary. All the participants met the criteria of being adults, responsible for grocery shopping, and regular fish and seafood consumers, with a frequency of at least once a week.

2.2. Focus Group Sessions

The focus group work sessions took place at the facilities of Instituto Universitario de 12 Ingenieria de Alimentos-FoodUPV (Universitat Politècnica de València, Spain). Two work-13 ing sessions were conducted, each with a total of 20 participants. The sessions were con-14 ducted using two modalities: in-person (for consumers and researchers) and remotely (for 15 chefs). Each group's session lasted 90 minutes [9]. The sessions were led by a moderator 16 and an additional senior laboratory technician who provided assistance during the sessions. 17 The moderator's skill is essential to foster a discussion environment in which all participants 18 can freely express their opinions without being influenced by others [10]. The focus group 19 sessions were carried out in five steps: Step 1, an online survey on the consumption of aq-20 uaculture products where participants provided their personal information and data about 21 the frequency of consuming seafood products; Step 2, exploration of recent launches of new 22 food products where they were introduced to their characteristics and keywords that iden-23 tify them; Step 3, brainstorming of new products for sea bream and prawn; Step 4, grouping 24 of ideas by product categories; and Step 5, analysis of all the ideas where participants were 25 invited to evaluate the generated ideas with the aim of providing additional input. Through 26 this qualitative methodology, the moderator was able to inquire about participants' view-27 points, facilitating a better understanding of the workshop's objective among the partici-28 pants [9]. 29

#### 2.3 Data analysis

Three researchers (moderator, assistant, and project coordinator) anonymously gener-32 ated a report listing all the proposed ideas for new products and their respective frequencies. 33 Subsequently, a comparison and discussion of the individual reports were conducted, 34 reaching a consensus on the ideas for new aquaculture products obtained for each species: sea bream and prawn. This evaluation methodology has been previously applied in a study [10, 11]. The following analyses were conducted: a bifactorial statistical analysis (ANOVA) 37 with participant profiles and aquaculture species as factors. The data used for this analysis 38 was the number of generated ideas. Additionally, a correspondence analysis (CA) was con-39 ducted on the contingency tables of frequency data for the qualitative variables (ideas for 40 each species), resulting in a multidimensional graphical map or bi-plot [12]. The statistical 41 analysis was performed using XLSTAT 2023.1.6.1410 software [13], and differences were 42 considered significant when p < 0.05. 43

# 3. Results and Discussion

#### 3.1. Participants' Characteristics

The sociodemographic characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1. The 48participants' age range was between 18 to 65 years old. Regarding gender, a balanced 49 distribution similar to the Spanish population was obtained [14]. Data on employment and 50 personal situations were collected to obtain broad opinions and perspectives [9]. In this 51 study, the opinions of consumers (50%), researchers (25%) and chefs (25%) were collected. 52 This method was also carried out in another study [15]. 53

1 2 3

4

5

6 7 8

9

10 11

35 36

44

45 46

47

30

GENDER		AGE (years old)		EMPLOYMENT SITUATION		FREQUENCY CONSUMPTION		PERSONAL SITUATION	
Q	55%	65 – 100	5%	Student	15%	Daily	10%	Living alone	10%
ď	45%	55 - 64	25%	Unemployed	5%	3-4 times per week	30%	Living with my partner	25%
		45 - 54	25%	Part-time employed	15%	1-2 times per week	50%	Living with my family	50%
		35 – 44	20%	Full-time employed	60%	Once every 2 weeks	10%	Sharing apartment	15%
		25 - 34	20%	Retired	5%				
		18 – 24	5%						

Table 1. Characteristics of the participants in focus group sessions expressed as a percentage.

#### 3.2 Focus Group

In Figure 1 displays the complete list of generated ideas and the percentage of 4 mention for each idea by participants. A total of 68 new product ideas were generated: 35 5 for sea bream (Figure 1a) and 33 for shrimp (Figure 1b). These were grouped into product 6 categories (fresh, dehydrated, canned, smoked, and fermented). 7

Analyzing Figures 1a and 1b, it can be observed that a high number of ideas were 8 generated for sea bream in some cases, with a mention percentage exceeding 40%. 9 Conversely, the generation of new product ideas for prawns reached a maximum of 30%. 10 After conducting an ANOVA, significant differences (p < 0.05) were observed between 11 aquaculture species. However, no significant differences were found among participant 12 profiles. 13

When evaluating the results by product categories, it is observed that participants 14 generated a higher number of ideas for new products in the fresh products category for 15 both species, sea beam (Figure 1a) and prawn (figure 1b). In the case of sea beam, the next 16 category with a higher participation of ideas was dehydrated products. On the other hand, 17 prawns showed a similar percentage of participation across different product categories. 18

The high percentage of mentión of ideas in fresh products could be due to the fact 19 that according to [2], preservation methods for seafood products (refrigerated, frozen, 20 canned, and smoked/salted) have an impact on consumers, with a progressive decrease in 21 the acceptance of processed products: frozen, canned, and smoked/salted [2]. Additionally, 22 a change in appearance, display, and packaging is also an important aspect to consider in 23 new products [16]. Regarding the dehydrated category in both species (Figures 1a and 1b), 24 mentions of snacks, dehydrated slices, and salted dehydrated products were frequently 25 repeated. There is a high demand for dry and spiced products, as well as their convenient 26 use (easy to consume). Therefore, it is essential to take into account their characteristics, as 27 well as the needs and feedback from users [16]. Many participants, in the canned products 28 category for sea bream (Figure 1a), mentioned options with different flavors (oriental sauce, 29 with vegetables, with legumes). To increase the popularity of value-added fish products 30 worldwide, diversifying products with international flavors, including ethnic flavors, is of 31 great importance [16]. Regarding the marinated category, many of the generated ideas 32 were related to flavors and spices. Marinated products are attractive to consumers due to 33 their distinctive taste and texture properties [16]. 34

After the discussion and consensus work carried out by the evaluators, the proposal 35 for new products ideas were defined. These ideas are indicated with an asterisk (\*) on the 36 axis of categories/new product ideas for sea beam (Figure 1a) and prawn (figure 1b). Using 37 the following criteria: unification of similar new product ideas (marinated cubes) canned 38 goods with spices-tomatoes-vegetables, pate-pasta in cans), frequency of word mentions. 39 The textual analysis focuses on the frequencies of keywords, co-occurrence, and contextual meaning [5]. 41





Figure 1. Frequency percentual of participants in the creation of ideas: (a) New Product 22 Ideas Sea Bream; (b) New Product Ideas Prawn.

#### 3.3 Projective map

Figure 2 shows a correspondence analysis (CA) of product categories, in which it can 2 be observed that the different profiles of the participants are associated with certain prod-3 uct categories. This allows for the comparison of qualitative variables [13]. In the case of 4 seabream products (Figure 2a), the fresh products category was frequently mentioned by 5 consumers, while the processed products category (dehydrated, marinated, and fer-6 mented) was closer to the dimensions of chefs and researchers. In the prawn analysis (Fig-7 ure 2b), ideas for the fresh products category were cited by researchers, while ideas for 8 the processed products category were situated in the consumers and chefs dimensions. 9 The results of CA allow for a deeper understanding of the associations between supple-10 mentary variables in relation to the frequency of obtaining different dimensions [13]. 11



Figure 2. Correspondence analysis of product categories: (a) Symmetric graph Sea Bream 23 Products; (b) Symmetric graph Prawn Products. 24

The frequency of mention is varied according to the type of aquaculture species 26 (prawn and sea beam) by consumers and researchers, suggesting that these participants' 27 profiles hold a different perception of the products. This fact could be related to consum-28 ers' interest in "minimally processed" products, especially when it comes to traditional 29 food products [7]. Meanwhile, chefs frequently mentioned processed products regardless 30 of the aquaculture species. It could be assumed that their inclination towards processed 31 products is related to their personality because a chef may be more adventurous in taking 32 or not taking risks to develop their creations [17]. 33

# 4. Conclusions

In the process of generating ideas for the development of new aquaculture products, spe-36 cifically sea bream and prawns, the focus group proves to be a valuable tool that allows 37 obtaining a preliminary idea of the products consumers might demand. Depending on 38 the participants' profiles, the mention or demand for types of products (categories) would 39 vary. In the case of sea bream, consumers predominantly mentioned fresh products. How-40 ever, when referring to prawns, they mentioned canned and dehydrated products. There-41 fore, in product development, the consumer profile should be considered. 42

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, P.J.-P., M.I., P.G.-S. and J.P.; methodology, P.J.-P., 44 M.I., P.G.-S. and J.P.; software, P.J.-P.; validation, M.I., P.G.-S. and J.P.; formal analysis, P.J.-P and 45 P.G.-S.; investigation, P.J.-P., P.G.-S and J.P.; resources, P.G.-S and J.P.; data curation, P.J.-P.; writ-46 ing-original draft preparation, P.J.-P.; writing-review and editing, P.J.-P., M.I., P.G.-S and J.P.; 47 supervision, M.I., P.G.-S and J.P.; project administration, P.G.-S and J.P.; funding acquisition, P.G.-48 49 S and J.P. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

1

25

34

35

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

**Funding:** This research was funded by the Ministry of Science and Innovation (MCIN) with funds from the European Union Next Generation EU under The Recovery, Transformation, and Resilience Plan (PRTR-C17.I1) and by the Generalitat Valenciana (Reference THINKINAZUL/2021/011).

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee of Universitat Politècnica de València (P07\_22-06-2022)."

**Informed Consent Statement:** "Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

**Data Availability Statement:** The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

- Claret, A.; Guerrero, L.; Aguirre, E.; Rincón, L.; Hernández, M.D.; Martínez, I.; Benito Peleteiro, J.; Grau, A.; Rodríguez-Rodríguez, C. Consumer Preferences for Sea Fish Using Conjoint Analysis: Exploratory Study of the Importance of Country of Origin, Obtaining Method, Storage Conditions and Purchasing Price. *Food Qual Prefer* 2012, p. 26, pp. 259–266, doi:10.1016/j.foodqual.2012.05.006.
- 2. Carlucci, D.; Nocella, G.; De Devitiis, B.; Viscecchia, R.; Bimbo, F.; Nardone, G. Consumer Purchasing Behaviour towards Fish and Seafood Products. *Patterns and Insights from a Sample of International Studies*. *Appetite* **2015**, p. 84, pp. 212–227.
- Reig, L.; Escobar, C.; Carrassón, M.; Constenla, M.; Gil, J.M.; Padrós, F.; Piferrer, F.; Flos, R. Aquaculture Perceptions in the Barcelona Metropolitan Area from Fish and Seafood Wholesalers, Fishmongers, and Consumers. *Aquaculture* 2019, p. 510, pp. 256–266, doi:10.1016/j.aquaculture.2019.05.066.
- 4. Claret, A.; Guerrero, L.; Gartzia, I.; Garcia-Quiroga, M.; Ginés, R. Does Information Affect Consumer Liking of Farmed and Wild Fish? *Aquaculture* **2016**, p. 454, pp. 157–162, doi:10.1016/j.aquaculture.2015.12.024.
- 5. López-Mas, L; Claret, A; Stancu, V; Bruns, K; Peral, I; Santa Cruz, E; Krystallis, A & Guerrero, L. New Fish Product Ideas Generated by European Consumers. Conference Aquaculture Europe 20 Eposter & e-Market, (12-15, April, 2021).
- 6. Mcquarrie, E.F.; Mcintyre, S.H. Focus Groups and the Development of New Products by Technologically Driven Companies: Some Guidelines. Marketing The University of Santa Clara. Santa Clara. CA Department. 1986
- Claret, A.; Guerrero, L.; Aguirre, E.; Rincón, L.; Hernández, M.D.; Martínez, I.; Benito Peleteiro, J.; Grau, A.; Rodríguez-Rodríguez, C. Consumer Preferences for Sea Fish Using Conjoint Analysis: Exploratory Study of the Importance of Country of Origin, Obtaining Method, Storage Conditions and Purchasing Price. *Food Qual Prefer* 2012, p. 26, pp. 259–266, doi:10.1016/j.foodqual.2012.05.006.
- 8. Byers, P.Y.; Wilcox, J.R. Focus Groups: A Qualitative Opportunity for Researchers. University of Miami. 2014. Downloaded from job.sagepub.com
- 9. Lazo Zamalloa, O. Development of new products from aquaculture fish species. the degree of Doctor from the University of Girona 2017.
- Juan, S.; Roussos, A. El focus groups como técnica de investigación cualitativa. 2010. Documento de Trabajo N° 256, Universidad
  de Belgrano. http://www.ub.edu.ar/investigaciones/dt\_nuevos/256\_roussos.pdf
  37
- 11. Carrillo, E.; Chaya, C.; Viadel, A.; Laguna, L.; Tarrega, A. Early Changes in Elderly Food Habits Related to Reduced Protein Intake. *Food Qual Prefer* **2023**, p. 108, doi:10.1016/j.foodqual.2023.104862.
- 12. Stoddard J.; Dotson M.; Das N. Using focus groups and correspondence analysis to explore the relationship between millennials' online behavior and their opinions of online reviews. 2016, *Atlantic marketing journal*; Vol. 5 Num. 2 Art. 4
- 13. López-Mas, L.; Claret, A.; Stancu, V.; Brunsø, K.; Peral, I.; Santa Cruz, E.; Krystallis, A.; Guerrero, L. Making Full Use of Qualitative Data to Generate New Fish Product Ideas through Co-Creation with Consumers: A Methodological Approach. *Foods* **2022**, *11*, doi:10.3390/foods11152287.
- 14. Estadística Continua de Población (ECP) a 1 de Abril de 2023 Datos Provisionales
- López-Mas, L.; Claret, A.; Bermúdez, A.; Llauger, M.; Guerrero, L. Co-Creation with Consumers for Packaging Design Validated 46 through Implicit and Explicit Methods: Exploratory Effect of Visual and Textual Attributes. *Foods* 2022, p. 11, 47 doi:10.3390/foods11091183.
- Prakasan S.; Value Added Fish Products. Fish Processing Division. ICAR-Central Institute of Fisheries Technology, Cochin.
  Recent Technological Developments in Fisheries: Pre and Post Harvest.
- Lin, P.M.C.; Baum, T. The Meaning of Applied Creativity in the Culinary Industry. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration* 2016, *17*, 429–448, doi:10.1080/15256480.2016.1226153.

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

38

39

40

41

42

43

44