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**Abstract**

When we imagine objects or events, we often engage in multisensory mental imagery. Yet, investigations of mental imagery have typically focused on only one sensory modality—vision. One reason for this is that the most common tool for the measurement of imagery, the questionnaire, has been restricted to unimodal ratings of the object. We present a new mental imagery questionnaire that measures multisensory imagery. Specifically, the newly developed Vividness of Wine Imagery Questionnaire (VWIQ) measures mental imagery of wine in the visual, olfactory, and gustatory modalities. Wine is an ideal domain to explore multisensory imagery because wine drinking is a multisensory experience, it involves the neglected chemical senses (smell and taste), and provides the opportunity to explore the effect of experience and expertise on imagery (from wine novices to experts). The VWIQ questionnaire showed high internal consistency and reliability, and correlated with other validated measures of imagery. Overall, the VWIQ may serve as a useful tool to explore mental imagery, for researchers, as well as individuals in the wine industry during sommelier training and evaluation of wine professionals.
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**1. Introduction**

Mental imagery is the ability to create an inner ‘image’ in any sensory modality, in the absence of a physical stimulus (Freeman, 1981; Pylyshyn, 1973). Imagery can be thought of as reconstructions of sensory experiences from the past, to anticipate experiences to come (Thomas, 2006). In this capacity, it can help in everyday activities, such as planning for the future and reflecting on past events (Gregg *et al*., 2005; Kosslyn, Thompson and Ganis, 2006), and it has been linked to several aspects of cognition, such as memory and spatial reasoning (Kosslyn, Behrmann and Jeannerod, 1995; Marschark and Cornoldi, 1991).

The private experiential character of imagery makes its investigation a difficult endeavor. Many studies rely on self-report. Self-report questionnaires have been developed to measure mental imagery in distinct sensory modalities, including vision (e.g., Marks, 1973), audition (e.g., Halpern, 2015; Willander and Baraldi, 2010), olfaction (e.g., Gilbert *et al*., 1998), and movement (Isaac, Marks and Russell, 1986). Other investigations have used neuroimaging methods to localize visual (e.g., Kosslyn *et al*., 1997), auditory (e.g., Halpern and Zatorre, 1999), and olfactory (Bensafi *et al*., 2007) imagery in the brain. These investigations suggest there is overlap with regions involved in perception. Behavioral experiments have been used as well, based on the idea that imagery can prime or interfere with external stimuli (e.g., Craver-Lemley and Arterberry, 2001; Tomiczek and Stevenson, 2009). Importantly, self-report responses have been shown to be related to or predict scores on behavioral tasks (e.g., Arshamian *et al*., 2011; Djordjevic *et al*., 2004; Halpern, 2015), and neuroimaging measures (e.g., Cui *et al.*, 2007; Djordjevic *et al.*, 2005; Flohr *et al.*, 2014; ).

The senses work together to interpret the world around us. Yet despite this, mental imagery is typically only investigated for distinct sensory modalities, neglecting the multisensory quality of imagery. For example, although the widely used versions of the Betts’ questionnaire (e.g., Betts, 1909; Sheehan, 1967) or the Plymouth Sensory Imagery Questionnaire (Andrade *et al.*, 2014) explore mental imagery across seven modalities, the vividness of imagery in each modality is assessed by imagining separate situations, rather than one situation involving multiple modalities. This could mean that estimates of vividness of imagery are inaccurate and not comparable across sensory modalities. For example, differences in ratings across sight, hearing, touch, taste, and smell (e.g., visual imagery being most vivid, cf. Arshamian and Larsson, 2014; Andrade *et al.*, 2014) could reflect differences between the situations depicted, and not necessarily differences specific to each sensory modality. To overcome this limitation, we present a new mental imagery questionnaire that assesses imagery for the same situation in multiple sensory modalities using wine as our domain of interest: the Vividness of Wine Imagery Questionnaire (VWIQ).

We chose wine for the study of multisensory mental imagery for several reasons. First, the experience of wine is inherently multisensory: we typically visually assess the color of a wine, sniff the wine, listen to the sound of the wine being poured, and then taste the wine, followed by experiencing the wine’s after-taste. Thus, wine enables the assessment of mental imagery from multiple senses while keeping the situation constant. In addition to the fact that wine engages multiple senses in its appreciation, it is inherently multisensory since the core ‘taste’ (technically ‘flavor’) of wine combines multiple sensory experiences at once including retronasal olfaction, gustation, oral texture, and trigeminal sensations (Smith, 2012; Spence, 2015). For the purposes of the present questionnaire, which is designed to be accessible to both novices and experts, we do not assess the individual components of flavor, but asked people about their unified oral (i.e., taste) experience instead.

Second, in the wine drinking experience, the often-neglected chemical senses of olfaction and gustation are of comparable significance to the more dominant visual modality (cf., Speed and Majid, 2017). The questionnaire can therefore tap the propensity for mental imagery in smell and taste, which can otherwise be difficult to assess. Finally, people differ in their experience with wine — from novices to professional sommeliers, for example — and so an instrument which measures imagery of wine provides the perfect opportunity to test theories of expert cognition. The new questionnaire can therefore be a useful tool to track the development of expertise and changes in mental imagery. Moreover, as an applied resource it may be valuable during the education of sommeliers. For a skilled sommelier, it is necessary to draw on imagery abilities across all senses when evaluating, comparing, and recommending wines. So, evaluating imagery would give direct feedback for students, and can also function as an evaluative tool in wine education. For example, by administering the questionnaire at several points during training, the development of wine imagery could be tracked.

In this study we present and validate the newly developed VWIQ. We first used principal components analysis to check the underlying structure of the questionnaire. Next, to assess construct validity we compared scores on the VWIQ with established questionnaires of mental imagery: the Vividness of Visual Imagery Questionnaire (VVIQ; Marks, 1973), the Vividness of Olfactory Imagery Questionnaire (VOIQ; Gilbert *et al.*, 1998), and the Plymouth Sensory Imagery Questionnaire (PSI-Q;Andrade *et al.*, 2014). We further validated the questionnaire by comparing scores on the VWIQ with wine-related measures (wine knowledge, knowledge of grape types, and wine consumption). In addition, we compared wine imagery scores across the different sensory modalities to test whether despite the more important role for the chemical senses in this arena, vision is still the most vivid sensory modality (e.g., Andrade *et al.*, 2014; Arshamian and Larsson, 2014; Kosslyn *et al.*, 2006).

**2. Methods**

The VWIQ is based on three separate validations. Below we report the design and validation of the final version of the questionnaire. The questionnaire evolved across validations with the most important outcome being that one out of the four included senses — audition — was removed. We initially focused on four senses: vision, sound, taste, and smell. We use colloquial ‘taste’ within the questionnaire to refer to ‘flavor’. We focused on those sensory experiences that would be accessible to novices and experts alike, and put aside those components that required specific training or instruction (e.g., mouthfeel, after-taste). To further accommodate novice levels of wine knowledge, jargon and technical language was avoided. Grape variety names were included, however, within the context of an explanation (e.g., *The tasting starts with a French white wine*, *a Sauvignon Blanc*) so as to provide more variation in the scenarios probed. Following the first two validation studies, we removed the sound subscale from the questionnaire since it showed low factor loadings and low test–retest reliability. Details of the first and second validation can be found in Supplementary Text S1 and S2, along with the corresponding questionnaires S3 and S4.

*2.1 The Vividness of Wine Imagery Questionnaire*

We designed scenarios phrased in analogy with the VVIQ (Marks, 1973) and VOIQ (Gilbert *et al.*, 1998), with sentences that focused specifically on the color, smell, and taste of wine. Each scenario started with a scene-setting description followed by statements related to the color, smell, and taste of the wine (see Table 1 for an example; the full questionnaire can be found in the Appendix). Six different scenarios were constructed, set in various locations, including: a vineyard, restaurant, bistro, a relaxing night at home, and two wine tastings. Within all six scenarios three statements were used to assess imagery in each modality (vision, olfaction, and taste), resulting in 18 statements. Statements occurred in the fixed order color–smell–taste, iconically reflecting a wine-tasting episode.

Following the VVIQ and VOIQ, we used a five-point scale ranging from “*1 — no image at all*, *just knowing that I’m thinking about the object*” to “*5 — perfectly clear and as vivid as the real situation*”(see Note 1). Therefore, each sensory modality had a minimum score of 6 (low vividness) and a maximum score of 30 (high vividness). The overall questionnaire has a minimum total score of 18, and a maximum total score of 90.

*2.2. The Vividness of Visual Imagery Questionnaire (VVIQ)*

The VVIQ (Marks, 1973) contains 16 statements describing visual scenes (e.g., “*The sun is rising above the horizon into a hazy sky*”). Participants are instructed to imagine each scene and rate how vivid their mental images are using the same five-point scale as used for the VWIQ. Participants are instructed to complete the questionnaire twice; once with their eyes open and once with their eyes closed. The total score is averaged across the two occasions. The minimum score on the VVIQ is 16 (high vividness) and the maximum score is 80 (low vividness).

*2.3. The Vividness of Olfactory Imagery Questionnaire (VOIQ)*

The VOIQ (Gilbert *et al*., 1998) contains 16 statements describing olfactory scenes (e.g., “*The smell of your shirt or blouse when you remove it*”). Participants are instructed to imagine each scene and rate how vivid their mental images are using the same five-point scale as used for the VWIQ. The minimum score on the VOIQ is 16 (high vividness) and the maximum score is 80 (low vividness).

*2.4. The Plymouth Sensory Imagery Questionnaire (PSI-Q).*

The PSI-Q (Andrade *et al*., 2014) measures vividness of imagery in seven sensory domains: vision, sound, touch, taste, smell, bodily sensations, and feelings. Each sensory domain has five items such as “*Imagine the appearance of a bonfire*”. Participants are instructed to rate their mental image on an eleven-point scale from 0 (“*no image at all*”) to 10 (“*as vivid as real life*”). Each sensory domain therefore had a minimum score of 0 and a maximum score of 50.

*2.5. Wine measures*

We also administered the Wine Knowledge Test (WKT; as used in Croijmans and Majid, 2016) which is based on the questionnaire used by Hughson and Boakes (2001). Since some of the questions in Hughson and Boakes (2001) were specifically targeting Australian wine expertise, they were replaced with comparable questions from the shorter (open answer) questionnaires from Melcher and Schooler (1996) and Lehrer (1983). Overall the questionnaire contains 10 items asking about the typical color of grape types, seven items assessing wine knowledge (e.g., “*Which wine is made with Flor yeast?*”) and two items about wine experience (“*How often do you drink wine?*”,“*How much have you read about wine?*”). Scores on this questionnaire range from 0 (none of the questions correct) to 13 (all questions correct). This questionnaire can be found in Supplementary Text S5.

*2.6. Participants*

In total, across all three validations trials, 300 participants were recruited through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (see Supplementary Text S1 and S2). In the final validation, 100 participants were recruited. Seven of these were excluded after outlier analysis (*M* ± 2SD). Two simple test questions were included in the questionnaire to ensure that participants were reading and responding to questions accurately. One question asked participants to click on the response “*clear and reasonably vivid*”, and the other asked “*what is the color of red wine*?”. Ten participants were excluded from analyses after failing these test questions. This left 83 participants (*M*age = 40.8, SD = 12.8, 45 female)*.* Participants were paid $1.50 for completion of the survey, and were informed that it was possible to take part in a follow-up study for which they could earn a bonus of $1. Fifty participants completed this follow-up.

*2.7. Procedure*

Questionnaires were conducted using a Qualtrics survey (Qualtrics, Provo, UT, USA). Participants gave their informed consent by clicking ‘accept’ to a standardized text. Participants completed the questionnaires in the following order: VWIQ, VVIQ, VOIQ, PSI-Q, WKT.

*2.8. Analysis*

Participant ratings on the VWIQ were averaged for each sensory modality and overall. To investigate whether the structure of imagery ratings reflected the three sensory modalities the VWIQ was designed to measure (vision, smell, and taste), a Principal Components analysis was conducted on all data from the first session using SPSS Version 23. Oblique rotation (Oblimin, with delta = 0) was used to maximize the difference between components.

To assess internal consistency (whether items for each modality led to similar ratings) McDonald’s omega was calculated separately for items within each modality (for more information, see Dunn, Baguley and Brunsden, 2014; Peters, 2014). The closer the value of omega to 1, the greater internal consistency a scale has. Omega was calculated in R (R Core Team, 2013) using the package *userfriendlyscience* (Peters, 2015).

To assess test–retest reliability, only data from participants that completed the VWIQ twice was analyzed. Test–retest reliability was operationalized using typical error (the difference between two test occasions), the change from mean (whether a significant difference exists between the two test occasions), and the correlation between two test occasions (test–retest correlation).

In order to compare the VWIQ to the established mental imagery questionnaires, correlations were conducted between the VWIQ subscales and the respective scales on the other questionnaires. We also performed correlations between the VWIQ subscales and ratings on the three aspects of the WKT to assess to what extent the VWIQ is related to experience with wine. Finally, we conducted an ANOVA to compare the scores of different sensory modalities of the VWIQ.

**3. Results**

Scores for all dependent variables are summarized in Table 2.

*3.1. Principal Components Analysis*

The sampling adequacy indicated a relatively good sample size (KMO = 0.818), with anti-image correlations in the range 0.640–0.909. The principal components analysis (PCA) suggested three components, indicated by the component loadings (>0.40 for the first three components) and interpretation of the scree plot. A fourth component had an eigenvalue of just over 1.0 (1.025) but was not supported by the scree plot. The first three components explained 68.8% of the variance. Component 1 explained 48.5% of the variance, with high loadings from smell and taste items. Component 2 explained an additional 13.3% of the variance, with loadings from vision items. Component 3 explained a further 7.1% of the variance, with negative loadings of smell items. Component loadings for the three-factor solution are displayed in Table 3.

*3.2. Internal Consistency and Reliability*

Internal consistency and retest reliability were high (Table 4), with omega values ranging from 0.88 (VWIQ-color) to 0.96 (VWIQ-taste). None of the test–retest values significantly differed between the two test occasions, and the test–retest correlations were high to very high for the total score and each of the subscales indicating very good test–retest reliability.

*3.3. Correlations*

In order to assess construct validity of the VWIQ subscales, we conducted correlations between the subscales of the VWIQ and the established mental imagery questionnaires, and between the subscales of the VWIQ and the measures of wine knowledge. The VWIQ subscales correlated highly with other questionnaires and their relevant subscales (Table 5). Wine knowledge was significantly related to the VWIQ total score, as well as the smell subscale (Table 6). Taken together, the VWIQ with three subscales (color, smell, and taste) proved to have sufficient construct validity, internal consistency, and reliability.

*3.4. Comparing across Modalities*

A repeated-measures ANOVA on total ratings found a significant difference in ratings across the three modalities, *F*(2, 164) = 12.91, *p* < 0.001, η2p = 0.136. Within-subject contrasts showed ratings of vividness of imagery were significantly higher for the visual modality compared to smell, *F*(1, 82) = 23.57, *p* < 0.001, η2p = 0.223, and taste, *F*(1, 82) = 5.28, *p* = 0.024, η2p = 0. 061, and higher for taste compared to smell, *F*(1, 82) = 9.84, *p* = 0.002, η2p = 0.107 (see Fig. 1).

*3.5. Summary*

The VWIQ questionnaire measuring mental imagery of wine in three modalities was satisfactorily validated. The principal components analysis showed three distinct components distinguishing the three sensory modalities vision, olfaction, and taste. Additionally, the questionnaire demonstrated high reliability and significantly correlated with related imagery constructs, as well as wine knowledge. Ratings of vividness of imagery were highest in the visual modality, followed by taste, and then smell.

**4. Discussion**

We constructed a new questionnaire to measure multisensory imagery in the domain of wine. Initial validations of the questionnaire determined that sound (e.g., the sound of wine being poured into a glass) was unrelated to the multisensory experience of wine. Analysis of ratings on the final version of the VWIQ revealed that the crucial sensory dimensions underlying mental imagery of wine are vision, smell, and taste. The questionnaire demonstrated good internal consistency and reliability, and ratings correlated with other validated measures of imagery (VVIQ, VOIQ, PSI-Q).

Scores on the WKT correlated with the overall score on the VWIQ, and with the individual smell subscale, supporting the construct validity of the questionnaire. We note, however, that wine consumption did not correlate with the VWIQ. This is likely because the tested participants did not reflect a wide range of consumption behavior (mean glasses of wine consumed per week was 2.45, SE = 0.12). Testing a wider range of participants differing in their consumption behavior weekly or over the longer term (i.e., lifetime) could reveal a different pattern.

Using PCA, we found that three components underlie ratings on the VWIQ. Furthermore, we found that vividness ratings significantly differed across the three modalities (vision, olfaction, and taste). This suggests that despite the strong correlation between sight, smell, and taste items, the questionnaire does not tap only one measure of general imagery, but also the separate constructs of visual, smell, and taste imagery to some extent. This is in line with the idea that mental imagery is modality-specific (e.g., Kosslyn, 2005).

Vividness of imagery of wine was strongest in the visual modality, followed by taste, and then smell, replicating findings elsewhere for mental imagery (Andrade *et al.*, 2014; Arshamian and Larsson, 2014). This is an intriguing finding given that naïve expectation would hold that taste is the most important component of a wine experience, and arguably, therefore, also the most salient for imagery. At the same time, it is possible that everyday consumers focus more on how a wine looks, making vision the easiest modality for them to imagine. Future research could assess how an individual’s idiosyncratic experience with wine predicts the vividness of their multimodal wine imagery.

The findings are also in line with the sensory hierarchy traditionally described in Western philosophy and linguistics (e.g., Levinson and Majid, 2014; Viberg, 1984). In accord with this hierarchy, people are thought to find naming odors more difficult than naming visual objects (e.g., Cain, 1979; see Olofsson and Gottfried, 2015). However, recent findings suggest this hierarchy is culturally relative (Majid *et al.*, 2018). For example, hunter-gatherers find odor naming easy compared to other communities (Majid and Burenhult, 2014; Majid and Kruspe, 2018; Majid *et al.*, 2018). Similarly, the ability to name the smell of wines has been shown to be better in wine experts (Croijmans and Majid, 2016). This opens the possibility that the difference between modalities in wine imagery may not exist in wine experts, since each modality is as important in the assessment of wine. This is in line with evidence that the sensory order for vividness of imagery can differ across cultures (Marsella and Quijano, 1974).

Exploring multisensory mental imagery in the domain of wine is useful for the study of imagery more generally, as imagining drinking a wine involves mental imagery in multiple sensory modalities. This is the first questionnaire that provides a measure of multisensory imagery within the same experience and object (i.e., the PSI-Q used different scenarios to measure imagery in different modalities). Furthermore, the domain of wine provides an ideal testbed to study the effect of the transition from novice to expert on mental imagery. Wine experts have been shown to be better at naming the odor of wines (Croijmans and Majid, 2016), and better at remembering wine odors (Parr *et al*., 2002, 2004) compared to novices. It is well established that expertise improves vividness of mental imagery in the sensory modality in focus (e.g., Bensafi *et al.*, 2013; Bensafi *et al*., 2017; ). It is, therefore, likely that experience with wine can improve wine experts’ ability to imagine wines too.

This questionnaire provides a means to test predictions about the role of experience in multisensory mental imagery of wines; for example by administering the questionnaire at different points in the accumulation of experience with wine. Moreover, the use of mental imagery is pivotal for sommeliers when evaluating wines (e.g., when recalling the memory of the perceptual experience of a specific fruit targeted in a wine). This is also reflected during the training of sommeliers, as the use of mental imagery is central in the Deductive Tasting Method used in master sommelier training by the Court of Master Sommeliers (see Note 2). However, until now there has not been any explicit method with which to measure the multimodal imagery experience of wines. So the VWIQ has the potential to be used during training and as an evaluative tool in wine education.

In our study, we asked people about the ‘taste’ of wine, and not the separate components that make up ‘flavor’, such as mouthfeel (the texture of wine in the mouth). Mouthfeel is a technical term that is seldom used in everyday parlance, and is difficult to understand for novices (Gawel, 1997). On the other hand, for wine experts mouthfeel is an important constituent for the appreciation of wine (e.g., Gawel, 1997; Gawel *et al*., 2000), and for the perception of foods in general (Guinard and Mazzucchelli, 1996). Future versions of the VWIQ could focus on the higher ends of the wine expertise spectrum, and target components such as mouthfeel explicitly, in order to provide a fine-grained assessment of mental imagery in wine experts.

We have presented a new questionnaire and accompanying data to assess vividness of mental imagery across the senses. In the future, other aspects of imagery could also be assessed, such as the granularity of the mental image (i.e., how fine-grained is the image). Specifically, one could ask whether measures of vividness and measures of the granularity of a mental image overlap. Another avenue open to future research is how self-report questionnaire measures align with brain-imaging measures, such as fMRI. Such research could help further elucidate the underlying representations at play.

In sum, we present a new validated questionnaire that measures vividness of mental imagery of wine simultaneously in the sensory modalities vision, smell, and taste. This questionnaire serves as a useful research tool to explore the effects of experience on imagery and possible differences across sensory modalities. The questionnaire also has utility outside of academia, and could be a useful measure of individual wine experience for use in the wine industry.
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**Notes**

1 In the VOIQ and VVIQ, the scale is reversed: “*1 – perfectly clear and as vivid as the real situation*” to “*5 – no image at all*, *just knowing that I’m thinking about the object*”.

2 http://www.courtofmastersommeliers.org/other/deductive-tasting-grid/

**References**

Andrade, J., May, J., Deeprose, C., Baugh, S.-J. and Ganis, G. (2014). Assessing vividness of mental imagery: The Plymouth Sensory Imagery Questionnaire, *Br. J. Psychol.* **105**, 547–563.

Arshamian, A. and Larsson, M. (2014). Same same but different: the case of olfactory imagery, *Front. Psychol.* **5**, 34. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00034

Arshamian, A., Willander, J. and Larsson, M. (2011). Olfactory awareness is positively associated to odour memory, *J. Cogn. Psychol.* **23**, 220–226.

Bensafi, M., Sobel, N. and Khan, R. M. (2007). Hedonic-specific activity in piriform cortex during odor imagery mimics that during odor perception, *J. Neurophysiol.* **98**, 3254–3262.

Bensafi, M., Fournel, A., Joussain, P., Poncelet, J., Przybylski, L., Rouby, C., & Tillmann, B. (2017). Expertise shapes domain‐specific functional cerebral asymmetry during mental imagery: the case of culinary arts and music. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, *45*(12), 1524-1537.

Bensafi, M., Tillmann, B., Poncelet, J., Przybylski, L. and Rouby, C. (2013). Olfactory and gustatory mental imagery: modulation by sensory experience and comparison to auditory mental imagery, in: *Multisensory Imagery,* S. Lacey and R. Lawson (Eds), pp. 77–91. Springer, New York, NY, USA.

Betts, G. H. (1909). *The distribution and functions of mental imagery*. Columbia University Teachers College, New York, NY, USA.

Cain, W. S. (1979). To know with the nose: keys to odor identification, *Science* **203**, 467–470.

Craver-Lemley, C. and Arterberry, M. E. (2001). Imagery-induced interference on a visual detection task, *Spat. Vis.* **14**, 101–119.

Croijmans, I. and Majid, A. (2016). Not all flavor expertise is equal: the language of wine and coffee experts. *PLoOS One* *11*(6), e0155845. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0155845

Cui, X., Jeter, C. B., Yang, D., Montague, P. R. and Eagleman, D. M. (2007). Vividness of mental imagery: individual variability can be measured objectively, *Vision Res.* **47**, 474–478.

Djordjevic, J., Zatorre, R. J. and Jones-Gotman, M. (2004). Effects of perceived and imagined odors on taste detection, *Chem. Senses* **29**, 199–208.

Djordjevic, J., Zatorre, R. J., Petrides, M., Boyle, J. A. and Jones-Gotman, M. (2005). Functional neuroimaging of odor imagery, *NeuroImage* **24**, 791–801.

Dunn, T. J., Baguley, T. and Brunsden, V. (2014). From alpha to omega: a practical solution to the pervasive problem of internal consistency estimation, *Br. J. Psychol.* **105**, 399–412.

Flohr, E. L. R., Arshamian, A., Wieser, M. J., Hummel, C., Larsson, M., Mühlberger, A. and Hummel, T. (2014). The fate of the inner nose: odor imagery in patients with olfactory loss, *Neuroscience* **268**, 118–127.

Freeman, W. J. (1981). A physiological hypothesis of perception, *Perspect. Biol. Med.* **24**, 561–592.

Gawel, R. (1997). The use of language by trained and untrained experienced wine tasters, *J. Sens. Stud.* **12**, 267–284.

Gawel, R., Oberholster, A. and Francis, I. L. (2000). A ‘Mouth-feel Wheel’: terminology for communicating the mouth-feel characteristics of red wine, *Aust. J. Grape Wine Res.* **6**, 203–207.

Gilbert, A. N., Crouch, M. and Kemp, S. E. (1998). Olfactory and visual mental imagery, *J. Ment. Imag.* **22**, 137–146.

Gregg, M., Hall, C. and Nederhof, E. (2005). The imagery ability, imagery use, and performance relationship, *Sport Psychol.* **19**, 93–99.

Guinard, J.-X. and Mazzucchelli, R. (1996). The sensory perception of texture and mouthfeel, *Trends Food Sci. Technol.* **7**, 213–219.

Halpern, A. R. (2015). Differences in auditory imagery self-report predict neural and behavioral outcomes, *Psychomusicology* **25**, 37–47.

Halpern, A. R. and Zatorre, R. J. (1999). When that tune runs through your head: A PET investigation of auditory imagery for familiar melodies, *Cereb. Cortex* **9**, 697–704.

Hughson, A. L., & Boakes, R. A. (2001). Perceptual and cognitive aspects of wine expertise. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, *53*(2), 103–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00049530108255130>

Kosslyn, S. M. (2005). Mental images and the brain, *Cogn. Neuropsychol.* **22**, 333–347.

Kosslyn, S M, Behrmann, M. and Jeannerod, M. (1995). The cognitive neuroscience of mental imagery, *Neuropsychologia* **33**, 1335–1344.

Isaac, A., Marks, D. F., & Russell, D. G. (1986). An instrument for assessing imagery of movement: The Vividness of Movement Imagery Questionnaire (VMIQ). *Journal of Mental Imagery*, *10*(4), 23–30.

Kosslyn, S. M., Thompson, W. L. and Alpert, N. M. (1997). Neural systems shared by visual imagery and visual perception: a positron emission tomography study, *Neuroimage*, **6**, 320–334.

Kosslyn, S M, Thompson, W. L. and Ganis, G. (2006). *The case for mental imagery*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY, USA.

Lehrer, A. (1983). *Wine and conversation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Levinson, S. C. and Majid, A. (2014). Differential ineffability and the senses, *Mind Lang.* **29**, 407–427. https://doi.org/10.1111/mila.12057

Majid, A., & Burenhult, N. (2014). Odors are expressible in language, as long as you speak the right language. *Cognition*, *130*(2), 266-270.

Majid, A. and Kruspe, N. (2018). Hunter–gatherer olfaction is special, *Curr. Biol.* **28**, 409-413.

Majid, A., Roberts, S. G., Cilissen, L., Emmorey, E, Nicodemus, B., O’Grady, L, Woll, B., LeLan, B., de Sousa, H., Cansler, B. L., Shayan, S., de Vos, C., Senft, G., Enfield, N. J., Razak, R. A., Fedden, S., Tufvesson, S., Dingemanse, M., Ozturk, O., Brown, P., Hill, C., Le Guen, O., Hirtzel, V., van Gijn, R., Sicoli, M. A. and Levinson, S. C. (2018). The differential coding of perception in the world’s languages, *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **115**, 11369-11376*.*

Marks, D. F. (1973). Visual imagery differences in the recall of pictures, *Br. J. Psychol.* **64**, 17–24.

Marschark, M. and Cornoldi, C. (1991). Imagery and verbal memory, in: *Imagery and Cognition,* C. Cornoldi and M. A. McDaniel (Eds), pp. 133–182. Springer, New York, NY, USA.

Marsella, A. J. and Quijano, W. Y. (1974). A comparison of vividness of mental imagery across different sensory modalities in Filipinos and Caucasian-Americans, *J. Cross Cult. Psychol.* **5**, 451–464.

Melcher, J. M., & Schooler, J. W. (1996). The misremembrance of wines past: Verbal and perceptual expertise differentially mediate verbal overshadowing of taste memory. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *35*(2), 231–245. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1996.0013>

Olofsson, J. K. and Gottfried, J. A. (2015). The muted sense: Nneurocognitive limitations of olfactory language, *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **19**, 314–321.

Parr, W. V., Heatherbell, D. and White, K. G. (2002). Demystifying wine expertise: olfactory threshold, perceptual skill and semantic memory in expert and novice wine judges, *Chem. Senses* **27**, 747–755.

Parr, W.V., White, K. G. and Heatherbell, D. A. (2004). Exploring the nature of wine expertise: what underlies wine experts’ olfactory recognition memory advantage? *Food Qual. Prefer.* **15**, 411–420.

Peters, G.-J. Y. (2014). The alpha and the omega of scale reliability and validity: why and how to abandon Cronbach’s alpha and the route towards more comprehensive assessment of scale quality, *Eur. Health Psychol.* **16**, 56–69.

Peters, G.-J. Y. (2015). *userfriendlyscience: Quantitative analysis made accessible.* R package version 0.3-0.

Pylyshyn, Z. W. (1973). What the mind’s eye tells the mind’s brain: A critique of mental imagery, *Psychol. Bull.* **80**, 1–24.

R Core Team (2013). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

Royet, J.-P., Plailly, J., Saive, A.-L., Veyrac, A. and Delon-Martin, C. (2013). The impact of expertise in olfaction, *Front. Psychol.* **4**, 928. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00928

Sheehan, P. W. (1967). A shortened form of Betts’ questionnaire upon mental imagery, *J. Clin. Psychol.* **23**, 386–389.

Smith, B. C. (2012). Perspective: complexities of flavour. *Nature*, *486*(7403), S6. <https://doi.org/10.1038/486S6a>

Speed, L. J. and Majid, A. (2017). Dutch modality exclusivity norms: simulating perceptual modality in space. *Behav. Res. Methods* **49**, 2204–2218.

Spence, C. (2015). Multisensory flavor perception. *Cell*, *161*(1), 24–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2015.03.007>

Thomas, N. J. T. (2006). Mental imagery, philosophical issues about, in: *Encyclopedia of Cognitive Science*, L. Nadel (Ed.), pp. 1147–1153. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Tomiczek, C. and Stevenson, R. J. (2009). Olfactory imagery and repetition priming: the effect of odor naming and imagery ability, *Exp. Psychol.* **56**, 397–408.

Viberg, Å. (1984). The verbs of perception: a typological study, in: *Explanations for Language Universals*, B. Butterworth, B. Comrie and Ö. Dahl (Eds), pp. 123–162, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, Germany.

Willander, J. and Baraldi, S. (2010). Development of a new Clarity of Auditory Imagery Scale, *Behav. Res. Methods* **42**, 785–790.

**Appendix**

**The Vividness of Wine Imagery Questionnaire (VWIQ)**

The following part of the questionnaire contains six sections. In each section, you will be given a description of a scene followed by three statements related to the scenario given. After reading each question, please close your eyes to construct a mental image of the described object or scene. Once your image of this scene has been formed, open your eyes to rate the mental image you constructed. You will do this for each different scenario-based mental image requested. You are then asked to rate how vivid several aspects of the image are, on the following scale:

**1** No image at all (only ‘knowing’ that you are thinking of the object)

**2** Vague and dim

**3** Moderately clear and vivid

**4** Clear and reasonably vivid

**5** Perfectly clear and as vivid as the real situation

**A**. Imagine you are visiting a sunny vineyard and order a glass of your favorite sparkling wine on their outdoor terrace.

1. The color of the wine as the sun is reflected in your glass

2. The smell of the wine as you sniff it in your glass

3. The taste of this wine as you have a sip

**B.** You are in a restaurant and are eating a stew. Imagine you have selected the wine for the table and it is being served.

1. The color of the wine when the waiter spills some on the tablecloth

2. The smell of the wine as you place your nose in the glass

3. The taste of the wine

**C.** Imagine you are going to a short wine tasting where you will try several different wines. The tasting starts with a French white wine (a Sauvignon Blanc).

1. The color of the wine when the hostess pours a little bit in your glass

2. The smell of the wine when you smell it in your glass

3. The taste of the wine when you have a sip of it and swirl it in your mouth

**D.** You have tasted several wines, and the hostess presents the last wines for the tasting.

1. The color of a white wine, a Chardonnay, that she gives you to try

2. The smell of the next red wine you try, a Pinot Noir

3. The taste of this red wine (Pinot Noir) when you try and taste the wine

**E.** You are in a bistro. You are having a light lunch, and you have selected a wine to pair with it.

1. The color of the wine when the waiter pours you some to try

2. The smell of the wine when the waiter asks you to check it

3. The taste of the wine when you have your first sip

**F.** Imagine you are having a relaxing night at home, and decide to have a casual glass of white wine to unwind, intended to be consumed fresh.

1. The color of the wine when you swirl it round in your glass

2. The smell of the wine when you place your nose in the glass to smell it

3. The taste of the wine when you have a sip and swirl it in your mouth to taste it

**Table 1.**

Example item from the VWIQ

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sentence function | Description |
| Scene setting  Vision  Odor  Taste | *Imagine you are going to a short wine tasting where you will try different wines. The tasting starts with a French white wine*, *a Sauvignon Blanc*  *The color of the wine as the sun is reflected in your glass*  *The smell of the wine as you place your nose in the glass*  *The taste of the wine when you have your first sip* |

**Table 2.**

Means, standard deviations, and range across all dependent measures

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scale | Full sample  (*n* = 83) | | |  | Follow-up sample  (*n* = 50) | | |
|  | Mean | SD | Range |  | Mean | SD | Range |
| VWIQ total | 60.5 | 12.0 | 36–87 |  | 60.4 | 11.4 | 36–86 |
| VWIQ vision | 21.5 | 3.7 | 12–30 |  | 21.5 | 3.3 | 16–30 |
| VWIQ taste | 20.1 | 5.3 | 6–30 |  | 20.3 | 5.3 | 6–30 |
| VWIQ smell | 18.9 | 5.2 | 6–30 |  | 18.6 | 5.1 | 6–30 |
| VVIQ | 37.5 | 11.0 | 16–73 |  | 37.4 | 11.3 | 16–73 |
| VOIQ | 41.2 | 11.7 | 16–73 |  | 40.7 | 11.8 | 16–77 |
| PSI-Q | 303.0 | 47.3 | 203–385 |  | 306.2 | 41.8 | 218–385 |
| PSI- Vision | 44.1 | 7.5 | 19–55 |  | 45.1 | 6.6 | 29–55 |
| PSI-Smell | 41.3 | 8.1 | 20–55 |  | 41.7 | 7.4 | 24–55 |
| PSI-Taste | 43.0 | 8.4 | 21–55 |  | 43.9 | 7.4 | 22–55 |
| WKT | 6.2 | 3.1 | 0–13 |  | 6.8 | 2.6 | 0–13 |
| Glasses/week | 2.5 | 1.2 | 1–6 |  | 2.6 | 1.1 | 1–6 |

**Table 3.**

Component loadings ordered by modality and question, with Oblique (Oblimin) rotation applied; component loadings <0.4 are suppressed

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Component | | |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Color Q1 |  | 0.719 |  |
| Color Q2 |  | 0.617 | 0.531 |
| Color Q3 |  | 0.828 |  |
| Color Q4 |  | 0.725 |  |
| Color Q5 |  | 0.725 |  |
| Color Q6 |  | 0.661 |  |
| Odor Q1 |  |  | –0.586 |
| Odor Q2 | 0.585 |  |  |
| Odor Q3 | 0.553 |  | –0.496 |
| Odor Q4 | 0.460 |  | –0.504 |
| Odor Q5 | 0.511 |  | –0.420 |
| Odor Q6 | 0.552 |  | –0.411 |
| Taste Q1 | 0.863 |  |  |
| Taste Q2 | 0.935 |  |  |
| Taste Q3 | 0.879 |  |  |
| Taste Q4 | 0.821 |  |  |
| Taste Q5 | 0.885 |  |  |
| Taste Q6 | 0.921 |  |  |

**Table 4.**

Internal consistency (omega), test–retest reliability (typical error), change from mean and retest correlations

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Omega  (*n* = 83) | Typical error  *M* and *SD*  (*n* = 50) | Change from mean  *t* (*p*)  (*n* = 50) | Retest  correlations  *r* (*p*)  (*n* = 50) |
| VWIQ-total | 0.95 | 0.38 (60.0) | 0.06 (0.955) | 0.865 (<0.001) |
| VWIQ-color | 0.88 | 0.02 (20.5) | 0.22 (0.828) | 0.785 (<0.001) |
| VWIQ-smell | 0.95 | 0.10 (30.2) | 0.62 (0.538) | 0.805 (<0.001) |
| VWIQ-taste | 0.96 | 0.26 (30.0) | 0.45 (0.654) | 0.831 (<0.001) |

**Table 5.**

Pearson correlation coefficients between related questionnaire scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Questionnaire scales | | Correlation |
| PSI-Q | VWIQ-total | 0.488\* |
| PSI-Vision | VWIQ-color | 0.508\* |
| PSI-Smell | VWIQ-odor | 0.357\* |
| PSI-Taste | VWIQ-taste | 0.433\* |
| VVIQ | VWIQ-color | –0.505\* |
| VOIQ | VWIQ-odor | –0.426\* |

\* Correlation significant at *p* < 0.001 (all two-tailed). *Note:* VVIQ and VOIQ scales were reversely anchored compared to the VWIQ scales, resulting in negative correlations.

**Table 6.**

Pearson correlation coefficients between VWIQ subscales and measures of wine knowledge

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | VWIQ-total | VWIQ-color | VWIQ-smell | VWIQ-taste |
| WKT | 0.228\* | 0.170 | 0.226\* | 0.171 |
| Grape score | 0.210 | 0.167 | 0.200 | 0.159 |
| Wine consumption | 0.092 | 0.050 | 0.065 | 0.106 |

**Figure 1.** Mean total ratings on the VWIQ for each modality.