

# Limits to Method Transfer: When the Question Changes but the Form Remains

A proposal by Ahmad Issam Maadarani examining protocol suitability in new contexts

## Official article information

|                                                |                               |                                                                                                                   |
|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Article author<br><b>Ahmad Issam Maadarani</b> | Article number<br><b>8315</b> | <br>Scan to verify the article |
| Article code<br>—                              | Protection number<br>—        |                                                                                                                   |
| Reference<br>—                                 |                               |                                                                                                                   |

By **Ahmad Issam Maadarani**

General headings do not make an assessment form suitable for every dish. This article reviews question, product, service, scale and information before transfer. It offers no universal accreditation or guarantee that training success extends to every task.

## 1. Transfer is a bounded claim

Previous success concerns a previous context; suitability elsewhere is a separate claim. Specify original product, task, sampling, descriptors and conditions, then changes. Different products do not automatically prohibit transfer, and visual similarity does not establish it. Examine whether criterion function and accessible evidence changed.

## **2. Five possible transitions**

Question changes concern comparison versus training. Product changes concern functions. Service changes concern conditions. User changes concern instruction and calibration. Scale changes concern score meaning or aggregation. This proposed map is non-exhaustive; several transitions may coexist and need specific review. Name changes rather than calling the form flexible without explanation.

## **3. Hypothetical case: stable dessert to immediate course**

A texture form used for cohesive dessert with multiple accessible bites is transferred to a course requiring rapid sequence between components. Unchanged sampling may examine one isolated element instead of the required relationship. Review sample unit, descriptors and service before interpreting scores. Texture remains relevant, but supporting evidence may require another method. Document the modified version rather than claim identical application.

## **4. Unchanged, modified and added elements**

Classify retained elements with reasons, changes and additions. Relate changes to tasks, not desired outcomes. Cross-version comparability needs more than similar numbers: 8 in one version may not mean 8 in another. Preserve a mapping record and do not merge data without explaining comparison meaning.

## **5. Test before consequential use**

Train with varied new-context cases, examining comprehension and application, then test cases absent from modification. Review inability and disagreement with predefined handling. User approval and agreement cannot establish that the method answers the right question. Address required functions left unassessable before declaring suitability.

## **6. When to defer expansion**

Task-specific conditions may defer use: essential requirements without evidence, non-discriminating descriptions, service changes undermining comparison or users lacking

necessary information. These are not universal thresholds. Deferral need not invalidate the entire idea; narrow use to examined scope and preserve development needs.

## 7. A bounded suitability file

Record version, context, tested functions, samples, users, modifications and limitations. Readers can judge whether their context needs new review. Selected success cases cannot justify suitability for all dishes. Preserve unassessable and modification-requiring cases because they define the tool's boundaries.

## 8. Conclusion

Strong methods state scope and untested areas. Breadth follows examination of question-to-evidence relationships, not broad titles. Visible modifications and limits support understandable expansion without promising shared score meanings that have not been established.

## 9. A concise working sheet

| Field       | Review question                    | What to record                                                      |
|-------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain      | What was the original scope?       | Record task, product, service, users and scale.                     |
| Transition  | What changed?                      | Identify retained, modified and new elements.                       |
| Meaning     | Does the score retain its meaning? | Do not compare numbers before examining descriptors and conditions. |
| Examination | Which cases test the new use?      | Include success, boundaries and unassessable cases.                 |
| Validity    | Where does the conclusion stop?    | Specify supported uses and those requiring further development.     |

Suggested citation: Maadarani, Ahmad Issam (2026). "Limits to Method Transfer: When the Question Changes but the Form Remains" Methodological article, version 1.0.

© 2026 Ahmad Issam Maadarani. All rights reserved, subject to applicable legal exceptions.