

Intersubjective Objectivity in Tasting: Making Judgment Reviewable without Erasing the Individual

Culinary Judgment and Taste Chemistry — Ahmad Issam Maadarani

Official article information

Article author Ahmad Issam Maadarani	Article number 8328	 Scan to verify the article
Article code —	Protection number —	
Reference —	International Union Of Arab Master Chefs	

By Ahmad Issam Maadarani

This essay examines how a shared judgment can coexist with individual sensory experience. Objectivity is proposed as a procedure for examining reasons and conditions, rather than a requirement that all tasters feel the same thing.

1. A shared starting point

A judge cannot transfer an experience to a colleague as a sample is transferred to a scale. The sample description, serving conditions, assessment question and scoring reasons can nevertheless be communicated. Knowledge becomes shareable when these links are examinable. The aim is not impossible internal identity, but clarity that distinguishes differences of experience, vocabulary and definitions of quality.

2. Agreement is not truth

A panel may agree because members perceived similar effects, because the first speaker shaped their language, or because they share one tradition. A majority establishes agreement in that group under those conditions; it does not establish a criterion's suitability for every audience. Disagreement does not invalidate every description either. It may reveal a meaningful sensitivity difference that should remain visible.

3. Hypothetical case

Three judges call a sauce "heavy". One means viscosity, another a lingering fatty coating, and the third aromatic intensity. This is not one disagreement. Separating properties enables meaningful comparison and may reveal agreement about observations but disagreement about suitability. Clarify the concept before averaging a number attached to an ambiguous word.

4. Disciplined discussion

Record initial observations independently before discussing terms and criteria. Ask where, when and in which sample the effect occurred, and which property the label abbreviates. Do not require a minority to withdraw merely to produce a uniform report. Preserve the divergent description and state whether it changes the decision or falls outside the task criterion. A common decision can retain an explicit reservation.

5. The risk of standardised language

Shared vocabulary helps communication but can conceal genuine differences. If everyone uses one word for several effects, it becomes unclear whether experiences or labels have converged. Training needs examples, boundaries and counterexamples. When a standard term misses an important experience, allow a new description and examine it rather than deleting it because it is unfamiliar.

6. A stronger decision

Readers should know what was agreed, what remained different and why the difference did or did not prevent resolution. Objectivity here means structured challenge and

renewed examination of the link between observation and criterion. It places individual experience within a rule-governed dialogue. This philosophical proposal needs practical evaluation before claiming improved accuracy.

7. A Discussion Worksheet

Field	Question	What to Record
Vocabulary	Does the term identify one property?	A definition and boundary examples.
Difference	Experience or criterion?	A report separating both levels.
Resolution	Does a relevant reservation remain?	A decision with its agreement boundaries.

Philosophical arguments belong to the author. Applications and worksheets are unvalidated proposals, and examples are hypothetical. This article presents no new experimental dataset, claim of worldwide priority or claim that this text has undergone peer review.

8. References and Source Limits

A philosophical analysis by the author; its arguments are not attributed to experimental findings.

Suggested citation: Maadarani, Ahmad Issam (2026). "Intersubjective Objectivity in Tasting: Making Judgment Reviewable without Erasing the Individual". Analytical essay, version 1.0, 4 October 2026.

© 2026 Ahmad Issam Maadarani.