

Pleasure and Culinary Quality: When Liking a Dish Is Not Enough

Culinary Judgment and Taste Chemistry — Ahmad Issam Maadarani

Official article information

Article author Ahmad Issam Maadarani	Article number 8329	 Scan to verify the article
Article code —	Protection number —	
Reference —		

By **Ahmad Issam Maadarani**

This essay distinguishes personal liking, execution and fitness for a task. Their relationship should be defined in advance so that preference does not become an undisclosed professional criterion.

1. Different questions

“Do I like this?” asks for a preference report. “Was it done well?” asks for assessment against a purpose. Both can be legitimate in one session if kept separate. A judge may dislike a flavour while recognising accomplished execution, and a consumer may enjoy a dish despite failure to meet a stated condition. Pleasure remains valuable, but its role must be identified.

2. Who defines quality?

Quality needs an intelligible purpose: ingredient clarity, a specified balance, coherent experience or audience suitability. Formal wording alone does not make a criterion professional. Explain why it matters to the task. Liking is central when measuring consumer acceptance; when evaluating a technique, one person's enjoyment cannot automatically cancel the execution requirement.

3. Hypothetical case

A deliberately bitter dish displeases a judge who prefers sweetness. The judge describes bitterness distribution, aromatic clarity and persistence, then examines whether the bitterness fulfils the function without dominating the rest. Unfamiliarity is not automatically merit, and personal dislike is not automatically a defect. Record preference separately when the task requests it.

4. Separation before tasting

A form can ask independently about task-related properties and personal preference. Rules state whether and how preference enters the result. Do not redefine the question after learning the dish's identity or creator. Restaurant criticism can explicitly describe a personal experience without marketing it as a comprehensive measurement of a kitchen's quality.

5. The persuasive-explanation problem

An appealing explanation need not accurately identify what produced a choice. Hall and colleagues' jam-and-tea study supports caution about assuming perfect correspondence between explanation and cause [\[HALL10\]](#). It does not establish that judges invent every reason. The proposed application records preference and description before discussing justifications, then examines consistency without forcing observations to defend the preferred result.

6. A philosophical conclusion

Pleasure may be a principal purpose, partial evidence or information excluded from

scoring, depending on the task. Its presence is not the problem; an undisclosed role is. A disciplined report distinguishes enjoyment, suitability and execution, explaining any transition between them. This transparency permits criticism even when no argument can make every reader enjoy the same experience.

7. A Discussion Worksheet

Field	Question	What to Record
Liking	Whose preference?	Audience and sample boundaries.
Execution	Relative to which purpose?	An explainable criterion.
Result	How did preference enter?	A rule declared before tasting.

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

1. **[HALL10]**Hall, L., et al. (2010). Magic at the marketplace: Choice blindness for the taste of jam and the smell of tea. *Cognition*, 117(1), 54–61. DOI: 10.1016/j.cognition.2010.06.010.[Original research](#)

Human study in a specified context; not proof that every judge’s explanation is unreliable. Source use: publication metadata and abstract; the full text was not reviewed for this edition.

Suggested citation: Maadarani, Ahmad Issam (2026). “Pleasure and Culinary Quality: When Liking a Dish Is Not Enough”. Analytical essay, version 1.0, 4 October 2026.

© 2026 Ahmad Issam Maadarani.