

Plurality of Taste and Standards of Quality: Respecting Difference without Abandoning Judgment

Culinary Judgment and Taste Chemistry — Ahmad Issam Maadarani

Official article information

Article author Ahmad Issam Maadarani	Article number 8333	 Scan to verify the article
Article code —	Protection number —	
Reference —		

By Ahmad Issam Maadarani

This philosophical framework distinguishes diverse purposes from differences in execution. Several models of success can coexist while each remains open to criticism against its own conditions.

1. Plurality is not disorder

Some dishes seek clarity of one flavour; others seek deliberate interweaving. Declaring a purpose does not make every result good. Each model needs an intelligible relation between purpose and effect, with discussable execution conditions. Plurality expands legitimate forms of success without eliminating failure within them.

2. Shared requirements

A task may impose common service, quantity or statement requirements while allowing different sensory structures. Shared constraints must not be confused with the judge's preferred style. Intensity and complexity are not always better. Explain why a property is required and how it supports this dish's function within the task.

3. Hypothetical case

A simple dish clearly expresses its central ingredient; a complex dish constructs several transitions. Treating layer count as a universal criterion advantages the second before tasting. Coherence and functional clarity may instead describe different forms of success. If the competition explicitly requires multiple layers, however, that condition is legitimate. Announce the purpose and do not switch it afterwards.

4. Comparing purposes

When legitimate purposes conflict, a single mean score cannot explain the decision. Describe how each dish fulfils its purpose, then apply the competition's ranking rule if necessary. State that the final choice uses a limited common criterion rather than proving one culinary philosophy superior to all others. Procedural legitimacy can coexist with critical disagreement about the criterion.

5. The intention defence

A cook may call every effect intentional to evade criticism. Intent does not prove achievement: a perceptible effect must connect to the purpose. Judges should not invent purposes after tasting to justify a result they like either. Request a brief advance statement when appropriate and compare it with achievement. Unclear expression can be criticised without denying the idea's legitimacy.

6. The framework's value

This separation teaches judges to recognise what a dish seeks to accomplish and examine its accomplishment without accepting it automatically. It prevents one school's taste from becoming the sole definition of maturity. This is a philosophical proposal, not experimental

evidence of improved fairness. Its initial contribution is exposing assumptions hidden in broad terms such as refinement, balance and innovation.

7. A Discussion Worksheet

Field	Question	What to Record
Purpose	Which model of success?	Description before evaluation.
Shared rules	Which constraints bind everyone?	Limited announced conditions.
Execution	Was the intention realised?	A perceptible link between purpose and outcome.

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). "Plurality of Taste and Standards of Quality: Respecting Difference without Abandoning Judgment". Analytical essay, version 1.0, 4 October 2026.

© 2026 Ahmad Issam Maadarani.