Food Pedagogies: Histories, Definitions and Moralities

Rick Flowers and Elaine Swan

From the *Slow Food movement* to the *World Street Food Congress* and Jamie Oliver's *Ministry of Food* and the 'healthy eating' campaigns of government and non-government agencies, efforts to 'teach' us about food have intensified. In this book we apply the concept of 'food pedagogies' to analyse the proliferation of teaching and learning about food, the diversification of food educational processes, the rise of new food pedagogues and the shift in expertise and knowledge about food. In essence, in this collection the term food pedagogies denotes a congeries of educational, teaching and learning ideologies and practices carried out by a range of agencies, actors, institutions and media which focus variously on growing, shopping, cooking, eating and disposing of food. This definition points to various forms, sites and processes of formal, informal and incidental education and learning, inside and beyond the classroom. Scholars in the field of adult education use the adjectives formal, informal and incidental to typologise, roughly speaking, the degree to which learning is programmatic; led by teachers; and undertaken purposely by learners (Flowers, Guevara and Whelan 2009). Examples of formal food pedagogies include cooking masterclasses, health education in schools, nutrition workshops in food security programmes, and permaculture courses; instances of informal food pedagogies are food programmes on television, community gardening, and social marketing campaigns led by food social movements or supermarkets; and

incidental food pedagogies cover learning from social occasions, eating and drinking with friends, families and on holidays.

As these examples suggest, food pedagogies entail significant and asymmetrical relations of power, authority and expertise. They reproduce 'moral economies' (Coveney 2006) of knowledge and food practices reproducing categories of 'good' and 'bad' mothers/eaters/consumers: those who look after their health and those who put their children's health at risk; those who have refined taste and those who eat indiscriminately; those who care about animal welfare and environmentalism and those who buy cheap food regardless of where it comes from; those who have cosmopolitan sensibilities and try new ethnic foods and those who are unadventurous, even racist, in their eating. Often classist, sexist and racist, food pedagogies are grounded in the assumption that the main determinant of 'bad' food choice is lack of knowledge, ignoring the social, political and cultural complexities of food in people's lives (Guthman 2008a and b; Hayes-Conroy 2009). As a result, food pedagogies position women as bad mothers and cooks; responsibilise individuals and ignore wider structural inequalities and social hierarchies; perpetuate universalist assumptions about what constitutes 'good food'; overemphasise nutritional scientific knowledge; and privilege bodily health over mental well-being (Coveney 2006; Guthman 2008a and b; Berlant 2010; Hayes-Conroy and Hayes-Conroy 2014).

Food pedagogies elevate those 'in the know' and their 'good intentions'; and shame classed and racialised forms of food knowledge, lifestyle and embodiment. Moreover, middle-class food pedagogies such as permaculture workshops and cooking classes, voluntarily paid for as leisure pursuits, reproduce status distinction and consolidate classed and racialised hierarchies of

taste, 'healthism' and 'doing good' (Guthman 2008a and b, Flowers and Swan 2012c). Indeed, garnering new knowledge about food constitutes the core of middle-class foodie, locavore and food adventurer identities (de Solier 2013; Johnston and Baumann 2010).

The proliferation and intensification of food pedagogies means that there is a plethora of pedagogues with a mission to 'educate' us about food:

- farmers and small food producers;
- cultural intermediaries, such as celebrity chefs, cookbook and food writers, food bloggers, lifestyle and nutritional practitioners, and food marketing, public relations and advertising professionals;
- school teachers, doctors and nurses, health educators;
- activists in diverse social movements from animal welfare, food justice, permaculture, slow food and organic farming;
- government bodies, local councils, and health agencies with their policy instruments such as national food plans, school curricula reform, labelling and nutrition guidelines;
- large corporate food producers and retailers.

Some of these clearly have extensive economic and cultural power to define meanings about 'good' food, health, and ways of consuming, and authors in this collection, in particular, discuss the politics of the food pedagogies of supermarkets, school teachers and health educators.

This list of food pedagogues underlines how wide the range of food pedagogies circulating across different sites is, and gives us a sense of the heterogeneity of their curricula including their specific educational aims, content, pedagogical relations, and learning processes. In spite of the power of pedagogues and the intensive, even invasive, nature of food pedagogies, we should not underestimate the agency of targeted 'learners.' As this book shows in detailing the effects and efficacies of various food pedagogies, learners do not simply slurp up the lessons on offer. Whether it is supermarkets trying to instil certain food lifestyles, shoppers reading labels, viewers watching food programmes on TV, school pupils being given nutritional edicts, French consumers of alcohol advertising, authors suggest that pedagogies can 'fail'.

The Pedagogical Turn

Having outlined the nature and extent of food pedagogies, in this next section we introduce how the concept of pedagogy has been used in education studies, the 'turn' to pedagogy as an analytic in cultural studies, and three approaches within this 'turn'. Narrowly speaking then, 'pedagogy' is a foundational concept in education studies, deployed to characterise teaching, learning and assessment practices in schools, colleges and universities (Lingard 2009; Hickey-Moody, Savage & Windle 2010). Thus, educational theorist, Bob Lingard (2009) states that in its most traditional usage, pedagogy refers to 'teachers in classrooms': i.e. instruction, teaching, and curricula. He calls, however, for pedagogy to be extended to the social and political context of classroom practices including macro discourses of learning, teaching and

assessment. For feminist educational theorists, analysis of pedagogy must include how gender underpins the context of the classroom and wider educational discourses (Luke & Gore 1992; Kenway & Modra 1992).

A burgeoning body of work outside of education studies has turned to the concept of pedagogy to analyse the educational effects of cultural and social processes beyond the classroom (Luke 1996; Giroux 2004a; Watkins, Noble & Driscoll 2015; Hickey-Moody, Savage & Windle 2010; Flowers & Swan 2012; Kenway & Bullen 2011; Swan 2012). Thus, Jennifer Sandlin, Michael O'Malley & Jake Burdick make clear that pedagogy:

> involves learning in institutions such as museums, zoos and libraries; informal educational sites such as popular culture, media, commercial spaces and the Internet; and through figures and sites of activism, including public intellectuals and grassroots social movements (2011: 338-9).

Broadly speaking, theorists use pedagogy to study, in particular, cultural and social processes which attempt to modify, or transform how we act, feel and think (Noble 2012; Watkins, Noble and Driscoll 2015). Anna Hickey-Moody, Glen Savage & Joel Windle (2010) gloss this body of work as 'pedagogy writ large' to underline the extension of pedagogy as an analytic to a diversity of cultural practices from health promotion, screen technologies, food activism, Disney films, marketing and advertising to children, reality TV, cosmetic surgery, through to shopping and community arts; and to highlight the range of theoretical traditions and methodological approaches being used in these analyses (Hickey-Moody, Savage & Windle 2010; Sandlin, Schultz & Burdick 2010; Sandlin & McLaren 2010).

To trace the development of this body of work, in this next section, we demarcate and describe three distinct, but related approaches: 'public pedagogy';

'pedagogies of everyday life' and 'cultural pedagogy.'

Public Pedagogy

Fundamentally, for theorists who examine public pedagogy: 'culture *can* and *does* operate in pedagogical ways' (Hickey-Moody, Savage & Windle 2010: 227). Although there are various lineages in the scholarship on public pedagogy, it is mainly a Northern American body of work based on neo-Marxist ideology-critique and heavily influenced by Henry Giroux (Hickey-Moody et al., 2010, Sandlin et al., 2011, Watkins et al., 2015). Using the term 'public pedagogy' first in 1998, Giroux a prolific writer, sees his project as putting an analysis of pedagogy in dialogue with cultural studies (1998, 1992, 2004a/b). More concretely, he deploys public pedagogy, first, to challenge what he sees as the educative project of capitalism transmitted through popular culture; and secondly, to refer to public intellectuals such as writers, journalists and artists who can teach citizens to transform the oppressive conditions in which they live. Thus, for Giroux, public pedagogy can be repressive *and* resistive; popular culture a site of social reproduction, and contestation. For example, he writes:

> the media, as well as the culture they produce, distribute, sanction, have become the most important educational force in creating citizens and social agents capable of putting existing institutions into question and making democracy work — or doing just the opposite (Giroux 2005: 45).

Studying a diverse range of cultural and social practices from Disney films, Calvin Klein and Benetton advertising, rap music and media coverage of Abu Graib, his recent work focuses on the repressive power of public pedagogy: how popular media 'teach neoliberalism' and corporations extend their influence on

public spaces and 'harness the resources of "the public" for corporate gain' (Hickey-Moody 2013: 28).

Studies of public pedagogy, however, are not limited to Giroux or ideology critique. North Americans, Jake Burdick and Jennifer Sandlin, by far the most prolific synthesisers of the field, edited a *Handbook of Public Pedagogy* (2010) with 65 chapters and a smaller volume entitled *Problematizing Pedagogy* (2014). These go beyond Giroux's approach by expanding the range of cultural sites studied, extending the role of public intellectuals to include social activists, grassroots organisations, and artist collectives; and drawing on post-structuralist theories of power. Burdick and Sandlin's extensive scholarship does important definitional work in the field and builds on the Girouxian view that public pedagogy can be about resistance as well as social reproduction (Sandlin, O'Malley & Burdick 2011).

Their frustration (like others) is that theorising on public pedagogy does not make clear what makes a space or process 'pedagogical.' Thus, pedagogy is cited frequently 'without adequately explicating its meaning, its context, or its location' (Sandlin, O'Malley & Burdick 2011: 339). Accordingly, they argue 'more work needs to be conducted on how the various sites, spaces, products and places identified as public pedagogy actually operate as pedagogy' (2011: 359). As a result, their more recent work turns to the topic of pedagogical processes: what they defined as 'the mechanisms and interactions that enable an individual's capacity to learn' (Burdick & Sandlin 2013: 143). Surveying literature on pedagogy, they chart (2013) three 'schools': transfer, relational and post-human - and identify the pedagogical processes associated with each. *Transfer* pedagogies are humanist and thus reproduce a view of learners as autonomous,

susceptible to the transmission of meanings and ideology in culture from mechanisms such as images, music, dialogue and sounds. Influenced by feminist arts scholarship, *Relational* pedagogies emphasise non-cognitive learning such as embodiment, movement, sensations and aesthetics. Finally, *Post-human* pedagogies challenge 'anthropocentric liberal subjectivity' centring animals, nature and the 'fabulous', rupturing modernist ideas of individual autonomy and control and dissolving binaries of sense/cognition and nature/culture/animal (2013: 167-168). This work is significant for researching food pedagogies on several counts. First, it elaborates a range of pedagogical processes outside transmission models of education; secondly, it challenges the idea that public pedagogy operates hypodermically, with culture as an 'educational force' working on unsuspecting humans; and thirdly, it shows how learning can be unpredictable, dynamic and relational. In sum, their work prises open the category of pedagogy, showing how people learning about food goes beyond cognitive, information transfer or ideological influence, and calls for more attention to be given to the concrete processes and interactions through which people transform how they cook, shop, and eat, and including senses, emotions, bodies and non-humans.

Pedagogies of Everyday Life

Not all pedagogy studies focus on public pedagogy. At the same time as Grioux started his writing on public pedagogy, Australian educationalist Carmen Luke, edited an interdisciplinary feminist book in 1996 to examine how the domestic and private sphere work pedagogically to teach children and

women about gender, class and race. Influenced by feminist and Foucauldian theories of power and discourse rather than neo-Marxian ideology critique, and somewhat overshadowed in accounts of public pedagogy, Luke describes the aim of her project as the interrogation of the 'pedagogical project of everyday life' (1996: 1). In the collection, authors explore popular culture in the home, from television programmes, computer games, parenting magazines, and toys; and discuss how friendship, mothering, and parenting constitute pedagogical relations. Her work matters for food pedagogy scholarship because contra Girouxian writing on the public as a site of pedagogy, the book emphasises the salience of the domestic as an arena of pedagogical relations and activities; and provides feminist detailed empirical studies of the relations between everyday life, learning, and identity formation in the home. In a prescient study of the everyday before the recent 'turn to the everyday' in social theory, her work augments feminist food studies on feeding work in the domestic because of its clear focus on pedagogy in the home. The book reminds us that everyday relations like friendships and mothering, activities such as reading magazines and playing with toys, and using objects such as computer games all teach. Whilst written some twenty years ago, and with cultural analysis of the everyday and domestic objects being much more widespread, Luke's book is important for food pedagogy studies because of the range of domestic objects and pedagogical relations it details, and the ways in which the authors show how popular culture in the home and intimate everyday practices are sites of learning and negotiation about class, gender and race.

Cultural Pedagogy

The third body of pedagogy studies derives from recent Australian scholarship by authors such as Gregory Noble, Megan Watkins, Catherine Driscoll, Glen Savage, Joel Windle and Anna-Hickey-Moody, who badge their work as 'cultural pedagogy,' to distance their approach from North American public pedagogy literature. For example, in a special issue on pedagogy, Hickey-Moody, Savage & Windle (2010) provide a detailed rationale for their use of the category cultural pedagogy. First, they argue that Giroux's take on public pedagogy is too North American, and assumes that all publics, regardless of local context, respond to American popular culture uniformly. Secondly, they suggest that Giroux sees pedagogy like socialisation, reproducing an idea of stable social systems transmitting pre-formed norms from society to individual; rather than taking as a starting point that society is structured by conflict, and that norms are developed and contested. Thirdly, his understanding of power is too narrow and repressive because he views public pedagogy as 'negative ideological forces that …act upon and corrupt individuals'; and furthermore, ignores the significance of affect, bodies and desire (Savage 2010: 109). Moreover, authors suggest that Giroux does not make clear how critical pedagogues are immune to the corrupting, monolithic forces of public pedagogy (Savage 2010, Noble 2004). In sum, these theorists recognise the contribution of Giroux but are critical of what they see as his deterministic, broad-brushed, and overly negative approach which gives little attention to learners (Hickey-Moody, Savage & Windle 2010; Noble 2004; Savage 2010).

Like Burdick and Sandlin, these theorists problematize the under-researching and under-theorising of pedagogical processes. For instance, Greg Noble argues that Giroux represents pedagogy as a 'black box'; signalling 'something is done but without explaining *how* it is done' (Noble 2004: 2). Indeed, Watkins, Noble and Driscoll (2015) develop this criticism further, taking cultural studies to task for deploying the term pedagogy 'rhetorically' rather than 'analytically'. The latter entails a more in-depth, and empirical examination of what makes a cultural or social process pedagogical and the effects these processes eventuate. Thus, Noble asserts cultural studies replaced 'crude, simplistic ideas about social and cultural transmission' with more 'nuanced categories of interpellation, appropriation, embodiment, becoming and identify formation', but 'without ever adequately unpacking the pedagogic dimensions of these processes' (2004: 2). Consequently he, Watkins and Driscoll are concerned to research and theorise the processes by which cumulative changes in 'how we act feel and think' are produced using concepts of 'capacitation, habituation and embodiment' to start to pin down the durational effects of pedagogical relations and mechanisms (Noble 2004: 2; Watkins et al. 2015). Indeed, as several of the chapters in this volume argue, pedagogic processes through which conduct is 'capacitated, fashioned, regulated, re-directed and augmented' are not simply cognitive but embodied (involving the training of specific capacities) and deeply affective (Noble, 2012: 2). In forcing us to examine more closely how transformation and learning take place, Noble and colleagues develop much further than Burdick and Sandlin, the dynamics of what makes a cultural and social process pedagogical. The durational nature of pedagogies, and what they can capacitate, is of particular concern for Noble, who writes that 'learning is

cumulative, accretive and iterative, and not about moments of enlightenment or liberation' (2012: 4). In foregrounding embodiment, habits and capacities, the work of Noble and colleagues can clearly contribute to food studies by encouraging us to scrutinise how forms of conduct; technical and cultural capacities; ideas; affect; and practices are acquired, shaped, fashioned and regulated discursively and materially. For example, to analyse the effects of TV cooking programmes on viewers – a popular topic in food studies - we might think more explicitly about theories of multi-modal representational processes; analyses of verbal, narrative, visual and music televisual properties; their meaning making potential and theories of audience reception such as psychoanalytic identification or non-representational affect (Flowers and Swan 2011). Furthermore, Noble and colleagues insist that it is through close up, concrete qualitative study that we can identify how people 'acquire' knowledge, values and skills about food, cooking, eating, gender, race and so forth. Their overall project being to prise open the black box of pedagogy to identify, describe and analyse the pedagogical relations, techniques and practices through which subjectivity is formed; minds and bodies are shaped; and the cultural resources to participate in social and cultural practices taught and learned.

Food Studies and Pedagogy

This brief summary of pedagogy studies raises questions about how authors in food studies have deployed the term pedagogy. Broadly speaking, we discern two core ways: rhetorically, to suggest that social and cultural practices in relation to food are educative; and analytically, to examine teaching and

learning processes about food, inside and outside education institutions. Additionally, some authors write about food learning and teaching but do not use the term pedagogy. Below we introduce authors from these three approaches.

First, we turn to Jennifer Sumner, who uses the term pedagogy of food in her writing and teaching, developing the first university subject to be called *Pedagogy of Food* at the University of Toronto in a Masters programme aimed at adult educators. Influenced by theories of adult education and sustainable education, Sumner (2008, 2013) writes of 'eating as a pedagogical act' and puts forward an argument about education, food justice and the global political economy of food. She discusses the design of her subject in more depth in her chapter in this book, in which she deploys the term pedagogy in a more traditional educational sense to describe the teaching of global food systems in the university, rather than as an analytic to examine public or cultural pedagogy.

Jessica Hayes-Conroy (2009) researches teaching and learning in school gardening and cooking programmes aimed at healthy eating in her doctoral thesis and dedicates a whole chapter to a discussion of food pedagogy. Her main aim is to examine 'taste education' in schools and how social difference produces differential access to viscerality. Like Sumner she deploys pedagogy to analyse formal education and institutional curricula and to evaluate the political potential of taste education to challenge social structures and categories. In similar vein, her sister, Alison Hayes-Conroy examines the Slow Food Movement. Together they study how bodies, sensations, moods and feelings are mobilised in alternative food activism (Hayes-Conroy, 2014). Their political project is to highlight that senses and viscera should not be romanticised as pre-

social in sensory education and food activism, but rather understood as profoundly classed, gendered and racialised. On the one hand, their work is not explicitly focused on producing knowledge about public or cultural pedagogy but on the other hand, like Noble and colleagues advocate, they trace pedagogical processes in empirical detail, discussing the body's presence in learning and learning through commensality. In a similar move, Ben Highmore (2008) calls for more research on sensual pedagogies in everyday life, to examine non-mentalist 'sensual habits' and 'corporeal learning'. Examining a white working class man eating a hot curry in the UK, he suggests the eating of the curry can be understood as having a 'pedagogical function', with the chilli being a kind of 'teacher' which educates the white body to accept new flavours and tastes. Thus, he argues that our bodies are 'in process', and eating 'foreign' foods provides us with an 'alimentary pedagogy'.

Whilst Hayes-Conroy and Hayes-Conroy show how alternative food activism produce visceral attachments, other scholars in education studies examine how health education creates affective investment in a normative ideal of a 'healthful' body. Using the concept of pedagogy, but pre-fixed by various terms such as– health, body and bio- these scholars have written a body of work, focused on formal and informal pedagogies aimed at children, mothers and parents, particularly focused on healthism, nutritional science (Coveney 2012) and 'obesity discourse' (Evans, Rich, Davies and Allwood, 2008). For instance, John Coveney (2006) wrote an in-depth Foucauldian analysis of the history and morality of nutritional education in his book *Food, Morals and Meaning*. In the book, Coveney uses the term pedagogy rhetorically more than analytically, to chart how Christian technologies of the self such as the confessional and

abstinence influence nutritional expertise and practice. In a later paper, he uses pedagogy more analytically to extend this discussion to the discourse of the decline of cooking skills in the media (2012). Although he does not situate his work in pedagogy literature, his focus on technologies of power and of the self– highly concrete, mundane, even 'minor and petty' forms of expertise, techniques, judgments and sanctions – in relation to nutritional science and its moral subjectivities, means that scholars interested more explicitly in the pedagogical processes of health promotion campaigns in and outside of schools have taken up his work (for instance, Leahy, 2010; Pike and Leahy, 2012; Powell and Giard, 2014; Rich and Evans and Leahy and Pike this volume).

Indeed the Foucauldian influence on anti-obesity health promotion pedagogy scholars is strong. For instance, since 2007, education academics Jan Wright and Valerie Harwood have coined the concept of 'bio-pedagogy' - after Foucault's term bio-power - to critique the governance and regulation of children and parents through formal school practices and informal educational initiatives aimed at normative ideals of 'healthy bodies' (Wright & Harwood 2009; Wrights & Hasle 2014). Their emphasis is on going beyond 'body pedagogies' to examine how multiple pedagogical sites such as formal curricula in school, public health campaigns including websites, lifestyle reality TV programmes, billboards, posters and pamphlets attempt to govern bodies and lives. Like traditional public pedagogy theorists, they analyse a wide range of media, but influenced by Foucauldian and feminist theorists of the body, they detail how discourses, ideals and media techniques produce meanings about bodies, resources for identity formation, and advice and techniques for monitoring and surveillance. Jan Wright argues that these media are pedagogical in the sense that they

attempt to increase knowledge, provide instruction, offer resources for sense-making and techniques for changing the self and others. Using the term pedagogical practices, they argue that these various media affect how children, young people and parents see themselves and others, and how they then act on themselves and others to change bodies and subjectivities (Wright 2009). In summary, they suggest that these pedagogies work as 'cultural relational practices' through which knowledge, norms, ideals, emotions and power are resisted, negotiated and reproduced (Wright 2009). Importantly, like authors in chapters in this book, they emphasise how these pedagogies produce not only ideas and knowledge but invoke emotions such as shame through positioning certain bodies and ways of eating as irresponsible and abject (Wright and Halse 2014). Their work is important in food studies as it emphasises the proliferation of anti-obesity media and analyses these in close detail, but from a pedagogy studies viewpoint, there is less scrutiny on what makes these media pedagogical and how the effects on children, teachers and parents are produced.

On the same terrain but using different conceptual resources, feminist geographers Bethan Evans, Rachel Colls, and Kathrin Horschelmann (2011) evaluate a British national anti-obesity public health campaign through the concept of relationality, locating their analysis in studies of embodied and public health pedagogies. Defining relationality as forms of 'embodied connections' between people – inter-subjectively, inter-corporeally, inter-sectionally and inter-generationally - they argue that relationality challenges neoliberal and corporeal individualism, and concomitant notions of individual agency and responsibilisation. Most public health pedagogy campaigns, they argue, reproduce a neoliberal view of subjects and bodies as bounded and singular –

what they call corporeal individualism - rather than as products of relations and multiple inter-subjectivities: what they call 'embodied-subjects'. In their view, a relational approach to health pedagogies offers a way to re-vitalise the see-saw debates on whether public pedagogies shape or meet resistance from subjects, by foregrounding the 'multiple elements of relatedness' in people's embodied lives (Rich et al., 2004 cited Evans et al., ibid: p 338). Whilst the campaign they study claims to offer an approach of society wide connectedness around food and embodiment, Evans and colleague show how it continues to individualise children's agency and mothers' responsibility, and thus does not challenge neoliberal views of embodied subjecthood in ways a relational approach can. In focusing on relational theories of bodies and food, the paper makes an important contribution to research on anti-obesity pedagogies, particularly Foucauldian influenced studies, but is limited in the extent to which it analyses pedagogical processes and effects.

Although food education, domestic science and school gardens have been part of Western schooling since the early twentieth century, there is now a body of work showing how schools are sites of intense pedagogical interventions around food and health (Hayes-Conroy 2009, Vileisis 2008). For instance, John Evans and Emma Rich make a substantial contribution to food pedagogy scholarship because they position their work clearly in a lineage of pedagogy studies literature including Basil Bernstein (Evans, Rich & Holyroyd 2004, Evans, Rich, Davies & and Allwood 2008) and Henry Giroux and Carmen Luke (Rich 2011). Moreover, they do not simply situate their analysis in this clear pedagogy studies literature but have undertaken extensive empirical research on pedagogical processes and their effects in a range of official and alternative

pedagogies in schools and popular culture (see also their chapter in this book for more work in this area).

Deana Leahy too, in sole authored research and with co-researcher, Jo Pike, writes in this book, and elsewhere, of the ways in which public health concerns, school food initiatives, and legislative reforms congeal into 'pedagogical assemblages' which work affectively to shame and scare children and parents, particularly mothers, through specific forms of what she calls, 'disgusting pedagogies' (Leahy, 2009; Leahy & Pike 2012). Like Evans and Rich, their work contributes to food pedagogy studies because they offer detailed studies of pedagogical processes and interventions rather than just invoking pedagogy rhetorically.

In our own work, we draw on feminist and cultural pedagogy scholarship to examine food activism, food multiculturalism, and food social enterprises for instance, ethnic food tours. In particular, we have attempted to examine what makes practices pedagogical: for example, we have analysed the specificities of how media such as films and websites operate pedagogically through their materialities and representational practices; and researched the racialised and gendered body work of ethnic food tour guides in 'teaching' food multiculturalism. Furthermore, in this collection, we draw on anthropological concepts of social reproduction as a way to understand pedagogies in families, drawing on important empirical scholarship on family meals and the subtle processes of informal learning through food, eating and conversation at the table (Quarmby & Dagkas 2013; Laurier & Wiggins 2011; Ochs & Shohet 2006). Keen to bring pedagogy studies in dialogue with food studies, we convened a special

issue of the *Australian Journal of Adult Learning* in 2012 (Flowers and Swan 2011, 2012a/b/c).

Having described studies in which pedagogy is used as a core concept, we briefly turn to food studies writers who are interested in teaching and learning about food but do not use the term pedagogy. For example, Julie Guthman (2008a/b) has critiqued the racialised and classed politics of knowledge and learning in alternative food initiatives and university teaching; and has referred although very briefly to the term 'radical food pedagogy' in an interview (Stoneman 2009). Coming from a very different perspective, anthropologist David Sutton (2001, 2006) researches the teaching and learning of women's cooking skills through a close-up analysis of micro-practices in Greek kitchens entailing sensory memories, embodied habits, and practical know-how. In a critique of the common-place view that cooking skills are in decline, Frances Short (2006) examines learning through home-cooking, and argues that preparing pre-prepared, convenience foods requires substantial knowledge and relatively advanced cooking skills. Aya Kimura (2008) provides an important critique of Japanese food reform aimed at food choices and cooking in the home. In emphasising that food education has been reduced to food literacy, a deficit model of food knowledge and skills, which individualises and depoliticises why people choose to eat certain foods, and furthermore, puts additional pressures onto women in the home in terms of their domestic labour, Kimura's argument extends way beyond Japan.

After schools, the media represents the site of teaching and learning most researched by food studies scholars. Hence, several authors research how, and what, TV cooking programmes, celebrity chefs, actors, and musicians, websites,

and cookbooks teach viewers about food, cooking and eating, and social difference (de Solier 2005, 2013; Rousseau 2012; Lewis 2008; Hollows & Jones 2010; Johnston & Baumann 2010; Johnston and Goodman 2015). Whilst authors debate how much viewers learn from the media, and in particular, TV cooking programmes, there is a clear intent to educate (de Solier 2005, 2013; Johnston and Baumann 2010). In contrast to public health and body pedagogy research, much of this scholarship examines middle class education and learning. For example, although they do not use the concept of pedagogy, in their research on foodiesm, Josee Johnston and Shyon Baumann (2009) show that interviewees define learning, and a disposition of aesthetic appreciation and knowledge acquisition as central to the foodie identity. Thus, respondents claimed that foodies needed to learn and practise cooking techniques. But also foodies seek out information about provenance, production, and sensory qualities of food, learning from newspapers, food blogs, cookbooks, cooking classes and TV and their social networks. The educational dimension of being a foodie means learning about food qualities, history, and conditions of production and consumption including highly specific and technical information and the dishes and ingredients associated with a very wide range of cuisines. What Johnston and Baumann underline is that the foodie creates status and distinction by acquiring knowledge and learning about food centred on aesthetic appreciation and deliberation.

Developing the centrality of learning in foodiesm further than Johnston and Baumann, Isabelle de Solier (2013) coins the term 'gastronomic education' to characterise how 'foodies' use their leisure time to learn about food from what she calls 'material media' such as lifestyle media, TV cooking programs,

cookbooks, restaurant guidebooks and watching peers cook. One of her arguments is that contra recent analyses of TV cooking, foodies do watch cooking shows – particularly those with a realist instructional mode - primarily to learn about what to consume and produce from professional chefs and not just to be entertained. She suggests that for the middle classes, these forms of learning about food constitute 'productive leisure' or knowledge based leisure: where productivity has been translated from work to leisure and entails 'new understandings of being productive… bound up with expressing or acquiring knowledge'. She explains in more detail that:

> this involves practices of learning and education, formal or informal. For many, it involves a material education; the acquisition and expression of knowledge of material objects, their consumption and production, from material media (2013: 6).

Importantly for food pedagogy studies, she discusses the nature of food knowledges in ways that extend beyond nutritional science, often the main focus in public health pedagogy writing. For example, she writes that within gastronomic education, there are theoretical and practical knowledges, culinary skills, taste formations, knowledge of restaurants, chefs, cuisines, ingredients, producers, suppliers, food history, anthropology and skills in food media like photographing food.

In contrast to Johnston and Baumann, and de Solier with their focus on foodie learners, Tania Lewis (2008) researches the array of media food pedagogues such as nutritionists, health consultants, food coaches and celebrity TV chefs, and the rise of particular forms of advice, knowledge and expertise, all of which, she claims, influence our conceptions of food. More specifically she compares nutritionist experts' rationalised, psychologised and medicalised views of food,

health and restraint with those of celebrity chefs such as Nigella Lawson and Jamie Oliver who draw on charismatic personality and life experiences to present food knowledge related to pleasure, aesthetics and ethics. Lawson and Oliver offer an antidote to the rationalisation of food with their focus on escapism and indulgence. Lewis' main point is that there are widely divergent and contradictory forms of advice and knowledge about in food pedagogies, sometimes embodied in one chef such as Oliver, but which condense contemporary cultural concerns and anxieties about responsibility, health, industrialisation, and risk. Whilst her book offers an important examination of different food pedagogues and their forms of expertise, she is less concerned with pedagogical processes and how consumers transform and modify their food habits.

In summary, although the term pedagogy is rarely used as an analytic, this work provides us with detailed empirical studies of food learning and food expertise across a range of media. Furthermore, they reinforce how food pedagogies are dominated by bourgeois values, knowledge and practices. As de Solier puts it:

> knowledge itself is not a neutral term… but is invested in systems of power and exclusivity, attaching different values to different types of knowledge and their possessors (2013: 29).

In their editorial for a special issue, Josee Johnston and Mike Goodman begin to unpack what they call 'the mediating impacts' of food celebrities, arguing like other theorists that media shape and reflect food cultures, but extending this often made point to highlight a number of influencing processes such as the use of powerful and spectacular images, emulation, authenticity, elevated media

voices, celebrity embodiment of lifestyle, and cultural intermediation between viewer and celebrity, all of which could be conceived of as pedagogical. In this collection, using different methods, sites, and forms of analysis, many of the chapters seek to identify, freeze-frame and describe such pedagogical processes, some focusing on media, and others, inter-personal encounters such as teaching or family meals.

Structure of the book

Chapters in this book draw to varying degrees on literature in pedagogy studies and food studies scholarship on teaching and learning. Many of the chapters can be seen as a response to the calls in the pedagogy literature to research pedagogy in practice. To different scales, the chapters examine food pedagogical aims, curricula, processes, and learners' receptions of these, drawing from empirical studies in France, Britain, Canada, USA and Australia. The authors in the book employ a range of research methodologies including ethnography, textual and visual methods, surveys, and in-depth interviewing which enable closer attention to be given to pedagogical mechanisms and effects, than is often the case in pedagogy and food studies. To structure the book, we organise the chapters into four themes, which speak to core debates in food studies scholarship on food pedagogy, and food studies more broadly:

- embodiment and identity
- transformation and affect
- governance and authority

- ethics and critique.

Section One: Embodiment and Identity

In this first section, the chapters present analyses of different pedagogical sites in three countries – English schools, an Australian mixed-race family and American alternative TV cooking programmes, and surface how food pedagogies work through embodied practices of eating, cooking and performing. Mobilising distinct theoretical frameworks, the chapters draw on surveys, interviews and media analysis to show close-up how pedagogical processes produce bodies, subjectification and identity making.

Emma Rich and John Evans – *Where's the pleasure? Exploring the meanings and experiences of pleasure in school-based food pedagogies*

In the first chapter, Emma Rich and John Evans, academics in the sociology of education, health and sport, examine the pedagogical effects of public health policies designed to address a perceived crisis in obesity in schools in the UK. Drawing on surveys and interviews with teachers and pupils, they trace how pleasure in food is constructed in school curricula and teachers' and pupils' discourses. More specifically, they illustrate how 'healthy lifestyle' reforms produce 'body pedagogies' which shape how young people learn about food pleasures. They show how teachers educate young people to curb their sensory desires through pedagogical processes such as direct classroom teaching, teacher and peer feedback. Moreover, teachers and peers reward young people's talk about pleasure through self-restraint. As a result of their analysis, Rich and Evans establish that cultural anxieties about the health risk of food pleasures lead

to the surveillance and pathologisation of certain populations in schools. In their summary, Rich and Evans call for a sensory food pedagogy which goes beyond narrow and moralistic food teaching and acultural, classed concepts of the senses. In relation to the theme of embodiment and identity, the chapter maintains that young people's interpretation of the school food pedagogies is sensory and corporeal as well as socio-cognitive. In other words, the school food pedagogies constitute embodied learning, affecting how the young people eat and feel. Of importance to food pedagogy studies, they emphasise that the development of sensory food pedagogies requires complex theorising of the intersection between pleasure, class, gender and race.

Rick Flowers and Elaine Swan - *Potatoes in the Rice Cooker: Family Food Pedagogies, Bodily Memories, Meal-time Senses and Racial Practices*

In the second chapter, we analyse how family food practices work pedagogically to perform race and gender in a mixed race Australian family. We argue that families are under-theorised as sites of racialisation and gendering in relation to food. Situating our analysis in relation to theories on cultural transmission and food racial practices, the chapter focuses on the childhood memories of two Anglo-Australian Chinese sons. Our chapter builds on sensory food studies, and Rich and Evans' point that senses are learned, to show how the cooking arrangements, smell, aesthetics, and bodily movements in the kitchen and at the dining table, taught the sons about race, gender and identity. We discuss too, how race includes whiteness. Emphasising that food memories are not always of the 'happy family meal', we work concretely through four remembered food incidents to stress that the family's pedagogical processes

include a congeries of modes, objects, media, senses and skills. We emphasise that pedagogical processes should be understood as racialised and gendered, and in so doing we speak to recent calls to attend to race in food studies (Slocum and Saladhana 2013, Williams-Forson 2013).

Seline Szkupinski-Quiroga, Jennifer A. Sandlin and Robin Redmon Wright - *You Are What You Eat!?: Crafting the (Food) Consuming Subject through Cooking Shows*

In the third chapter, Seline Szkupinski-Quiroga, a health anthropologist, and two adult education academics, Jenny Sandlin and Robin Redmon-Wright, contrast mainstream TV 'celebrity chef' cooking programmes shown on the U.S. Food Network channel to 'alternative cooking programmes' shown on community channels. The alternative cooking programmes feature a vegan activist chef and a punk performance artist chef. The chapter draws our attention to the differently performed embodied pedagogies and notions of conviviality and consumption in the two cooking programmes. In the mainstream cooking programmes, the authors claim that pedagogies include 'teaching' people to aspire to consumerist lifestyles through sleek staging, celebrity branding, and charismatic presenting. In contrast, drawing on parodies of celebrity chefs, and 'lo-fi staging', Szupinski-Quiroga, Sandlin, Redmon-Wright suggest that the alternative programmes 'teach' their audience to consume in ethically and politically alternative ways, mobilising discourses of animal rights, and socio-political discussions of health and corporate agri-business. Their overall argument is that the alternative chefs offer a pedagogy of ethical-political community. Although there is a proliferation of food studies

research on food TV programmes as we discussed above, with some focusing on pedagogies, this chapter makes a distinctive contribution with its examination of alternative chefs as pedagogues (De Solier 2005, 2013).

Section Two: Transformation and Affect

The theme for this section is how affect and emotion are imagined to produce transformations in habits of working; shopping; and drinking. Researching quite different pedagogical sites – reality TV, French drink advertising and food shops- the chapters analyse how emotions such as passion, pleasure and anger are mobilised by Jamie Oliver and his TV producers, the French government and self-identified radical shoppers to enable learning. Harrison, Kelly and Campbell and Robert, in particular, illustrate the complexities of affect as a pedagogical mechanism.

Lyn Harrison, Peter Kelly and Perri Campbell - *Food and passion: Technologies of self-transformation in Jamie's kitchen*

In their chapter, education scholars, Lyn Harrison, Peter Kelly and Perri Campbell develop a Foucauldian analysis of technologies of the self in Jamie Oliver's reality-based television program *Fifteen*. Their main argument is that passion becomes a 'pedagogical device' to educate 15 young, previously unemployed, London-based trainee chefs. Harrison, Kelly and Campbell show how Jamie Oliver's biography, his willingness to learn and work hard, and importantly, his passion for food and cooking are put together to construct a pedagogical role-model of entrepreneurial qualities of get-up and go, and self-discipline. The aim of the pedagogy is that the trainees should 'emulate' his

capacity to undertake mundane, repetitive restaurant work, and his passion for slow, organic and sustainable food in order to transform their working lives. While observing that learning 'passion' opens up opportunities for the trainees to pursue alternative futures, the authors argue that the programme sidelines the trainees' own off-screen passions and realities of their work futures. Like other chapters in the book, they highlight the significance of emotion and affect in food pedagogies, but more specifically emphasise how the chefs are being taught neo-liberal entrepreneurship.

Julie Robert - *The Loi Evin: A pedagogical experiment in responsible drinking*

In her chapter, Julie Robert, a cultural and international studies academic, examines the imagined power of affect-based advertising images through the lens of pedagogy. To challenge taken-for-granted assumptions about the influence of affect in drink advertising, she undertakes a close textual and visual analysis of campaigns produced under some of the world's most stringent alcohol legislation in France – known as the *Loi Evin*. The *Loi Evin* prohibits the advertising of alcoholic drinks on television and permits it only on billboards, radio and the internet. The law set out to 're-teach' young people in France how to drink more responsibly. Images of people and lifestyles were effectively banned as it was imagined they would have dangerous affective pedagogical qualities, leading to people emulating role models in adverts and as a result, take up excessive drinking lifestyles. Hence, advertising was stripped of the 'affective pedagogy' of lifestyle images and replaced with an 'informational pedagogy' of rational drink and health messages. Robert shows how the *Loi Evin* is based on

reductive assumptions about advertising's pedagogical effects and how these 'work' on drinking motivations and behaviours.

Kaela Jubas - *If I am what I eat, who am I? How critical shopping teaches adults about food, identity and social change*

The chapter by Kaela Jubas, a scholar in the field of adult learning, explores ethical food consumption, drawing on 32 interviews conducted with self-identified 'radical' shoppers. Jubas claims that 'radical' food shopping 'functions pedagogically' to 'teach' people about global issues. Examining shopping as a process of informal and incidental learning, she asserts that knowledge and understanding alone do not necessarily change shoppers' actions, echoing some of the themes in other chapters. Jubas describes how 'radical' shoppers argue that their experience of emotions such as anger or pleasure work pedagogically. Hence, Jubas suggests that social change through food pedagogy is as much a process of affect as of reason. Although sensitive to the attempts of shoppers to exert individualised ethical consumption as a result of their learning, she concludes that a collective ethical pedagogy would be more politically effective.

Section Three: Governance and Authority

The two chapters in this section extend studies of governmentality in food studies, illustrating the pedagogic authority of supermarkets and teachers. Both chapters show through detailed observation how the pedagogical authority of these pedagogues is reproduced through prevailing discourses of health. Isaacs

and Dixon in their study show how pedagogical processes of information and advice giving are undertaken by the supermarkets, and Leahy and Pike reveal how pedagogical techniques of disgust and surveillance in the schools are deployed by schools. Both chapters emphasise the tactics of resistance to the pedagogical authorities mobilised by local activists in the case of Isaacs and Dixon, and pupils in the study by Leahy and Pike.

Bronwyn Isaacs and Jane Dixon – *'Making it local': the rural consumer, the supermarket and competing pedagogical authority*

In their chapter, Bronwyn Isaacs, an anthropologist and Jane Dixon, a public health scholar, offer an ethnographic study of rural supermarkets and 'pedagogical authority' in a rural Australian town. They position a range of stakeholder groups in the rural region as having pedagogical 'authority,' particularly on the question of who supports 'local' food. These groups include farmers, local retail and food manufacturing businesses, growers' markets, and consumer activists. Their focus is, however, on the pedagogical authority of the two largest supermarket chains in Australia – Coles and Woolworths. Their findings suggest that people in a rural community have a strong concern for the health of their regional economy and in particular, the livelihood of local farmers. But alongside these community values, sits an appreciation of the convenience and abundance that large supermarkets offer. Isaacs and Dixon present a detailed study of the struggle that takes place between the various 'pedagogical authorities' in the region. Significantly for our thinking on pedagogues, they emphasise the weight and reach of the power of supermarkets in shaping lifestyles, values and habits: what they call 'experts in subjectivity'.

They draw our attention to the variety of pedagogical strategies that are deployed, from information-giving, profiling of certain foods, and the privileging of particular types of advice about which foods are 'best' (i.e. cheap, easy, healthy and family friendly) and most 'local.'

Deana Leahy and Jo Pike – *Just say no to pies: Food pedagogies, health education and governmentality*

Building on their previous work on parenting pedagogies, and governmentality studies, they analyse three vignettes of the 'hurly-burly' of classroom teaching in school to map the 'assemblage' of knowledge, rationalities and technologies mobilised by teachers as they inculcate pupils in government policies on obesity. Although they argued that 'hybrid' knowledge about food circulates in schools, pupils find it difficult to resist the weight of the anti-obesity discourse. As an instance, they show how pupils are taught to surveille their eating behaviours through food diaries which makes it difficult to problematise expert-sanctioned, nutritional knowledges. Seeing the classroom as a 'contact point' for the take up of policy pedagogies and governmentality, they emphasise, like other chapters in this volume, that it is not just expertise being deployed in school pedagogies, but also affect. Thus, disgust and repulsion are mobilised to shape pupils' food choices, aspirations and skills. Leahy and Pike show, however, that attempts to govern and teach are messy and meet with resistance from pupils. Like other chapters, they emphasise how food pedagogies are forged from emotional and rational registers which get into your brain, heart, and sense of self (Ellsworth 1997: 6 cited in Leahy & Pike's chapter in this book).

Section Four: Ethics and Critique

In the fourth section, the authors in the three chapters explore pedagogies on the ethics of food production and consumption, with the first chapter asking whether food labels help shoppers make ethical decisions when choosing foods. The other two chapters offer applied case studies of teaching critical theory in universities. Informed by quite different theoretical resources, the authors discuss 'real-life' examples of using food to teach their own students about food production and consumption: with Jennifer Sumner drawing on a critical pedagogy tradition, including the work of Paulo Freire; and Meredith Abarca working with postcolonial theorists and literary works. Albeit examining quite different domains – shops and university classrooms – the three chapters reflect on the knowledge people need to make ethical decisions about what they buy, cook and eat.

Heather Bray and Rachel Ankeny - *What do food labels teach people about food ethics*

Whereas Isaacs and Dixon write about the contestation between supermarkets and local actors in a rural economy, in their chapter, Rachel Ankeny, an historian and Heather Bray, a scholar in science-communication, examine the specific micro practices of reading 'ethical food' labels in supermarkets. Ankeny and Bray argue that food labels are 'boundary objects': 'not free floating bundles of information' but a form of interface between stakeholders with diverse food ethics. Drawing on their qualitative research about consumers' decision-making when shopping for meat and genetically modified foods, Ankeny and Bray question how labels work to produce

knowledge. Their overall point is that education about the 'facts' of food ignores the cultural, social, moral and historical context in which people make decisions about what to buy. Their concern is that labels do not teach consumers enough about the wider and deeper issues of ethical consumption.

Jennifer Sumner - *Learning to eat with attitude: Critical food pedagogies*

Based in adult education, Jennifer Sumner has been teaching a course entitled *Food Pedagogy* for postgraduate students in the University of Toronto, Canada since 2010. In the chapter, Sumner describes the design of her curriculum and assessment strategies and her pedagogical rationale in detailed, pragmatic terms. She outlines how students undertake research about topics such as unsustainable fish, fair-trade chocolate, bottled water, local food, genetically modified organisms, and the 'Western' diet. For Sumner, the aim is for students to learn about the political economy of environmentalism, food production and consumption and develop strategies to address food injustices, in what she calls, after Paulo Freire, a pedagogy of the possible.

Meredith E. Abarca - *Food consciousness: Teaching critical theory through food narratives*

Meredith Abarca teaches womens' studies and cultural studies at the University of El Paso in Texas, USA. In contrast to Sumner who teaches a subject called pedagogy of food, Abarca uses 'food narratives' to teach critical theory in humanities and social theory. She defines food narratives as personal stories, images and passages from literary works (such as novels, poems, short stories, autobiographies). Echoing previous chapters, Abarca claims that 'the analysis of

food passages is not purely a cognitive process but most often it is one that begins through the sensory recollections they evoke.' A key pedagogical concept for Abarca is 'food consciousness' where 'students begin to understand that their food choices are never neutral, but governed by social, political, economic, and cultural ideologies that continuously (re)shape their individual, familial, and cultural sense of self.' Abarca's pedagogical philosophy is informed by concepts from postcolonial scholars, - bell hooks' engaged pedagogy, Louise Pratt's contact zones, M. Jacqui Alexander's pedagogies of crossing, and Gloria Anzaldua's 'meztizo' consciousness. Using the reading of texts in the classroom, together with other pedagogical processes such as sharing of food memories, collaborative thinking, and collective eating, her main aim is to enable the students to understand the complexities of critical theory and to do so by mobilising representations of food and material food practices such as cooking and eating as a resource for critique.

Conclusion

Our intention in this collection was to prise open the aims, curricula and processes in food pedagogies across a range of sites. Responding to the call in pedagogy studies to go beyond rhetorical assertions that cultural and social practices are pedagogical, chapters in the book ground their analyses in empirical research on the interactions, content and relations in pedagogical encounters. As a result various food practices, structures, institutions and pedagogical sites such school, shopping, supermarkets, families, university

classrooms and relations of knowledge, affect, embodiment, resistance, and power are brought into view.

Food pedagogies are important not only because they are proliferating but because of the social, cultural and symbolic meanings of food and 'good lives; which they reproduce. Thus, food is seen as the means through which we can (and should) improve our individual and collective lives: our physical and mental health, the happiness of children and families, our sense of community and connection, the state of the environment, and the future of the planet. Consequently, food pedagogies offer us hope that we can learn so much: about the Other, about our selves, our food producers, and the animals and plants which are our food. Many of them promise us that we can become 'fairer, kinder, healthier', and more moral, nourished, ecological and well-fed (Freidberg 2010). Pedagogues, described by authors in various chapters, reproduce culturally circulating ideas about healthism, 'doing good' and 'being good' through food. Importantly though, several chapters emphasise how food pedagogies go beyond the transmission of knowledge. They illustrate how they affect how we feel about what we eat and drink: from disgust to shame, pleasure, aspiration, pride and anger. The affective economy of food pedagogies is unevenly distributed because as we see from chapters in the book, some forms of food education are classist, racist and sexist, and shame, patronise and berate 'targeted learners' and their lives.

An important theme for many authors in the collection are the political and moral effects of food pedagogies. From the chapters, we can see how there are powerful actors who have clear 'educational' agendas to control what we eat, and how we think and feel about food: for example, supermarkets, policy

makers, health authorities, nutritionists, advertisers, and celebrity chefs. There is a classed, racialised and gendered politics to who is set up as 'in the know'. Hierarchies are created of 'good' and 'bad' consumers, diets, eaters, parents, families, cooks, and foods (Flowers & Swan 2011). Scholars in this book, and elsewhere, point to the way that women and in particular, working class mothers are targeted, responsibilised and shamed. For instance, knowledge about how to cook is imagined to be on the decline as a result of 'modern' motherhood and subject to policy and media commentary, and pedagogical intervention (Short 2006, Kimura 2011). As a result, mothers are seen to be responsible for the ill-health of their children and the nation. In particular, working class mothers are demonised, seen as deficient and irrational in their food habits. Indeed, health focused food pedagogies – making 'healthy' school lunch boxes, shopping for local and organic ingredients, and cooking slow food – position women's place as back doing intensive and unpaid labour in the kitchen (Kimura 2011). Gender and class are vital for understanding food pedagogies but several chapters underline that age is critical, given the extent and intensity of food messages aimed at young people (Leahy & Pike; Rich & Evans; Harrison, Kelly & Campbell). Authors emphasise too how food pedagogies reproduce hetero-normativity (Rich & Evans; Robert).

Whilst the book has made inroads into researching the practices involved in food pedagogies across different social domains, there are opportunities for further research, particularly in relation to two themes: first, race and food pedagogies; and secondly, how pedagogical processes 'operate' on us, which includes how food pedagogies be encountered and negotiated by 'learners'. In their chapter, Quiroga, Sandlin and Redmon-Wright show how on alternative TV

programmes, issues of race, class and food are discussed, and Iranian-Guatamalan and Jewish food of the presenters' backgrounds profiled rather than white middle-class foodie cooking, and done in ways which do not exoticise but position food culture through narratives of colonial history. Our own chapter attends to the racialised nature of food pedagogies generally, and focuses in particular on the under-researched topic of food practices in mixed-race families. But in relation to racialisation, there are more questions to be answered about the social justice, food inequalities and the whiteness of food pedagogies. For instance, there is growing critique of the racialised and classed inequalities of food production and consumption, and the politics of white, middle-class alternative food movements (Williams-Forson & Walker 2013; Alkon & Agyeman 2011; Paddock 2011; Slocum 2007, 2008, 2011; Guthman 2008a/b; Etmanski 2012; Walter 2012). This critique shows how sustainable and ethical food consumers make normative judgments about what constitutes 'good' food, diets and consumption and morally deride other types of food consumption. Moreover, ethical food consumption itself has become a symbolic marker of classed capital (Johnston & Baumann 2010; Paddock 2011). The financial and time resources needed to sustain these forms of consumption, and access to the 'health-giving' properties of middle class 'good' food have been roundly challenged for being out of the reach of white and racially minoritised working classes (Guthman 2008a/b; Paddock 2011). On the racialisation of alternative food practices such as food markets and alternative agriculture, Guthman and Slocum suggest such initiatives reproduce white embodied spaces, discourses, and political aims which reconsolidate racial food inequalities and exclusionary practices. In an important redress to the sensory turn in food movements and food studies,

Jessica Hayes-Conroy (2009) challenges the romanticisation of white taste and sensory education in school garden projects, emphasising that food pedagogues need to understand senses not as natural and acultural but as grounded in classed and racialised practices.

Secondly the book expands understanding of how social and cultural processes are pedagogical. Hence, chapters show that people learn about food knowledges, meanings and practices through various formal and informal processes, media and mechanisms, in cognitive, sensory, embodied, gendered, classed and racialised ways. As pedagogues promulgate across a front of media from webpages, food workshops, print media through to television, more empirical and theoretical attention needs to be given to the complex debates in cultural and media studies about how meaning is made, how media mediate. For instance, in our work on food activist films and food tourism websites, we have attended to the specificities of film and website representational practices in pedagogising food. As we noted, authors in pedagogy studies insist that we move beyond assuming food pedagogies are 'forces' which 'shape' our identities, what we think and feel, and how we act. Thus, further research should be given to theorising what the 'catalytic stuff' of food pedagogies is and how it 'work upon' or constitutes individuals, class, gender and race: examining what of us is 'shaped', and what into what 'ideal endpoint' we are 'shaped' (Swan 2007, 2008). At the same time, chapters in the book illuminate that readers and viewers do not simply uncritically slurp up so-called ideological messages about food: they

counter, reject and ignore food pedagogies, although the resources needed to do this against powerful pedagogues are unevenly allocated by race, class and gender. Nevertheless, as work on race and food movements points out, alternative food pedagogies from a range of activists are gaining momentum: the pedagogies of activists and social movement learning being another area ready for more research attention.

Finally, chapters in the book have begun to expand on concepts of subjectification, identification and social reproduction as ways of explicating learning and transformation, but as pedagogy studies scholars emphasise practices of embodiment, capacitation and habituation need more research. Recent theorising on senses, viscera, materialisation of race and bodies in food studies can aid this project, augmented by work by pedagogy scholars such as Hickey-Moody who investigates the pedagogy of affect: vibrations, sensation, rhythms and sounds. This would entail extending our concepts of how food pedagogies interpellate, mobilise and produce us, individually and collectively, through a plethora of bodily, intellectual, sensory and emotional 'materials': for example, cognition; the unconscious; visuality; smell; touch; habits; imagination; aspirations; fantasies; dreams and desires. What this argument emphasises, and many chapters in the book foreground, is that food pedagogies work not simply through information-giving and messages, but through emotional, ethnical, and embodied registers and attachments, which means that any activist, resistive and

alternative food pedagogies should not be based on addressing what are seen as different groups' knowledge deficits: or as Guthman (2008b) succinctly puts it, the white middle class food activist rhetoric of 'if only they knew'.

Acknowledgement: Ideas in this chapter have been published in an earlier form in our introduction to the 2012 special issue on Food Pedagogies in the Australian Journal of Adult Learning

References

Alkon, A. H. & Agyeman, J. (2011) Cultivating Food Justice: Race, Class and Sustainability. London: MIT Press.

Belasco, W. J. (2007). *Appetite for change: How the counterculture took on the food industry*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Berlant, L. (2010) Risky Bigness: On obesity, eating and the ambiguity of 'health.' In J. M. Metzl & A. Kirkland (Eds.). *Against health: How health became the new morality*. NYU Press.

Burdick, J., & Sandlin, J. A. (2013). Learning, becoming, and the unknowable: Conceptualizations, mechanisms, and process in public pedagogy literature. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *43*(1), 142-177.

Burdick, J., Sandlin, J. A., & O'Malley, M. P. (Eds.). (2013). *Problematizing Public Pedagogy*. Routledge.

Burdick, J., Sandlin, J. et al. (2010). "Educational inquiry and the pedagogical other: On the politics and ethics of researching critical public pedagogies." In J. A. Sandlin, B. Schultz & J. Burdick (Eds.) *Handbook of Public Pedagogy: Education and learning beyond schooling*, London/New York: Taylor & Francis: 116-124.

Cook, S. (2009). New spaces and new places: Adult education and the creation of alternative foodscapes. *Contributors of the Graduate Food Discussions Paper Series, Volume 1*, 19.

Coveney, J. (2006). *Food, morals and meaning: The pleasure and anxiety of eating*. London: Routledge.

De Solier, I. (2005). TV dinners: culinary television, education and distinction. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, *19*(4), 465-481.

De Solier, I. (2013). *Food and the Self: Consumption, Production and Material Culture*. A & C Black.

Edwards, R. & Usher, R. (2007). *Globalisation & pedagogy: Space, place and identity*. London: Routledge

Etmanski, C. (2012). A critical race and class analysis of learning in the organic farming movement. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, *52*(3), 484.

Evans, B., Colls, R. & Hörschelmann, K. (2011) 'Change4Life for your kids': embodied collectives and public health pedagogy, *Sport, Education and Society*, 16:3, 323-34

Flowers, R. and Swan, E. (2011) 'Eating at us': Representations of knowledge in the activist documentary film Food, Inc. in *Studies in the Education of Adults*, Volume 43, Number 2, Autumn: 234-250 (17).

Flowers, R. and Swan, E. (2012a) 'Eating the Asian Other? Pedagogies of Food Multiculturalism in Australia', *Portal Journal of Multidisciplinary International Studies*, vol. 9, no. 2, 1-30.

Flowers, R. and Swan, E. (2012b) Editors. Special Issue Australian Journal of Adult Learning: '*Food Pedagogies*.' Volume 52, Number 3, November 2012, 532-572

Flowers, R., & Swan, E. (2012c) Pedagogies of doing good: Problematisations, authorities, technologies and teleologies in food activism. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, *52*(3), 532.

Flowers, R., Guevara, R., & Whelan, J. (2009). Popular and Informal Environmental Education: The Need for More Research in an 'Emerging'Field of Practice. *Report: Zeitschrift für Weiterbildungsforschung*, 2(2009), 36-50.

Freidberg, S. (2010). Perspective and power in the ethical foodscape. *Environment and planning*. A, 42(8), 1868.

Freire, P. (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, trans. Myra Bergman Ramos. *New York: Continuum*.

Giroux, H. (1992) Resisting difference: Cultural studies and the discourse of critical pedagogy. *Cultural studies*, 199-212.

Giroux, H. A. (1988) *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Greenwood Publishing Group.

Giroux, H. A. (2004a) Cultural studies and the politics of public pedagogy: Making the political more pedagogical. *Parallax*, *10*(2), 73-89.

Giroux, H. A. (2004b) Cultural studies, public pedagogy, and the responsibility of intellectuals. *Communication and critical/cultural studies*, *1*(1), 59-79.

Giroux, H. (2005) *Against the New Authoritarianism: politics after Abu Ghraib*, Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring

Guthman, J. (2008a). Neoliberalism and the making of food politics in California. *Geoforum*, *39*(3), 1171-1183.

Guthman, J. (2008b). Bringing good food to others: investigating the subjects of alternative food practice. *cultural geographies*, *15*(4), 431-447.
Giroux, H.A. (2005) *Against the new authoritarianism: Politics after Abu Ghraib*. Winnipeg, MB:
Hayes-Conroy, A., & Hayes-Conroy, J. (2008) Taking back taste: feminism, food and visceral politics. *Gender, Place and Culture*, *15*(5), 461-473.
Hayes-Conroy, J., & Hayes-Conroy, A. (Eds.). (2014). *Doing nutrition differently: critical approaches to diet and dietary intervention*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd..
Hayes-Conroy, J. (2009) Visceral reactions: *Alternative food and social difference in American and Canadian schools*. PhD dissertation Geography and Women's Studies, Pennsylvania State University.
Hickey-Moody, A. (2013). *Youth, arts and education: Reassembling subjectivity through affect*. London: Routledge.
Hickey-Moody, A., Savage, G. & Windle. (2010). "Pedagogy writ large: Public, popular and cultural pedagogies in motion." *Critical Studies in Education* 51(3): 227-236.
Highmore, B. (2008). Alimentary agents: food, cultural theory and multiculturalism. *Journal of intercultural studies*, *29*(4), 381-398.
Hollows, J., & Jones, S. (2010). 'At least he's doing something': Moral entrepreneurship and individual responsibility in Jamie's Ministry of Food. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, *13*(3), 307-322.
Johnston, J., & Baumann, S. (2010). *Foodies: Democracy and distinction in the gourmet foodscape*. London/New York: Routledge.
Jubas, K. (2006). The trouble with shopping: Discourses, practices and pedagogies of the consumer-citizen. In M. Hagen & E. Goff (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 47th Annual AERC* (196-202), May 19-21, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
Jubas, K. (2007). Consuming fiction: Stories about consumerism, shopping and consumption. In L. Servage & T. Fenwick (Eds.), *Joint International 48th Annual AERC and the 26th Annual Conference of CASAE/ACÉÉA. Learning in community* (pp. 325-330), June 6-9, 2007. Halifax: Mount Saint Vincent University.
Kelly, P. and L. Harrison (2011). *Working in Jamie's kitchen: salvation, passion and young workers*, Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
Kelly, Peter 2009, Food, passion and marginalised young people : technologies of the self in Jamie's kitchen, *in TASA 2009 : Proceedings of the Annual Conference of The Australian Sociological Association 2009 : The future of sociology*, TASA, Canberra, 1-12.
Kenway, J., & Bullen, E. (2011). Skin pedagogies and abject bodies. *Sport, education and society*, *16*(3), 279-294.
Kenway, J., & Modra, H. (1992). Feminist pedagogy and emancipatory possibilities. In C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds.) *Feminisms and critical pedagogy*. Psychology Press: 138-166.
Kimura, A. H. (2011). Food education as food literacy: privatized and gendered food knowledge in contemporary Japan. *Agriculture and Human Values*, *28*(4), 465-482.
Lewis, T. (2008). *Smart living: Lifestyle media and popular expertise* (Vol. 15). Peter Lang.
Lewis, T., & Potter, E. (Eds.). (2011). *Ethical consumption: A critical introduction*. London: Routledge.
Lindenfeld, L. (2010). Can Documentary Food Films Like Food Inc. Achieve their Promise?. *Environmental Communication*, *4*(3), 378-386.
Lingard, B. (2009). Towards a sociology of pedagogies. In M. Apple, S. J. Ball, & L. A. Gandin, (eds). *The Routledge international handbook of the sociology of education*. London: Routledge
Long, L. M. (Ed.). (2013). *Culinary tourism*. University Press of Kentucky.
Luke, C. (1994) Childhood and Parenting in *Popular Culture in Sociology*, Vol 30, No 3: 289-302.
Luke, C. (Ed.). (1996). *Feminisms and pedagogies of everyday life*. New York: SUNY Press.
Luke, C., & Gore, J. (Eds.). (1992). *Feminisms and critical pedagogy*. Melbourne: Psychology Press.
Mair, H., J. Sumner, et al. (2008). "The politics of eating: Food practices as critically reflexive leisure." *Leisure/Loisir* 32(2): 379-405.
Meek, M. (2013) Foreword in Freire, P., & Macedo, D. *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. London/New York: Routledge.
Narayan, U. (1997). *Dislocating cultures: Third world feminism and the politics of knowledge*. London: Routledge

Noble, G. (2004) *Pedagogies of the Everyday*, paper presented at the Cultural Studies Association of Australasia annual conference, Murdoch University, Fremantle, 9-11 December
Noble, G. (2012) *Pedagogies of civic belonging*. Unpublished paper
Paddock, J. (2011). *Class, food, culture: exploring 'alternative' food consumption* Doctoral dissertation, Cardiff University.
Palovaara-Soberg, L. & Thuv, S (2009). 'Food pedagogy', paper presented at symposium, *What is food about? A new approach for promoting changes in food related behaviour*, convened by Consumer Citizenship Network, Technical University of Berlin.
Pike, J., & Leahy, D. (2012). School food and the pedagogies of parenting. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, *52*(3), 434.
Rich, E. (2011a). 'I see her being obesed!': Public pedagogy, reality media and the obesity crisis. *Health:*, *15*(1), 3-21.
Rich, E. (2011b). Exploring the Relationship Between Pedagogy and Physical Cultural Studies: The Case of New Health Imperatives in Schools. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, *28*(1).
Rousseau, S. (2012). *Food media: Celebrity chefs and the politics of everyday interference*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
Sandlin, J. A. (2010). "Learning to survive the 'Shopocalypse': Reverend Billy's anti-consumption 'pedagogy of the unknown'." *Critical Studies in Education* 51(3): 295-311.
Sandlin, J. A. and J. Burdick (2010) (Eds.) *Handbook of Public Pedagogy: Education and learning beyond schooling*, London/New York: Taylor & Francis.
Sandlin, J. A. and J. L. Milam (2008). "Mixing Pop (Culture) and Politics": Cultural Resistance, Culture Jamming, and Anti-Consumption Activism as Critical Public Pedagogy." *Curriculum Inquiry* 38(3): 323-350.
Sandlin, J. A. and McLaren, P. (2010) Exploring Consumption's Pedagogy and Envisioning a Critical Pedagogy of Consumption: Living and Learning in the Shadow of the "Shopocalypse". In J. A. Sandlin & P. McLaren (Eds.) *Critical Pedagogies of Consumption: Living and Learning in the Shadow of the "Shopocalypse"*. London/New York: Routledge.
Sandlin, J. A., O'Malley, M. P., & Burdick, J. (2011). Mapping the complexity of public pedagogy scholarship 1894–2010. *Review of Educational Research*, *81*(3), 338-375.
Savage, G. C. (2010). Problematizing "public pedagogy" in educational research. J. A. Sandlin, B. Schultz & J. Burdick (Eds.) *Handbook of Public Pedagogy: Education and learning beyond schooling*, London/New York: Taylor & Francis: 103-115
Short, F (2006). Kitchen secrets: The meaning of cooking in everyday life. Oxford: Berg
Slocum, R. (2006). Whiteness, space and alternative food practice. *Geoforum*, *38*(3), 520-533.
Slocum, R., & Saldanha, A. (Eds.). (2013). *Geographies of race and food: fields, bodies, markets*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
Slow Food (2014). Slow Food Education. www.slowfood.com accessed January 19 2014.
Stoneman, S. (2009) interview with Julie Guthman, On Globalisation, Neoliberalism, Obesity, Local Food and Education, *Politics and Culture*, issue 2: 37-44
Sumner, J. (2008). Eating as a pedagogical act: Food as a catalyst for adult education for sustainability. *Kursiv-Journal fuer politische Bildung*, 4, 23-37.
Sutton, D. (2001) *Remembrance of repasts: An anthropology of food and memory*. New York: Berg Publishing.
Swan, E. (2008) 'Let's Not Get Too Personal: Critical reflection, reflexivity and the Confessional Turn', *Journal of European Industrial Training*, vol. 32, no. 5: 385-399.
Swan, E. (2008) 'You Make Me Feel Like A Woman: Therapeutic Cultures and the Contagion of Femininity', *Gender, Work and Organization*, vol. 15, no. 1: 88-107.
Swan, E. (2009) *Worked up Selves: Personal Development Workers, Self-Work and Therapeutic Cultures*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
Swan, E. (2012). Cleaning Up? Transnational Corporate Femininity and Dirty Work in Magazine Culture. In R. Simpson (Ed.). (2012). *Dirty work: Concepts and identities*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
Swan, E. & Fox, S. (2009) 'Becoming flexible: Self-flexibility and its pedagogies', *British Journal of Management: challenging management theory and practice*, vol. 20, no. 1: 149-159.
Trubek, A. & Belliveau, C. (2009) Cooking as Pedagogy: Engaging the Senses through Experiential Learning, *Anthropology News* April issue
Trubek, A. B. (2008) *The taste of place: A cultural journey into terroir*, Vol. 20, University of California Press

Trubek, A. B. & Belliveau, C. (2009) "Cooking as Pedagogy: Engaging the Senses through Experiential Learning." *Anthropology News* 50(4): 16-16.
Vidgen, H. A., & Gallegos, D. (2010). Food literacy: time for a new term or just another buzzword? *Journal of the Home Economics Institute of Australia*, *17*(2), 2-8.
Vileisis, A. (2008). *Kitchen literacy: How we lost knowledge of where food comes from and why we need to get it back*. New York: Island Press.
Walter, P. (2012). Educational alternatives in food production, knowledge and consumption: The public pedagogies of Growing'Power and Tsyunhehkw^'. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, *52*(3), 573.
Watkins, M., Noble, G., & Driscoll, C. (2015) *Cultural Pedagogies and Human Conduct*. London: Routledge
Williams-Forson, P. (2008). More than Just the "Big Piece of Chicken": The Power of Race, Class, and Food in American Consciousness. In C. Counihan & P. Van Esterik (Eds.). (2013). *Food and culture: a reader*. New York: Routledge., 342-353.
Williams-Forson, P. & Walker, J. (2013) Food and Race: An Overview, in Albala, K. (Ed.). (2013). *Routledge international handbook of food studies*. London: Routledge.
Wright, J., & Harwood, V. (Eds.). (2009). *Biopolitics and the'obesity epidemic': governing bodies*. London: Routledge.