CrossMark

Australian Journal of Environmental Education, vol. 31(1), 146–164, 2015
© The Author(s) 2015. doi 10.1017/aee.2015.27

Clearing Up the Table: Food Pedagogies and Environmental Education — Contributions, Challenges and Future Agendas

Elaine Swan & Rick Flowers
University of Technology Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

Abstract In our paper, we draw on recent scholarship on food pedagogies and pedagogy studies to explore themes in the collection of articles in this special issue. In particular, we show how the articles variously conceptualise formal and informal pedagogies, their curricula, aims, and potential effects in relation to food and sustainability. Drawing on debates in pedagogy studies, we investigate how the papers reflect on what makes a pedagogy pedagogical. We then turn to food studies literature to identify how the articles in this special issue construct food as a theoretical and empirical object. Given food's multifaceted nature, which means that food works materially, biologically, economically, symbolically and socially, we explore which versions of food and its attributes are profiled across and within the articles. Inspired by critiques on race and class in relation to food and food social movements, in the final section of the paper we ask how the articles and future research on food and environmental education can take account of the racialised, gendered and classed dimensions of education for food sustainability. As part of our discussion, we evaluate the ethics of doing good, the moral economy educators reproduce in relation to class, race and gender, and the contribution feminism and critical race theory can make to future research agendas and writing in the field.

In drawing together this fascinating international collection of empirically based papers, the editors entitled the special issue 'Putting Food Onto the Table'. Across the methodologically diverse and practice-rich papers, we get a taste of many types of food, from broccoli grown by young Maori children, home-made hummingbird cake in a child's lunchbox, to patty burgers in seeded buns, soda drink, beans and squash, feijoa fruit, pork bones, popcorn, tomatoes, marmite sandwich, soups, jams, and even a hakari (feast). These foods are served not just on domestic kitchen tables, but on communal tables in early childhood centres and school gardens, and by feminist food activist groups.

In this issue, we meet a wide range of people who help bring food to the table and teach about sustainability, from urban growers, feminist activists, organic farmers, shopkeepers and fisherfolk, to early childhood, school and university teachers. We

Address for correspondence: Elaine Swan, School of Communication, UTS, 365 Jones St, Broadway NSW 2000. Email: Elaine.Swan@uts.edu.au

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hear about the diversity of food practices that enable food to arrive at the table: hunting, preparing soils for planting, harvesting, berry picking, gardening, preserving fish and meat; finding foods in marshes, woods, and grocery stores; chopping and cooking, and sitting down to eat and sharing food. Through this survey of the non-human and human actors involved in feeding us and teaching us, the articles carve out the possibilities for environmental education and its intersections with food, with a little help from seeds, mulch, chicken tractors and micro-beasts.

The collection seeks to bring food for thought to the environmental education table: to rethink food pedagogies outside the narrow, and we would add gendered, racialised and classed discourses of risk, obesity, healthism and 'gastronomification'. The call reminds us of very real fears about global food sustainability, and across the papers, we can feel these anxieties, but also hope and determination.

Food Pedagogies

At the same time, we all have some way to go to understand the others putting food on the table (Swan, 2013). The labour of food production, in all its facets from agriculture and manufacture to retailing and feeding work, is dominated by racially minoritised women and men, and White working-class women. Except for the articles by Jenny Ritchie and Holly Stovall, and Lori Baker-Sperry and Judith Dallinger, gender, race and class are somewhat under-discussed, as we discuss more fully later. First, we situate the collection in relation to food pedagogies to offer a new set of concepts and concerns. Along with others such as Deana Leahy, Emma Rich and Jo Pike (Leahy & Pike, 2015; Pike & Leahy, 2012; Rich, 2011; Rich & Evans, 2015), Jennifer Sumner (2008, 2015), who for some time has convened a subject on pedagogies of food and writes about 'eating as a pedagogical act', we have developed a body of work researching food pedagogies (Flowers & Swan, 2011, 2012a, 2012b, 2012c, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c; Swan, 2013). As we write elsewhere, efforts to 'teach' us about food have intensified (Flowers & Swan, 2012a, 2015a). To understand this cultural trend, we deploy the concept of 'food pedagogies' to help us examine a number of processes: the proliferation of teaching and learning about food; the diversification of food educational curricula; the rise of new food pedagogues; the shift in expertise and knowledge about food; and the racialised, gendered and classed inequalities produced through these shifts (Flowers & Swan, 2012a, 2015a). In sum, we characterise food pedagogies as a congeries of educational, teaching and learning ideologies and practices carried out by a range of agencies, actors, institutions and media that focus variously on growing, shopping, cooking, eating and disposing of food (Flowers & Swan, 2012a, 2015a). In relation to learning, the term *pedagogies* points to various forms, sites and processes of formal, informal and incidental education, and learning inside and beyond the classroom.

We use the term *food pedagogies* because 'pedagogy' is capacious enough to denote a range of sites, processes, curricula, 'learners' and even types of human and non-human 'teachers' as papers in the collection attest. At the same time, the concept of pedagogy is constrained enough to denote some kind of intended or emergent change in behaviour, habit, emotion, cognition, and/or knowledge at an individual, family, group or collective level.

Food has become a battleground for politics, policy, reform and education in recent years, and food pedagogies seek to get us to change what and how we eat (Flowers & Swan 2012a, 2015a). Intensified attention to our food habits is more than just about food. How we eat, and what we eat, are at the centre of what we want to be and how we will want the world to be: a point made very clear across the articles in this collection (Galutsky, 2010). It also involves politics and inequalities: there are many different

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'pedagogues' — policy makers, churches, activists, health educators, schools, tourist agencies, chefs — who think we don't know enough about food and what to do with it (Flowers & Swan, 2012b, 2015a). Some are powerful actors with clear educational intent: the food industry, health authorities, nutritionists, research scientists, advertisers and consumers. As this collection makes clear, teachers from childcare to universities are critical to the design, promulgation and politics of food pedagogies and their moral economies (Leahy & Pike, 2015; Rich & Evans, 2015).

Pedagogy and Education

Of course, 'pedagogy' is a foundational concept in education studies, used in its most narrow sense to characterise teaching, learning and assessment practices in schools, colleges and universities (Lingard, 2009). Thus, educational theorist Bob Lingard (2009) states that in its most traditional usage, pedagogy refers to 'teachers in classrooms'; that is, instruction, teaching and curricula. But, like other academics in education studies, he calls for pedagogy to be extended to the social and political context of classroom practices, including macro discourses of learning, teaching and assessment. Feminist educational and critical race theorists go further and insist that an analysis of pedagogy must grapple with how gender, class and race inflect teaching and learning and wider macro educational discourses (Luke & Gore, 1992). These arguments speak directly to the discussions in the collection of articles in this special issue.

Pedagogy Studies

But there is another way to think about pedagogy, which is being developed outside of traditional education studies. Hence, scholars from cultural studies and adult education use the concept of pedagogy to analyse the educational effects of cultural and social processes beyond the classroom (Flowers & Chodkiewicz, 2009a, 2009b; Flowers & Swan, 2012a, 2015a; Hickey-Moody, Savage, & Windle, 2010; Luke, 1996; Swan, 2012; Watkins, Noble, & Driscoll, 2015). Thus, Sandlin, O'Malley, and Burdick (2011) 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' (pp. 338–339).

Broadly speaking, theorists study the cultural and social processes that attempt to modify or transform how we act, feel and think (Watkins et al., 2015). Hickey-Moody et al. (2010) stress that the defining characteristics of classroom pedagogy — pedagogical intent, substance or content, including hidden curriculum and teaching and learning processes — can be applied to the study of public and everyday pedagogies. Analysis of the politics of pedagogies involves locating them within wider social, cultural and political relations of power. Thus, Luke (1996) emphasises that pedagogy cannot be conceived as an isolated intersubjective event where one analyses teaching and learning; rather, it 'is fundamentally defined by and a product of a network of historical, political, sociocultural, and knowledge relations' (p. 130). An important point to consider when reflecting on the articles in the collection and how they contextualise their foci.

Food, Sustainability and Environmental Pedagogies

Across the papers, scholars introduce us to deliberate designs for bringing food into dialogue with environmental education in formal institutional and non-formal learning contexts. They show us how field trips, interviews with elders, singing, cooking, gardening, research, watching cartoons and sharing food memories constitute creative pedagogical processes. We examine these more closely in this section, focusing on five

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

articles in the collection, three of which write about formal education, one on informal adult learning, and one on public pedagogy.

Formal Education

In three of the articles, the authors detail how they design curricula. In so doing they bring together questions about food and sustainability, each of them drawing on different intellectual and curricula resources. Studying primary and secondary schools in Change Islands, a semi-isolated coastal community off Canada's most eastern province, Carole Harris and Barbara Barter conceptualise their approach as 'critical place based pedagogy' — the bringing together of critical theory with place-based pedagogy — using what they refer to as experiential-, discovery- and arts-based approaches. In contrast to the somewhat unbridled enthusiasm for distance learning in education and policy contexts, the authors 'emplace' education and food practices in an historical and geographical location. They introduce us to the local community: fisherfolk, shop owners, community workers and young people who live, study and work in a location devastated by the loss of their fishery and traditional food habits.

The authors' design principle is 'making room for the local' in the curriculum. In building local curriculum, they seek to return the students to the rural, to give learning back to the community, and to teach students how to produce food locally in subsistent ways. They see their curriculum as a political intervention in the urban centre's imposition of education policy and the government's globalised neoliberal approach to industrialised food production. As with other articles in the collection, they emphasise the attenuated form that food studies takes in curricula, being based on health and consumer choice. Food-based sustainability pedagogy is an investment in the future: the food future the community desires, the future of students who are often taught in 'community dis-embedding' ways, and the future of training teachers and educational leaders in social justice. Their intent is to provide equitable, expressive modes of education outside of the imperatives of standardisation, the urban and the 'cult for efficiency'.

Whereas Harris and Barter return place to the classroom, our next authors, Nelson Lebo and Chris Eames in New Zealand, encourage secondary school students to leave the classroom and emplace themselves in new educational spaces such as food forests and eco-accommodation. In contrast to Harris and Barter, who use traditional critical pedagogical approaches to inspire food production, Nelson and Eames bring permaculture design principles to curriculum development: a system of agricultural design that 'seeks to recognise and maximise beneficial relationships while minimising or eliminating harmful relationships'. They show us that the seeds and soil for growing education for sustainability can be found outside of the fence of traditional curriculum theorising and practice.

Their project, like Harris and Barter, is to teach teachers as much as students about sustainability and new ways to teach. In using permaculture principles, they offer students science learning away from memorisation, facts and figures and towards science knowledge that can be used for sustainable food production. Their work extends notions of pedagogy to include a conceptualisation of learners using permaculture metaphors and learning as cultivating and trellising, thus stimulating us to think through learning through food and agriculture.

While Lebo and Eames encourage teacher learning as well as student learning, Jennifer Elsden Clifton and Debi Futter Puati teach teacher education. Their context is New Zealand, where they teach units on food education to teacher trainees in a Bachelor of Primary Education degree. In designing curriculum that brings together health education and education for sustainability, as with the first two articles, the authors

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

want to design a new space for teaching food and sustainability by creating a discursive and educational space of new meaning in a 10-week course, rather than using field trips. Like the first two articles, this one also sees teachers as pivotal to achieving a more sustainable society, particularly given the expectations put on teachers to teach young people about food. Thus, there has been a push to encourage teachers to talk about sustainability — including food choices, organic foods, fair trade, animal welfare, food mileage, and teaching through school gardens. Through the concept of third space, the authors want to ensure that trainee teachers learn more broadly about food than just healthism through which food is positioned as medicine, fuel or risk. They are concerned about how teachers can inadvertently reinforce diet or weight loss, nutritional misinformation and stigmatisation, and position obesity as a medicalised illness.

This article can be placed in an emergent and important body of work on the effects of health reform in schools and the roles teachers play in perpetuating narrow ideas about health and food. For example, Leahy and Pike (2015) and Rich and Evans (2015) have done significant research on what and how teachers teach about food and the problematic politics and representations of food and bodies that result. Elsden Clifton and Futter Puati aim to create a pedagogical space where the student teachers destabilise binaries such as healthy and unhealthy. A significant contribution of their work is to emphasise how alternative knowledges of food and eating can be a little po-faced and puritanical, having the effect of editing 'the potential positive social and cultural relationships with food'. Thus, they leave us with a tantalising question, returned to by O'Flynn, which is how can educators learn to theorise and teach about the pleasure in food.

Informal Learning

The last two articles move out of the classroom to the urban garden and home TV screen to discuss informal learning and public pedagogy. In an Australian context, Federico Davilla argues that urban growers can transform their understanding of how food is produced locally and globally through growing food. He opens up the possibility of doing environmental education outside of the classroom and draws on theoretical traditions beyond teacher education; in particular, deploying two categories often used in studies of adult learning but rarely in school studies — transformative learning and critical consciousness. In contrast to the previous papers, he removes the teacher from the educational experience and emphasises the importance of community participation, and how growing food in cities and taking part in alternative food activist groups can enable adults to change how they think about food systems. He privileges what he calls personally engaging approaches to learning that he sees as produced through being closer to the realities of food production, but admits that people may have to educate themselves through food groups to see the global connections in food production.

Our final article turns to popular culture as pedagogy: the children's American cartoon *Spongebob*. In literature on food pedagogy, scholars have examined a range of forms of popular culture, particularly TV cooking programs and cookbooks, but less attention has been given to children's television. Thus, like Davilla, Piatti Farnell mobilises the notion of public pedagogy, influenced by Henry Giroux. In focusing on an internationally widely viewed cartoon, she shows how what seems trivial has important messages about food and the connections between health, disposability and culture. Thus, popular culture, pedagogy and entertainment collide. In a close reading of the cartoon, she reveals that its messages are more complex and ambivalent than one might imagine. It celebrates fast food and the hamburger, seeing them as emblematic of American

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

consumerist values and lifestyles, but at the same time, the cartoon offers a satirical critique of fast-food for generating so much waste.

Farnell's article reminds us of the importance of interrogating popular culture in education and, in particular, the effects of public, cultural and everyday pedagogies in relation to food and sustainability. In food studies, there is a subfield of research on the proliferation of food media, especially on television programs about food and celebrity chefs (Hollows, 2003; Lewis, 2011; Pike & Leahy, 2012; Rousseau, 2012), food writing and particular cookbooks (Mennell, 1997; Gallegos, 2005), films such as *Food Inc*., *Julie and Julia*, and *Chocolat* (Lindenfeld, 2010), and blogs and websites (Adami, 2014; Flowers & Swan, 2015d). But very little of this has examined their pedagogical effects.

Indeed, Farnell's article is in a long tradition of education work on everyday media and objects in the home and public sphere that perhaps has been too easily ignored by educators. Thus, as far back as 1996, Australian educationalist and feminist Carmen Luke edited an interdisciplinary feminist book to examine how the domestic and private sphere work pedagogically to teach children and women about gender, class and race. Influenced by feminist theories of power and discourse, Luke (1996) describes her project as the interrogation of the 'pedagogical project of everyday life' (p. 1). In the book, authors explore popular culture in the home, from television programs and computer games, to parenting magazines and toys; and discuss how friendship and mothering constitute pedagogical relations. We think there are opportunities to take more inspiration from Luke (1996). For example, in future teaching and research on environmental education, authors might consider films such as *Mad Max Fury*, cartoons like *The Simpsons*, cookbooks, food blogs, food tourism, restaurant menus, gardening catalogues and food reviews as cultural pedagogies on food and sustainability.

Knowledge-scapes

In sum, these interesting articles offer us rich empirical studies of designing formal curricula. Overall, reading across the papers stimulates questions about the kinds of knowledge needed for educating for food and sustainability. Importantly, both the call and the articles point to the over-dominance of nutrition and obesity science, as well as to the need for local knowledge, experiential, community alternative science, Indigenous, embodied, emotional and feminist knowledges. Indeed, much of what is going on in food social movements are 'struggles over knowledge systems' (Goodman & DuPuis, 2002). But, while some articles clearly explain the different knowledges on which they draw, often these are not theorised. Moreover, the gendered, racialised and classed dimensions of food knowledges in these articles are under-developed. Most of the disciplinary sources for knowledge discussed across the articles tends to be either from environmental education or critical health; however, food curricula could also be inspired by disciplinary knowledge from geography, anthropology, history, feminist studies and cultural studies.

Furthermore, the 'knowledge dynamics' of the curricula could be examined. Food studies show that knowledges are much more intertextual and interactional than is sometimes imagined (Fonte, 2008). As Goodman, Boykoff, and Evered (2008) write: 'just beneath the thin yet oft-authoritative veneer of "crisp" science and eco-political discourses are variegated, messy and contentious interactions of knowledge, power and ideology' (p. 5), in which facts, values and interpretations are all debated. For example, research shows how new combinations or 'blends' of lay and expert knowledge are being produced, which break down the simplistic binary of lay-good/expert-bad sometimes invoked in environmental adult education (Csurgo, Kovach, & Kucerova, 2008). For

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

example, the papers in the special issue tend to focus on food production and food producers — gardening, permaculture, fishing people, organic farmers, and urban growers. But Goodman and DuPuis (2002) argue we should not privilege producer over consumer knowledge. They write: 'how the consumer goes about knowing food is just as important as farmers' knowledge networks in the creation of an alternative food system' (p. 15). In addition, they stress how new knowledges in food produce new figures and types of subjectivity; for example, 'discerning food consumers' (p. 8) that circulate in discourses on food and knowledge. We might ask what kinds of knowledges are marginalised in the articles? And what kinds of discerning subjectivities produced — ethical eaters, good teachers?

Problematisations

Another way to think about these articles pedagogically is to ask what the authors see as the problems in food practices and in environmental education that they wish to solve? The Foucauldian concept of problematisation can help us (Flowers & Swan, 2012c). A problematisation refers to 'how problems are given a shape through the ways they are spoken about and through the 'knowledges' that are assumed in their shaping' (Bacchi, 2010, p. 2). Hence, examining problematisation entails interrogating knowledge production: 'Where, how and by whom are aspects of the human being rendered problematic according to what systems of judgement and in relation to what concerns?' (Rose, 1996, p. 25). Thus, we can ask what judgments authors make about food, good food practices, and poor environmental education. What suppositions and presumptions are being reproduced, based on what kind of knowledges? For example, an assumption underpinning several articles is that there is a disconnect between people and food production. On what basis is this made? Another question is how food sustainability and environmentalism are conceptualised in the papers? In food social movements, there is a plethora of political practices and issues such as organic foods, local foods, anti-industrialised food production, vegetarianism, food for social justice, slow food movement, food security, to name but a few, but only some of these feature in the papers (Flowers & Swan, 2012a, 2015a). What gets taken up in curricula and why?

A second aspect of problematisations is that they designate certain types of people and behaviour as in need of transformation. People who need changing have to be known to be governed (Bacchi, 2012, p. 5). Hence, problematisations produce problematic people, habits and objects, and people who know, and people who don't (Flowers & Swan 2012c). Solutions are already set in train through the ways in which the problematisations are shaped. Thus, research on food pedagogies show that a range people are seen to be in need of changing: women, mothers, children, working classes, and racially minoritised groups. In this collection, the focus is more on children and young people, and teachers. For instance, teachers are not seen as being committed to sustainability or having the right of food knowledges, or being too reliant on healthism. Is this fair? How else might we understand the position in which teachers find themselves? What support do they need?

Pedagogical Capacitation

Finally, we turn to the most important question being debated in pedagogy studies in relation to public and cultural pedagogies: What makes something pedagogical? Thus, like Watkins, Noble, and Driscoll (2015), we are frustrated that theorising on public pedagogy does not make clear what makes a space or process 'pedagogical'. In similar vein, Sandlin et al. (2011) argue 'more work needs to be conducted on how the various sites, spaces, products and places identified as public pedagogy actually operate as

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pedagogy' (p. 359). This means examining 'the mechanisms and interactions that enable an individual's capacity to learn' (Burdick & Sandlin, 2013, p. 143). Noble (2004) argues that the effect of under-researching pedagogy means that it operates in scholarship like a 'black box'; signalling 'something is done but without explaining how it is done' (p. 2). Indeed, Watkins et al. (2015) develop this criticism further, taking studies to task for deploying the term pedagogy 'rhetorically' rather than 'analytically'. Usefully, they call for more research into the processes by which cumulative changes in 'how we act feel and think' are produced. They invoke concepts such as 'capacitation, habituation and embodiment' to encourage more focus on the durational effects of pedagogical relations and mechanisms (Watkins et al., 2015). And, as several of the articles in the collection suggest, pedagogic processes through which conduct is 'capacitated, fashioned, regulated, re-directed and augmented' are not simply cognitive, but embodied and deeply affective (Noble, 2012, p. 2).

Food

Having discussed the stimulating questions raised by the articles on pedagogy, we turn next to the theme of food. When we read across the papers in this special issue, while authors discuss food in many ways, they do not theorise food as deeply or explicitly as food studies academics might do. We are not saying that food is not studied or referenced. It is. But the multifaceted nature of food and its complex cultural, social and political effects are less discussed. Food is freighted with meaning and constitutes bodily nutrition, but also pleasure, anxiety, labour and morality (Rozin, 1996). Food has multiple 'regimes of value' (Appadurai, 1986) and is 'simultaneously symbolic, economic, politic, material and nutritional' (Abbots & Lavis, 2013, p. 1). Even the act of eating is multidimensional, encompassing the spatial, cultural, biological, symbolic and material (Abbots & Lavis, 2013). Thus, mealtimes are symbolic, social, religious and material events that define, reproduce and sustain families, gender, race, class and boundaries (Flowers & Swan, 2015b). So, how is food conceptualised and discussed in the articles? What kind of object does food become in this special issue? What kinds of relations and forms of sociality do the papers see food enabling? To answer these questions, we discuss the four remaining articles, focusing on how the authors construct food.

Messy Food

A critical health researcher, Gabriella O'Flynn combines personal reflections with critical health theorising to reflect on how the realities of her own feeding work challenge dominant healthism and 'commonsense' ideas about food. To do this, she analyses the pedagogical web resources for an Australian health promotion program aimed at teachers called *Munch and Move* which, in her words, produce a calculative notion of food and health based on obesity discourses. The healthy self constructed through these resources is not only at odds with her own experience, but also environmentally sustainable ways of knowing about food. Through positivist science claims based on so-called facts and truth, it individualises health — encouraging a notion of 'my body, my health', while depoliticising both. As a result, a moral economy of healthy bodies and practices, food choices and body shape are read as markers of choice, with slim fit bodies seen as 'good' and virtuous, and large bodies as 'bad' and gluttonous.

O'Flynn writes about how in her feeding work there are many competing emotions and power relations that play out as 'decisions' are made. As she writes, 'my decisions are not linear or only influenced by me. Sometimes my decisions even contradict my own ethical and health priorities.' The *Munch and Move* program makes food and health seem certain and resolute, easy to achieve and unequivocally good. This stands in

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contrast to what O'Flynn refers to as the messy and complex place of food in her life. Moreover, she shows how food pedagogies can bring shame. Thus, she felt she was positioned as a bad mother for putting a cake in her child's school lunchbox. Her priorities in choosing food for her children are seen as irrelevant and misplaced, and the symbolic place of the cake-making as part of her family practices ignored. The article challenges us to think about the place of food and eating in contemporary life. Referencing Berlant (2010), she shows how capitalism choreographs our physical, cognitive and emotional energy, to which we respond by eating. Hence, food is about mental health as much as physical health.

Food as Community Building

In her article, Jenny Ritchie too tackles issues of individualism and neoliberalism, writing about Maori worldviews and values of 'manaakitanga' (caring, hospitality, generosity) and 'whanaungatanga' (relatedness), performed through early childhood education for sustainability in Aotearoa, New Zealand. Teachers, parents and children grow, cook and share food as a way to demonstrate compassion towards themselves, others and the environment. Through food, children learn to care for human and more than human others. Ritchie claims that Indigenous knowledges provide alternative conceptualisations about stewardship for the earth. This approach to food is a political response to neoliberalism and its lack of care for the environment and 'Papatuanuku' (Earth Mother). The teachers see their food education as an intervention in neo-liberal policies causing poverty and serious issues of childhood obesity, poor nutrition and illnesses for Maori and Pacific Island children. In contrast to 'pre-packaged obesogenic processed foods produced anonymously via energy-intensive, polluting and often obesity-promoting, industrial food manufacturing systems' (Blair, 2009, p. 18, as cited in Ritchie), the food in the centres is locally grown, contributing to children's understandings of ecosystems, seasonal cycles, processes of food production, recycling and regeneration. According to Ritchie, growing and sharing produce is a form of gift-giving outside the capitalist economy and reflects values of nurturing and caring. Children learn about traditional Maori foods such as boil-up — pork bones and 'puha' (sowthistle) from the garden, fish heads, fried bread and 'kai moana' (seafood). The garden provides a link to culture and physical and spiritual sustenance. Eating together is a celebration of the collective sustenance and affirms whanaungatanga. Food is not simply fuel but understood in a holistic, sensory, and spiritual way. Gardening is a source of wellbeing and the growing, preparation and sharing of food is a source of nurturing and community building, a counter to capitalist, industrialist food production. The paper emphasises that food is a form of making sociality, spirituality, and politics.

Kitchen Work as Feminist Politics

In an explicitly feminist paper set in rural United States, Holly Stovall, Lori Baker-Sperry and Judith Dallinger, like O'Flynn, write about their own and other activists' feeding work. But in contrast to much second wave feminism, they seek to position kitchen work as both feminist and environmentalist. Given the rise of anxieties about food, cooking and localism, they claim that: 'Kitchen work has acquired political importance. Daily cooking must be seen as public, as well as private.' And, like Ritchie, they write about collectivism through feeding work.

They raise an important feminist issue in food activism that is often neglected, namely about the extra burden kitchen work can place on women. Cooking local foods from scratch is time consuming. The women food activists they research have paid work and after-work commitments, and little time or creative energy for cooking or even

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the simple processes of washing, chopping food and making a meal. Making good food requires patience, care and attention.

Much environmental education literature has omitted the kitchen. Indeed, feminism has devalued kitchen work and the housewife and full-time domesticity due to the unequal unpaid division of labour in the private sphere. While recognising how feminist food studies reveal the pleasure, power, status, drudgery and tensions of cooking in women's lives, they insist that feminists must prioritise food alongside activism and revalue the traditional work of the kitchen. To produce the kitchen as a site of environmental education means cooking on feminist terms. First, by choosing local foods as a way to support small-scale farmers of which women make up a large percentage; second, men must cook so there is fairer division of labour; and third, they call for more alternative spaces for cooking and eating — for example, gender-integrated community kitchens. In this way, cooking can support community building, teaching and learning, where men and women display skills and creativity.

Non-Humans

Whereas the previous articles focused on ways that food through human contact can make families and communities, Monica Green brings the non-humans in the production of food and knowledge into view. Focusing on garden pedagogies aimed at children, she argues that agentic capacity of non-human forces such as the soil, sun and insects produces different knowledge about children's experiences. Responding to what she calls 'the escalating and prolonged unease about children's declining connectedness to food', she argues that gardening can increase children's food consciousness and rejuvenate children's relationship with fresh food. Thus, in Green's view, gardening can deepen children's food knowledge, showing them where it comes from, how to cook it, and how it affects their bodies. In particular, she charts how children's interactions with life systems of the soil, air and sun, weather patterns, seasons, the cycles of day and night, animals and mini-beasts can develop their ecological literacy. Children's intense, joyful engagements with non-human life forms help them understand ideas of interdependence and food webs and the interrelatedness of all life. Thus, through maintaining, planting, harvesting and cooking food, digging, pruning, making and spreading compost, collecting and planting seeds, weeding, watering and mulching, children can enter into meaningful relationships with other species to increase awareness of the complexity and interrelatedness of the earth's support life support systems. Food for Green becomes less an object on the table and more a web of material and affective interactions.

Food Relations

These articles and others in the special issue underline the complex relationships we have to food and how food works symbolically, culturally and nutritionally to create connections and performatively make communities. Thus, we can start to see that food is not just something we put in our mouths but constitutes counter-politics, relationship-building, gender-making, and family-making.

While some of the articles hint at the political inequalities of food and eating — particularly in relation to healthism, obesity and neoliberalism — generally they focus on positive, equal sustaining relations in gardening, sharing and cooking foods. In contrast, feminists and critical race theorists in food studies emphasise that cooking, eating and other food practices can 'isolate and divide as much as they can create sociality and cohesion' (Abbots, Lavis, & Attala, 2015, p. 2). For example, meal times do not just

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

provide nourishment but also teach about gendered, classed and radicalised labour, control and violence (Flowers & Swan, 2015b).

Moreover, this work stresses the perfomative aspects of food, cooking and eating. For example, practices such as shopping, cooking and feeding work do not 'take place within a pre-given entity such as the "family" ... but instead the meanings of home and family are produced, reproduced and negotiated through domestic practices' (Hollows, 2008, p. 60). As a result, food practices become performative resources through which people learn about how to 'do' family, gender, race, sexuality and enact specific roles such as being a good mother or grateful child (Flowers & Swan, 2015b). Food practices entail the cultural transmission of who does what in relation to food, what foods mean, how power operates, how gender, class and race are done through food, what being a child means, and how to be a certain kind of group such as a family, activist group or classroom. Such arguments raise important questions in relation to the papers and how food is constructed and theorised.

Struggle and inequality underpin 'feeding work': the gendered, classed and racialised tasks of shopping, cooking, serving, and washing up in the home and eating out (DeVault, 1991). As part of feeding work in the home, women organise their own and family schedules, choose and prepare food that are not their preferences, and do this in order to provide comfort for their children, partners and families. Feminist authors (Charles, 1995; DeVault, 1991, 1999; Hollows, 2008; Valentine, 1999) emphasise how families are suffused with, and constitutive of, social and power relations, including the gendered division of domestic labour. Thus, feminist writers caution us not to romanticise the food and family, or the food and community. Charles (1995) writes: 'sharing food is an important part of family life and a symbol of community', but 'this sharing, although symbolising a community, is not necessarily equal' (p. 101). Furthermore, meal times can be a site of male aggression and domestic violence (Charles, 1995; Lupton, 1996).

The table is, then, a site of accommodation, compromise and conflict (Lupton, 1996). There can be 'tension and friction rather than peace and harmony at mealtimes' (Charles, 1995, p. 109). Food can be used to 'punish, cajole, or reinforce hegemonic or patriarchal structures' (Roth, 2005, p. 182). Conflict can arise when parents view the table as a pedagogical site to insist on their children performing good table manners and eating habits. Men enact domestic violence at the table (Lupton, 1996). Family meal times are not always the site of a happy family, and we can add the community and classroom. How do these politics play out in the food curricula discussed in the articles?

Theorists such as Williams-Forson (2006, 2010; Williams-Forson & Walker, 2013), Guthman (2008a, 2008b, 2011), and Slocum (2007, 2011) insist that racism and racialisation are central to the production, consumption and representation of food and the reproduction of racial inequalities. In her work, Williams-Forson (2006, 2010) documents the under-researched specificities of African-American food practices, and is keen to highlight how for Black women, food has been an integral part of their community building, individual and collective uplift, and feminist consciousness-raising. As she writes, food is 'inseparably tied to race' although how the intersection between food and race is researched varies methodologically and theoretically (Williams-Forson & Walker, 2013, p. 285). Albeit with different emphases and theoretical resources, Guthman (2008a, 2008b, 2011) and Slocum (2007, 2011) examine the Whiteness of so-called alternative food practices and ideas about food justice, with both explicitly theorising Whiteness as a racialised formation in relation to food. In our own work, we discuss the politics and inequalities of multiculturalism food pedagogies and 'eating the other' (Duruz, 2010; Flowers & Swan, 2012a, 2015b; Hage, 1997; Heldke, 2003). In her paper

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

on Maori food politics, Ritchie brings out some of these issues, but overall, race is somewhat neglected in the papers.

Sensory Dis/connections

A key theme in the articles is that authors see the growing of food as a means through which children, urban consumers and young people can learn about food sustainability. In particular, the sensory aspects of gardening and the material properties of plants and soil are imagined to produce new knowledge and affective attachments. Future work in this area could draw on visceral scholarship that challenges us to reflect on the classed and racialised aspects of sensory learning, which are under-explored in the issue (Hayes-Conroy, 2009; Hayes-Conroy & Hayes-Conroy, 2010). This work does not essentialise or individualise smell, taste, sight, hearing and touch, but sees them as historical socio-culturally located practices, performative of race, class and gender. In particular, Hayes-Conroy's (2009) work on teaching and learning in school gardening shows how 'taste education' is classed and racialised and produces differential access to viscerality. Senses and viscera should not be romanticised as presocial in sensory education and food activism, but understood as unequally distributed by class, gender and race.

Denaturalising Nature

A related question is how authors conceptualise food in relation to nature. As is often the case, in the papers, localism, de-industrialism, self-sufficiency and tradition are polarised as self-evident 'goods' in relation to science, and globalisation and industrialised foods as 'evils'. A wholesome view of nature circulates across several of the articles. Vileisis (2004) argues that as food production became intensely industrialised in the 19th century, people imagined that their senses, which provided knowledge about food, were taken over by food science. This led to a nostalgia for rural knowledge and nature, primarily among the middle classes. The countryside was associated with the natural and the pure, in contrast to the city, with its connotations of the synthetic and polluted. As a result, city foods were seen as not natural. We can seem similar resonances in some of the papers.

Indeed, there are complex politics in the way that activists construct the natural (Flowers & Swan, 2012). As Myerson and Appignanesi (2000) write, 'there was never a nature in which all the categories were pure' (p. 37). Indeed, they argue 'we can no longer talk with confidence about "nature" or "culture"' (p. 62). To give a specific example: feminist Donna Haraway critiques the idea of impurity used by food activists in their arguments about genetically modified foods. Haraway (1997) writes, 'it is a mistake in this context to forget that anxieties over the pollution of lineages is at the origin of racist discourse in European cultures' (p. 35). This work asks us to think hard about what we romanticise as authentic or real. Often, alternative food networks invoke a romantic localism that can reproduce inequalities for minority groups and new modes of ethical subjectivities for privileged groups (Parkins & Craig, 2009).

Food Memories

We would like to make a further point about the idea of the sensory and its potential to connect. Several papers hint at the centrality of bodies, but this research could be productively extended through a dialogue with studies on embodied learning and food. For example, anthropologist David Sutton (2001) has researched the 'doing/learning' of cooking through an ethnographic study of women cooking in Greece. He argues that cooking involves an 'embodied apprenticeship' involving cognitive and embodied

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

memory as forms of knowledges. This, for Sutton, is not about remembering a set of rules but involves 'images, tastes, smells and experiences, techniques that can only be partially articulated, or memory-jogged, through the medium of recipes' (p. 135). His argument brings out the sensuousness of knowledge in food production and consumption, but through a close analysis of embodied cooking practices.

Putting Some Other Things on the Table

To bring our commentary to a close, we finish by offering three final provocations on the politics of doing good: race, gender and class, and methodology. In focusing on what we call 'doing good', we interrogate how food educators legitimate their claims. Food pedagogies entail asymmetrical relations of power, authority and expertise. The studies and the curricula in the collection can be seen to reproduce 'moral economies' of knowledge and food practices reproducing categories of 'good' and 'bad' eaters, producers, cooks, teachers and students (Coveney, 2006). Food pedagogies elevate those 'in the know' and their 'good intentions'; and shame classed, gendered and racialised forms of food knowledge, lifestyle and embodiment (Flowers & Swan, 2012a, 2015a). As we write elsewhere, middle-class food pedagogies such as permaculture workshops and cooking classes, voluntarily paid for as leisure pursuits, consolidate classed and racialised hierarchies of taste, 'healthism' and 'doing good' (Flowers & Swan, 2015a). How then do the authors and teachers in the articles see themselves doing good, and on what terms?

The politics of knowing, what is known, who produces it and 'who is in the know' are critical to food reforms. For example, knowledge about what and how to cook is imagined to be on the decline among 'modern' mothers and children and subject to much policy and media commentary (Flowers & Swan, 2012a; Kimura, 2011). Scientific knowledge in the service of corporations — whether in relation to genetically modified foods or the industrialisation of foodstuffs — is constructed as 'bad' knowledge. In the 'locavore' food movement, knowing who made your food and where it hails from, and buying local foods is a political imperative, even though the environmental benefits of food miles is contested and the livelihoods of racialised groups growing food in distant countries rarely discussed. Of course, in all of this, there is a classed, racialised and gendered politics about who is seen as in need of knowledge and who is set up as 'in the know'.

Race, Gender and Class

The most noticeable omissions across the papers were of race, class and gender, the articles by Ritchie and Stovall, Baker-Sperry and Dallinger notwithstanding. We mention earlier that race and racialisation are under-researched and under-theorised in food studies (Flowers & Swan, 2012a, 2012b, 2015d; Freedman, 2011; Guthman 2008a, 2008b; Pandoongpatt, 2011; Slocum, 2011; Williams-Forson, 2006; Williams-Forson & Walker, 2013). As Freedman (2011) notes, the quotidian question 'What should we have for dinner?' is not such a simple, innocent question, because gender, race and class are made and consumed through the production and consumption of everyday meals. Hence, she argues that when we eat food, 'we nourish and maintain our bodies but also produce and reproduce social worlds' (p. 81). Thus, when thinking about bringing sustainable food to the environmental table, we need to theorise the bodies that laboured to plant, harvest, preserve, procure and prepare foods for others, as well as interrogating how these food practices reflect and reproduce social hierarchies (Freedman, 2011, p. 82).

We can extend this challenge to other aspects of environmental education mentioned in the articles. Thus, food scholars critique the racialised and classed politics of white, middle-class alternative food movements (Guthman, 2008a, 2008b; Paddock,

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2011; Slocum, 2007, 2011). In this critique, sustainable and ethical food consumers and activists are shown to make normative judgments about what constitutes 'good' food, diets, production and consumption. For example, Paddock (2011) argues that alternative food practices provide a platform for the reproduction of middle-class identities and culture, leading to the moral derision of working-class people and their food consumption. 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, 2008b; Paddock, 2011). Guthman (2008a, 2008b) and Slocum (2007, 2011) suggest such initiatives reproduce White embodied spaces and political aims that not only ignore racial food inequalities and exclusionary practices, but significantly reconsolidate them. How do these hierachies influence the curricula discussed? Ritchie and Stovall, and Baker-Sperry and Dallinger stress how cooking sustainable food can increase the burden on feminist activists. In her important work on food reform, Aya Kimura (2010) has argued we need to ensure that women are not seen as the problem and solution in food reform, returning women to the domestic sphere.

Furthermore, issues of race, gender and class do not stop at food but are critical for understanding pedagogical relations and educational processes. In this regard, very few of the articles discuss the gendered, racialised and classed practices of teachers or students. For example, educational research on classrooms shows that teachers respond to boys and girls unequally in the classroom, and that boys often dominate space and practices. Accordingly, how did the children and young people acted in gendered, radicalised and classed ways on the field trips and in the classroom? How were the curricula gendered? Keen to address important issues of environmental education, few attended to the unequal and discriminatory performances of gender, class and race by teachers and students. Although positive affects of joy and sharing were profiled, what about shame, greed, competition, racism, and righteousness?

Meaning-Making Potential

To bring our discussion to a conclusion, we finish by raising a point about methodologies, food pedagogies and environmental education. The articles draw on a rich variety of methods. While these provide innovative data, there are still questions about the status of the data and forms of analysis undertaken. For example, we might think more explicitly about theories of multimodal representational processes, meaning-making potential and audience reception (Flowers & Swan, 2011, 2015d). Thus, in cultural studies there are complex debates about how meaning is made and negotiated, indicating that people do not simply uncritically slurp up so-called ideological messages. How might these help us think about how learners negotiate meanings in food and environmental classrooms and media?

How do we know if someone has learned? How do we know what kinds of effects and affects teaching produces? What kinds of methods are needed to examine these processes? How can we bring learners' voices and experiences to the centre of our research. In foregrounding embodiment, affect, habits and capacities, pedagogy studies academics encourage us to scrutinise how forms of conduct, technical and cultural capacities, and ideas and affect are acquired, shaped, fashioned and regulated discursively and materially (Watkins et al., 2015). Several of the papers implicitly write about the importance of affect: Green on children and life forces in gardens; O'Flynn on pleasure cooking with her children; Ritichie on sharing and care. How could we find ways

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to research and analyse how these work as part of education and learning? In their ground-breaking visceral fieldwork, the Hayes-Conroys show how bodies, sensations, moods and feelings are mobilised in alternative food activism (Hayes-Conroy & Hayes-Conroy, 2010). Our bodies, senses, mouths, eyes, tongues, stomachs, noses and hands have all become the targets of teaching across diverse food curricula (Flowers & Swan, 2012a, 2015a). So, how might we find embodied methods and analyses? In her work on dance and disability, Hickey-Moody (2013) emphasises the significance of affect — vibrations, sensations, rhythms and sounds — in cultural pedagogies. In our work we examine visuality in food tourism websites and food activist films, and bodily and emotional 'materials', and stress the role of cognition — the unconscious, habits, imagination, fantasies, desires and dreams (Flowers & Swan, 2015b, 2015d). Noble and colleagues insist that it is through close-up, concrete qualitative study that we can identify how people 'acquire' knowledge, and skills and the cultural resources needed to participate in social and cultural practices such as gardening and localism.

In summary, this special issue develops significant, new knowledge in the field of food studies and environmental education. The collection draws on original empirical studies of diverse education sites and insists that food in its varied manifestations — collective, messy, material, symbolic, sensory, political, embodied — needs to be placed at the centre of debates on sustainability education. Future research should prioritise how food and environmental education conceptualises the concepts of embodiment as well as sustainability. In this vein, we would do well to question, as have the feminists and critical race theorists we cite, and to interrogate the ethics of doing good, and of the versions of bodily over mental and emotional health being promulgated, and think about the many ways in which food forms part of our lives, worlds and inequalities way beyond our eating tables (Berlant, 2010; Mol, 2010).

Keywords: food pedagogies, public pedagogy, cultural pedagogies, everyday pedagogies, food and gender, food and race

References

Abbots, E.J., & Lavis, A. (Eds.). (2013). *Why we eat, how we eat: Contemporary encounters between foods and bodies*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate

Abbots, E.J., Lavis, A., & Attala, L. (Eds.). (2015). *Careful eating: The embodied politics of food*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Adami, E. (2014). *Social taste and meaning at glance: A multimodal framework of aesthetics in webtexts*. London: National Centre for Research Methods Working Paper, Institute of Education.

Appadurai, A. (1986). *The social life of things*. Cambridge: Cambridge Press.

Bacchi, C. (2010, June). *Foucault, policy and rule: Challenging the problem-solving paradigm*. Paper presented at Feminist Research Centre in Aalberg, Denmark.

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* (pp. 26–39). New York and London: New York University Press.

Blair, D. (2009). The child in the garden: An evaluative review of the benefits of school gardening. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, *40*, 15–38.

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

Charles, N. (1995). Food and family ideology. In S. Jackson & S. Moore (Eds.), *The politics of domestic consumption*. Hemel Hempstead, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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

Csurgo, B., Kovach, I., & Kucerova, E. (2008). Knowledge, power and sustainability in contemporary rural Europe. *Sociologia Ruralis*, *48*, 292–312.

DeVault, M. (1991). *Feeding the family: The social organisation of caring as gendered work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

DeVault, M. (1999). Comfort and struggle: Emotion work in family life. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *561*, 52–63.

Duruz, J. (2010). Floating food: Eating 'Asia' in kitchens of the diaspora. *Emotion, Space and Society*, *3*, 45–49.

Flowers, R., & Chodkiewicz, A. (2009a). Developing a more research-oriented and participant-directed learning culture in the Australian environmental movement. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, *49*, 294–317.

Flowers, R., & Chodkiewicz, A. (2009b). Local communities and schools tackling sustainability and climate change. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, *25*, 71–81.

Flowers, R., & Swan, E. (2015a). Food pedagogies: Histories, definitions and moralities. In R. Flowers & E. Swan (Eds.), *Food pedagogies*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Flowers, R., & Swan, E. (2015b). Potatoes in the rice cooker: Family food pedagogies, bodily memories, meal-time senses and racial practices. In R. Flowers & E. Swan (Eds.), *Food pedagogies*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Flowers, R., & Swan, E. (2015c). Multiculturalism as work: The emotional labour of ethnic food tour guides. In E.-J. Abbotts, A. Lavis, & L. Attala (Eds.), *Careful eating: Bodies, food and care*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate: Ashgate.

Flowers, R., & Swan, E. (2015d). *Seeing benevolently: Digital multiculturalism, multimodal meaning-making and ethnic food tour webpages.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Flowers, R., & Swan, E. (2011). 'Eating at us': Representations of knowledge in the activist documentary film *Food, Inc*. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, *43*, 234–250.

Flowers, R., & Swan, E. (2012a). Eating the Asian other? Pedagogies of food multiculturalism in Australia. *PORTAL Journal of Multidisciplinary International Studies*, *9*, 1–30.

Flowers, R., & Swan, E. (2012b). Introduction: Why food?: Why pedagogy?: Why adult education?. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, *52*, 419–433.

Flowers, R., & Swan, E. (2012c). Pedagogies of doing good: Problematisations, authorities, technologies and teleologies in food activism. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, *52*, 532–572.

Fonte, M. (2008). Knowledge, food and place. A way of producing, a way of knowing. *Sociologia Ruralis, 48*, 200–222.

Freedman, D. (2011). Embodying Food Studies: Unpacking the ways we become what we eat. In M.J. Casper & P. Currah (Eds.), *Corpus: an interdisciplinary reader on bodies and knowledge* (pp. 81–93). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gallegos, D. (2005). Cookbooks as manuals of taste. In D. Bell & J. Hollows (Eds.), *Ordinary lifestyles: Popular media, consumption and taste* (pp. 99–110). Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

Galutsky, W. (2010). 'Playing Chicken: Technologies of Domestication, Food, and Self' in *Science as Culture*, *19*, 15–35.

Goodman, D., & DuPuis, M. (2002). Knowing food and growing food: Beyond the production-consumption debate in the sociology of agriculture. *Sociologia Ruralis*, *42*, 5–22.

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Goodman, M.K., Boykoff, M.T., & Evered, K.T. (Eds.). (2008). *Contentious geographies: Environmental knowledge, meaning, scale*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate
Guthman, J. (2008a). Bringing good food to others: Investigating the subjects of alternative food practice. *Cultural Geographies*, *15*, 431–447.
Guthman, J. (2008b). 'If they only knew': Color blindness and universalism in California alternative food institutions. *The Professional Geographer*, *60*, 387–397.
Guthman, J. (2011). If they only knew. The unbearable whiteness of alternative food. In A.H. Alkon & J. Agyeman (Eds.), *Cultivating food justice: Race, class and sustainability* (pp. 263–281). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Hage, G. (1997). At home in the entrails of the west: Multiculturalism, ethnic food and migrant home-building. In G. Hage, L. Johnson, J. Langsworth, & M. Symonds (Eds.), *Home/world: Space, community and marginality in Sydney's west* (pp. 99–153). Sydney, Australia: Pluto Press.
Haraway, D. (1997). *Modest witness at second millennium. FemaleMan meets OncoMouse: Feminism and technoscience*. London: Routledge.
Hayes-Conroy, J. (2009). *Visceral reactions: Alternative food and social difference in American and Canadian schools*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, PA.
Hayes-Conroy, J., & Hayes-Conroy, A. (2010). Visceral geographies: Mattering, relating, and defying. *Geography compass*, *4*, 1273–1283.
Heldke, L. (2003). *Exotic appetites: Ruminations of a food adventurer*. London and New York: Routledge.
Hickey-Moody, A. (2013). Affect as method: Feelings, aesthetics and affective pedagogy. In R. Coleman & J. Ringrose (Eds.). *Deleuze and research methodologies* (pp. 79–95). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Hickey-Moody, A., Savage, G., & Windle, J. (2010). Pedagogy writ large: Public, popular and cultural pedagogies in motion. *Critical Studies in Education*, *51*, 227–236.
Hollows, J. (2003). Oliver's Twist leisure, labour and domestic masculinity in *The Naked Chef*. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, *6*, 229–248.
Hollows, J. (2008). *Domestic cultures*. Maidenhead, UK: McGraw-Hill.
Johnston, J., & Baumann, S. (2010). *Foodies: Democracy and distinction in the gourmet foodscape*. London/New York: Routledge.
Kimura, A.H. (2011). Food education as food literacy: Privatized and gendered food knowledge in contemporary Japan. *Agriculture and Human Values*, *28*, 465–482.
Leahy, D., & Pike, J. (2015). Just say no to pies: Food pedagogies, health education and governmentality. In R. Flowers & E. Swan (Eds.), *Food pedagogies*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
Lewis, T. (2011). Making over culture? Lifestyle television and contemporary pedagogies of selfhood in Singapore. *Communication, Politics & Culture*, *41*, 21–32.
Lindenfeld, L. (2010). Can documentary food films like *Food Inc.* achieve their promise? *Environmental Communication*, *4*, 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* (pp. 166–178). London: Routledge.
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, Australia: Psychology Press.
Lupton, D. (1996). *Food, the body and the self*. London: Sage.
Mennell, S. (1997). On the civilizing of appetite. In C. Counihan & P. van Esterik (Eds.), *Food and culture: A reader* (pp. 315–337). New York: Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mol, A. (2010). Moderation or satisfaction? Food ethics and food facts. In S. Vandamme, S. van de Vathorst, & I. de Beaufort (Eds.), *Whose weight is it anyway? Essays on ethics and eating* (pp. 121–132). Leuven: Acco Academic Publishers.

Myerson, G., & Appignanesi, R. (2000). *Donna Haraway and GM foods*. Cambridge, UK: Icon.

Noble, G. (2004, December). *Pedagogies of the everyday*. Paper presented at the Cultural Studies Association of Australasia annual conference, Murdoch University, Fremantle, Australia.

Noble, G. (2012). *Pedagogies of civic belonging*. Unpublished manuscript.

Paddock, J. (2011). *Class, food, culture: Exploring 'alternative' food consumption.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cardiff University, UK.

Pandoongpatt, T.M. (2011). Too hot to handle: Food, empire and race in Thai Los Angeles. *Radical History Review*, *110*, 83–108.

Parkins, W., & Craig, G. (2009). Culture and the politics of alternative food networks. *Food, Culture & Society*, *12*, 77–103.

Pike, J., & Leahy, D. (2012). School food and the pedagogies of parenting. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, *52*, 434–459.

Rich, E. (2011). 'I see her being obesed!': Public pedagogy, reality media and the obesity crisis. *Health*, *15*, 3–21.

Rich, E., & Evans, J. (2015). Where's the pleasure? Exploring the meanings and experiences of pleasure in school-based food pedagogies. In R. Flowers & E. Swan (Eds.), *Food pedagogies*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Rose, N. (1996). *Inventing our selves: Psychology, power and personhood*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Roth, L.A.K. (2005). 'Beef. It's what's for dinner': Vegetarians, meat-eaters and the negotiation of familial relationships. *Food, Culture and Society*, *8*, 181–200.

Rousseau, S. (2012). *Food media: Celebrity chefs and the politics of everyday interference*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Rozin, P. (1996). Towards a psychology of food and eating: From motivation to module to model to marker, morality, meaning, and metaphor. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *5*, 18–24.

Sandlin, J.A., O'Malley, M.P., & Burdick, J. (2011). Mapping the complexity of public pedagogy scholarship 1894–2010. *Review of Educational Research*, *81*, 338–375.

Slocum, R. (2007). Whiteness, space and alternative food practice. *Geoforum*, *38*, 520–533.

Slocum, R. (2011). Race in the study of food. *Progress in Human Geography*, *35*, 303–327.

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.

Sumner, J. (2015). Learning to eat with attitude: Critical food pedagogies. In R. Flowers & E. Swan (Eds.), *Food pedagogies*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Sutton, D. (2001). *Remembrance of repasts: An anthropology of food and memory*. Oxford: Berg.

Swan, E. (2012). Cleaning up? Transnational corporate femininity and dirty work in magazine culture. In R. Simpson, N. Slutskaya, P. Lewis, & H. Hopfi (Eds.), *Dirty work: Concepts and identities* (pp. 182–202). London: Palgrave McMillan.

Swan, E. (2013). Cooking up a storm: Politics, labour and bodies. *Leisure/Loisir*, *37*, 433–443.

Valentine, G. (1999). Eating in home, consumption and identity. *The Sociological Review*, *47*, 492–524.

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Vileisis, A. (2004). *Kitchen literacy: How we lost knowledge of where food comes from and why we need to get it back*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
Watkins, M., Noble, G., & Driscoll, C. (2015). *Cultural pedagogies and human conduct*. London: Routledge.
Williams-Forson, P. (2010). Other women cooked for my husband: Negotiating gender, food, and identities in an African American/Ghanaian Household. *Feminist Studies*, *36*, 435–461.
Williams-Forson, P.A. (2006). *Building houses out of chicken legs: Black women, food, and power*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
Williams-Forson, P.A., & Walker, J. (2013). Food and race: An overview. In K. Albala (Ed.), *Routledge international handbook of food studies* (pp. 282–292). London and New York: Routledge.

Rick Flowers was Head of Adult Education and Postgraduate Programs in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University of Technology Sydney for six years, and before that Director of the Centre for Popular Education at the University of Technology, Sydney from 1999 to 2007, which undertook research in environmental education and advocacy, community cultural development, health education and community development, the pedagogy and politics of working with young people, union and community organising, and community leadership. Rick is currently collaborating with Elaine Swan. Drawing on Rick's research on collective action and learning, and Elaine's work on whiteness, gender and public pedagogies, they are developing a major research program on food pedagogies. They have edited a special issue on Food Pedagogies for the *Australian Journal of Adult Learning* (2012), and written journal papers about food activism, culinary tour guiding, the internet and food multiculturalism. Rick plans to extend a research agenda that focuses on everyday, cultural and public pedagogies. His work has been influenced by scholarship in the field of popular education.

Elaine Swan is the author of *Worked up Selves* (Palgrave), on the interface between therapeutic cultures and the workplace, and *Gender and Diversity in the* Workplace (with Caroline Gatrell, Sage). Recent papers include 'Cooking up a Storm: Politics, Labour and Bodies' in a Special Issue of *Leisure/Loisir* on Food and Leisure, 'States of White Ignorance, and Audit Masculinity in English Higher Education', (Social Politics), 'Commodity Diversity and Smiling Faces' (*Organization).* With Rick Flowers she has been researching food pedagogies under the umbrella of a program on everyday, cultural and public pedagogy, out of which they have published an edited volume entitled *Food Pedagogies* (Ashgate), an article, 'Eating the Asian other? Pedagogies of Food Multiculturalism in Australia' (*Portal Journal of Multidisciplinary International Studies)* and and co-edited a special issue of the *Australian Journal of Adult Learning* on Food Pedagogies. Her work is underpinned by the concept of pedagogy, inspired by Carmen Luke's wonderful book *Feminism and the Pedagogies of Everyday Life*, and always influenced by critical race theorist and feminist writers, including Sara Ahmed, Catriona Elder, Charles Mills, and Beverley Skeggs. Working with Rick, she is starting research on multiculturalism as work, which will examine unpaid labour, body work and pedagaogies, with case studies on food tours, food festivals and food social enterprises.

https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2015.27 Published online by Cambridge University Press