Australian Journal of Adult Learning
Volume 52, Number 3, November 2012

Guest editorial

Introduction: Why food? Why pedagogy? Why adult education?

Rick Flowers and Elaine Swan
University of Technology, Sydney

We convened this special issue on *Food pedagogies* to start to address what we saw as lacunae in both research on adult education and food studies. Thus, in spite of the expanding body of work on informal learning and pedagogies amongst adult educators, food as an object, site, target and 'technology' of education and learning has been relatively neglected (see Cook 2009, Jubas 2011 and Sumner 2011, for exceptions). This is somewhat surprising as many food studies academics argue: the growing, buying, preparing, provisioning, cooking, tasting, eating and disposing of food have become the target of intensified pedagogical activity across a range of domains (Kimura 2011; Short 2006; Coveney 2006). Hence, many different 'pedagogues' – policy makers, churches, activists, health educators, schools, tourist agencies, celebrities, chefs – think we don't know enough about food and what to do with it. 'Technologies'

of learning and teaching about food range from cookbooks, to life-style and cooking programmes, health promotion projects, recipe cards in supermarkets, food labelling, grower's markets, nutrition guides and community gardens. This means that we could argue that adult educators can include: retailers, farmers, chefs, people who cook at home, public health practitioners, advertisers, food writers and 'foodies'. Some of the groups involved in food pedagogies are powerful actors with clear educational aims and intents and they include the food industry, health authorities, nutritionists, research scientists, advertisers and media chefs.

In the interdisciplinary field of food studies - which includes geography, anthropology, history, and sociology - terms such as pedagogy and learning have been invoked to denote proliferations and intensifications of, and shifts in, expertise and knowledge about food. There has also been discussion on the politics of these new sites and formats of education but with relatively little focused theoretical or empirical exploration on the nature of the pedagogies themselves (see also Noble 2004). In contrast, there is a growing literature on 'public pedagogy' which seeks to examine education and learning outside of the classroom as performed through institutions, signs and media which, we argue, can help us typologise and classify contemporary processes of teaching people about food. This literature can help us prise open the pedagogical aims, content, mechanism, effects and relations of different food teaching, education and learning. Thus, we can start to analyse:

- the specificities of 'technologies' of teaching about food: from cooking programs, food labelling, grower's markets, and nutrition guides;
- the pedagogues who claim to 'educate' us about food, which now includes a growing litany of cultural intermediaries / occupational groups such as farmers, chefs, food writers, food bloggers, health practitioners and advertisers;

- government and corporate organisations such as local councils, health agencies, food advocacy groups, and supermarkets;
- media such as women's magazines, internet sites, online short films, recipe repositories, activist newsletters and food labels; and
- policy instruments such as national food plans, labelling guidelines, and nutrition edicts.

Hence, we can now argue that the food 'classroom' can be the farm, TV, garden, and online short films. Our bodies, senses, mouths, eyes, tongues, stomachs, noses and hands, have all become the targets of teaching, and even teachers in their own right, across diverse food curricula. Drawing on a range of political and theoretical perspectives, the collection of papers in this special issue seeks to analyse the cultural politics of food pedagogies by examining pedagogical content, techniques, relations, curricula; and constructions of teachers and learners across a number of empirical sites and regional contexts.

To date, the term itself - food pedagogies - has had very little circulation in adult education and wider social theory, although it is beginning to get some traction. In the field of adult education, Jennifer Sumner in Canada is one of the first to deploy it in her teaching at the University of Toronto where it is a Masters level adult education subject. In 2009, the influential American food studies theorist, Associate Professor Julie Guthman, who has written some of the most challenging research on race, class, gender and food reform, uses the term 'radical food pedagogy' in an interview entitled 'On Globalisation, Neoliberalism, Obesity, Local Food and Education' in the online journal *Politics and Culture*. In the interview, she argues that a radical food pedagogy would interrogate why food is being studied by students from privileged backgrounds. We ourselves only started to use the term in 2011 as a core concept in our research, with a number of seminars, and in the call for papers for this special issue, and subsequent journal papers (see reference list). In 2009 a symposium entitled *Food Pedagogy* was held in

Berlin by two Norwegian health and sports academics but focusing on more traditional use of the term in relation to training teachers in food, sports and health studies (Palovaara-Soberg & Thuv 2009). There has been some use of the term in relation to schools; so in the USA, Jessica Hayes-Conroy (2009) who has published on visceral fieldwork, focused on school gardens for her doctorate and chapter six was entitled food pedagogy; in Australia, Monica Green has published on school gardens and pedagogies of food (2008: 11). Activists are also beginning to use the term; for example, there is reference on a web site for an ecologically sustainable farm in the USA, called Ecotone. The term bio-pedagogy - after Foucault's term biopower - has been used for some time in relation to concerns about the so-called obesity epidemic and associated educational initiatives, particularly in schools, led by Jan Wright in Australia who set up a bio-pedagogies research consortium in 2007 and co-edited a book in 2009 (Wright & Harwood 2009). More recently, Emma Rich (2011) also writing about obesity on reality TV uses the term public pedagogy.

Of courses, assertions about what constitutes the 'right' food curricula vary across these widely different pedagogies. As the papers by Helen Benny, John Coveney, and Jo Pike and Deana Leahy in this special issue argue, according to public health practitioners, policy makers, teachers and TV chefs, one area that is deemed to require educational intervention is 'food skills,' which are widely imagined to be on the decline, particularly in the case of working class mothers; whereas, for so-called 'foodies,' good 'taste' is associated with caring about certain classed and racialised 'food knowledge' and learning about novel food, restaurants and ingredients (Johnston and Baumann 2010). For ethical and sustainable food activists, their concern is that we need to understand the provenance of our food. And in the 'locavore' food movement, knowing who made your food and where it hails from is seen as a political and moral citizenship imperative.

Not only is food an *object* of learning, but it is also a *vehicle* for learning. So food studies emphasises food consumption as a cultural, place-based, relational and social practice. As a range of food theorists (for example, Lupton 1996, Jackson 2009, Bell and Valentine 2006) argue food consumption involves social relationships, kinship and intimate relations, collective identities, gift exchange, and social interaction. This body of work underscores the importance of understanding the role of affect, bodies, desire, fantasy, memory, ethics, risk, anxiety, and family relations in food culture. How then might these play out in relation to food pedagogies in gendered, classed and racialised ways? There has also been a turn to sensory pedagogy emphasising how taste, touch and smell are critical to learning about food and culture, but are also not acultural and are classed, gendered and racialised (Sutton 2001). In relation to race, food is often seen by policy makers, tourist agencies and educators as 'multicultural pedagogy', a practice of intercultural bonding. The politics of what has been called 'colonial food adventuring' and 'eating the other' is much debated (Duruz 2005; Flowers & Swan 2012; Heldke 2003). These analyses from food studies raise important issues for adult education scholarship about the pedagogic sites, processes, relations and politics of doing gender, bodies, class, race, citizenship, ethics and family through food consumption, food preparation, and food rituals, and the way these are taught and learned across a range of sites, public and everyday pedagogies, informal and formal educational practices and technologies.

In sum, then, commentators assert that through food we are taught about power, culture, bodies, gender, class, race, status, identity, pleasure, pain, labour, health, morality, our place in the world; as is often said, 'who and what we are'. Across food pedagogies then we have different pedagogic regimes, pedagogic encounters, politics, inequalities and educator-learner relations. Of course in all of this, there is a politics to who is seen as in need of educating and who is set up as 'in the know'.

Of course, we could refer to terms such as 'food education', 'food and informal learning' or 'food literacies'. But we prefer the term 'food pedagogy' for a variety of reasons? So why the term 'pedagogy'? In the past ten years, social theorists have turned to the analytic tool of 'pedagogy' using it in a broader sense beyond classroom teaching practices in schools and universities to examine the proliferation and intensification of teaching, learning, curricula, training and education outside of educational institutions (Luke 1996; Hickey-Moodey, Savage & Windle 2010; Flowers & Swan, 2012; Swan 2012). We might say there is a pedagogical turn. But following Carmen Luke's work (1996) we conceptualise pedagogy on different terms than in traditional educational theory where typically pedagogy is defined in terms of formal curricula, classroom processes and educational institutions. Instead we define pedagogy as the sites, processes and technologies of learning and teaching that happen outside of formal educational systems (Sandlin, Schultz & Burdick 2010; Luke 1996). Pedagogical sites are now seen to include mass media, popular culture, museums, art galleries, public policy projects, welfare institutions, health, community activities, reality TV, psy practices, the internet, screen technologies and media, and social networking sites. The term 'public pedagogy' is used to refer to 'top down' educative influences through cultural forms and 'bottom up' teaching and learning in communities, hobby groups and social movements (Sandlin et al. 2010); 'everyday' pedagogy is used by feminists to explore the gendering processes in the home and family (Luke, 1992) and 'cultural pedagogies' to refer to 'learning' about social axes of difference (Hickey-Moodey, Savage & Windle 2010). Informal sites of learning now include popular culture, museums, the internet, magazines, social movements, mass media, social media and the home (Luke 1996; Sandlin, Schultz & Burdick 2010; Ellsworth 2005; Giroux 2004; Swan 2009 & 2012).

We use the term 'food pedagogies' because it is capacious enough to denote a range of sites, processes, curricula, 'learners' and even

types of human and non-human 'teachers' but tight enough to refer to some kind of intended or emergent change in behaviour, habit, emotion, cognition, and/or knowledge at an individual, family, group or collective level. Thus, we use the term to mean more than the extension of sites of learning to the outside of classrooms. Pedagogy also implies but does not define a priori the power relations involved in educative and learning technologies and processes. Part of the analysis of the politics of pedagogies involves locating them within wider social, cultural and political relations of power. Thus Carmen Luke emphasises that pedagogy cannot be conceived as an isolated inter-subjective event where one analyses the dyadic relations of teaching and learning: rather it 'is fundamentally defined by and a product of a network of historical, political, sociocultural, and knowledge relations' (1996: 130). 'Food pedagogies' refer to a congeries of education, teaching and learning about how to grow, shop for, prepare, cook, display, taste, eat and dispose of food by a range of agencies, actors and media; and aimed a spectrum of 'learners' including middle class women, migrants, children, parents, shoppers, and racially minoritised and working class mothers. We know that the term 'food pedagogies' has clear resonance with adult education scholars because there were 29 abstracts submitted to the special issue.

In this special issue and future research, including a forthcoming edited book on *Food pedagogies* (Flowers & Swan 2013), we intend to interrogate the multiple conceptualisations of food, skills, knowledges and expertise across a range of fields of practices, domains and contexts and to delineate the particularity of their teaching technologies, educational aims, content, curricula and constructions of teachers and learners. Our aim always is to identify the politics of food pedagogies. It is also the focus for all of the papers in this special issue, although they define politics in different ways.

In their paper on 'School food and the pedagogies of parenting', **Jo Pike** from the University of Leeds in the UK and **Deana Leahy** from Southern Cross University in Australia examine how mothers are morally positioned in relation to formal and informal food pedagogies and school food in classed and gendered ways. They undertook ethnographic research in classrooms and school dining rooms; interviews with head teachers and school-meals staff, and employed participatory methods with children aged 4-6 and 10-11 in Australia and the UK. Working through Foucault's notion of governmentality, they focus, in particular, on what they refer to as the 'pedagogies of the school lunchbox' – an 'assemblage of governmental techniques and strategies' – through which governments attempt to direct certain types of mothers – working class mothers - to include or remove certain foods and drinks from their children's lunches. Arguing that much current literature on food pedagogies in schools focuses on children, they focus their attention on the pedagogies which are 'pedagogicalising parents.' In particular they show how the so-called obesity epidemic has rendered the lunchbox, and working class mothers, the subject of intense surveillance. Their conclusion is that these school food pedagogies are forms of moral regulation which pathologise working class mothers as unhealthy and less capable at looking after their children's food and health.

Shifting to a different country, institutional site and learner, the next paper, 'Throw your napkin on the floor: Authenticity, culinary tourism, and a pedagogy of the senses', by **Lisa Stowe** and **Dawn Johnston** from the University of Calgary in Canada, turns to the politics of culinary tourism on their third year undergraduate subject *Food culture* in Spain which involves taking students to Spain for a three-week trip. In their paper, they analyse the formal, informal and incidental learning, and in particular, the sensory learning that the undergraduates experience eating in city and rural restaurants and bars, and visiting a family-run olive press. Drawing on the students' assessments and interviews with students, Stowe and

Johnston carefully interrogate the concepts of 'eating the other' and 'authenticity' – which are much debated concepts in food studies, particularly in relation to the power dynamics of consuming ethnic foods. They show how the students learn new ways to eat, shop and cook back in Canada as a result of cognitive and bodily learning in Spain. In particular, through sensory pedagogies of tasting olives, raspberry sorbet and salty tuna for the first time, drinking in noisy crowded bars and seeing olive oil being pressed, the students actively and critically reflect on what it means to define Spanish culture and food, and their own tourist experiences as authentic.

The next paper, entitled 'A critical race and class analysis of learning in the organic farming movement' by **Catherine Etmanski** from Royal Roads University in Canada, brings in new pedagogical actors: she shows how organic farmers are educators; activists are learners; and farms are pedagogical sites. Taking forward the theme of class analysis introduced by Pike and Leahy, Etmanski argues, using critical race theorists, and food studies theorists Julie Guthman and Rachel Slocum, that we need to attend to whiteness, privilege and race in the organic food movement. Positioning herself as an adult educator committed to social justice, Etmanski is keen to ask how anti-racist and Indigenous Rights perspectives might be brought to bear on the small-scale organic farming pedagogical initiative. The paper is based on ethnographic work she undertook as an apprentice on farms, engaging in a particular kind of learning, getting her hands dirty and being taught about crop diversity, permaculture, animal welfare and soil health. Her main question is how the Eurocentric organic farming movement can learn from and work with the Indigenous food sovereignty movements in Canada but also internationally.

From Canada and the organic farming movement and its farmer-educators, we now turn to Japan and its recent law, 'shokuiku kihonhō', which aims to reform food production and consumption

through food pedagogies. This is discussed in a paper by **Cornelia Reiher** from the University of Halle in Germany, entitled 'Food pedagogies in Japan: From the implementation of the Basic Law on Food Education to Fukushima'. Reiher's main focus is two-fold: to examine how the Fukushima nuclear disaster has affected food knowledge being promulgated by the government. She argues that knowledge about food safety from consumer co-ops and radioactivity measurement has been marginalised in official food pedagogies. Her overall argument is that the food law focuses too much on domestic food producers, nutrition and cooking and reproduces the view that Japanese food is safer than imported food. She sums up her paper by concluding that the Japanese state leaves consumers with an impoverished knowledge about food safety.

In our paper (**Rick Flowers** and **Elaine Swan**) which we have called 'Pedagogies of doing good: Problematisations, authorities, technologies and teleologies in food activism', we analyse data from a roundtable we organised with food activist educators from Australia, using a framework from Nikolas Rose. Our paper has two aims: first to add a new framework as a means for analysing adult education and learning approaches to draw attention to different kinds of power in educational work, and secondly, to use it to commence a meta-analysis of food activist pedagogies in particular. Using Rose's work, we focus of the politics of 'doing good', how educators legitimate and authorise their pedagogical efforts. Applying the framework in a detailed and concrete way to three types of food activist pedagogies, we examine the diversity of knowledges about food, health and education they drew on and what these mean for how 'doing good' relates to race, gender and class in relation to food and learning.

Pierre Walter, from the University of British Columbia in Canada, turns our attention to adult learning sites in the food movement in USA, in his paper entitled 'Educational alternatives in food production, knowledge and consumption: The public pedagogies of

Growing Power and *Tsyunhehw^*. Building on Etmanski's concern that organic farming pedagogies have not attended to issues of race and class sufficiently, Pierre analyses two alternative food initiatives based in Wisconsin in the US: *Growing Power*, an urban farm in an impoverished African American neighbourhood, and *Tsyunhehkw^*, an integrated food system of the Native American Oneida Nation. Drawing on site visits, documentary analysis and digital research, Walter analyses the production of an 'imagined public pedagogy' across these media. He argues that these initiatives constitute anti-racist, decolonising public pedagogies which disrupt the whiteness and middle-class foundations of food movements. While this is an important step forward, he concludes by asking, however, how much they have attended to gender oppression in their educational work.

The next paper – 'When traditions become innovations and innovations become traditions in everyday food pedagogies' – by **Helen Benny** from Swinburne University of Technology in Australia, continues to ask questions about the relationship between food, learning and ethnicity. The pedagogical spaces she focuses on are the domestic, work and leisure settings in Melbourne, Australia. Utilising a perspective termed 'everyday multiculturalism' (Wise & Velayutham 2009) which looks at the lived experience of diversity on the ground in everyday encounters, as opposed to state and policy ordained multiculturalism, Benny explores the food memories of three Australian women. They are Nadia, Anita and Simone who are of different ages and ethnicities. Benny examines the dynamics of tradition and innovation in 'ethnic' cooking and eating through what she terms pedagogies of innovation and pedagogies of preservation. This focus offers insights into the nature of everyday learning processes in 'ethnic' cultures and food traditions.

The final paper is by **John Coveney**, **Andrea Begley** and **Danielle Gallegos**, food historians of nutrition at three Australian universities. In this paper, 'Savoir Fare: Are cooking skills a new

morality?', the authors build on the body of work using Foucauldian analyses of nutritional approaches as forms of governmentality over the twentieth and twenty-first century. They use the term 'savoir fare' to get at the types of authoritative knowledges which are seen to constitute the expert endorsed know-how and know-what-about of cooking in the US, UK and Australia. Historicizing the idea currently circulating in health, education and public policy that cooking skills are on the decline, they argue that there is a proliferation of social technologies such as food literacy programs and cooking TV programs which position cooking skills as life skills. These are not just food pedagogies though, but constitute moral pedagogies which define what constitutes 'good cooking.' And they argue the result is a powerful food and family morality that is both 'disciplined and disciplinary'.

How does a focus on food pedagogies open up how we conceptualise and research adult education and adult learning? We can see through the special issue that it enables us to enrich the depth of our understanding of informal learning and the sites and processes through which education and learning take place from the kitchen to the TV to the school lunch. Theoretical perspectives in food studies bring new vocabularies, concepts, methodologies into dialogue with current thinking in adult education. It provides us with clear examples of educational work to do with food across a rich set of sites and methods. In this special issue, we can see how authors draw on digital research, media analysis, Foucauldian influence analytics, historical and documentary research and ethnographic methods. Future research in adult education and food studies could investigate the reception of these aims by 'intended learners' in closer detail.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank

- Roger Harris, editor of the *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, for supporting this special issue and his editorial advice
- the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Cosmopolitan Civil Societies Research Centre, University of Technology, Sydney for funding our 'food pedagogies' research
- Greg Noble, University of Western Sydney, for conversations and his unpublished papers about the concept of pedagogy
- Jennifer Sumner for her pioneering work in this field

References

Bell, D. & Valentine, G. (2007). *Consuming geographies*, London: Routledge

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

Cook, S. (2009). *New spaces and new places: Adult education and the creation of alternative foodscapes*, Graduate Food Discussions Paper Series, Ryerson University, Canada, vol. 1, Fall: 19-31.

Duruz, J. (2005). 'Eating at the borders: Culinary journeys,' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 23, no. 1: 51–69.

Ellsworth. E. (2005). *Places of learning: Media, architecture, pedagogy*, New York: RoutledgeFarmer.

Flowers, R, & Swan, E. (2012). 'Eating the Asian other? Pedagogies of food multiculturalism in Australia', *Portal Journal of Multidisciplinary International Studies*. vol. 9, no. 2.

Flowers, R. & Swan, E. (eds.) (2013, forthcoming). *Food pedagogies*, London: Ashgate.

Giroux, H. A., and McLaren, P. (1994). *Between borders: Pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies*. London: Routledge.

Green, M. (2008). *Food gardens: Cultivating a pedagogy of place*, AARE Conference November 2007: 1-11.

Guthman, J. (2009). On globalization, neoliberalism, obesity, local food and education interviewed by Scott Stoneman, in *Politics and Culture*, issue 2.

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.

Heldke, L. (2003). *Exotic appetites: Ruminations of a food adventurer*. Routledge, London.

Hickey-Moody, A. Savage, G. & Windle, J. (2010). Pedagogy writ large: public, popular and cultural pedagogies in motion', *Critical Studies in Education*, vol. 51, no. 3: 227-236.

Johnston, J, and Baumann, S. (2010). *Foodies: Democracy and distinction in the gourmet foodscape*. New York: Routledge.

Jubas, K. (2011). 'Shopping for identity: Articulations of gender, race and class by critical consumers', *Social Identities*, vol. 17, no.3: 321-335.

Kimura, A. (2011). 'Food education as food literacy: Privatised and gendered food knowledge in contemporary Japan', *Agriculture and Human Values*, vol, 28: 465-482.

Luke, C, (1996). *Feminisms and pedagogies of everyday life*, New York: Suny Press.

Lupton, D. (1996). *Food, the body and the self*, London: Sage.

Jackson, P. (2009) (ed.). *Changing families, changing food*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Noble, G. (2004). 'Pedagogies of the everyday', paper given at CSAA.

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.

Rich, E. (2011). 'I see her being obesed: Public pedagogy, reality media and the obesity crisis', *Health*, 15(1), 3-21.

Sandlin, J., Schultz, B. & Burdick, J. (2011) (eds.). *Handbook of public pedagogy: Education and learning beyond schooling*, New York: Routledge.

Short, F (2006). *Kitchen secrets: The meaning of cooking in everyday life*, Berg, Oxford; New York.

Swan, E. (2012). 'Cleaning up? Transnational corporate feminity and dirty work in magazine culture', in Ruth Simpson, Natasha Slutskaya, Patricia Lewis, Heather Hopfl (eds.), *Dirty work: Concepts and identities*, Houndsmill Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan: 182-202.

Sumner, J. (2011). 'The pedagogy of food', Master's degree subject at Ontario Institute of Education Studies, University of Toronto, Canada.

Swan, E. (2009). *Worked up selves: Personal development workers, self-work and therapeutic cultures*, Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

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.

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

Wise, A. & Velayutham, S. (2009). 'Introduction: Multiculturalism and everyday life', in Wise, A & Velayutham, S (eds.), *Everyday multiculturalism*, Houndsmill Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wright, J. & Harwood, V. (2009) (eds.). *Biopolitics and the "obesity epidemic": Governing bodies*. New York: Routledge.