

Australian Food, Society and Culture Network Symposium, 26 July 2013

10.00 am - 10.15 am:	Welcome and opening remarks Deborah Lupton (University of Sydney)
10.15 am- 10.45 am	<p>'It's the mother's responsibility': a critical analysis of a citizens' jury assessment of banning food sponsorship of children's sports</p> <p>John Coveney (Flinders University), Elizabeth House (Flinders University), Julie Henderson (Flinders University), Samantha Meyer (Flinders University), Rachel Ankeny (University of Adelaide), Michael Calnan (University of Kent) and Paul Ward (Flinders University)</p> <p>Deliberative engagement techniques and citizens' juries are touted as means of incorporating the public into policy decision-making, managing community expectations and increasing commitment to public health policy. This paper reports a study to examine the feasibility of citizens' juries as a means of collecting data to inform public health policy through evaluation of the conduct of a citizens' jury about food regulation. A citizens' jury was conducted with a representative sample of 17 South Australians to explore their willingness to consider the proposition that food and drink advertising and/or sponsorship should be banned at children's sporting events. The results showed that, in relation to the central proposition and evaluation data from the jury, most jurors indicated that they thought that food and drink sponsorship and/or advertising at children's sporting events would have little or no effect on altering children's diet and eating habits, with the proportion increasing during the jury process.</p> <p>Parents, especially mothers, were seen as having the main - and according to some jurors, sole - responsibility for governing children's eating habits. The role of food industry in marketing unhealthy foods to children was underplayed. The citizens' jury provided a valuable insight into decision-making by lay groups, especially in relation to responsibilities in promoting unhealthy foods to children.</p>
10.45 am- 11.15 am	<p>Articulating appetite: obesity and children's embodied experiences of food and hunger</p> <p>Jessie Gunson, Megan Warin and Vivienne Moore (University of Adelaide)</p> <p>Children from low socio-economic backgrounds have been made a significant priority in government obesity interventions. Such programs tend to focus on promoting change in food and exercise practices. This paper reports findings from qualitative, ethnographic research with children aged 10-14 to explore how they engage with a large</p>

	<p>government funded obesity prevention program. We propose that central to children's experiences of food, particularly in low socio-economic settings, is the acute negotiation and management of hunger. We argue that attention to both the embodied and social impacts of hunger on children is key in forming more complex, contextualised understandings of obesity.</p>
11.15 am - 11.45 am	<p>Time to eat: a tale from three generations Cathy Banwell, Jane Dixon, Dorothy Broom and Anna Davies (Australian National University)</p> <p>The preparation and consumption of family meals has changed considerably over the lifetime of three generations of Australians as their perceptions and practices related to time and busyness have shifted. This paper draws on in-depth interviews with a stratified, random sample of 111 male and female Australians aged between 67 and 83 (the Lucky Generation) who were recruited for in-depth interviews from an existing large longitudinal cohort. This group and 28 of their children (Baby Boomers) and 12 of their grandchildren (Generation Y) were asked how aspects of their lives have changed over their lifetime. Their reflections, representing an 80 year time span (1920s to mid-2000s) shows that the content, timing and structure of family meals and other family activities were remarkably stable and consistent until the 1980s. Around this time, when Baby Boomers were raising their Gen Y children, a rise in perceptions of time pressure and busyness influenced these features to produce the modern family meal, a much more flexible but still valued occasion</p>
11.45 am- 12.15 pm	<p>Policing women through policy: analysis of Australian consumption guidelines for pregnant women, 1985-present Rachel A. Ankeny (University of Adelaide) and Catherine Kevin (Flinders University)</p> <p>An extensive scholarly literature exists exposing the various explicit and implicit ways that policies and practices are used to patrol women's behaviours, and how responsibility and blame are apportioned in relation to these behaviours. However limited attention has been paid specifically to how dietary guidelines and policies have been used to influence pregnant women's behaviours in Australia. This paper provides a policy analysis with regard to consumption practices during pregnancy from 1985 to present, including alcohol, folic acid, and diet, with particular attention to how concepts of risk, harm, and responsibility have been articulated. It argues that at the same time as appearing to provide precise and certain information about risk, these governmental policies have been subject to frequent change: where uncertainty exists in the scientific evidence, risk aversion reigns.</p>

1.00 pm- 1.30 pm	<p>'Aussie kids are Weet-bix kids': Breakfast as a symbol of 'a good start'</p> <p>Tanya Zivkovic (University of Adelaide), Megan Warin (University of Adelaide), Paul Ward (Flinders University), Vivienne Moore (University of Adelaide) and Michelle Jones (SA Health)</p> <p>This paper investigates the symbolic meanings of breakfast in Australia's largest health promotion initiative (OPAL). We trace the formation of how breakfast (in particular, 'Australia's favourite breakfast', Weet-Bix) is packaged and promoted to socially disadvantaged families in Adelaide's northern suburbs, as a 'healthy start' to the day. Through ethnographic investigation, we argue that eating certain types of breakfast are symbolic of a classed, healthy lifestyle pattern, embodying parental and child preparedness to routinely structure and coordinate daily life by way of family mealtimes, the rhythms of which are often difficult to reconcile with the wider socio-cultural context in which many people live.</p>
1.30 pm- 2.00 pm	<p>'Good value' when food shopping: Mothers, money and morals</p> <p>Gina Harris, Deakin University</p> <p>Disparities between the quality of diets of the wealthy and the poor are often attributed to high prices of healthy foods in comparison to less healthy options. Whilst prices are fundamental in consumer decisions, 'good value' means much more than simple economic food calculations. A broad concept of 'value' was used as a starting point to investigate how mothers from both high and low income households discipline themselves as they recount their food shopping experiences. This paper highlights the ways in which women in this study positioned their food shopping decisions and practices according to moralities of quality and thrift, and in doing so constructed themselves as good providers, good mothers and ultimately good citizens.</p>
2.00 pm- 2.30 pm	<p>Stranger in the domestic space: food, care and the male subject in women's magazines</p> <p>Teresa Davis (University of Sydney), Tanja Schneider (Oxford University), Alan Petersen (Monash University), Margaret Hogg (University of Lancaster) and David Marshall (University of Edinburgh)</p> <p>Visual data from the Australian Women's Weekly (1950-2010) and the Good Housekeeping (UK 1950-2010) are used to examine how men are depicted in the domestic space. A particular emphasis on the relationship between food and men used and the changes in this relationship are examined. The need to depict men in particular roles in relation to food, mealtime and femininity are explored. The role of</p>

	<p>fatherhood in relation to food and filial relationships is shown to be one that changes over the decades while yet reinforcing ideas of the nuclear, 'normal' family. We find that anxieties around men cooking and are actively 'managed' by particular depictions of the male within the domestic (female) space.</p>
2.30 pm- 3.00 pm	<p>Parents as neo-liberal citizens: individualising responsibility for children's exposure to unhealthy food marketing Kaye Mehta, John Coveney, Paul Ward, Elizabeth Handsley (Flinders University)</p> <p>This research explored parents' perceptions of responsibility in relation to children's exposure to energy-dense nutrient-poor foods (EDNP) food marketing. The research employed qualitative methods and interviewed fourteen South Australian parents between 2008 and 2009. The parents accepted primary responsibility for mitigating the adverse effects of EDNP food marketing. In contrast they had somewhat confused notions about their own rights in relation to food marketing. They felt that children had rights to be protected from unhealthy marketing, and few responsibilities due to their age and cognitive development. They considered corporations to have some responsibility to market more healthily to children, but also rights to market their products in order to make money. They favoured government as the overarching regulator. The parents exemplified neo-liberal citizenry who accept food marketing as part of modern capitalist society, and who individualise the problem of unhealthy food marketing that children are exposed to. As neo-liberal citizens most parents uncritically accepted primary responsibility for mitigating the adverse effects of EDNP food marketing. They were highly reflexive of their parenting practices and embodied the 'good parent' discourse, demonstrating pride in their firmness and being judgemental of other parents who gave in too easily to their children's demands.</p>
3.30 pm- 4.00 pm	<p>AFSCN 'Next Steps' discussion</p>