

ORIGINAL ARTICLE



The Sociology of Food and Eating

Dr. Ashok Yakkaldevi

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Sociology,
A.R. Burla Mahila Varishtha Mahavidyalaya, Solapur

ABSTRACT:

In this examination paper, we investigate the humanism of sustenance and eating, one of the rising subspecialties of humanism. We take a gander at its roots in sociological history and its status as a still little yet extending subfield that meets with other sociological claims to fame and with different orders. Sustenance studies are by their tendency interdisciplinary. Different fields have enhanced sociological nourishment concentrates; likewise, human science has made special calculated and hypothetical commitments to the sustenance related work of researchers in different controls. We present some center subjects and inquiries that drive sociological exploration on sustenance. At long last, we guess on the fate of this claim to fame: Does the human science of sustenance and eating can possibly flourish as an autonomous subfield? The incorporation of this exploration paper in humanism classification recommends that human science is making a spot for the investigation of sustenance frameworks and eating practices.

KEYWORDS: humanism of sustenance and eating,

I. Introduction

One trouble in talking about the humanism of nourishment and eating is that its way of life as a subfield is later, however sociologists' sustenance studies are most certainly not. Throughout the years, sustenance related exploration has been finished by provincial, therapeutic, and different sociologists. Late works have been delivered inside of the humanistic systems of society, utilization, the body, and sex. To talk about a human science of nourishment and eating, then, involves appropriating for this subfield grant delivered by the individuals who don't characterize themselves as "sustenance sociologists" yet who rather find their work inside different spaces. In this manner, the humanism of nourishment and eating might appear a build misleadingly made via "cutting out" the sustenance related works of different subspecialties. We contend that since the 1980s a different subfield has risen, bit by bit assuming its position close by different regions inside of the order. By the by, we confront a handy issue: How would we be able to portray this zone without being drawn into depicting different subfields (and, far more detestable, different orders) that have settled sustenance written works? The answer, obviously, is that we can't. What we endeavor here is to highlight some center worries of and hypothetical impacts on sociologists (and some nonsociologists) who study nourishment, and we indicate the peruser other related zones.

This early field still looks for a personality—even what to call the strength has been talked about throughout the years. John Bennett (1943) alluded to a "human science of eating routine" to depict considers by provincial sociologists of the connects and implications of what individuals ate. This moniker appears not to have grabbed hold, and it would not portray most sustenance studies by contemporary sociologists. The name we utilize, the human science of nourishment and eating, we owe to Anne Murcott (1983), who in

1983 distributed an altered volume of "exploratory and theoretical" (p. 1) articles on the good and basic ramifications of nourishment. A few researchers stress a connection to sustenance examines by alluding to "the human science of nourishment and sustenance" and "nutritious social science" (Germov and Williams 1999). Alex McIntosh (1996) has alluded in the plural to "human sciences of nourishment and sustenance," recognizing that nourishment related points are concentrated sociologically from an assortment of viewpoints, while Alan Warde (1997) alludes essentially to "the human science of sustenance." Recently, Murcott (1999, 2001) has contended that what is today called "the humanism of nourishment" would all the more honest to goodness be called "the social science of eating" for its accentuation on utilization and the "interest" side of the nourishment framework, and its relative disregard of the creation or "supply" side. In any case, for the time being, Murcott's unique accentuation on both nourishment and eating appears the most suitable method for depicting this different field.

II. Food as Grist for the Sociological Mill: A History

Their inquiry was being addressed even as it was inquired. Over 10 years prior, Murcott (1983) had accumulated her altered book, *The Sociology of Food and Eating*, since she and others felt that "the sociological criticalness of sustenance and eating is imperative" (p. vii). That year that Ferguson and Zukin offered their conversation starter, Whit's (1995) *Food and Society: A Sociological Approach* and Wood's (1995) *The Sociology of the Meal* were distributed. These were followed in short request by McIntosh's (1996) *Sociologies of Food and Nutrition*, Beardsworth and Keil's (1997) *Sociology on the Menu*, Warde's (1997) *Consumption, Food and Taste*, Germov and Williams' (1999) *A Sociology of Food and Nutrition*, and Warde and Martens' (2000) *Eating Out: Social Differentiation, Consumption, and Pleasure*. All touted the benefits of considering nourishment and eating sociologically, and most included records for human science's relative disregard of sustenance when contrasted and different trains, for example, humanities and history. Nourishment had been "underestimated" (Beardsworth and Keil 1997; McIntosh 1996), maybe inadequate with regards to an academic cachet because of its relationship with the everyday—home, family, and ladies' local parts (Beardsworth and Keil 1997; Mennell 1999). Alan Beardsworth and Teresa Keil (1997:3) ascribed human science's "demureness in connection to sustenance and eating" to an apparent need to make an extraordinary scholarly area separated from matters of physiology. The deficiency of thoughtfulness regarding nourishment is obvious in Neil Smelser's (1988) *Handbook of Sociology*, wherein uncommon references to sustenance generation and dietary patterns are scattered crosswise over sections on work, sexual orientation, family, and medicinal human science. Warren Belasco (2002) connected the disregard of sustenance to the impacts of a nineteenth-and twentieth-century "mechanical utopianism" that imagined a fate of advancement where the combination of nourishment pills made in shining research facilities and "robotized manufacturing plant ranches" may free individuals from modest work (p. 8). Such dreams encouraged an institutional inclination that expelled social researchers from thinking about the dim universes of conventional sustenance generation, preparing, and bundling. At the point when sustenance was concentrated, seldom was it the essential object of request: "As opposed to being the end center, it has a tendency to be a novel intends to light up officially acknowledged disciplinary concerns" (p. 6).

Obviously, sociologists hadn't totally disregarded nourishment and eating. Nineteenth-and mid twentieth-century social scholars laid the preparation for human science by perceiving the essentialness of nourishment as both an object of human movement and a marker of the human condition. Friedrich Engels ([1845] 1969) associated specialists' nourishment proportions to their wages, with the most reduced paid and unemployed subsisting on ruined, regularly contaminated sustenances. Thorstein Veblen ([1899] 1953) noticed that at the inverse end of the social range, rich sustenances served as objects of "prominent utilization," showing a high social standing. Prominent utilization was conceivable in view of shared inclinations all through society indicating which things are generally prestigious. Georg Simmel ([1915] 1991), differentiating the basic public feast of farmworkers with the formal supper of higher classes, saw the dinner as a model of the way of life's inescapable, malignant development from nature toward expanding convention and social request. The formal supper, with its coordinating tableware and controlled conduct, symbolized for Simmel a cutting edge society antagonistic to individual uniqueness in spite of its "faction of singularity." The feast spoke to congruity: "The plate symbolizes request. . . . The plates on an eating table should all be indistinguishable; they can't endure any uniqueness; diverse plates or glasses for various

persons would be totally silly and monstrous" (Simmel [1915] 1991:348). These established scholars perceived sustenance and dietary patterns as inseparably attached to and characteristic of an intense societal structure.

In spite of the fact that there was no "human science of sustenance and eating" thusly for the greater part of the twentieth century, sociologists were examining nourishment and eating in fields, for example, country, medicinal, and family human science. They tended to numerous issues that worry today's researchers: dietary patterns, sustenance, hunger, the implications of nourishment in every day life. In rustic human science, for instance, these hobbies were long-standing; country sociologists started to look at nourishment propensities and method for enhancing individuals' eating regimens after World War I (Bennett, Smith, and Passin 1942). Amid the Great Depression, imbalances in sustenance plenteous countries, for example, the United States left upwards of 33% of subjects deprived (Taeuber 1948). Such concerns provoked studies surveying the sustenance and nourishment inclinations of country inhabitants (Bennett 1943; Bennett et al. 1942), standing out them from the eating regimens of urban occupants (Leevy 1940). John Bennett (1943), for instance, demonstrated that the devastated occupants of a rustic "riverbottom zone" stigmatized certain sustenances for their relationship with lower-status amasses and craved the handled "urban nourishments" that showed higher status and upward portability. Worldwide sustenance ampleness was of worry too, particularly after World War II. Conrad Taeuber (1948:653), a demographer prepared in provincial human science, depicted the sociological difficulties confronted by the United Nation's Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), whose mission included enhancing worldwide nourishment, the proficiency of sustenance generation and dispersion, and rustic living conditions. Taeuber saw sociologists assuming a fundamental part in helping the FAO to comprehend the social elements that influenced hunger: Local traditions and religious practices could anticipate acknowledgment of specific nourishments. Horticultural upgrades must be suited to the social situations into which they were presented, or they would fall flat. Enhanced sustenance could lessen mortality additionally cultivate populace increment. In a few places, a superior nourishment supply would goad industrialization and change examples of cultivating and land residency. Today, rustic sociologists handle these and other, new issues. For instance, open concerns stimulated by the growing utilization of hereditarily changed sustenances, by vigorously advanced influxes of nourishment borne sickness, and by clashing messages with respect to wellbeing and nourishment have incited provincial sociologists to look at open impression of nourishment security and dangers (e.g., Knight and Warland 2005). Provincial sociologists keep on taking a gander at neighborhood agrarian advancement and in addition worldwide sustenance frameworks. As the human science of sustenance creates as a subfield, we expect that examination from claims to fame, for example, rustic social science will keep on yielding essential bits of knowledge into the part of nourishment in the public arena.

Sustenance readiness and utilization have since a long time ago gave sociologists chances to pick up bits of knowledge into methods of creation, political standard, rustic advancement, social wellbeing issues, talk and dialect, picture and class, race and sex, family structure and capacity, intergenerational relations, and territorial contrasts. There is presumably no field of sociological try that couldn't address parts of sustenance or eating in some manner or to some advantage.

Take, for instance, the numerous ethnographies of the eatery, a rich milieu for analyzing such differing points as influence connections, the working of group, and personality development. William Foote Whyte (1948) depicted communications and status relations among eatery laborers and clients in an extending, progressively complex nourishment administration industry. Joanne Finkelstein (1989, 1998) examined feasting conduct in eateries utilizing the typical interactionist system of Erving Goffman. "The eatery," she contended, "marks the joining of the individual and the social, the private and general society" (Finkelstein 1998:203). There, a sort of exhibitionism happens, "where the impacts of social demands, cleverness, and the manages of design have been unequivocally in proof" (p. 203). Eatery conduct associates eating out with false originations—and bogus presentations—of the self. A more generous representation of eating and drinking foundations is found in Ray Oldenburg's (1989) work; he considers them to be "third places" possessing a domain in the middle of open and private circles. In such connections, home-style nature and casual communication coincide with the fervor of seeing and being seen. As a "third place," a café or eatery may feed the body as well as food a feeling of group soul and pride of spot. Gary Allen Fine's (1996) examination of the word related talk of culinary experts in upscale eateries demonstrated how

gourmet specialists utilize the dialects of polished methodology, craftsmanship, business, and work to case distinction and keep up a feeling of self-esteem in a control of equivocal status—cook, director, craftsman—in people in general's psyche. Jennifer Parker Talwar (2002) depicted the fast-food eatery as a venue in which foreigners adjust to American society while at the same time molding the nearby operations of what are regularly worldwide partnerships. These various studies show the adaptability of sustenance related themes for investigating sociological thoughts.

That started to change in the 1980s, when a couple takes a shot at sustenance and eating hones showed up. Anne Murcott (1983) laid out principal inquiries still tended to by today's nourishment sociologists: What are the good and typical implications of sustenance, and how are sustenance and eating identified with progressions of class, age, and sexual orientation? Stephen Mennell (1985) drew on Elias' ([1939] 1978) work to follow the "acculturating of hankering" in England and France since the Middle Ages. Joanne Finkelstein (1989) investigated eating out as a type of amusement that, by transforming feelings into items, permitted individuals to buy and present pictures of self.

It was amid the 1990s that a minimum amount of interest fortified improvement of a sociological strength in sustenance and eating—yet

III. Just Add Sociology and Stir: Interdisciplinary Food Studies

What is clear from the most recent decade's endeavors to characterize a human science of sustenance and eating is that this subfield would not be, couldn't be, an absolutely sociological attempt. The investigation of sustenance and society is characteristically interdisciplinary as nourishment touches almost every edge of human presence. Grant on nourishment and eating shows up in the written works of human studies, history, financial matters, topography, showcasing, sustenance science, theory, political science, brain research, and general wellbeing. That sociologists routinely draw on these literary works is evident in both their examination references and their perusing records for sustenance and society courses, where we normally discover the grant of human sciences (e.g., Douglas 1972; Goody 1982; Harris 1985; Levi-Strauss [1964] 1969; Mintz 1985), history (e.g., Gabaccia 2000; Levenstein 1988, 1993), social studies (e.g., Barthes [1957] 1972; Lupton 1996), American contemplates (e.g., Belasco 1993), topography (e.g., Bell and Valentine 1997; Shortridge and Shortridge 1998), theory (e.g., Curtin and Heldke 1992), and reporting (e.g., Pollan 2002, 2003; Schlosser 2001; Sokolov 1991).

Every order gives bits of knowledge that add to a more thorough perspective of this wide extending subject, filling crevices or absence of consideration in different fields. Ben Fine, Michael Heasman, and Judith Wright (1996) fight that the many-sided quality of the sustenance framework requires cross-preparations among various controls. Anne Murcott (2001) contends that an undue accentuation on utilization by sustenance sociologists has abandoned some inadequately outfitted to manage issues of creation, where analysts in different claims to fame might be more learned. Regardless of the possibility that nourishment sociologists are not distracted with utilization, there still are great explanations behind those concentrating on sustenance to approach the grant of different orders. Different fields look at items and wonders that would commonly be past the domain of human science. A culinary history specialist, for example, Phyllis Pray Bober (1999), utilizing archeological strategies, can dive into the eating methodologies of ancient times, or, utilizing the soonest narrative sources, the foods of days of yore, giving purposes of correlation with sociological investigations of today's eating rehearses. Additionally, work in different trains regularly parallels research in humanism. Anthropologist Jack Goody (1982) alludes to his work on the political economy of sustenance creation and utilization as "sociological." Geographers, whose work in some cases covers that of rustic sociologists (Murcott 2001), point out the significance of spot, district, and migration in routes well known to sociologists. For instance, Gill Valentine's (1999) chip away at "eating in" advances our comprehension of the unpredictable relationship between character development and the home by investigating sustenance utilization and the spatial flow of cooking and eating.

For sociologists, interdisciplinary associations additionally encourage proficient improvement. Given the still low profile of sustenance studies inside of humanism, nourishment sociologists have observed interdisciplinary associations to be perfect venues for sociation and presentation of sustenance situated exploration. The Agriculture, Food, and Human Values Society, sorted out in 1987 by individuals from a few controls (among them sociologists), advances cross-disciplinary work on farming and sustenance

(Agriculture, Food, and Human Values Society 2005). The Association for the Study of Food and Society, established about the same time by sociologists and others inspired by agrarian and healthful issues (Whit 1999), now asserts part affiliations with 23 disciplines (Association for the Study of Food and Society 2005). The joint meeting of these two associations draws professionals from the sociologies, humanities, wellbeing/nourishment sciences, advertising, and culinary expressions. Different venues for presentation are the Popular Culture Association-American Culture Association meeting and gatherings of local society affiliations. Interdisciplinary diaries (among them Food and Foodways; Gastronomica; Food, Culture, and Society; and The Journal of Popular Culture) distribute sociologically arranged nourishment concentrates on.

IV. Key Ingredients: Concepts and Themes in Food Studies

At present, there is no "nourishment hypothesis" as such. Maybe, nourishment sociologists draw on hypothetical viewpoints and ideas drawn from different claims to fame inside and outside human science. Despite the fact that the creators of these thoughts may not be related to nourishment considers, utilization of their work associates the humanism of sustenance and eating to a custom of sociological thought.

A. Three Paradigms

Stephen Mennell and his partners (1992) distinguished three essential ideal models in the examination of nourishment and eating: structuralism, spoke to underway of Levi-Strauss ([1964] 1969) and Douglas (1972, 1984); social realism, as displayed by Harris (1979, 1985); and the formative approach, Mennell's (1985) use of Elias' ([1939] 1978) thought of the "acculturating process." Although persuasive, these methodologies have not get to be center ideal models—sustenance concentrates on have spread too broadly, past their spaces. By the by, the bits of knowledge these ideal models gave urged researchers to consider sustenance as critical in human culture and to examine why people groups fluctuate in their decisions and in the typical loadings they provide for their eating hones.

1. Structuralism

In *The Raw and the Cooked*, Claude Levi-Strauss ([1964] 1969) thought about a "culinary triangle" of three classifications of sustenance: the cooked, the crude, and the spoiled. While the entry from either crude or cooked to spoiled is a characteristic process, the change from crude to cooked is a social one; the juxtaposition of crude and cooked speaks to the double resistance of nature and society. Exploring so as to examine nourishment as a sort of dialect societies' theoretical classifications for sustenance order, and also their traditions and principles for sustenance readiness, is a methods by which Levi-Strauss tried to see all around shared structures of human insight. Mary Douglas (1972, 1984), seemingly the most persuasive structuralist creator on sustenance, likewise considered dinners as frameworks of decipherable codes that reflect arrangements inside of the bigger society. "In the event that nourishment is dealt with as a code," she composed, "the messages it encodes will be found in the example of social relations being communicated. The message is about various degrees of chain of command, incorporation and avoidance, limits and exchanges over the limits" (Douglas 1972:61). This code communicates various implications in a very ritualized, yet underestimated "example of social connections" (p. 61). Not at all like Levi-Strauss, Douglas did not consider nourishment to be uncovering all inclusive examples, but rather for both scholars, sustenance uncovered fundamental structures and implications of social centrality.

2. Social Materialism

Marvin Harris (1979, 1985) tested the perspective that eating examples are to be perused for the more extensive codes they uncover by drawing nearer nourishment decision as an issue of productivity and usefulness. Consequently, Americans and Europeans pick not to eat bugs and other "little things" not on the grounds that they are intrinsically sickening but rather on the grounds that these individuals have more proficient wellsprings of protein as little warm blooded creatures and fish. In different parts of the world, little things are savored as nourishment, to a limited extent as a result of the deficiency of other open types

of protein additionally in light of the fact that the little things accessible are frequently bigger or more proficient sustenance sources—swarmed creepy crawlies, for instance, or substantial bugs and grubs. Thus, Harris (1985) clarified the Hindu respect for the consecrated cow and the Semitic scorn for pig-calling so as to eat regard for the natural parts played by these creatures and in addition to the social ramifications of their utilization by people.

3. The Developmental Approach

Stephen Mennell's formative methodology gets essentially from Norbert Elias' ([1939] 1978) idea of "edifying procedure." Elias explained a progressive yet broad enlightening procedure that happened in Western social orders more than a few centuries. One of its belongings was a movement from the activity of outside requirements on people toward the disguised imperatives that people exercise on themselves, bringing about more prominent self-restraint and poise. Mennell developed Elias' hypothesis of edifying process expressly to sustenance, contending that an "acculturating hankering" mirrors a slow increment in discretion over voracity. Hence, we see a movement in accentuation from amount to quality in the cooking of the European privileged societies amid the eighteenth and nineteenth hundreds of years. Prior, devouring had been an indication of riches, however progressively, polish and refinement came to be spoken to by the delicacy of the nourishment eaten and the balance of hunger.

B. The Culture Industry

Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno ([1944] 2002) have utilized the idea of "society industry" in breaking down the spread of mass society and the commodification of social benchmarks. Their way of life industry proposition highlights the developing equivalence of social practices universally. With institutionalization, individuals get to be detached purchasers: Millions purchase fast food day by day without considering where this sustenance originated from and how it was made. Eric Schlosser's (2001) depiction of a universal American fast-food scene echoes Horkheimer and Adorno's expectation of a "compatible equality" coming about because of large scale manufacturing. The feeling of the fast food eatery—the "surge of cool air . . . the illuminated shading photos over the counter" (p. 3)—has gotten to be common: "The entire experience of purchasing fast food has turned out to be so standard, so completely unexceptional and commonplace, that it is currently underestimated" (p. 3). That normal experience has gotten to be worldwide, "making a homogenized global society" (p. 229). Institutionalization infests all parts of the fast-food industry, influencing bosses, workers, and customers. Boss ordered scripted associations at the fast-food counter pass on the hallucination of value administration to the client while permitting representatives to keep up a social separation and generic quality (Leidner 1993). Yi-Chi Chen and Monina Wang (2002) watch that a McDonald's outlet is identifiable by all accounts of administration and item, its standard welcome and grins. The floor arrangement and nourishment fixings are ascertained and institutionalized to advance productive readiness. Both team and clients are associated in now-standard utilization conduct: Queue up to request, take the sustenance to the table, and tidy up before taking off. Institutionalization subsequently encapsulates a type of control that can be measured and observed to accomplish strength and all inclusiveness.

C. McDonaldization

Such examinations bring out George Ritzer's (1993) generally referred to chip away at "McDonaldization," in which the fast-food industry gets to be both the model of and similitude for contemporary authoritative conduct. Depicting the justification of the fast-food industry, Ritzer indicates how consistency (of item, of conduct), calculability (of time, of amount), productivity (of nourishment readiness, of administration), and control (of supervisors, specialists, and shoppers) have empowered the fast-food industry to extend and benefit, turning into a model for different associations and foundations in contemporary society.

The homogenization that went with the move to a worldwide mass society has offered ascend to reasons for alarm that neighborhood foodstuffs, flavors, and culinary practices might vanish. The Slow Food Movement, established via Carlo Petrini in 1986, tested the center standards of McDonaldization by advancing the protection of territorial horticultural differences and the festival of the sexy "joys of the table" (Slow Food USA 2005). The reaction to McDonaldization is now and again all the more specifically fierce—French ranch activists increased overall reputation in 1999 when they dissented the industrialization of sustenance by obliterating another McDonald's outlet with tractors (Frost 2002).

D. Habitus

The nourishment writing in humanism every now and again refers to Pierre Bourdieu's ([1979] 1984) thought of "habitus," disguised structures that shape people's activities without fundamental reference to the convictions or consciousness of the people who have disguised them. The idea is appealing to social researchers who examine solid subtle elements of ordinary life or way of life—clothing, behavior, eating rehearses, and so forth—to follow how a belief system might be particularly and for all intents and purposes executed, even without the cognizant consciousness of the performing artist. In *Distinction*, Bourdieu ([1979] 1984) depicts "taste" as a methods whereby class refinements are duplicated and strengthened. An individual disguises states of mind, inclinations, propensities for conduct that speak to his class. Sustenance and dietary patterns, organized by class-related open doors, are basic appearances of every class' taste. Along these lines, for instance, without an individual's mindfulness, his decisions (of nourishments, of eateries), his practices (his real carriage and conduct at the table), and his states of mind (toward others' decisions, behavior, and ways of life) all imitate the belief systems of class he has disguised. Such qualifications, notwithstanding, might shift crosswise over social orders: Michele Lamont (1992) found that the Americans were less inclined to making such separations than were Bourdieu's French.

E. The Reflexive Project of the Self

By Giddens (1991), individuals in current society confront the weight and the freedom of building their own particular personalities in a procedure he alludes to as "the reflexive undertaking of the self" (p. 52). He composes, "The inquiry 'By what method might I live?' must be replied in day-today choices about how to act, what to wear and what to eat" (p. 14). In customary society, settling on decisions about living—about how to be and the proper behavior—is moderately direct. In postmodern culture, it is unpredictable, distressing, and dangerous in light of the fact that data is divided and differing: "Assuming responsibility of one's life includes hazard, since it implies going up against an assorted qualities of open conceivable outcomes" (p. 73). Barry Smart (1994) addresses the uneasiness of postmodern eating hones. Contemporary eating encounters look like divided previews—individuals snack in the cafeteria, and meander, overpowered, past horde sustenance things displayed here and there megamarket passageways. Picking the foodstuffs and formulas they ought to utilize is troublesome. Polished cookbooks and the broadcast cooking shows of big name gourmet specialists venture pictures of what individuals can turn out to be, yet the desires of delight that they motivate are never entirely acknowledged by the individual (p. 171). Reflexive cookbooks are "gastro-porn" (p. 170), pleasurable to take a gander at, yet unattainable as a general rule. The outcome is "frenzy eating," a "blow out of gastroglobal variance" (p.175), significant of what Giddens portrayed as the twofold edge—weight and freedom—of assuming responsibility of one's life.

F. Social Contextual Factors in Eating Practices

Eating rehearses include the setting and climate of a dinner: the aggregate experience of what and where we eat, how we start every supper, what we eat with, and with whom we eat. Along these lines, these practices include a bundle of socially, socially, and verifiably contextualized encounters. The sociological investigation of nourishment and eating adds to a more full photo of this connection particular experience. Rick Fantasia (1995) contends that connections can change the implications of eating. Concentrate fast food in France, he watches that the very brought together, inflexibly institutionalized operation of McDonald's is seen by more youthful eras as the authoritative exemplification of vote based system, independence, and free

venture (p. 209), a message they grasp to dismiss the stuffiness and unbending nature of French custom. Rhapsody considers "the development of the fast food involvement in France to be socially and socially decontextualized" (p. 235). Distinctive implications develop in various settings.

Another sociological investigation of setting—here, time as opposed to geographic space—shows up in Joseph Gusfield's (1992) correlation of common sustenance developments in the 1830s and 1950s. While both developments rejected social controls and organizations, the implications of their messages separate because of the connections in which every development emerged. In the 1830s, the common sustenance development saw eating rehearses as a method for reconnecting with the "ethical power" intrinsic in nature. By correlation, in the 1950s and later, nature was no more saw as a wellspring of good power. Rather, an arrival to common eating spoke to a countercultural dismissal of an innovative, popularized society.

G. The Interplay between the Global and the Local

Sustenance can uncover emotional social change. Issues raised at the turn of the twenty-first century—globalization, antiglobal responses, and the resurrection of patriotism—have made a blast in nourishment contemplates, rousing exploration on, for instance, the globalization of sustenance conveyance frameworks, most remarkably those connected with the fast-food industry (Belasco 1989; Bloomfield 1994; Reiter 1991; Royle and Towers 2002). Obscuring of the limits between national, territorial, and ethnic characters has provoked studies catching the impacts of globalization and the multifaceted nature of the worldwide nearby nexus.

Richard Wilk (1999) looks at whether globalization deletes neighborhood custom in Belize, where there "has been a surprisingly worldwide society, with open outskirts, a versatile populace, and close associations with universal trade" (p. 69). In this connection, one would not hope to locate a national food. Yet globalization, by means of tourism, has energized the making of neighborhood culinary conventions. Wilk found that "Belizeans of various ethnic gatherings have manufactured a wonderful level of accord on what they get a kick out of the chance to eat and how it ought to be arranged" (p. 86). The association in the middle of worldwide and neighborhood can likewise be found in topics of the other in the connection of expansionism. Uma Narayan (1997) portrays how the pilgrim British imported curry from India and how they "naturalized and nationalized" it (p. 163), accordingly "creating" today's Western curry powder. Indian kitchens and basic supplies have no "curry powder." What Indians purchase or make are masalas, distinctive blends of ground flavors used to season an assortment of dishes; curry in vegan South India alludes to a very diverse spicing of vegetables and rice (p. 164). Narayan characteristics the creation of curry powder to a British longing to "tame" Indian culture and delete the risks connected with the Indian other.

H. Nourishment and Identity

Nourishment is a vehicle, typical and material, for arranging and developing a feeling of who we are. Individuals' practices around sustenance develop in a variety of social spaces, each having suggestions for character. A substantial writing analyzes how eating hones articulate characters: national (e.g., Ohnuki-Tierney 1993; Pilcher 1996; Tam 1997), territorial (e.g., Bahloul 1995; Fuller 1995; Toombs 1993), ethnic (e.g., Brown and Mussell 1984; Caglar 1995; Ray 2004), and sexual orientation (e.g., Beoku-Betts 1995; Brown and Jasper 1993; Counihan 1988). These studies detail how certain sustenances and ceremonies turn out to be intense images in the development of frameworks of shared implications. Socially developed implications around nourishment, these creators contend, serve to check limits between sexual orientations, life-cycle stages, social classes, occupations, religions, geological locales, racial and ethnic gatherings, and countries.

Cookbooks are a critical medium for the development of character. Arjun Appadurai (1988) contemplates the creation through cookbooks of a national food in contemporary India. He found that white collar class ladies over the subcontinent corresponded with each other through the medium of cookbooks, obscuring territorial, ethnic, and rank limits and in this way encouraging a feeling of Indian national character. Appadurai indicates how individuals transform sustenances into capable images of gathering partiality. Essentially, Rafia Zafar (1999) looks at the production of cookbooks by African American ladies

as a method for building up a voice and character in a circumstance of interior expansionism. As these ladies expound on specific nourishments, they review particular destinations. In this manner, for Gullah ladies, composing prompts the enlivening of a chronicled cognizance in which custom is imaginatively rethought, prompting self-certification and self-creation.

I. Sustenance and the Social Construction of Everyday Life

Michel de Certeau (1984) concentrates on how normal individuals use ordinary protests and spaces. In doing as such, he uncovers the imagination in ordinary schedules

V. Finding a Place at the Table: The Future of the Subfield

Previously we referred to Ferguson and Zukin's (1995) inquiry, "Why is there no sociology of food?" As we move well into the twenty-first century, the question has become "What is the future for a sociology of food and eating?" Food studies in sociology are gaining ground as a vibrant arena for the application and extension of sociological ideas. Still, as a field that readily links itself with other disciplines, the sociology of food has yet to become fully recognized as a subfield. What is the likelihood that it will do so?

Just as the cultural field of gastronomy in nineteenth-century France drew energy from an increasingly enthusiastic discourse on food and cooking (Ferguson 1998), today's broad popular and academic fascination with food and eating has inspired a disciplinary fervor among sociologists studying food-related topics. A new generation of scholars identify themselves as sociologists of food, thereby affirming the value of the study of food production, distribution, and consumption practices for our understanding of culture and society. We see the work of these scholars unfolding in various ways—in journals and a growing number of textbooks, at conferences, and in the classroom. Eventually, we may witness the establishment of a section on food and eating within the American Sociological Association.

For a field to develop an autonomous identity, certain conditions must be present. For example, Priscilla Parkhurst Ferguson (1998) argues that the field of gastronomy developed in France during the 1800s because certain social and cultural circumstances existed, among them increasing urbanization, the movement of well-trained chefs from the homes of the elites following the Revolution into their own restaurant businesses, and increased eating out in these establishments. These conditions inspired an increasingly enthusiastic public discourse about food and eating, which gradually became linked to established domains of French cultural discourse. There are certain echoes of the development of nineteenth-century gastronomic discourse in today's emergence of the sociology of food and eating. Rapid and significant changes in food production and consumption have prompted increased sociological discourse on food and eating. Therein we find a point of convergence for those in established sociological subfields—culture, health/medicine, gender, race/ethnicity, religion, family, work and occupations, and rural sociology among them—who were already studying food-related topics. These interconnections may prove advantageous in reinforcing the sociology in the sociology of food and eating, perhaps strengthening its own identity within sociology while the subfield draws on the insights of other disciplines.

As discussed previously, food scholars have taken this new subfield in multiple directions. We believe this trend will continue. While this multiplicity of interests could hinder intellectual cohesiveness of the area, it also provides opportunities for interdisciplinary research and theory development. Ultimately, the sociology of food and eating offers ways of rethinking notions of production and consumption, technology, law and policy, everyday mundane practices, material culture, and identity and embodiment. In its broad scope of inquiry, the sociology of food and eating will continue to acknowledge the myriad manifestations in which food operates in human society.

Browse all example research papers or see the list of sociology research paper topics.

Bibliography:

1. Agriculture, Food, and Human Values Society. 2005. "Agriculture and Human Values." Gainesville, FL: Agriculture, Food, and Human Values Society. Retrieved August 9, 2014 (<http://afhvs.org/publications/society-journal/>).

2. Appadurai, Arjun. 1988. "How to Make a National Cuisine: Cookbooks in Contemporary India." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 30:3–24.
3. Association for the Study of Food and Society. 2004. "About the Organization." Retrieved August 9, 2014 (<http://www.food-culture.org/>).
4. Atkins, Peter and Ian Bowler. 2001. *Food in Society: Economy, Culture, Geography*. New York: Oxford University Press.
5. Bahloul, Joelle. 1995. "Food Practices among Sephardic Immigrants in Contemporary France: Dietary Laws in Urban Society." *Journal of American Academy of Religion* 63:485–96.
6. Barthes, Roland. [1957] 1972. *Mythologies*. Translated by A. Lavers. New York: Hill and Wang.
7. Beardsworth, Alan and Teresa Keil. 1997. *Sociology on the Menu*. New York: Routledge.
8. Belasco, Warren. 1989. "Ethnic Fast Foods: The Corporate Melting Pot." *Food and Foodways* 2:1–30.
9. Belasco, Warren. 1993. *Appetite for Change: How the Counterculture Took on the Food Industry, 1966–1988*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
10. Belasco, Warren. 2002. "Food Matters: Perspectives on an Emerging Field." Pp. 2–23 in *Food Nations: Selling Taste in Consumer Societies*. Edited by W. Belasco and P. Scranton. New York: Routledge.
11. Bell, David and Gill Valentine. 1997. *Consuming Geographies: We Are Where We Eat*. London, England: Routledge.
12. Bennett, John. 1943. "Food and Social Status in a Rural Society." *American Sociological Review* 8:561–68.
13. Bennett, John W., Harvey L. Smith, and Herbert Passin. 1942. "Food and Culture in Southern Illinois: A Preliminary Report." *American Sociological Review* 7:645–60.
14. Beoku-Betts, Josephine. 1995. "We Got Our Way of Cooking Things: Women, Food, and Preservation of Cultural Identity among the Gullah." *Gender and Society* 9:535–55.
15. Bloomfield, A. Victoria. 1994. "Tim Horton: Growth of a Canadian Coffee and Doughnut Chain." *Journal of Cultural Geography* 14:1–16.
16. Bober, Phyllis Pray. 1999. *Art, Culture, and Cuisine: Ancient and Medieval Gastronomy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
17. Bourdieu, Pierre. [1979] 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Translated by R. Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
18. British Sociological Association Food Study Group. 2005. "Food Study Group." Retrieved August 9, 2014 (<http://www.britisoc.co.uk/specialisms/Food.aspx>).
19. Brown, Catrina and Karin Jasper, eds. 1993. *Consuming Passions: Feminist Approaches to Weight Preoccupation and Eating Disorders*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Second Story Press.
20. Brown, Linda Keller and Kay Mussell, eds. 1984. *Ethnic and Regional Foodways in the United States: The Performance of Group Identity*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
21. Brownell, Kelly D. and Katherine B. Horgen. 2004. *Food Fight: The Inside Story of the Food Industry, America's Obesity Crisis, and What We Can Do about It*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
22. Caglar, Ayse. 1995. "McDoner: Doner Kebab and the Social Positioning Struggle of German Turks." Pp. 209–30 in *Marketing in a Multicultural World: Ethnicity, Nationalism, and Cultural Identity*, edited by J. Costa and G. Bamossy. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
23. Caldwell, Melissa. 2002. "The Taste of Nationalism: Food Politics in Post-Socialist Moscow." *Ethnos* 67:295–319.
24. Chen, Yi-Chi and Monina Wong. 2002. *New Bondage and Old Resistance: Realities and Challenges of the Labour Movement in Taiwan*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Christian Industrial Committee.
25. Chernin, Kim. 1981. *The Obsession: Reflections on the Tyranny of Slenderness*. New York: Harper & Row.
26. Cook, Ian. 1995. "Constructing the Exotic: The Case of Tropical Fruit." Pp. 137–42 in *A Shrinking World?*, edited by J. Allen and C. Hamnett. Oxford, England: Open University Press.
27. Cook, Ian and Phillip Crang. 1996. "The World on a Plate: Culinary Culture, Displacement and Geographical Knowledges." *Journal of Material Culture* 1:131–54.
28. Copelton, Denise A. and Betsy Lucal, eds. 2005. *The Sociology of Food: Syllabi and Other Instructional Materials*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

29. Cordell, Gina and Carol R. Ronai. 1999. "Identity Management among Overweight Women: Narrative Resistance to Stigma." Pp. 29–47 in *Interpreting Weight: The Social Management of Fatness and Thinness*, edited by J. Sobal and D. Maurer. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
30. Counihan, Carole. 1988. "Female Identity, Food, and Power in Contemporary Florence." *Anthropological Quarterly* 61:51–61.
31. Critser, Greg. 2003. *Fat Land: How Americans Became the Fattest People in the World*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
32. Curtin, Deane and Lisa Heldke, eds. 1992. *Cooking, Eating, Thinking: Transformative Philosophies of Food*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
33. de Certeau, Michel. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
34. Degher, Douglas and Gerald Hughes. 1999. "The Adoption and Management of a 'Fat' Identity." Pp. 11–27 in *Interpreting Weight: The Social Management of Fatness and Thinness*, edited by J. Sobal and D. Maurer. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
35. Deutsch, Jonathan, ed. 2003. *Teaching Food: Agriculture, Food and Society Syllabi and Course Materials Collection* (syllabus set compiled for the Association for the Study of Food and Society and the Agriculture, Food and Human Values Society). Retrieved August 9, 2014 (http://foodsecurecanada.org/sites/default/files/Teaching_Food_-_Agriculture_Food_and_Society_Syllabi_2003.pdf).
36. DeVault, Marjorie L. 1991. *Feeding the Family: The Social Organization of Caring as Gendered Work*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
37. Douglas, Mary. 1972. "Deciphering a Meal." *Daedalus* 101:61–81.
38. Douglas, Mary. 1984. "Standard Social Uses of Food." Pp. 1–39 in *Food in the Social Order: Studies of Food and Festivities in Three American Communities*, edited by M. Douglas. New York: Sage.
39. Elias, Norbert. [1939] 1978. *The Civilizing Process*. Translated by E. Jephcott. New York: Urizen Books.
40. Engels, Friedrich. [1845] 1969. *The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844*. London, England: Granada.
41. Fantasia, Rick. 1995. "Fast Food in France." *Theory and Society* 24:201–43.
42. Ferguson, Priscilla Parkhurst. 1998. "A Cultural Field in the Making: Gastronomy in 19th Century France." *American Journal of Sociology* 104:597–641.
43. Ferguson, Priscilla Parkhurst and Sharon Zukin. 1995. "What Is Cooking?" *Theory and Society* 24:193–99.
44. Fine, Ben. 2002. *The World of Consumption: The Material and Cultural Revisited*. 2d ed. London, England: Routledge.
45. Fine, Ben, Michael Heasman, and Judith Wright. 1996. *Consumption in the Age of Affluence: The World of Food*. London, England: Routledge.
46. Fine, Gary Allen. 1996. "Justifying Work: Occupational Rhetorics as Resources in Restaurant Kitchens." *Administration Science Quarterly* 41:90–115.
47. Finkelstein, Joanne. 1989. *Dining Out: A Sociology of Modern Manners*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
48. Finkelstein, Joanne. 1998. "Dining Out: The Hyperreality of Appetite." Pp. 201–15 in *Eating Culture*, edited by R. Scapp and B. Seitz. Albany: State University of New York Press.
49. Fox, Nicols. 1997. *Spoiled: The Dangerous Truth about a Food Chain Gone Haywire*. New York: Basic Books.
50. Frost, Caroline. 2002. "Jose Bove: Profile" (BBC Four, April 20).
51. Fuller, Robert. 1995. "Wine, Symbolic Boundary Setting, and American Religious Communities." *Journal of American Academy of Religion* 63:497–517.
52. Furst, Elisabeth L'Orange. 1997. "Cooking and Femininity." *Women's Studies International Forum* 20:441–49.
53. Gabaccia, Donna. 2000. *We Are What We Eat: Ethnic Foods and the Making of Americans*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
54. Gatta, Mary Elizabeth. 2002. *Juggling Food and Feelings: Emotional Balance in Restaurant Work*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Press.

55. Germov, John and Lauren Williams. 1996. "The Sexual Division of Dieting: Women's Voices." *Sociological Review* 44:630-47.
56. Germov, John and Lauren Williams, eds. 1999. *A Sociology of Food and Nutrition: The Social Appetite*. South Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: Oxford University Press.
57. Giddens, Anthony. 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
58. Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
59. Goffman, Erving. 1963. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
60. Goody, Jack. 1982. *Cooking, Cuisine and Class: A Study in Comparative Sociology*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
61. Gusfield, Joseph. 1992. "Nature's Body and the Metaphors of Food." Pp. 75-103 in *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*, edited by M. Lamont and M. Fournier. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
62. Harris, Marvin. 1979. *Cultural Materialism: The Struggle for a Science of Culture*. New York: Vintage Books.
63. Harris, Marvin. 1985. *Good to Eat: Riddles of Food and Culture*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
64. Haworth-Hoepfner, Susan. 1999. "Medical Discourse on Body Image: Reconceptualizing the Differences between Women with and without Eating Disorders." Pp. 89-111 in *Interpreting Weight: The Social Management of Fatness and Thinness*, edited by J. Sobal and D. Maurer. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
65. Heldke, Lisa. 2003. *Exotic Appetites: Ruminations of a Food Adventurer*. New York: Routledge.
66. Honeycutt, Karen. 1999. "Fat World/Thin World: 'Fat Busters,' 'Equivocators,' 'Fat Boosters,' and the Social Construction of Obesity." Pp. 165-81 in *Interpreting Weight: The Social Management of Fatness and Thinness*, edited by J. Sobal and D. Maurer. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
67. hooks, bell. 1998. "Eating the Other: Desire and Resistance." Pp. 181-200 in *Eating Culture*, edited by R. Scapp and B. Seitz. Albany: State University of New York Press.
68. Horkheimer, Max and Theodor Adorno. [1944] 2002. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Translated by E. Jephcott. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
69. Inness, Sherrie, ed. 2001. *Cooking Lessons: The Politics of Gender and Good*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
70. International Sociological Association. 2005. "Working Group on Famine and Society WG05." Retrieved August 9, 2014 (<http://www.isa-sociology.org/wg05.htm>).
71. Jenkins, J. Craig and Stephen J. Scanlan. 2001. "Food Security in Less Developed Countries, 1970 to 1990." *American Sociological Review* 66:718-44.
72. Joannise, Leanne and Anthony Synnott. 1999. "Fighting Back: Reactions and Resistance to the Stigma of Obesity." Pp. 49-70 in *Interpreting Weight: The Social Management of Fatness and Thinness*, edited by J. Sobal and D. Maurer. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
73. Kaufman, Phil R. 2002. "Food Retailing." Pp. 21-33 in *The U. S. Food Marketing System*, edited by M. Harris, P. Kaufman, S. Martinez, and C. Price (ERS/USDA Agricultural Economic Report AER811).
74. Knight, Andrew and Rex H. Warland. 2005. "Determinants of Food Safety Risk: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach." *Rural Sociology* 70:253-75.
75. Lamont, Michele. 1992. *Money, Morals, and Manners: The Culture of the French and American Upper-Middle Class*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
76. Leevy, J. Roy. 1940. "Contrasts in Urban and Rural Family Life." *American Sociological Review* 5:948-53.
77. Leidner, Robin. 1993. *Fast Food, Fast Talk: The Routinization of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
78. Lester, Rebecca J. 1999. "Let Go and Let God: Religion and the Politics of Surrender in Overeaters Anonymous." Pp. 139-64 in *Interpreting Weight: The Social Management of Fatness and Thinness*, edited by J. Sobal and D. Maurer. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
79. Levenstein, Harvey A. 1988. *Revolution at the Table: The Transformation of the American Diet*. New York: Oxford University Press.

80. Levenstein, Harvey A. 1993. *Paradox of Plenty: A Social History of Eating in Modern America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
81. Levi-Strauss, Claude. [1964] 1969. *The Raw and the Cooked*. Translated by J. Cape. New York: Harper & Row.
82. Long, Lucy M. 1998. "Culinary Tourism: A Folkloristic Perspective on Eating and Otherness." *Southern Folklore* 55:181–204.
83. Long, Lucy M., ed. 2004. *Culinary Tourism*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.
84. Lupton, Deborah. 1996. *Food, the Body and the Self*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
85. Mankekar, Purnima. 2002. "'India Shopping': Indian Grocery Stores and Transnational Configurations of Belonging." *Ethnos* 67(1):75–98.
86. Maurer, Donna. 1999. "Too Skinny or Vibrant and Healthy? Weight Management in the Vegetarian Movement." Pp. 209–30 in *Weighty Issues: Fatness and Thinness as Social Problems*, edited by J. Sobal and D. Maurer. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
87. Maurer, Donna. 2002. *Vegetarianism: Movement or Moment?* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
88. Maurer, Donna and Jeffery Sobal, eds. 1995. *Eating Agendas: Food and Nutrition as Social Problems*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
89. McIntosh, Wm. Alex. 1996. *Sociologies of Food and Nutrition*. New York: Plenum Press.
90. Mennell, Stephen. 1985. *All Manners of Food: Eating and Taste in England and France from the Middle Ages to the Present*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
91. Mennell, Stephen. 1999. "Foreword." Pp. v–vii in *A Sociology of Food and Nutrition*, edited by J. Germov and L. Williams. South Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: Oxford University Press.
92. Mennell, Stephen, Anne Murcott, and Anneke H. van Otterloo. 1992. *The Sociology of Food: Eating, Diet and Culture*. London, England: Sage.
93. Miller, David and Jacquie Reilly. 1995. "Making an Issue of Food Safety: The Media, Pressure Groups, and the Public Sphere." Pp. 305–36 in *Eating Agendas: Food and Nutrition as Social Problems*, edited by D. Maura and J. Sobal. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
94. Mintz, Sidney W. 1985. *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History*. New York: Viking.
95. Murcott, Anne. 1999. "Not Science but PR: GM Food and the Makings of a Considered Sociology." *Sociological Research Online* 4(3). Retrieved June 15, 2005 (<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/4/3/murcott.html>).
96. Murcott, Anne. 2001. "Public Beliefs about GM Foods: More on the Makings of a Considered Sociology." *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 15:9–19.
97. Murcott, Anne, ed. 1983. *The Sociology of Food and Eating: Essays on the Sociological Significance of Food*. Aldershot, England: Gower.
98. Narayan, Uma. 1997. *Dislocating Cultures: Identities, Traditions, and Third-World Feminism*. London, England: Routledge.
99. Nelson, Emily. 2001. "Too Many Choices." *Wall Street Journal*, April 20, p. B1.
100. Nestle, Marion. 2002. "Hunger in the United States: Policy Implications." Pp. 385–99 in *Food in the U.S.A.*, edited by C. Counihan. New York: Routledge.
101. Nestle, Marion. 2003. *Safe Food: Bacteria, Biotechnology, and Bioterrorism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
102. Ohnuki-Tierney, Emiko. 1993. *Rice as Self: Japanese Identity through Time*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
103. Oldenburg, Ray. 1989. *The Great Good Place: Cafes, Coffee Shops, Community Centers, Beauty Parlors, General Stores, Bars, Hangouts, and How They Get You through the Day*. New York: Paragon House.
104. Parham, Ellen S. 1999. "Meanings of Weight among Dietitians and Nutritionists." Pp. 183–208 in *Weighty Issues: Fatness and Thinness as Social Problems*, edited by J. Sobal and D. Maurer. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
105. Pilcher, Jeffrey. 1996. "Tamales or Timbales: Cuisine and the Formation of Mexican National Identity, 1821–1911." *Americas* 53:193–217.

106. Pollan, Michael. 2002. "Power Steer." *New York Times Magazine*, March 31, pp. 44–51, 68, 71–72, 76–77.
107. Pollan, Michael. 2003. "The (Agri)Cultural Contradictions of Obesity." *New York Times Magazine*, October 12, p. 41.
108. Price, Charlene. 2002. "Food Service." Pp. 34–49 in *The U.S. Food Marketing System, 2002*, edited by M. Harris, P. Kaufman, S. Martinez, and C. Price (Agricultural Economic Report AER 811).
109. Ransom, Elizabeth. 1999. "Creating 'Uniformity': The Construction of Bodies in Women's Collegiate Cross Country." Pp. 183–206 in *Interpreting Weight: The Social Management of Fatness and Thinness*, edited by J. Sobal and D. Maurer. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
110. Ray, Krishnendu. 2004. *The Migrant's Table: Meals and Memories in Bengali-American Households*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
111. Redhead, Steve. 1995. *Unpopular Culture: The Birth of Law and Popular Culture*. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press.
112. Regmi, Anita. 2002. "Changing Structure of Global Food Consumption and Trade: An Introduction." Pp. 1–3 in *Changing Structure of Global Food Consumption and Trade*, edited by A. Regmi (Agriculture and Trade Report WRS-01–1). Market and Trade Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture).
113. Reilly, Jacquie and David Miller. 1997. "Scaremonger or Scapegoat? The Role of the Media in the Emergence of Food as a Social Issue." Pp. 234–51 in *Food, Health and Identity*, edited by P. Caplan. New York: Routledge.
114. Reiter, Ester. 1991. *Making Fast Food: From the Frying Pan into the Fryer*. Montreal, Quebec, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.
115. Ribar, David C. and Karen S Hamrick. 2003. "Dynamics of Poverty and Food Insufficiency" (Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Report 36). Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
116. Ritzer, George. 1993. *The McDonaldisation of Society: An Investigation into the Changing Character of Contemporary Social Life*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
117. Rosen, Stacey. 2003. "Sub-Saharan Africa." Pp. 12–16 in *Food Security Assessment*, edited by S. Shapouri and S. Rosen (Agriculture and Trade Report GFA-14). Market and Trade Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
118. Royle, Tony and Brian Towers, eds. 2002. *Labour Relations in the Global Fast-food Industry*. London, England: Routledge.
119. Schlosser, Eric. 2001. *Fast Food Nation: The Dark Side of the All-American Meal*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
120. Shapouri, Shahla and Stacey Rosen, eds. 2004. "Food Security Assessment" (Agriculture and Trade Report GFA-15).
121. Shortridge, Barbara and James Shortridge, eds. 1998. *The Taste of American Place: A Reader on Regional and Ethnic Foods*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.
122. Simmel, Georg. [1915] 1991. "The Sociology of the Meal." *Food and Foodways* 5:345–50.
123. Slow Food USA. 2005. "About Us" Brooklyn, NY: Slow Food USA. National Office. Retrieved August 9, 2014 (<http://www.slowfoodusa.org/about-us>).
124. Smelser, Neil J. 1988. *Handbook of Sociology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
125. Smart, Barry. 1994. "Digesting the Modern Diet: Gastro-Porn, Fast Food, and Panic Eating." Pp. 158–80 in *The Flaneur*, edited by K. Tester. London, England: Routledge.
126. Sobal, Jeffery. 1995. "Medicalization and Demedicalization of Obesity." Pp. 67–90 in *Eating Agendas: Food and Nutrition as Social Problem*, edited by D. Maurer and J. Sobal. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
127. Sobal, Jeffery. 1999. "The Size Acceptance Movement and the Social Construction of Body Weight." Pp. 231–50 in *Weighty Issues: Fatness and Thinness as Social Problems*, edited by J. Sobal and D. Maurer. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
128. Sobal, Jeffery, Wm. Alex McIntosh, and William Whit. 1993. "Teaching the Sociology of Food, Eating, and Nutrition." *Teaching Sociology* 21:50–59.
129. Sokolov, Raymond. 1991. *Why We Eat What We Eat: How the Encounter between the New World and the Old Changed the Way Everyone on the Planet Eats*. New York: Summit Books.

130. Stassen, Robert E. and Matthew A. Waller. 2002. "Logistics and Assortment Depth in the Retail Supply: Evidence from Grocery Categories." *Journal of Business Logistics* 23:125–43.
131. Stinson, Kandi M. 2001. *Women and Dieting Culture: Inside a Commercial Weight Loss Group*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
132. Taeuber, Conrad. 1948. "Some Sociological Problems in the Work of FAO." *American Sociological Review* 13:653–59.
133. Talwar, Jennifer Parker. 2002. *Fast Food, Fast Track: Immigrants, Big Business, and the American Dream*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
134. Tam, Siumi Maria. 1997. "Eating Metropolitaneity: Hong Kong Identity in Yumcha." *Australian Journal of Anthropology* 8:291–307.
135. Toombs, Charles P. 1993. "The Confluence of Food and Identity in Gloria Naylor's *Linden Hills*: 'What We Eat Is Who We Is.'" *CLA Journal* 37:1–18.
136. Turgeon, Laurier and Madeleine Pastinelli. 2002. "Eat the World: Postcolonial Encounters in Quebec City's Ethnic Restaurants." *Journal of American Folklore* 115:247–68.
137. Valentine, Gill. 1999. "Eating In: Home, Consumption and Identity." *Sociological Review* 47:491–524.
138. Veblen, Thorstein. [1899] 1953. *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions*. New York: Mentor.
139. Warde, Alan. 1997. *Consumption, Food and Taste: Culinary Antinomies and Commodity Culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
140. Warde, Alan and Lydia Martens. 2000. *Eating Out: Social Differentiation, Consumption, and Pleasure*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
141. Watson, James. 2002. "China's Big Mac Attack." Pp. 347–57 in *Food in the U.S.A.*, edited by C. Counihan. New York: Routledge.
142. Watson, James and Melissa L. Caldwell, eds. 2005. *The Cultural Politics of Food and Eating*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
143. Way, Karen. 1995. "Never Too Rich . . . Or Too Thin: The Role of Stigma in the Social Construction of Anorexia Nervosa." Pp. 91–113 in *Eating Agendas: Food and Nutrition as Social Problems*, edited by D. Maurer and J. Sobal. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
144. Whit, William C. 1995. *Food and Society: A Sociological Approach*. Dix Hills, NY: General Hall.
145. Whit, William C. 1999. "The Association for the Study of Food and Society Newsletter: Continuities and Change." Presidential address at the joint annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Food and Society and the Agriculture, Food, and Human Values Society, June 3, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
146. Whit, William and Yvonne Lockwood, eds. 1990. *Teaching Food and Society: A Collection of Syllabi and Instructional Materials*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
147. Whyte, William Foote. 1948. *Human Relations in the Restaurant Industry*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
148. Wilk, Richard. 1999. "Real Belizean Food: Building Local Identity in the Transnational Caribbean." *American Anthropologist* 101:244–55.
149. Wood, Roy C. 1992. "Dining Out in the Urban Context." *British Food Journal* 94(9):3–5.
150. Wood, Roy C. 1995. *The Sociology of the Meal*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.
151. Zafar, Rafia. 1999. "The Signifying Dish: Autobiography and History in Two Black Women's Cookbooks." *Feminist Studies* 25:449–61.