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Abstract

Convenience food is a contested category in the food assortment; while valued for its time- and effort-saving qualities, it is often critiqued to be unwholesome and contributing to diminishing food skills. This thesis uses practice theoretical insights to explore shared understandings of convenience food among young adolescents (12 to 15 years) in a Dutch high school context. It is relevant to focus on young consumers, as they grow up in a food environment that is increasingly characterized by the pursuit of convenience. By building on practice theory and the new sociology of childhood, this study provides a sociological account on how adolescents conceive convenience as an attribute of food, and how these understandings relate to their food practices. A derivative of focus group discussions served as the general methodology, including several food-related assignments part of workshops provided at four schools in and around Amsterdam. Findings were analyzed based on the three elements of practices: material, competence and meaning, and their interrelations. It is concluded that adolescents have a set of shared understandings when it comes to convenience food. Key associations include meanings and ideas of health, taste and artificiality; competences related to the food industry, their own cooking know-how and use of technology; and material in the form of specific convenience products and general categories, its packaging, brands and places. Moreover, conceptions of normality are contradictory in that convenience food (due to its different forms) is both conceived as normal and special. These findings contribute to an understanding of how young people make sense of their food environment, and how social conventions and justifications play a role in their meaning-making process. It is suggested to enrich food education activities with room for critical reflection about current food on offer to equip young consumers with critical reflection competences to make their own judgments and informed food choices.
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1. Introduction

In today’s food environment there is an extensive array of food products available aimed to offer some sort of convenience to consumers; predominately to save time, physical and mental effort in the planning, preparation and consumption of food (Brunner, Van der Horst & Siegrist, 2010). Many of these products have an additional attribute next to convenience, as many of them are high in fat, salt and sugar (Jolly, 2010). Additionally, convenience food often implies a shift in responsibility from the consumer to the food processing industry, as steps of food preparation are outsourced. Consumers in this sense, become more dependant of industry, dependency that is likely to expand when consumers will increasingly rely on convenience in their food choices and loose the ability to cook along the way (Lang, 2004). Yet convenience of food is not merely negative, as it also provides benefits to people not in the position to cook (Fresco, 2013). Additionally, consumers tend to negotiate convenience, balancing its negative and positive characteristics. All in all, convenience food is a contradictory food category.

While the influence of convenience food has received scholarly attention, foremost in establishing understandings of its link to health deterioration (Jabs & Devine, 2006) and identifying individual consumption motives (Brunner et al., 2010) less attention is paid to the normality that convenience nowadays has in people’s food consumption. The question arises whether convenience is currently a prominent result of consumer demand, or if it is more related to the supply-side, e.g. demand is ‘created’ by the food processing industry benefiting from value-adding (Pollan, 2013). Additionally it is relevant to see the rise of convenience food in a historical context, with technological (introduction microwave and the like.), social (changing household structures, lifestyles etc.) and cultural (changing norms and values) changes contributing to its widespread normalization in our contemporary food environment (Warde, 1999; Shove, 2000; Shove & Southerton, 2000; Gram-Hanssen, 2010; Lyon and Kinney, 2013).

Where convenience is an increasingly important determinant in people’s food choices, it is interesting to look deeper into its role in people’s consumption and how people conceive their food environment in which convenience has a prominent place.

Authorities, including scientists, policy makers and food activists, emphasize the need for consumers to “eat right and to gain the necessary knowledge and skills about food that enable to do so”. Although how to conceptualize to ‘eat right’ is a matter of debate, in general it is recognized that people should be more informed about food and engage in critical consumption (Kimura, 2010). Current trends in research go beyond nutritional knowledge as an important factor in making healthy choices, and look at more broad socio-cultural dimensions of food. Food literacy, defined by the ability to apply knowledge of food on food choices, is a concept receiving attention in this respect (Närvänen, Saarijärvi & Simanainen, 2013). In order to make informed choices, consumers must be aware of the choice environment, and thus also of the role convenience plays in the food environment.

1.1 Scope of research

The scope of this research is the context of convenience food consumption and its normality in our food environment. Convenience is a very visible attribute found in our food environment nowadays, and the scope of this research is on how people think and give meaning to this social phenomenon (e.g. convenience) to acquire understanding of its normality in our food environment and the role its plays in consumer food practices. There are a number of empirical studies concentrating on food practices in which convenience food plays a role. However, it is not often placed at the centre of research (Halkier, 2012). In this study, convenience food is the main focus. Young adolescents are chosen as the population under investigation, as it is interesting to dive into their way of understanding the food environment cluttered with convenience, as they grow up with an increasing offer of convenience-oriented products.
As a consequence of this changing food environment, meanings ascribed to food simultaneously change. As in earlier times convenience might have signified comfort and a release for women (‘the burden of cooking’), convenience has now found its place in the realm of normality and its use is more about the manipulation of time and timing than about saving time in an attempt to provide comfort (Warde, 1999). As such it becomes interesting to look at the contemporary associations with convenience of young adolescents, as they are assumed to be divergent than the associations of their parents, because convenience now has a different and more prominent place in our food environment. Earlier research supports the assumption that there are significantly different perspectives on this food category in terms of generations (Moisio, Arnould & Price, 2004). Furthermore, from a consumer socialization perspective, it is interesting to look at this target population, as the changing food environment also requires different skills and competences in handling food. One interesting notion concerning this is ‘food assembly’ as termed by Lang and Caraher (2001), which will be discussed in the theoretical framework. Besides the acquisition of new skills and competences, what makes young adolescents also interesting to investigate from a socialization perspective, is that their food practices are not yet imbedded in routines and patterns as is more likely with older consumers. Hence, their view on food, in this case on convenience food, might be less dominated by their own individual experiences and routines, but more an outcome of the normative conceptions embedded in social practices.

1.2 Research aims
The primary aim of this research is to gain insight into young adolescent consumers’ understandings and conceptualizations regarding the convenience food environment, because this provides insight into the process of normalization of consumption in a changing food context. Context is relevant in determining how people use and relate to food (Persson Osowski et al., 2012) and the food environment is increasingly recognized as shaping dietary practices (Delormier, Frohlich & Potvin, 2009). A convincing example of this is the notion of the obesogenic environment, broadly defined as the sum of opportunities and conditions in the food environment promoting over-consumption and consequently obesity (Townshend & Lake, 2009). As the context of convenience food is the scope here, it will be relevant to explore how young people reason about and make sense of this food category, and how knowledge is constructed. Its social relevance lies in the practice theoretical inspired assumption that it is relevant to look into the processes behind the formation of practices (or routines). It is thus socially relevant to acquire understanding of elements forming practices, in this case understanding young adolescents’ food practices and eating patterns.

The secondary and more practically oriented aim of this study is to engage young people into thinking and talking about food-related issues by use of participatory techniques. This is in line with the aim of Think.Food, a non-profit organisation that provides interactive workshops on food topics at Dutch high schools. The social relevance of this aim is evident; it is important to empower children to think about food, where it comes from, how it is produced, what it contains and what sort of consequences (e.g. in relation to health) come with it and to improve their food literacy, as it will help them to make informed food choices benefiting their health. It is important to consider that this aim is not directed to make normative claims about ‘good’ or ‘bad’ food and to impose this on young people. The aim is directed towards critical thinking, to provide young adolescents the opportunity to think about the food on offer and to make their own judgments and conclusions about it.

1.3 Research question
To achieve these research aims, the following research question will be addressed: How do young adolescents conceptualize and understand convenience as an attribute of food products and how does this relate to their food practices?
In this study context, food practices are understood by its separate and interlinked elements ‘material’, ‘competence’ and ‘meaning’ as proposed by Shove, Pantzar and Watson in their book The Dynamics of Social Practice: everyday life and how it changes (2012). Chapter 3 aims to explain the theory of practice and the Shove, Pantzar and Watson’ useful proposition to analyze practices on the hand of these overlapping elements.

1.4 Collaboration with Think.Food
This study is conducted in collaboration with the organisation Think.Food. As stated Think.Food provides interactive workshops on food topics at Dutch high schools. These workshops range from practical cooking classes to more theoretically oriented workshops with practical assignments that aim to let the children think critically about food. Topics include amongst others food and technology, food and media, food and the body. Through these workshops children are challenged to think critically about the food they consume, to question what they normally take for granted or to pose questions on food-related issues that they think are important. The workshops are aimed at providing a playful way of learning about our food system.

Motivated (university) students of relevant fields of studies give the workshops of Think.Food as so-called guest lecturers. As a guest lecturer myself, I experienced that children are keen to learn more about food, and have interesting conceptions of food. I think is very interesting to use their insights as data for research and it comes along in alignment with the participatory approach, saying that the method of gathering data is also participatory.

1.5 Structure of thesis
This thesis begins with addressing existing literature in the field of convenience food, followed by an elaboration on the practice theoretical approach and the methodological approach of participatory research. Then, in chapter 5, the methodology is discussed in more detail, followed by the results in chapter 6. The results are analyzed and related to existing literature in the discussion section, and in addition reflections on the process and implications of the study are discussed. Finally conclusions are drawn.
2. Theoretical framework: convenience food

In this theoretical framework, literature and research on convenience food is reviewed to generate a context of this study and indicate the relevance of investigating new and changing conventions towards convenience as an attribute of food.

2.1 What is convenience?

Broadly defined, convenience food products are products that help to save time, physical and mental effort associated with planning, preparation and consumption of food (Brunner, Van der Horst & Siegrist, 2010). Convenience is an interesting field of study within the broader food context, because next to the fact that it has become one of the key drivers in food choices, especially amongst young people and in developed countries, it connotes both positive and negative aspects.

Although often broadly defined as above in terms of saving time and effort, the notion of convenience is not as simple as this might imply.

A considerable amount of literature has been devoted to the underlying conceptions of convenience. Gofton (1995) refers to the vagueness surrounding the term, as convenience food is, like other common-sense and conventionally used concepts such as “healthy” or “proper food”, in general understood, but when it comes to clearly defining it, problems arise. In his attempt to clarify what is actually meant by convenience, Gofton argues that convenience is relative. He points out that for food to be convenient, it has to fit into the “overall pattern of provisional practices” (Gofton, 1995, p. 157). Hence, convenience addresses more than time spent on cooking, and includes the pursuit of convenience in other stages in the provisional process, e.g. planning, shopping, preparation, serving, eating, disposal and cleaning-up. In essence, Gofton highlights that convenience is not to be understood as an attribute of a product, but rather as an outcome in the way it is used.

Gofton (1995) also touches upon the changing moral status of convenience foods. From a symbolic perspective, food can be seen as an expression of care, respect or duty. From a utilitarian perspective on the other hand, benefits of using convenience food are recognized and the meal as a collective social event is marginalized too fit everyday schedules. More on changing conventions of convenience in the last paragraph of this theoretical framework.

So what types of food can be classified as convenient? Taking Goftons’ argument into consideration that in order to be convenient, the food needs to fit into the overall pattern if provisional practices, a broad definition and classification will be adopted within this theoretical framework (however opened to alterations when results show divergent views). Convenience food as such refers to convenient food used at home and out of home, ranging from domestic consumption of ready-to-eat to ready-to-cook foods (i.e. partly-prepared food items) and out-of-home consumption such as fast food and take-away. Food products include amongst others ready-to-eat microwave meals, meal packages, and singular items such as pre-cut vegetables, soup bases, marinated meat etc., next to foods available out of home. It is chosen to leave room for foods with different levels of convenience, to see how young adolescents make sense of these differences, and how they place them in their daily food context.

2.2 Convenience in relation to time

Other authors (Warde, 1999; Shove, 2000) approach the concept of convenience differently. In his article on time and space of convenience, Warde describes how conceptions of convenience changed over the years. Where in the 1960’s convenience related predominately to providing comfort and saving labour, more recent conceptions focus on the re-evaluation or the manipulation of time. Warde introduces
the concept of a “society on a schedule”; time is increasingly seen as a source of trouble. People feel the burden of having insufficient time, and consequently they try to cope with this by including more activities in the same timeframe and re-arranging activities. Accordingly, he argues: “This is about timing rather about time” (Warde, 1999, p. 521). As a consequence, convenience (food) is legitimized and normalized, or even becomes an obsession of the society on a schedule.

Additionally, Warde makes a distinction relevant for seeing convenience in perspective of time, namely the distinction between modern and hypermodern convenience. Where modern convenience has the reduction of time as the ultimate goal, hypermodern convenience refers to the re-arrangement of time to ensure greater flexibility, and thus room for re-ordering time according to personal schedules (Warde, 1999; Shove, 2012). Next to this new view on timing, it is also relevant to look at social and institutional order and how changes occur, or more specifically, how it is loosening (e.g. 24-hour society, extended opening times, television on demand to name a view examples). Together, the increasing fragmentation of time and the decreasing socially shared order, is reinforcing the demand for convenience. This tendency is illustrated by figure 2.1 adopted from Shove (2003). The figure shows the direct relation between the reliance on individual means of coordination and the loosening collective structure (Shove, 2003). Relating this to convenience food, one obvious illustration of this reinforcement is the increase of convenient one-person meals and the decreasing importance of the communal family meal.

Shove continues that the pursuit of convenience makes sense in response to pressures associated with the fragmentation of time and speeding up, illustrated by her quote: “the more harried we become, the more we value time, the more convenience counts and the more we consume in its name” (Shove, 2012, p.299). However, she warns that when taking time as the central issue of convenience, we risk to overlook the more complex relations between convenience (the convenient solution, in this case convenient food) and the practices to which it relates (Shove, 2012).

2.3 Convenience as a multifaceted development
From a historical perspective, convenience food has technical, social and cultural dimensions interconnected with each other.

From a technological perspective, convenience in the kitchen increased with technological appliances coming into use, the most prominent being the refrigerator, the freezer and the microwave. These appliances meant a technological transition in regard of domestic food practices. Technological transitions refer to technological changes in the societal organisation of, for example, food consumption (Gram-Hanssen, 2012). Shove and Southerton (2000) offer an interesting example of this normalization.
tation of appliances in their elaboration on how the freezer found its way in British households. By discussing three phases, they describe the way from novelty (pre-1970’s) towards normality of this domestic device. Shove and Southerton describe the freezer as: “a symbol of modernization in the 1970s, a pre-condition for domestic and economic efficiency in the 1980s and a device of convenience in the busy 1990s.” (Shove & Southerton, 2000, p. 314). These changing conceptions of this domestic device and the “narrative of normalization” provided by Shove and Southerton, illustrate how objects and object attributes (such as convenience) can play a part in changing patterns of food consumption and provisioning. Although new technologies are often adapted slowly, they are eventually appropriated and domesticated in the daily use, or as Gram-Hanssen (2012) calls it, a relationship develops between the consumer and the consumer good, in this case a technological appliance such as a microwave.

Although technology has had and continues to have dramatic impact on how people organize everyday practices in terms of convenience, technological devices such as illustrated by the examples of the microwave and freezer, are not stand-alone instruments offering straightforward convenience. They have to be seen in the socio-cultural context. From historical perspective the most obvious implication of timesaving and convenient appliances and solutions, is that on the distribution of household work and women’s participation in paid labour (Lyon & Kinney, 2013). It can be seen visa versa; technology played its part in the re-distribution of household work, freeing up time for paid work next to unpaid domestic work. Other way around, women emancipation and decreasing time shaped the conditions for the demand for timesaving solutions. Additionally, social developments such as changing household structures and changing lifestyles had its impact on the proliferation of convenient solutions. In sum, technological and social changes are two sides of the same coin (Shove, 2000).

From a cultural perspective, the rise of convenience food use can be seen in light of a global food culture, characterized by a more distant relationship between people and food, as will be later explained in this theoretical framework. Increased reliance on convenient and fast foods is evident in both developed and developing societies, and can be explained by changing conventions on what is normal.

2.4 Convenience food consumption drivers
While the rising demand of convenience food over the last decades is enhanced by the above-described socio-cultural and technological developments, it is also relevant to look into individual drivers of convenience food consumption. Much research has been conducted to identify the key drivers behind consumption of this food category (Brunner et al., 2010). Interesting is the consensus on the fact that time pressure does not play a major role in the actual choice of convenience food, re-assuring the ambiguity surrounding convenience which is often defined in this respect.

Socio-demographic characteristics such as gender, age, household structure and size, education and income are researched as indicators of convenience food consumption. In general, convenience food is more often used by male consumers, and less used when age increases. Household structure and size play a role insofar that single-living adults without children consume convenience food more often. Education and income have a more debated role in the process, as there are contrasting accounts in this respect. While Warde (1999) discusses that households with a higher disposable income spend more on convenience foods, Brunner et al. (2010) have not found a significant relationship between income and consumption. Likewise, there is uncertainty about the effect of education. Other drivers are more associated with the involvement with food, namely cooking enjoyment, variety seeking, avoiding waste, health concerns, cooking skills, concerns on naturalness and nutrition knowledge (Brunner et al., 2010). All these drivers are negatively correlated with the use of convenience food.
Going back to the properties of convenience food, it can be stated that convenience food is foremost an adult-oriented product category. In this respect, most studies have focused on convenience food use of the persons mainly responsible for the purchasing and preparation of food in the household (Brunner et al., 2010). Research on convenience food use of children is mostly directed to a specific category within the convenience food context, namely that of fast food restaurants and food available in school canteens, as well as the overarching concept of an obesogenic environment, hence the focus is on out-of-home consumption mainly. Less attention is devoted to convenience food available for home use and children’s perspective on this, as these often concern products like ready-to-eat meals, semi-prepared meal packages, washed and cut vegetables and alike, which are more in the realm of parental choice (Patrick & Nicklas, 2005).

2.5 Negotiating convenience

In reviewing the debate on the importance of cooking, Tim Lang cites the well-know argument in favour of processed foods from a historic perspective, “liberation for women in general” (Lang, 2004, p. 208). He contrasts this with his personal view on the importance of cooking, stating that when people do not learn how to cook, a dependency culture is created. When people loose touch with basic means of food preparation, they loose control of their diet as they become dependant of what others cook for them or what the food industry provides to them. This, he states firmly, is far away from consumer sovereignty. While convenience is one of the key drivers in food choices nowadays, especially amongst young people, it is often overlooked that convenience also implies a shifting responsibility from the consumer to the food processing industry (Lang, 2004).

Returning to the historical perspective on convenience food, Michael Pollan (2013) describes that there is no consensus if the emergence of convenience foods in the consumer market was a demand-driven development, driven amongst other reasons by the increase of women in the workforce and accordingly the demand for timesaving solutions, or a supply-driven development, initiated by the food industry out of profit motives. Convenience food is quietly assimilated in most of western food cultures (more in the US and Nordic regions of Europe than in the Mediterranean area) and nowadays convenience has a prominent place in our food environment (Lyon & Kinney, 2012; Pollan, 2013). Pollan goes further, suggesting that the food industry has redefined the meaning of cooking. Moreover, he argues although processed foods have not totally diminished parents’ feelings of obligation towards meal preparation; it surely has had its impact on how family meals are cooked.

He states that the most important thing in our diets is not the nutritional content, but rather who is cooking it, e.g. a person or a food manufacturing company. He worries that the next generation will be so distant to cooking, that ‘cooking from scratch’ will become an exotic phenomenon, just as brewing one’s own beer for example is now. Because people are getting used to outsourcing (steps of) food preparation to the food industry, skills are getting lost and cooking as an everyday practice is in trouble. In his defence of cooking in his most recent book ‘Cooked: a natural history of transformation’, Pollan also touches upon the relation between rising obesity rates and the decline of home cooking. As part of the solution Pollan proposes the need to rebuild a ‘culture of cooking’. While in the post-war period the emergence of processed convenience food ensured a renegotiation of household labour, not in the least supported by industry with proclaiming ‘cooking as a women’s burden’, now it is time for both men and women to renegotiate their time, and simply take the time to cook, and utterly important, involve children in cooking too. Although Pollan is discussed controversially because of his blunt arguments against the food industry, he does have a point in describing the influence of convenient solutions on the re-structuring of time and its impact on cooking and eating practices.

Whilst Pollan is in true defence for cooking and blames the food industry for its stake in people’s detachment from food, Dutch professor Louise Fresco provides a more nuanced image of the state of food and
the role of the food industry. She contrasts ideas of Pollan by stating the improvements in our food safety and availability due to intensification of agriculture and bio-industry. Furthermore, she proclaims that local and regional food is not an option to feed the world. She also counters the idea that fast food and convenience food is bad per se. Although Fresco acknowledges that many convenience options contain too much fat and salt, she refutes the idea that reducing processed food to a minimum and cooking ourselves is the ultimate solution. It is not simply as black and white as Pollan proposes. In today’s world of mobility and more one-person households than ever before, fast food is a logical component in our society, which also offers benefits to many people not in the position to cook. Besides her disagreement with some of Pollan’s arguments, she does agree to the statement that we as people are becoming alienated from our food. This she argues is due to the fact that we are not capable anymore to see the real value of food. Like Pollan, Fresco points towards the young generation, by emphasizing that this generation is the first one to grow up detached from the places where the actual food grows, due to increasing urbanization (Fresco, 2013).

The above-described debate illustrates the contradictory accounts when it comes to convenience food. It is not a simple and clear-cut dimension within the food context. An illustration of this is provided by Närvänen, Saarijärvi and Simanainen (2013) in their study on online conversation practices in the context of convenience food, wherein they stress the negotiating and contradictory properties of the use of convenience food. Narvanan et al. (2013) discuss their research in this context:

Concentrating on convenience food, which is a contradictory consumption area within the larger context of food and health, this research was able to build theory to understand how positive and negative meanings are negotiated through oppositional practices.

Analysing convenience food from a practice perspective yields interesting insights in the process of negotiation between the positive and negative sides of the phenomenon of convenience. The described conversation practices show that tension-increasing and tension-relieving characteristics (for example convenience food as unhealthy versus convenience food as suitable in many occasions) are balanced to construct individual practices and normative guidelines (Närvänen et al., 2013).

2.6 Convenience food and culinary transition

Like culture in general, culinary culture is dynamic; foodways and eating habits are subject to change. Foodways can be defined as commonly shared eating and culinary practices (Cwiertka, 2000). While changes in foodways are often reviewed from a sense of place and time, there is some universality to it. During the 20th century the food industry’s pursuit to profit had its impact on food consumption. Though not merely negative as industrialized food production ensured greater variety in our diets, new products and increased efficiency to feed the growing world population, is also implies an altered relationship between people and food, characterized by the greater distance between them (Cwiertka, 2000). This can be seen as the premises of what is now seen as the current culinary transition.

Lang and Caraher (2001) explain culinary transition as “a process in which whole cultures experience fundamental shifts in the pattern and kind of skills required to get food onto tables and down throats”. The current culinary transition is characterized by a lack of confidence to cook, rather than by a decline of skills. ‘Food assembly’ plays a significant role in foodways, referring to assembling different pre-prepared foods to compose a meal (Engler-Stringer, 2010). This transition is the result of various social, cultural, economic and physical changes, many of which can explain the increasing reliance on convenience foods. First and foremost there is the increased availability of processed foods. Additionally, technological advances in the storage and preparation of food results in changing levels of knowledge and skills required to cook food. Also altered time demands and shifting family priorities contribute to
the changes in culinary culture and results in the fact that convenience foods has become normalized in many household food patterns (Chenhall, 2010). Consequences are not only in the realm of changing skills, but also touch upon health, as the reliance on prepared foods often means increased intake of salt and fats and inadequate intake of fruits and vegetables, especially for lower income households as they often do not have the financial resources to opt for healthier convenient options (Engler-Stringer, 2010).

The notion of culinary transition can be linked with Langs’ distinction between two models of consumption patterns, the dominant versus the alternative model. Lang illustrates his point by providing key indicators for each model (some are omitted in the below table). In his view, these two paradigms reveal current policy challenges. While in the dominant model consumer choice is ruling, the alternative models strives for sustainability.

Table 2.1: Competing models for patterns of food consumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The dominant model</th>
<th>The alternative model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>monoculture</td>
<td>biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processed (stored) food</td>
<td>fresh (perishable) food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food from factories</td>
<td>food from the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deskilling</td>
<td>skilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standardization</td>
<td>‘difference’ and diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niche markets on shelves</td>
<td>real variety on field and plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people to food</td>
<td>food to people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>created wants (advertising)</td>
<td>real wants (learning through culture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brands</td>
<td>local distinctiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘burgerization’</td>
<td>local food specialties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>microwave re-heated food</td>
<td>cooked food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fast food</td>
<td>slow food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individualized food</td>
<td>commensality/shared food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food from anywhere</td>
<td>bio-regionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>top-down controls</td>
<td>bottom-up controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependency culture</td>
<td>self-reliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consumers</td>
<td>citizens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lang (2004), adopted and adjusted

2.7 Changing conventions of convenience

As evident from the paragraphs above, convenience food is a contested food category. Over the years conventions of what is normal changed and continues to change. Or as Shove (2003) has phrased it: “what people take as normal is completely malleable”. In her work on comfort, cleanliness and convenience, Shove (2003) describes how taken-for-granted conventions of normality change and thus how “normal” practices are constantly re-defined. On the hand of examples as air-conditioning, heating and bathing, Shove provides an account on how transitions take place in everyday activities and consumer behavior and how conventions of what is normal change accordingly. She further elaborates on how the use of convenient devices has escalatory consequences for time in terms of fragmentation and coordination. Figure 2.2 shows the process of this escalatory path.
Shove argues that because current conventions are that normalized, we tend to overlook how meanings of convenience (in this case) become as they are and how they might change in the future.

1. Use of convenience devices to ease problems of coordination and create periods of 'quality' time

2. Convenience devices engender new divisions of time and labour, create more fragmented episodes, exacerbate problems of co-ordination and so increase reliance on (new) convenience devices to create periods of 'quality' time

Source: Shove (2003), p. 183

Figure 2.2: Escalatory path of convenience
3. Theoretical starting point: A practice theoretical perspective on consumption

A practice theoretical approach is used in this study, as the aim was to look at young adolescents’ understanding and conceptualization of convenience food and how this might influence their food practices (later in life). The rationale behind this theoretical perspective is to come to an understanding of the processes that underlie the formation of practices, rather than zooming in on individual consumption or zooming out on social norms guiding behaviour.

Furthermore, practice theory offers new ways of reviewing conditions and infrastructures of practices, and consequently its insights can be used to positively change people’s behaviour. Analyzing from a practice theoretical perspective can offer insights on how practices develop, both regarding internal dynamics and external conditions (Warde, 2004). Additionally, Gram-Hanssen (2010) states that socially shared knowledge and attitudes hold practices together. In this research context, looking at socially shared conceptions of convenience food yielded insights in the conditions of the practice of choosing and using convenience food products and the development of what is seen as appropriate conduct within this field of food consumption. In sum, practice theory provides a certain way of analyzing social phenomena (Reckwitz, 2002), and it is this ‘vocabulary’ that is used to analyze young adolescents way of seeing this particular food category.

3.1 Practice theory opposed to other social theories

Practice theory provides a way to analyze and understand everyday actions in a social context. It thereby shifts away from the conspicuous and extraordinary, to the more mundane and routine practices in everyday life (Reckwitz, 2012). Although practice theory is applied in various forms to study consumption, it can provide useful insights into how consumption is organized (Warde, 2012).

The practice theoretical approach differs from other social theoretical approaches in the way an actor (or consumer) is conceived. The *Homo Economicus* on the one hand, depicts an individualistic actor, handling solely out of self-interest, whereas the *Homo Sociologicus* is seen as a tabula rasa, an actor internalizing social norms in its desire for group membership. The smallest unit of analysis is respectively the individual or normative structures (Reckwitz, 2012; Warde 2012). On the contrary, practice theory is more flexible and pluralistic, seeing the actor as a “carrier of the practice” (Reckwitz, 2012), and the practice as a pattern embedded in social structures (Halkier, 2012). Summarized by Schatzki (1996), “a practice is a nexus of doing and sayings”. It is not a singular entity, but consists of several elements located in the social. The most common and used quote explaining the basic premises of practice theory, is Reckwitz claim that practices consist of ‘forms of bodily activities, forms of mental activities, things and their use, a background knowledge in the form of understanding, know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge’ (Reckwitz, 2002). For empirical use of practice theory in this study, I refer to a simpler scheme provided by Shove, Pantzar and Watson in their book ‘The dynamics of social practice’, the so-called element-based approach.

3.2 The Element-based approach

The element-based approach by Shove, Pantzar and Watson (2012) makes use of three basic elements: material, competence and meaning. Shove et al. argue that practices can be defined by the relation between these elements, and as these “ingredients” change, practices evolve. Hence they put forward the centrality of the linking between the elements, and emphasize the dynamic character of practices. This approach makes it possible to question issues of stability and change; in case of food consumption it helps in analyzing the (re)production of foodways and the normalization thereof (e.g. convenience food use in this study context). This analytical approach helps to find answers on how convenience becomes established in food practices.
Material
Material is the most straightforward element of the three, and is essential in the performance of practices. Materials include objects, but also infrastructure and technology can be placed in this category. When analyzing the role of material in practices, it is also relevant to pay attention to the access to material, the sites of production and the circulation of goods (Shove et al., 2012). Applying this element to food practices, the most evident material is the food products self. The infrastructure is important to consider, referring to the food industry in general but also to supermarkets and places where food is consumed, and even the online environment. Another aspect of material is technology and tools used in food consumption.

Competence
Competences refer to both explicit and tacit knowledge and skills necessary to perform a practice. Where some competences are explicitly learned, like in a teacher-pupil situation, other competences are learned by doing without directly noticing it, for example knowledge that passes from generation to generation. Moreover, Shove et al. (2012) mention that competences not only circulate between people, but also between practices. They provide the interesting example of how in the 19th century, competences transferred from the work to the household. Certain techniques were appropriated to the household context in order to run the household as efficiently as one would manage work. Shove et al. (2012) emphasize the role of industry in this respect; they positioned new household appliances as “necessary for managing the household efficiently” to promote sales and influenced discourses associated with homework by framing women as ‘homemakers’. Additionally, it is interesting to take the relation between materials and competences into account. As competences not only travel between people and between practices, but also from product to person, it is relevant to see these elements of practice side by side. Shove et al. (2012) describe this relation by providing a context where certain things fall out of use and subsequently associated know-how, once accounted as ‘common knowledge’, disappears. Next to disappearing competences, also new competences emerge. The diffusion of technology can be analyzed in such a way that appliances take over certain competences from persons, but it can also be viewed is the sense that the new competences of handling technology emerge. When seeing this in light of food-related competences there are ample examples to illustrate this delegation of competences from person to product, and therefore it provides a meaningful starting point in studying the diffusion and normalization of convenience food.

Meaning
The third and by Shove, Pantzar and Watson termed most delicate of the three elements, is the element meaning. They refer to it as delicate as associations and meanings are easily made, appropriated or broken. Again like with the other elements, they emphasize how meanings can travel and evolve, and how practices change accordingly. An interesting example of this is provided by Shove and Pantzar (2005), in their research on the re-classification of Nordic walking. They describe the process of changing symbolic associations, and how the practice of Nordic Walking became linked with established narratives of health and fresh air. By putting meaning at the center of their analysis, Shove et al. discuss how practices are classified and also how these categories develop. Referring to the example of Nordic Walking, this practice is linked with meanings of health, thus performing this practice is categorized as healthy. Consequently, the category of being healthy or well-being is ‘populated’ by the practice of Nordic Walking besides other practices signifying health.

Another important notion when considering meaning is relation to practices is that of representations. Shove et al. (2012) stress that representations are critical in the assignment of meanings and key associations. This illustrates that meanings assigned to practices are not an individual product, but rather collectively shared. Also the role of advertisement becomes clear in the dynamic process of meaning making, as advertisement (in all its diverse forms) shapes a certain context of which practitioners can
derive meanings. Relating this to food practices and convenience food, the food industry has power in framing food in terms of convenience, and framing this convenience as something desirable and necessary. As already discussed in the theoretical framework on convenience food, the meaning assigned to convenience has changed over the years, and the food industry plays a significant role in this. For this study it is thus interesting to look at how certain meanings are attached to convenience food.

In the below table, some examples illustrate how the described elements are used in relation to this study.

Table 3.1: Examples of the elements constituting food practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>food items</td>
<td>practical consciousness: know-how,</td>
<td>motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrastructure</td>
<td>background knowledge</td>
<td>symbolic meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(supermarkets,</td>
<td>cooking/food</td>
<td>ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in- and out-home</td>
<td>shared understandings of appropriate conduct</td>
<td>opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consumption, online)</td>
<td>evaluating performance</td>
<td>aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food industry</td>
<td>skills: shopping, choosing, preparing, technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology/tools</td>
<td>scheduling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The methodological approach of participatory research

Next to the practice theoretical approach, a participatory research design as a guiding methodological approach, aims to involve the participants as “co-researchers” or “social actors” in the study. Special interest has been presented lately in participatory research with children, acknowledging them as agents and consumers in their own right and considering them as subjects, rather than treating them as passive objects of investigation (Bergström, Johnsson, and Shanahan, 2010; Mason & Hood, 2010; Persson Osowski, Göranzon & Fjellström, 2012). Coming from a “new sociology of childhood” (Mason & Hood, 2010), this approach takes the stance that children “are the experts on their own subjective experiences, perceptions and lives” (Bergström et al., 2010), and it is therefore worthy to involve them in the research process to get a grip on how they interpret the social context of their daily lives. As already stated in the first chapter of this thesis, young adolescents are an interesting population to investigate from a consumer socialization perspective as well as from the idea that the changing food environment has a distinctive impact on food practices and (as already stated) the children grew up in the current food environment, they have been and probably still in the socialisation that does not know old foodways.

4.1 Adolescent consumers and consumer socialization

Young adolescents are an interesting population segment in studies on consumption, as they are relatively new yet increasingly sophisticated consumers (Ali, Batra, Ravichandran, Mustafa, Rehman, 2012). Consumer socialization is regarded as a cumulative process in which children mature in their role as consumers (Ward, 1974; John, 1997; Ali et al., 2012). In her review article on consumer socialization, Deborah Roedder John (1997) describes three stages of consumer socialization based on age; the perceptual stage (3 to 7 years), the analytical stage (7 to 11 years) and the reflective stage (11 to 16 years). These stages represent important shifts in consumption-related knowledge, skills and attitudes. The reflective stage, of most interest for this research, is characterized by more nuanced and reflective ways of thinking about consumption-related issues than the other stages; a shift from rather concrete to more abstract orientations towards the market environment (for example viewing advertisements solely as fun and informing to detecting commercial intentions). As children move into adolescence, they become more aware of social meanings, and they are actively constructing their own identity while simultaneously being occupied to comply with group expectations. Overall, an interesting stage to look at as young adolescents begin to construct consumer identities and consumer behaviour, and as supported by behavioural science perspective, these experiences are the foundation of patterns of behaviour later in life (Ward, 1974).

However, while adolescents become sophisticated consumers, they are not yet in the position to make individual consumption choices at all times, as most children aged 11 to 16 still live with their parents. Food, especially dinner, is still largely the domain of adult choice. And although adolescents are increasingly competent to influence family decisions, they will be subject to their parents’ food choices to a certain extent (Ward, 1974). Aside from this limited responsibility for food decisions, children are expected to have experience with food shopping, albeit in accompanying their parents for food purchases or helping to cook once in a while (John, 1994). Thus it is assumed they are to a certain extent aware of the shopping environment, and the products available within it.

4.2 A new sociology of childhood

Moving forward from the theory of socialization, it is interesting to look at the so-called “new sociology of childhood” (Mason & Hood, 2010; Persson Osowski et al., 2012). From this sociological perspective on childhood, children are seen as active agents constructing their social lives and as “moral interpreters of the world they engage in” (Mason & Hood, 201, p. 492). This is opposed to early socialization theories
that regard children having a passive role in a society in which they are trained to become members (Persson Osowski al., 2012). A dichotomization evident here is that of adults being active and children being passive. Children are then regarded to be less competent to make sense of the adult world; they are denied some form of agency in the social context of their daily lives (Mason & Hood, 2010).

In research on children and childhood, there are four approaches distinguishable in the way children are seen and subsequently their role in research (Christensen & Prout, 2002). The most traditional way of seeing children is as objects of investigation, assuming children’s dependency, neglecting their (social) agency and studying their lives from an adult perspective (Christensen & Prout, 2002; Person Osawski et al., 2012). Research is carried out about them rather than with them, often in the form of adults reporting about them, as children are seen as less trustworthy of giving factual information, and lacking the ability to consent.

One step further towards seeing children as accountable human beings in their own right is the approach of seeing children as subjects rather than objects (Christensen & Prout, 2002). This orientation acknowledges children’s subjectivities and the importance thereof in understanding their life world, however, it still confines to traditional socialization theories based on age and corresponding cognitive abilities.

A third approach to children goes further by recognizing children as social actors in their own right, with their own understandings and experiences. Or as Christensen and Prout state: “Children are seen to act, take part in, change and become changed by the social and cultural world they live in. (...) Children are given central and autonomous conceptual status.” (Christensen & Prout, 2002, p. 481). Hence children are assigned a central position in research and are no longer seen as solely part and dependant of social entities as the family, school etc., dismissing the natural dichotomy of adult/child that takes the distinction for granted.

The fourth and most recent approach has put a new sociological perspective on childhood into practice by including children as active participants in research. The idea behind this approach is that children should be involved, informed, consulted and heard in the research process, and this results in new methodologies to accommodate this co-production between researcher and informant (Christensen & Prout, 2002). The process involves information sharing, dialogue and reflection (Mason & Hood, 2010). This line of thought is in accordance with what Corsaro has termed ‘Interpretive reproduction’. ‘Interpretive’ here refers to children’s ability to appropriate information from the adult world to use it within their own cultural context. ‘Reproduction’ refers to the assumption that children do not merely internalize society and culture; they contribute to cultural production and change in their own way (Persson Osowksi et al., 2012). This perspective suggests that children are always part of two interwoven cultures, the adult culture and their own peer culture, however these are not opposed to each other as some theorists on childhood suggest (Corsaro, 2012).

4.3 Children as social actors in research

An interesting example of the new role of children in research is offered by Ben-Arieh (2005) in his research on child wellbeing. In his research Ben-Arieh takes children’s subjectivities into account to construct indicators to measure child wellbeing. Interesting results revealed next to traditional indicators used to measure wellbeing (for example access to education, poverty). From a child’s perspective, other things deemed important, for example leisure opportunities and civic life skills (Mason & Hood, 2010).

Another study that has explored how children can participate in research on issues that concern them focuses on understanding food habits of children in order to develop effective ways of promoting healthy eating amongst them (Bergström et al., 2010). To let children voice their own preferences and understandings, insights are gained on children’s everyday interaction and conceptions of food. Bergström
et al. (2010) point out that it is effective to make use of a multiplicity of methodological approaches, to fully grasp the richness of their experiences. Methods they employed to reach this were amongst others: letting the children report on food practices and reflections in a notebook; letting children construct research questions; drawing food events; observation in supermarkets and canteen; photographing food events; and analyzing food commercials. It comes down to letting the children participate through several activities. In this way everything that happens within the given timeframe of the research process can be valuable data. Bergström et al. (2010) conclude that their findings were that the children were knowledge seeking, inquisitive, experimental, concerned about the global food situation, and having potential to become well-informed consumers.

In brief, these examples illustrate that by incorporating children’s perspectives on their own life in research, a more realistic account can be created.
5. Methodology

To find an answer to the research question ‘How do young adolescents conceptualize and understand convenience as an attribute of food products and how does this relate to their food practices?’ a qualitative study is conducted. This chapter provides insight in the methodology used.

5.1 Research design

Qualitative research focuses on the way people make sense of their life world, and how they interpret their experiences. By using a qualitative approach there is room to explore people’s perspectives and the context of their experiences can be taken into account (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007).

This research design is in the form of a qualitative in-depth study, in which the understandings and conceptualizations of young adolescents are the concepts researched. The study was of explorative nature, to ‘open up’ the way convenience food is thought of by the target population. The data is collected in an informal and semi-structured form of questioning, to leave as much room as possible for the understandings to reveal and to let the young adolescents explain what makes sense as convenience food, what kind of meaning they associate with it. Furthermore, a multiplicity of methods is employed to have a broad coverage of the different conceptions the young adolescents possess. Moreover, methods used were of participatory nature, to engage the adolescents in the process of the research and to give them freedom in choosing the manner best representing their worldview.

5.2 Methods and procedures

Data is gathered from different food-related exercises within a classroom context, as well as from observations during the workshops.

The general methodology is a derivative of the focus group method. Mason and Hood (2010) emphasize that focus groups can be used to study how meanings are constructed in everyday life. As a derivative of focus groups is used in this study, the participants are faced with different topics related to convenience food on the hand of several assignments, and in this way they had room to display how they conceptualize convenience food through interaction within their group. Also Bagnoli and Clark (2010) emphasize that one of the biggest benefits of focus groups is that data are produced through social interaction, rather than that it is a collection of individual opinions. This suits the participatory nature of the study and of the theoretical background in the new sociology of childhood. And, of course, it relates to the practice theoretical approach as it concerns the meaning making process and the opening up of understandings.

As stated, multiple assignments were executed, so a variety of data sources was available from the workshops. As it concerned a newly developed method, trial and error learned that some assignments resulted in more valuable data than others; that is why some data sources are omitted from analysis. The following breakdown shows which data is used for analysis and which data is omitted.

Table 5.1: Data sources used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Used for analysis?</th>
<th>Nr. of workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations in class</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical choice situations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking assignment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingredients/recipe dish</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing each other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing products</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual evaluations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2: Overview of workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop part</th>
<th>Data collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing myself and Think.Food, topics to be discussed, and structure of workshop.</td>
<td>Response to Youtube clip: are they familiar with program, do they show interest? How do they respond to production method seen in clip?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short youtube clip: excerpt of Dutch television show “Keuringsdienst van Waarde”, to indicate the importance of questioning what we eat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theoretical part</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By means of timeline shortly explaining human’s relationship to food, amongst other topics techniques and innovations that people employed to make sure food is safe, available, transportable. Some important discoveries in food science are discussed. This part is used to catch student’s attention and to provide a context. Then, introducing “convenience” as element of food.</td>
<td>Classroom discussion in form of response to question about examples of convenience food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First assignment: What is convenience food?</strong></td>
<td>Communal output in form of mind-map, list of key-terms etc. Rounding up assignment in classroom discussion: What are major findings? Groups share main conceptualizations, summarized by researcher to validate results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In groups the students need to brainstorm about their associations with convenience food. They are given the freedom to choose method of representing the group opinion, e.g. list, questions, mind-map, drawings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuation theoretical part of workshop</strong></td>
<td>Observations of interest displayed, and questions asked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing convenience food in different perspectives. Continuing on conceptualization of former assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second assignment: Food choices</strong></td>
<td>Choices of groups (convenience or no convenience) and reasons of choices, plus observations of group discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hypothetical situation is outlined and students are asked to make choices on the hand of an assortment of products. Products are presented on sheets, and in groups they have to discuss the possibilities and choices to construct a meal. They have to note down why they make particular choices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finalizing</strong></td>
<td>Final questions, remarks of students. Evaluation forms to see what students liked and disliked of the workshop, and to give an opportunity to grade and leave comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom discussion to summarize finding second assignment and individual evaluations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All seven groups of adolescents that participated in the data gathering were asked to do a brainstorm on ‘convenience food’ to elicit their conceptualizations and associations. The adolescents were free in choosing the reporting method. The second assignment involved different hypothetical situations were food choices had to be made, with the choice of products ranging in level of convenience. Additionally, they had to indicate the reason supporting their choice as resulting from their group discussion. Furthermore, one class participated in an extra assignment, consisting of a practical cooking experience. These adolescents were asked to cook a tomato sauce themselves on the basis of instructions, and in the end they had to taste and evaluate their ‘homemade’ sauce next to a convenient alternative.
In another class, the young adolescents were asked to write down their favourite dish, and additionally a list of ingredients and steps of the preparation involved. These last two assignments were performed at the only VMBO school in the sample, as the two workshops provided there could last for 90 minutes as opposed to 45 minutes at the other schools. The choice was made for these more concrete and practical assignments in addition to the other two assignments to cover two hours and to match the more practical orientation of the school.

The table above gives an overview of the performed workshops, the data collected and the procedures followed. Prior to the data collection, a pre-test was carried out to see whether the methods suited the aims.

5.3 Sample

The sampling of the schools was purposive, as the main inclusion criterion was that the schools were part of the Think.Food network, so that they were already familiar with the educational approach of Think.Food and had shown interest in the past. In total 18 schools in and around Amsterdam were approached with a flexible proposition to accommodate potential time constraints. The final sample consisted out of four schools, where seven workshops were conducted. Data collection resulted in a total of approximately 145 young adolescents aged between 12 and 15 (first and second grade Dutch high school system) participating in the study. The following breakdown represents the schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Ws provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam (A₁)</td>
<td>VWO</td>
<td>1st grade</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam (A₂)</td>
<td>VWO</td>
<td>2nd grade</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haarlem (H)</td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>1st grade</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wormerveer (W)</td>
<td>VMBO</td>
<td>2nd grade</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Data analysis

The theoretical lens of practice theory does not provide an explicit way to analyze or interpret data, as this approach is used in various forms and to various purposes (Warde, 2005). However with its emphasis on seeing a practice as social, it provides a way of recognizing patterns of collective thought. For this study it helped explore common patterns of understandings constituting the practice of choosing and using convenience food or the formation thereof. The focus is on collective understandings emerging from the interaction and outputs generated during several food-related exercises; data in the form of observations, interaction between the adolescents, as well as the communal output. These data sources were sorted into units for analysis, coded, and categorized to find similarities and differences in how the participants conceptualized convenience food. Then, the data is examined on relations and linkages on the hand of the elements of practices. Data analysis started during the data collection for practical and theoretical reasons. The huge amount of data was screened for relevance. In addition, it helped to refine the procedures at the moment itself, directing the data collection process in certain ways, which suits the research design as it is of explorative nature.

Each output was given an identification code to indicate the school, e.g. A1 and A2 for the two schools in Amsterdam, W for the school in Wormerveer, and H for the school in Haarlem. Additionally, a group number codes each output so that outputs and observations could be matched.
5.5 Ethical considerations
As this study dealt with children, the issue of consent needed consideration. It was important that the children agreed to participate in the research, and information was therefore provided at the start of each workshop. Additionally, it was necessary to conduct consent from the schools. The schools were informed on the purpose and nature of the research. In consultation with the schools, it was determined not necessary to seek informed consent of parents, as activities in the data collection workshop were more or less in line with activities of Think.Food workshops, and focus was on collective understandings and not on individual accounts. Therefore consent of school authority was sufficient. Furthermore, anonymity of both schools and participants was guaranteed.
6. Results

In order to answer the main research question (How do young adolescents conceptualize and understand convenience as an attribute of food products and how does this relate to their food practices?), the data is first analyzed to find categories of convenience foods to reveal how the young adolescents think of convenience food. Subsequently, as this study is carried out from a practice theoretical perspective, the findings are organized into the elements of practices; material, competence and meaning. Finally the interrelations between the elements are presented.

6.1 Categories of convenience food

The first exploration of the data revealed eight categorizations of how young adolescents think of convenience food. An overview of these categorizations is presented in Table 6.1. The examples illustrate typical representations of each category.

Table 6.1: Eight categories of convenience food

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Convenience food as…</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unhealthy</td>
<td>Junk food, fast food, obesity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>Fruits, vegetables, water, vitamin pills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasty</td>
<td>Looks tasty, appealing package, considered as something special (compared to “normal” food)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial</td>
<td>Food made in factories, unnatural, plastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branded</td>
<td>McDonalds, KFC, Knorr, Unox, Cup-a-soup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place specific</td>
<td>Take-away, delivery, (fast food) restaurants, (online) ordering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Quick, easy, practical, justified when having time scheduling problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>“readymade” products, normality of convenient devices such as microwave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These categories were most prominent in both the brainstorm outputs and the hypothetical choice situations. Especially the association of convenience food as unhealthy was prominent in all workshops. Not only did most participants exchange multiple examples of by them defined unhealthy convenience food products; they also referred to unhealthy properties of convenience food as a reason not to choose it and discussed possible consequences related to health. Examples include references to obesity and weight problems, and unhealthy as many convenience products contain too much salt and lack in vitamins.

A considerate amount of groups managed to see convenience as not equal to unhealthy by providing healthy examples of what they considered as convenient. Next to examples such as raw vegetables and “fruits you don’t need to peel”, two groups in different workshops discussed food supplements such as vitamin pills. Some references were made to drinking water or milk as easy.

Next to a definite tendency to see convenience food in opposing categories healthy/unhealthy, many participants also reasoned why they would choose for convenience food. Taste appears to be a major factor in the choice process of young adolescents. Although recognized as unhealthy, fast foods like McDonalds is conceived as “very tasty” and “special because it is different than food on a typical day at home”. Observations during the group discussions support this as many adolescents showed great
enthusiasm when talking about convenient food items such as hamburgers and pizzas. This is perhaps not that surprising given the age of the participants, however it does show taste is overruling health in food practices regularly.

Another noticeable association with convenience food many groups had, was artificiality. By defining convenient food as food made in factories and containing many additives to make it convenient, many adolescents showed more abstract comprehension of this food category next to making concrete links to specific food items. References such as “plastic” reveal that adolescents assign a negative value judgment to processed foods.

Many of the brainstorm outputs include mentions of branded food products or food chains. Examples are manifold, ranging from canned Unox soup to fast food chains as McDonalds and KFC. These direct associations indicate young adolescents familiarity with the food category of convenience food.

Another noticeable feature found in this first exploration of the data, is that the participants often link convenience food to places. Not only are there many mentions of fast food chains, also links were made to procedures of take-away and delivery services. There are occasional references to specific ethnic cuisines that are identified as convenient take-away/delivery food, most referred to are Chinese, Turkish and Italian take-away/delivery. Moreover, one group referred to a Dutch supermarkets delivery service: “AH: to the kitchen”. Also the possibility of online ordering of food was mentioned often.

In describing what they think of when hearing the term ‘convenience food’, many adolescents gave general definitions incorporating easy, practical, or effort. Some referred to specific procedures: “something that is easy to eat, to get, to prepare” and “easy to swallow, structure”.

6.2 Observations and findings from class discussions

The first data collection moment in each workshop concerned observations on how the participants reacted on the introductory Youtube clip of the program ‘Keuringsdienst van Waarde’. This short film introduced the program as investigating issues of production of various consumer goods, mostly food products. The example concerned canned mandarin parts, and a few scenes were shown on how this product is produced and critical questions were asked. At the end of the film, the participants were asked if they are familiar with the program and what they thought of the production methods seen. In all seven workshops most of the participants indicated that they were familiar with the program, as can be illustrated by many examples given of other products investigated by the program (“goldfish”, “sushi”, “milk”).

Additionally, a high level of interest was displayed towards questioning how products are made and consumer issues in general. This was most evident at the schools in Amsterdam and Haarlem, in which discussing the short clip took longer as many participants were eager expressing their knowledge of current consumer issues. Examples of topics included questioning additives (most references to conservatives
present in many products), sustainability concerns and animal welfare (for example drinking water out of bottles and the “plofkip” (literally exploding chicken) referring to factory farmed chickens). At the Wormerveer school also interest was displayed during both workshops, however there was a greater discrepancy between adolescents who clearly liked thinking and talking about food-related issues and adolescents distracted by other things happening.

6.3 The elements of practice
Turning now to describing the results in light of the elements of practice. Firstly the data is analyzed by each separate element, followed by the integration of elements to have a more complete picture on how convenience food practices are composed. As Figure 6.1 illustrates, elements may exist next to each other without being linked, termed proto-practice by Shove et al. (2012). Next, with the definition of Shove et al. (2012) at hand that practices exist when the elements are linked and integrated, a practice constitutes of the linked elements. Additionally, elements can be mutually shaping. Beside their interdependency, elements can be transformative in relation to each other. Taking the practice of driving as example, as the material arrangement of multilane roads emerged, accordingly competences of driving changed and so did the relation between the car and the driver (Shove et al., 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Convenience food as…</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unhealthy</td>
<td>Junk food, fast food, obesity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>Fruits, vegetables, water, vitamin pills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasty</td>
<td>Looks tasty, appealing package, considered as something special (compared to “normal” food)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial</td>
<td>Food made in factories, unnatural, plastic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branded</td>
<td>McDonalds, KFC, Knorr, Unox, Cup-a-soup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place specific</td>
<td>Take-away, delivery, (fast food) restaurants, (online) ordering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Quick, easy, practical, justified when having time scheduling problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>“readymade” products, normality of convenient devices such as microwave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Shove, Pantzar & Watson (2012), pp. 25, 32

Figure 6.1: From separate elements, to linked elements, to mutually shaping elements of a practice

In the end of this chapter, both the linkages and mutually shaping capacity of elements constituting the practice of convenience food consumption will be discussed.

6.3.1 Material
Following Shove et al. (2012) materials consist of: “things, technologies, tangible physical entities, and the stuff of which objects are made.” The data reveal four categories covering this domain.

Food items, brands and packaging
The most direct associations with convenience food concerned specific food products, brands and packaging. In all seven workshops the initial reaction to the question “what is convenience food” concerned examples such as pizza, candy, fruit or products with ‘readymade’ in the name or branded products like Knorr or McDonalds. In one workshop a participant specifically referred to “food that is easy to eat, easy to swallow”. Also the follow-up assignment in which the adolescents had to work together to display their associations with convenience food resulted in naming many specific food products next to more general categories like meal packages, fast food, and take-away. Next to recurring food products, also many brands were repeatedly referred to, indicating that some brands signify convenience to many
adolescents. Branded products such as Knorr, Unox, Hak, Maggi, and Cup-a-soup occurred most often, both in writing, mind-maps and drawings.

Figure 6.2: Brainstorm illustrating adolescents’ direct associations with specific products and general product categories

The most named restaurant/fast food brand was McDonalds. One group even rephrased the Dutch term ‘gemaksvoeding’ (convenience food) into “deMacsvoeding”, indicating the definite tendency to equal convenience food with fast food like McDonalds. Other fast food chains were also repeatedly mentioned, as well as one “healthy convenience food chain” named pret-a-manger. More general were the references to restaurants, indicating that the practice of eating out of home is convenient in the perception of adolescents. Moreover, some groups referred to specific take away food, namely Chinese food.

Figure 6.3: Associations with McDonalds Figure 6.4: Illustrating convenient packages

Another distinction regularly made concerned the packaging of food. The most frequently made association in this respect was that of canned food (e.g. canned food, soup, fruits). One group giving the general definition of convenience food as “things in can, bag or jar...”. Other associations regarding packaging concerned the convenience of products assembled in one package, such as meal packages, ready-made salads (often supermarket chain Albert Heijn was mentioned additionally), noodles in a box, and herb mixes. Also frozen products were regularly named, frozen pizza most frequently. Additionally, when citing reasons for their choice in the hypothetical choice situations, adolescents cited “nice package” as the main reason for their choice of readymade endive. In defining what they think is convenience food, some indicated the condition “easy to open” for food to be convenient.

Where convenience food comes from/infrastructure
Next to the food products, brands and packages directly linked to convenience food, other associations that can be assigned to the element material include references to place and infrastructure, thus more related to the accessibility of material and the sites of production (Shove et al., 2012). Regarding access to food, many adolescents are familiar with different types of convenience food because of the availability in supermarkets. Other repeatedly occurring references are the convenient solutions of take-away or delivery foods, some specified as ordered online (thuisbezorgd.nl).

Relating to sites of production, many groups display associations with the food industry, ranging from equaling convenience food with “food made in factories” to trust displayed when professionals make the food.

**Technology/tools**
The third component of material resulting from the data, are references to technology and tools related to convenience food. Microwaves are repeatedly mentioned in association to convenience food, as well as the oven to prepare readymade dishes such as lasagna, and freezers in order to store food. Other conceptualizations relating to technology concern references to conservation techniques employed by the food industry.

*Price and time*
There are occasional references to the price of convenience food. Where some indicate that convenience food is cheap, others indicate the opposite, saying that making a meal from fresh produce is cheaper than using processed food products. Furthermore, there are a couple of findings relating to the resource time. From the cooking assignment, one participant motivated that he would choose to make tomato sauce himself next time when time allows him to: “if you have time, it is quit fun, sometimes...”. Another participant motivated his choice to buy the readymade sauce when facing the choice, because “to buy is quicker”. A group wrote down “quickly to prepare by using for example a microwave” in their brainstorm output, combining time and use of technology. Also indirect references are made concerning time, for example in motivating choice for frozen pizza: “(...) you can just do other things while pizza is in the oven”.

6.3.2 Competence
According to Shove et al. (2012), competences “encompass skill, know-how and technique”. The data reveal two categories linked to competences: one relating to competences of the food industry, the other relating to know-how and skills of the adolescents.

Competence of food industry
Data from different assignments reveal contrasting accounts on how adolescents evaluate the food industry and its competence in providing quality food to consumers. One the one hand, there are several groups that express their trust in the food industry, illustrated by the following excerpts: “The makers know what they are doing” (in motivating choice for readymade tomato sauce instead of homemade sauce in cooking/tasting assignment) and “professionals make the food, so it must be good” (in motivating choice in hypothetical choice situation assignment, making pizza or take-away pizza of pizza place).

While these quotes illustrate that some adolescents have trust in the competences of food industry, and that food prepared by professionals signifies quality, other adolescents are more hesitant, expressing their uncertainty when they were not making the food themselves. In the hypothetical choice situations, a noticeable number of groups motivated their non-convenient choice by mentioning their doubt of the role of food producers, exemplified by quotes as “they didn’t do anything with it...”.

Knowledge of food and cooking procedures
When it comes to know-how and experience with cooking, the results reflect differences between workshops and among adolescents. In general, most adolescents report some familiarity with basic cooking competences; most of them regularly assist their parents in cooking.

Choosing convenience food often relates to competences. In motivating why they would choose for convenience food, many adolescents refer to not having to do the preparation themselves, or describing which cooking procedures they have to do to make the convenient product ready for consumption. Some examples illustrating this tendency: “fries: quick, you don’t have to do it yourself”, “cup-a-soup: cook water and done”, “burger king: simple, you don’t have to prepare yourself”.

When asked what is needed to make a salad dressing oneself, one group responded, “going to the shop”. In another hypothetical choice situation, multiple groups of young adolescents motivated their choice for using semi-prepared pizza dough and to choose for toppings themselves instead of choosing a prepared frozen pizza, because they valued the procedure of choosing and placing toppings themselves. Cooking in that way is valued as fun. There are also negative associations with cooking procedures. One group explained their choice for cut and washed mixed salad in a bag because “it is less work than cutting the salad yourself”.

The relation to know-how is sometimes also evident from the examples of convenience products cited.
A group of girls placed “béchamel sauce” in their mind-map. When asked why this sauce is convenient to them, they answered: “comes in a package”. No reference is made that a product like béchamel sauce is also something that can be made without a package.

The majority of the adolescents participating in the cooking assignment indicated they liked to learn a new technique (peeling tomatoes), and they liked to taste the difference between a convenient and non-convenient version of the same food product. They showed competence in tasting the difference, as most of them were able to argument on what points the homemade tomato sauce differed from the convenient alternative.

6.3.3 Meaning
Following Shove et al. (2012), meanings include: “symbolic meanings, ideas and aspirations.” This section is devoted to the meanings young adolescents ascribe to convenience food.

Meaning of health
In many brainstorm representations, the issue of health was raised in relation to understandings of convenience food. The majority of adolescents talked about convenience foods as either unhealthy or even that consuming too much of it results in overweight or obesities. Additionally, many specific products were mentioned, referring to a categorization of ‘unhealthy foods’, examples repeatedly displayed being hamburgers, pizzas, snacks and sweets. In contrast, many groups also included convenience foods that they referred to as healthy, sometimes even directly opposing it to unhealthy convenience foods. Such healthy examples of convenient food items included several fruits, raw vegetables, water, and even vitamin pills.

The discourse of health in relation to convenience food was also evident in one mind-map in which the centre was termed “vreten” (translated similar as ‘devour’), and only examples of snacks and the like were included. In the hypothetical choice situations, many adolescents motivated their choice for unprocessed options as being healthier than the more convenient-oriented alternatives. One group even exclaiming to not choose “pre-cooked junk!”; another group discussing that when food is made ‘from scratch’ and with fresh/natural ingredients, it is more healthy, because then you know what is in it. One group questioned whether semi-prepared foods could still be considered healthy.

One group of girls indicated to choose dried spaghetti because “you than make it yourself and then you know for sure it is hygienic and healthy”.

Figure 6.9 shows a typical representation on how health plays a role in young adolescents’ conceptualization of convenience food.

Figure 6.10: Output representing different meanings of convenience: cozy, easy and fast

Figure 6.9:
Brainstorm representing associations related to health: reference to pizza, fast food, readymade, candy.
Taste appeared to be a major reason for the consumption of convenience food. A large number of groups described convenience food as tasty during the brainstorm assignment. One girl reasoned that convenient food she ate at home was nicer and tastier because the ‘normal’ food always consisted of the same (meat, potato, vegetable, considered as typical Dutch meal). Additionally, during the choice situations, choices were supported by claims as “looks tasty”, and “package looks appealing”. One adolescent reported to choose instant potato mash as the picture on the package looked appealing. Fast food, although recognized as unhealthy in most instances, was rated as ‘tasty’ by most adolescents. One group even defined convenience food as “something that you like”. One adolescent in response to the question why she would eat convenience food, stated: “you eat it because it is tasty, not because your are hungry.” Additional examples she gave were popcorn, candy and McDonalds.

In the cooking and tasting test done at one school, the homemade tomato sauce was rated better than the convenient alternative by most of the students, reasons varied from more taste, to appreciation because it was made by themselves instead of by food industry. By contrast, the ones that liked the convenient version more also cited taste as the main reason, specifically stating that: “the sauce out the jar tasted more like tomato”.

Ideas of normality
The data reveals that in most instances young adolescents do not see convenience food as normal, at least it can be said that it is not part of their discursive consciousness (e.g. they do not verbally express that they think aiming for convenience is normal). This is based on interpretations on that for example McDonalds is still conceived as something special, as well as references to ‘normal’ home cooked meals consisting of meat, potatoes and vegetables, and not for example meal packages. Only a couple of groups associated convenience food with products like cut vegetables, wok vegetables, bagged salad, or herb mixes.

However, there are some examples of the taken-for-granted reality of convenience in their food environment. Many adolescents give examples of specific products with ‘readymade’ in the name, signifying their familiarity with convenient alternatives of food items. Other examples include comparisons of readymade with convenience products. The already stated example of béchamel sauce illustrates that some convenient products are normalized.

In motivating their choice in the hypothetical choice situations, there were occasionally references to what they are usually use at home, for example prepared tomato in a jar, because “we always use it”. One adolescent based his choice of a non-convenient product on what his parents want. During the assignment in one of the workshop in which the participants had to write down their favorite dish, including a list of ingredients and cooking procedures, some participants did not come further than referring to their favorite dish (for example lasagna). When asked if they had an idea of what is needed to prepare it, and how, responses were “I don’t know, my mum always makes it”, and “it comes in the box and you have to put it in the oven”.

Ideas of artificiality
There were many references to convenience food being artificial or unnatural, and occasionally groups described convenience food as “food made in factories” or containing many E-numbers. Especially evident from the choice situations were the motivations for choosing unprocessed food because they were considered more natural, “less plastic” and “it doesn’t contain artificial supplements”. Choosing fresh produce instead of processed alternatives was also valued because it was considered as “pure natural and no additives”. A noticeable number of groups motivated their non-convenient choice by mentioning their doubt of the role of food producers, exemplified by quotes as “they didn’t do anything with it..”.

Value of time and effort
As convenience food is generally defined as food that saves time, mental and physical effort, it proves interesting to look how young adolescents relate time and effort to convenience food. Most brainstorm outputs show references towards the ease and quickness of convenience foods, differing in positive and negative valuations. However, most groups seem to value convenient attributes of foods, something that becomes evident in the choice situations. Where adolescents choose for unprocessed options by justifying their appreciation for naturalness, adolescents opting for more convenient variations motivate their choice by its ease of preparation, practicability, quickness to make and consume and contrasting it with options that take more effort. One group even relates the choice of convenience with the harriedness of life, stating that being busy with a lot of things, cooking is less important, so in that case convenience food is justified. A girl elaborating on a typical weekday when different members of the household have different activities, so more convenient food is chosen to accommodate different time schedules. This is another example of the justification of the use of convenient options. By contrast, there is also mention that the use of convenience food means being lazy and unknowing.

Figure 6.11: Drawing indicating how adolescents see time as determining food choice (translated from left to right: “I still need to do a lot”/“first chips”/“I’m relaxed dude”)

6.3.4 Linking the elements
Taking the definition of Shove et al. (2012) at hand that the interdependent relations between the elements material, competence and meaning can define a practice, this section is devoted to linking the above described findings. The categories of convenience are be dealt within the context of the interrelated elements. Subheadings indicate the nature of the linkage.

A. Competence and meaning

Artificiality as a consequence of processing
The first connection between competence and meaning evident is the association of artificiality of food defined as convenient. Adolescents often described convenience food as unnatural, made in factories or even designating it as plastic. These meanings ascribed to this food category say something about adolescents’ perceptions of the food industry providing these food products offering convenience. They discuss industry’s capacity to transform food in such a way that ‘convenience’ becomes an attribute of the product. Many adolescents associating unnaturalness with convenience food also expressed negative value judgments regarding the food industry, stating to distrust foods containing a large number of additives (E-numbers) and processing methods employed by producers raising doubts. They thus call into question food industry’s competences to provide healthy and safe quality food that offers convenience at the same time. Besides the relation between artificiality and the supply systems’ competences, this line of argumentation in itself shows young adolescents’ know-how and values when it comes to food choice. Nevertheless, some adolescents display trust instead of distrust towards food industry’s competence in providing quality food.
Aspiring taste of processed food
Whereas adolescents clearly question food producers’ ability to provide safe and healthy food, they do recognize some manufactures as competent in providing ‘tasty’ food designated as convenient. They seem to choose for convenient products when it looks tasty or when they know from experience it is tasty. In their reasoning it is therefore apparent that they trust certain food producers in providing the taste they aspire. Implicitly, they are not aware or not in the position to satisfy their aspiration for that ‘tasty food’ by use of their own competences.

Valuing time related to cooking
Another link between meaning and competence is the value placed on food being easy and effortless related to steps in the preparation of food. Adolescents tend to see convenience food in terms of preparation steps they do not have to do if they use convenient products. In contrast to what is described above (adolescents valuing non-convenient foods because of its naturalness), convenience food, in turn, is valued because of its time- and effort-saving qualities. Less preparation steps (or provisional steps if planning, shopping and other stages are considered) are needed, thus time is left for other practices. Time is a valued resource in the perception of adolescents, illustrated by expressed valuations of time-saving possibilities. Time spend on cooking is not always valued; often the focus is on the outcome, the food/meal to be consumed should be tasty in the first place. However, there are some results relating to the meaning or pleasure of cooking.

The normality of cooking
Additionally, it proves interesting to look at ideas of normality related to cooking experience and competence. Most adolescents reported to be familiar with basic cooking practices, mostly resulting from experience by assisting their parents, and in case of the Wormerveer school by practicing in (bi)-weekly cooking classes. Prior experience provides a framework of what is seen as normal. The data reveal that although all adolescents have an idea of convenience food and can provide ample examples, they do not report much experience with processed products in the home environment. They have more direct experiences with out-of-home consumption and preparation of convenience food (visiting (fast food) restaurants, take-away/delivery food). Only the recipe assignment performed in one class provides results supporting the normality of convenience food products used at home to construct a meal. When asked to describe their favorite dish by its ingredients and preparation steps, several participants referred to different types of convenience food products, ranging from cut vegetables to readymade dishes available at supermarkets.

B. Meaning and material

Tasty convenience food
Where taste can be linked to the competences of food industry or the agents’ own competence of providing and preparing it, taste can also be linked with the element material. Many of the participants evaluated convenience food as tasty; they ascribed positive meanings to convenience foods, especially to fast food. Specific brands were named in accordance with this. McDonalds food for example, is regarded as something special and different than what one normally eats. The findings reveal the social and symbolic meaning attached to food as material. Convenience food is equal to fast food or snacks in the eyes of many adolescents and rated as tasty or attractive by most. Eating at McDonalds or eating a readymade or take-away pizza symbolizes fun, a special occasion or sensory pleasure.

Convenience food and the discourse of health
Next to tasty, convenience food is repeatedly thought of as either unhealthy or healthy. As such, food defined as convenient plays a significant role in the discourse of health. While most adolescents describe convenience food as unhealthy, some also attempt to provide healthy alternatives that are still conve-
nient. However, despite the fact that healthy convenient foods such as raw vegetables and fruits are repeatedly cited, there is an overall tendency to classify consumption of convenience food as unhealthy. Accordingly, certain brands also signify unwholesomeness, as well places from which convenience food can be obtained.

Visual and verbal representation of convenience food
Additionally, the way food is presented and its packaging plays a crucial role in the association process. As evident from the results of the choice assignments, adolescents often chose one out of multiple presented products (with different levels of convenience) based on how it looks (as it concerned a hypothetical choice situation on paper, other sensory perceptions are not possible). Appealing looks of the food items itself or its package, influences the meaning ascribed to it. In some cases, tasty appearance of the food, or ‘nice’ appearance of the package, resulted in choosing the convenient alternative (for example readymade meals and frozen pizza). On the other hand, negative evaluations of its appearance (e.g. looks fake, has indefinable bits and pieces in it, referring to instant mash and bottled salad dressing) resulted in choosing more natural unprocessed versions. Next to the visual representation of food products, also the information provided on the package, or retrieved information provided in advertisements and media, shape conditions on which adolescents derive meanings from.

Technology as normalized
Another distinguishable connection between material and meaning concerns technology as a component of material and its taken-for-granted place in young adolescents view on food. The presence of technology and its use for preparing (convenient) food is normal in the eyes of most participants. Many references are made to microwave- or oven-ready meals for example. The normality of the use of such devices is also apparent in the recipe assignment, as these technologies are referred to extensively in the listing of cooking steps. In the cooking assignment, one participant ridiculed the process of boiling water in a pan on the stove, by referring to his routine of using water from an electric kettle.

C. Material and competence

Knowing the place of convenience
In brainstorming about convenience food as a food category, many groups made references to physical or online places to obtain convenience food. This illustrates that many adolescents are capable of providing themselves with convenience food. Be it by visiting (fast food) restaurants for consuming convenient food outdoors or for take-away, or by ordering online for domestic consumption, the participants did not seem to find it difficult to associate convenience with localities.

Know-how of cooking typical meals
Furthermore, there are contradictory accounts of adolescents’ common sense and know-how concerning cooking procedures of common-known dishes (in the Netherlands) as presented in the four hypothetical choice situations (appendix III). In addition to making choices between more or less convenient-oriented components of the stated dish, they are asked to discuss steps in the preparation process to get an idea of their practical understanding of handling and preparing food. Some groups made a detailed account of the process where others could not name more steps than shopping for food. Moreover, there is an occasional reference to convenient food use as lazy and unknowing.

Tools and its use
The last linkage relevant for understanding convenience food practices of young adolescents is the link between technology/tools and competences. Earlier, it was explained that handling technology seems natural to help preparing (convenience) food to adolescents. This not only concerns the connection of
the elements material and meaning, but also relates to competences as embodied skills are important to consider. The use of devices such as microwaves, electric kettles and freezers to store food in, are part of adolescents embodied skills and know-how. It may not be part of their discursive consciousness, but is surely is part of their practical consciousness.

6.3.5 Practices as a whole
Practices are always in the process of formation, re-formation, and de-formation (Shove et al., 2012), so are food practices subject to change. However, elements are relatively stable, and therefore something can be said about current understandings of a practice by the use of these elements.

In sum, what follows from the above-described elements and their interrelations, is a set of shared understandings regarding convenience food as a (contested) category and its use in food practices:

Convenience food (practice):
- is in many cases unhealthy
- is often appreciated due to its taste, ease and time-saving capabilities
- involves less demanding skills and competences than non-convenient food
- is often associated with out-of-home preparation and consumption
- is also associated with at home consumption of processed foods
- involves convenience in different stages of the provisional process (e.g. shopping, preparation, eating, etc.)
- is considered as artificial due to industrialized processing by the food industry
- is often associated with technology in the form of kitchen devices
- is occasionally seen as lazy or unknowing
- is often associated with specific brands and certain forms of packaging
- is experienced both as normal and special
- is recognized as tasty which is more important than health

These shared understandings exist next to shared conventions and justifications related to convenience food practices. These are discussed in the following chapter.
7. Discussion

The main purpose of this research was to examine young adolescents' understandings and conceptualizations of convenience food by focusing on the shared understandings related the elements constituting practices. The data is firstly dissected into categories of convenience, followed by its division by each element, to finally come to linking the elements and to present the practice of convenience food use as a whole. In this chapter, these findings are discussed in light of the existing literature dealt with in the theoretical framework and the chapter on practice theory. Furthermore, reflections on the research process including limitations and suggestions for further research, and implications of the findings are discussed.

7.1 Findings in relation to literature

The findings related to competences and meanings suggest contradictory accounts of how convenience food is understood and what meanings adolescents give to this food category. On the one hand, findings indicate adolescents' critical stance towards the food industry and its competence to provide healthy and safe quality food offering convenience at the same time. The participants especially doubt the ‘naturalness’ of the convenience food products, and question the use of additives and the processing techniques. This reflective way of thinking about how food is produced and the implications thereof, can be seen in light of Deborah Roedder-John’s (1997) classification of consumer socialization stages. Johns’ (1997) description of the reflective stage, which is characterized by more nuanced and reflective ways of thinking about consumption-related issues, is also evident in this study context. Instead of simply mentioning examples of convenience food products, most participants were rapidly involved in discussions calling into question food industry’s capabilities and intentions. Many adolescents displayed distrust in overly processed foods and described aiming for more natural products instead. However, there were also findings indicating the contrary, as some results can be interpreted as a representation of trust towards industry’s capabilities of providing food. Hence, it can be stated that the way young adolescents understand convenience food is related to their personal experiences.

As such, Truninger’s (2011) notion of a ‘career of practice’ proves useful. By taking the perspective that practitioners learn from experience, different stages of a career of practice exists, with corresponding levels of competence. Analyzing the results in light of the elements competence and meaning showed that young adolescents possess different conceptions of the role and competence of the food industry. This is in line with what Truninger (2011) describes as the effect of positive and negative experiences on the career of a practice. She states that where negative experiences discourage further performance in a practice, positive experiences can result in increased confidence in performing a practice (Truninger, 2011). Likewise, the negative associations with food industry’s competences in providing food is likely to discourage convenient food consumption, while positive associations (e.g. “the makers know what they are doing”) is likely to result in confidence to rely on food produced by industry. It is these contrasting views that are characteristic for young adolescents’ attempt to make sense of their food environment. In one way, trust towards food producers is based on some form of authority placed upon professionals. Professionally prepared foods signify quality. In the other way, homemade or natural foods are placed above processed convenience foods in many group discussions.

Where artificiality is directly associated with convenience food, adolescents also identify convenience food with taste, as can be concluded from the results. The results show that taste is a major factor in the food choices made. This is consistent with previous research on individual drivers of consumption of convenience food (Brunner et al., 2010). Taste is often assigned more importance than health or safety
of food, especially amongst young people. This can mean that although young adolescents would reject convenience food based on meanings of health or safety they assign to it, their degree of liking a particular convenience food can still convince them to consume the product. These contradictory accounts that show how adolescents struggle in their acceptance of convenience food, support the theory of Närvänen et al. (2013), who proposed that positive and negative meanings are negotiated through oppositional practices of convenience food, and how such meanings are balanced to form individual practices and normative guidelines.

Moreover, the value placed on cooking and on time is relevant to discuss in relation to theory. In accordance with McMeeken & Southerton’s (2012) definition of ‘practice as performances’, the practice of ‘doing’ cooking is only performed when practitioners ascribe meaning and importance to it. When doing cooking is not seen as important in itself and only the outcome (meal) is deemed important, there is room for substitutes classified as convenience food, provided that it price and attractiveness matches that of what it substitutes. Competences change accordingly, because competences are learned and based on experience (Truninger, 2011; Shove et al., 2012). When adolescents have never learned to cook without using convenience products, competences and know-how supporting cooking ‘from scratch’ will disappear and meanings change accordingly. This tendency is already visible (Lang and Caraher, 2001; Lang, 2004; Pollan, 2013). Lang and Caraher (2001) see the increasing reliance on convenience foods as part of the current culinary transition, which is characterized by a lack of confidence to cook. ‘Food assembly’ is the new competence required, referring to the ability to assemble different pre-prepared foods to compose a meal of. This ‘new’ competence is also identified in the results of the recipe assignment, where several mentions of convenient food items were said to be necessary to ‘cook’ the desired meal. Furthermore, the results concerning competence and meaning show an overemphasis of associations between convenience food and out-of-home consumption of food, just as evident from prior research, stating that most research concerning convenience food and children focus on out-of-home consumption such as fast food and canteens (Patrick & Nicklas, 2005).

The last point worth discussing in relation to the theory and meanings/competences, is adolescents’ valuation of time. The results show their tendency to ascribe positive meaning to the time- and effort-relieving abilities of convenience food. In accordance with Warde’s notion of a “society on a schedule” (1999), also adolescents seem to see time as a source of trouble, and therefore motivate their choice for convenience by placing time at the centre. However, it is not said that this conception of time scarcity is intrinsic to the adolescents. As discussed in the theoretical framework, both the perception of time (as scarce) together with changes in social and institutional order enhancing individualization, are paramount to the legitimization and normalization of convenience food (Shove, 2003; Warde, 2005). Conventions of normality are shared and they also influence the perceptions and practices of young adolescents. Nevertheless, more research is needed to confirm this influence, as this research only concentrated on adolescents describing practices, not the actual everyday performance of practices.

In line with theory on childrens and adolescents’ food choice process, taste is given priority over health in results of this study. This might be considered not surprising, given the age (12-15 years) of the participants, though it is interesting to see these conflicting accounts. The results show that although defined as healthy and therefore inferior to homemade food or fresh produce, adolescents are still choosing based on the appreciation of taste when faced with the choice. This is in line with Truninger’s (2011) conception that meanings belong to practices instead of self-contained individuals. Wherein the brain-storm assignment, many groups discuss convenience food as unhealthy, they simultaneously adore it because of its taste. The disourse of health and the value attached to it, is thus more likely to belong to the practice than belonging to the young adolescents’ as individuals. Moreover, Gram-Hanssen (2011) has pointed out that meanings tend to be general rather than individualistic accounts when practitioners
lack knowledge. When more (or better) knowledge is acquired, conventions of normality tend to change. So too the normative acceptance of convenience food differs with knowledge levels.

Also the role of representation is relevant to discuss here. The results show that the way food is presented, both in terms of packaging and appearance, play a critical role in meaning-making. Positive evaluations of pictures of the package, or the appearance of the product itself influence the willingness to use the product. These findings support the idea that the way food is framed influences perception and eventually consumption. Advertising, media, packaging and the like all provide a context of which practitioners derive meaning. Although this research does not cover advertising and media environment, it does re-affirm the influence of packaging and appearance on consumer choice, in this case hypothetical. Adolescents are easily affected by the looks of a product/package, which in its turn can be analyzed in regard of consumer socialization. Although adolescents are in the reflective stage, they are still sensitive to misinterpret producers’ attempt to shape practices in such a way suiting their commercial interest (John, 1997; Warde, 2005).

In addition, the results regarding technology and normalization can be related to Shove’s and Southern’s ‘narrative of normalization’ (2000). Similarly as the freezer in their research, appliances such as microwaves and electric water kettles are now evidently part of the narrative of normalization regarding convenience food use. However, the findings do not confirm Warde’s notion on hypermodern convenience (1999), as no evidence is found that technology is used to ensure greater flexibility of time instead of just seeking time reduction. In similar vein, also the process as illustrated in Figure 2.2 provided by Shove (2003) regarding the escalatory path of convenience cannot be applied to the use of technology and convenience food. Yet Shove et al. (2012) statement that with the diffusion of technology, not only skills disappear, but also new skills emerge, can be confirmed by the findings. From the discursive account of their common food practices, it can be said that most adolescents have embodied skills when it comes to the use of technology supporting convenience. This is also in line with Lang’s (2000) notion of a culinary transition. Next to skills related to technology the skill referred to a food assembly is apparent in the results. Although not directly part of adolescents’ discursive consciousness, the accounts collected in this study give hints of technology skills and food assembly as skills to be part of what Giddens’ calls ‘practical consciousness’.

Relating the results with literature concerns the element material and competence, the findings indicate that adolescents link convenience food to specific places in many occasions, thus are capable of buying and consuming convenience food when they aspire to do so. Considering Gofton (1995), adolescents know how and where to pursue convenience through the different stages of the provisional process (e.g. in this case planning, shopping, eating). More research is needed to distinguish this pursuit of convenience in the other provisional practices.

Lastly, it is relevant to see know-how of cooking typical meals in comparison with theories and statements by Lang, Pollan and Fresco. Lang (2000) and Pollan (2013) both see deskilling and the increasing reliance on convenience food as a source of trouble. Lang (2000) sees it as a shift in responsibility from consumers to industry, implying that consumers lose control over their diet and become dependent. Pollan (2013) goes further by propagating the re-establishment of a ‘culture of cooking’, and importantly, to involve children it this. Fresco (2013) is more nuanced, but does confirm to the observation that the relationship between human and food had altered; the distance is growing. In respect of findings of this current study, some of these statements can be confirmed regarding decreasing know-how of how food is prepared and where it comes from. Langs’ concerns about the increasing dependency on processed foods are apparent in some instances. However, we should not be too pessimistic, as the data also reveals that many adolescents respond to enjoy cooking, have some sort of idea what it entails, and are engaged in current food issues. This conclusion provides grounds to come back to the secondary aim of
the study, namely to engage young people into thinking and talking about food-related issues. It shows how young people like those participating in this study are able to critically think about our food system and its implication when given the opportunity.

The above provided discussion leads to the summarized answer of the main research question:

*How do young adolescents conceptualize and understand convenience as an attribute of food products and how does this relate to their food practices?*

From the categories, elements and linkages between the elements, it can be concluded that adolescents share understandings of convenience food. Although internally differentiated, they come down to the following shared understandings:

**Convenience food (practice):**
- is in many cases unhealthy
- is often appreciated due to its taste, ease and time-saving capabilities
- involves less demanding skills and competences than non-convenient food
- is often associated with out-of-home preparation and consumption
- is also associated with at home consumption of processed foods
- involves convenience in different stages of the provisional process (e.g. shopping, preparation, eating, etc.)
- is considered as artificial due to industrialized processing by the food industry
- is often associated with technology in the form of kitchen devices
- is occasionally seen as lazy or unknowing
- is often associated with specific brands and certain forms of packaging
- is experienced both as normal and special
- is recognized as tasty which is more important than health

Shared conventions and justifications guide these understandings. Conventions of what is taken-for-granted and justifications what is seen as normal or appropriate conduct of convenience food practice, are collective in our society. As adolescents are part of this society, their understandings are also guided by these conventions and justifications. However, they do have the capability to adjust understandings by using their own experience as a frame of reference, and thus this study, which builds on the new sociology of childhood, incorporates adolescents’ own perspectives of their food environment. Thereby, this study contributes to the growing body of literature emphasizing the need to treat children as agents and consumers in their own right.

### 7.2 Reflection

Some limitations concerning the research set-up and process are important to discuss. At first, while the practice theoretical approach proved to be useful to dissect shared understandings, conventions and justifications part of adolescents’ convenience food practices, its application could be improved by narrowing the focus to a more specific practice within the realm of convenience food practices. As Schatzki (1996) has pointed out, there is a difference between dispersed and integrative practices, the first entailing singular practices, and the latter build up by multiple dispersed practices. Schatzki provides the example of cooking practice as an integrative practice. It thus is evident that the practice under investigation in the current research, convenience food practice, can also be termed integrative and highly complex, what made analysis challenging. For further research it is therefore suggested to focus on a smaller and more specifically defined practice within this complex set of practices comprising con-
venience food, for instance by addressing solely the domestic use of convenience food products such as ready-to-eat meal packages. Moreover, a pitfall during the analysis process was to keep the collective pattern of thought in focus, and not ascribing understandings of individuals to be collective when they are not shared. Nevertheless, the findings of this study are still meaningful due to its broad coverage of practices, and the way the theoretical approach is used suits the nature of explorative research.

Moreover, it is relevant to reflect on the research methods used. The combination of practice theory and participatory research design together with the context of workshops provided in class to thirty adolescents at a time, asked for new methods to be developed. These participatory methods had to not only elicit relevant data in order to answer the practice theoretical inspired research question; they also needed to fit in a Think.Food workshop structure, provide a context for the adolescents, and arouse interest and enthusiasm amongst them (secondary aim). Accordingly, a derivative of focus groups served as an overarching methodology. The separate measures within were diverse and varied between schools to accommodate education level differences. However, as multiple assignments were used to elicit data, it resulted in an overload of data, which made data analysis more cumbersome than initially expected. Besides, the idea was that observations of group discussions would be a major source of data. However, it proved difficult to act as a guest lecturer and focus group mediator simultaneously when faced with five to ten groups per class. Although a second observer was present fifty percent of the time, this aim was still set too high, especially taking into account the limited teaching experience of the main researcher. Also the workshops resulted in too much data, because many data sources were still used for analysis despite the fact that some were discarded before analysis took place. Nevertheless, the measures taken and the experience with generating data with them can serve as basis to further develop participative methods to be used in research with young people.

Also regarding the sample size, targets were set too high. The sample consisted of four schools and seven workshops were provided in total, resulting in approximately 145 participants. For qualitative research this is an exceptional amount. Suggested is to limit the scope and sample size, to be better able to focus on the details and narratives of adolescents concerning their (food) practices.

One of the last issues to be addressed concerns the nature of the unraveled practices. This research focused on the elements of practices as present in the discourses and understandings of young adolescents, not on the actual practices themselves, as other research is necessary to track such behavior. Only the cooking assignment provided a glace of what actually happens in the kitchen, although context differs from everyday life. Taken into account this discursively nature, it should also be considered that participants, acting in groups and in a classroom context, provide socially desired answers (for instance negative value judgments of convenience food) and can feel restrained to share actual food practices. Surprisingly, products such as meal packages, while readily available in supermarkets and known to be very popular in use throughout the Netherlands, did not have a place in the immediate associations with convenience. The question remains if that is a consequence of socially desired answers, or maybe because it is that normalized? Further research on this topic is therefore suggested, next to possible research on the appropriation of convenience food in the domestic environment.

Finally, it should be considered that education level does not play a role in this study context, although the sample included both schools of the lowest level and the highest level high schools in the Dutch system. Besides, the lowest leveled school concerned a school with specific programs to accommodate children with learning difficulties. However, it is chosen not to distinguish based on education differences, as the topic of food concerns everyone; every individual has associations with food and is affected by shared conventions and practices. Though further research could direct towards exploring this level of influence by differentiating based on education level or social status.
7.3 Implications
Some implications are already discussed in the previous section, however this section is devoted to briefly address the implications of the study not yet covered.

The combination of a practice theoretical perspective and a participatory approach proves to be useful for studying complex practices and for the use of explorative research. The participatory approach left room for choice, so that the concept could be approached according to what they though was the best way, matching how they interpret the social context of their daily lives. The participatory methods were also very suitable for in-class use; used in combination with theory to make a diverse and fun workshop catching and retaining childrens’ attention and interest. This is promising for educational research. Furthermore, this research builds further on the existing literature of the practical application of practice theory on empirical studies focused on consumption. It can therefore be used as a reference to guide which pitfalls could be overcome next time.

Besides these theoretical implications, the findings contribute to an understanding of how young adolescents’ evaluate and understand convenience food in their food environment, and how shared conventions and justifications play a role. This research outcome can be used in the development of educational activities stimulating critical thinking about food. Another implication of this study is that the relevance of providing workshops on schools (as in the context of Think.Food) is even more apparent: food education must become an integral part of the high school curriculum at all levels to equip young people with common sense and critical reflection competences to make their own judgments and informed food choices. Currently, the most food-related educational activities carried out at Dutch high schools focus on nutrition only, mainly basing its educational objective on learning children the food pyramid. In these times with an abundance of food (of which many are highly processed), contradictory and misleading information everywhere, more is needed to educate people about the food they consume.
8. Conclusion

The main purpose of this study was to examine young adolescents’ understandings and conceptualizations of convenience food. This is examined using a practice theoretical approach and several participatory methods in workshops provided at four high schools in and around Amsterdam. The results were subject to content analysis to dissect categories, and subsequently these categories are analyzed by use of the practice theoretical inspired element-based approach. The results of this present study provide a sociological account of how young adolescents make sense of their food environment cluttered with convenience.

Using the theoretical lens of practice theory yielded insight into the collective aspects of consumption, as opposed to individual motivations and attitudes driving consumption. The element-based approach proposed by Shove, Pantzar and Watson (2012) proved to be useful to further analyze how the practice of convenience food consumption constitutes of materials, competences and meanings and to see to which extent linkages between these elements are relevant for understanding young adolescents’ views on convenience food.

The young adolescents participating in this study shared their views on what they defined as convenience food, their experiences with this food category, their conceptions of ‘normal’ food in relation to convenience and their motivations for choosing or not choosing food products offering some sort of convenience. Furthermore, one group of adolescents participated in a cooking assignment in which ‘home-made’ was directly evaluated next to the convenient alternative to generate data on actual consumption practices besides discursive accounts of convenient food usage. Another group reported on their favorite meals included ingredients and cooking steps necessary. The results are supported by in-class observations.

In conclusion, it can be said that young adolescents, although contradictory accounts are present in the findings, have a set of shared understanding when it comes to convenience food. Key associations include meanings and ideas of health, taste and artificiality; competences related to the food industry, their own cooking know-how and use of technology; and material in the form of specific convenience products and general categories, its packaging, brands and places. Moreover, conceptions of normality are contradictory in that convenience food (due to its different forms) is both conceived as normal and special. This is in accordance with what is known about society in a broader sense; convenience food, as a consequence of perceived time scarcity amongst many factors, is negotiated through opposing practices.

Next to several suggestions for further research and some theoretical and practical implications, one of the main implications of this research are the provided arguments to promote general food education as an integral part of the high school curriculum. Altogether, this thesis supports recommendations aimed at consumers to critically reflect upon what food industry is introducing on the market under the guise of convenience.
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Appendices
## Appendix I. Outline of basic workshop structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESVERLOOP</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Plaatje</strong></td>
<td>Logo Think.Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Introduceer jezelf</strong></td>
<td>Wie ben jij? Achtergrond, motivatie etc Onderzoek/geen test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Doelstelling gastles</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Historisch perspectief: bewerken van voeding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Voedings als wetenschap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Wat is gemaksvoeding?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Voedingskeuze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Tussendoor opdrachten &amp; filmpjes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Vraag / gesprek</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Tijdbalk overzicht</strong></td>
<td>Aan de hand van historisch perspectief gaan we in op verschillende onderwerpen met het thema voeding Tussendoor een paar opdrachten en filmpjes. Beginnen met filmpje om te begrijpen waarom het belangrijk is om over voedsel na te denken: keuringsdienst</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **8. Zoom in op 20e eeuw** | Voeding als wetenschap:  
| | - 1920: vitaminen ontdekt  
| | - Nadruk op smaak en functie van voeding (effect op lichaam)  
| | - Nieuwe technieken om houdbaarheid te verlengen, zoals inblikken, pasteuriseren, koelen, invriezen.  
<p>| | - Industriële voedselproductie in volle gang; doelstellingen zijn o.a.: bederf tegengaan, gehele jaar voldoende voedsel, consistente kwaliteit. |
| <strong>9. 21e eeuw</strong> | Voeding moet tegenwoordig niet alleen meer veilig, gezond en lekker zijn, maar ook gemak bieden.. voorbeelden? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Filmpje</th>
<th>Reclame Knorr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wat zijn additieven?</td>
<td><em>Hulpstoffen die tijdens industriële productie van voedingsmiddelen worden toegevoegd om een bepaalde eigenschap te behouden dan wel te verbeteren (De Jong).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functie: Houdbaarheid, consistentie, uiterlijk, geur, kleur, smaak, verbeteren van kook of bakproces. Geef enkele voorbeelden. Ook in contrast met natuurlijke methoden en natuurlijke smaakversterkers (kruiden, knoflook, ui, citroensap etc.) .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Additieven ook gebruikt om te suggereren wat er niet is... vb roze kleur van aardbeienyoghurt. Smaakversterkers in bijv cup-a-soup. Functional foods: becel pro-activ: Wat is functionele voeding? Gezonde additieven: extra gezonde stof toegevoegd om product (nog) gezonder te maken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wat zijn E-nummers: Er wordt tegenwoordig veel onderzoek gedaan naar de schadelijkheid van additieven; als niet schadelijk: goedgekeurd door EU en dan krijgen de additieven en uniforme code = E + cijfer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Er zijn wereldwijd meer dan 5000 additieven. Er is altijd nog onzekerheid over de veiligheid, nooit helemaal 100% zeker, daarom altijd nog veel discussies, ook over goedgekeurde E-nummers. Vb Cola light. Ook nog steeds gerommel: vb. melkpoeder met hars in China!
- Het is wel verplicht voor voedselproducenten om alle additieven op etiket te zetten, maar is het wel duidelijk wat er in zit?

| 13. Mens als omnivoor | Herbivoor – carnivoor – mens is zogezegd omnivoor, een alleseter. Afvragen of keuze instinctief is? Kiezen wat we nodig hebben: voorbeeld leeuw als echte carnivoor is tevreden met zelfde stuk vlees. De mens is kieskeuriger en zoekt meer variatie in dieet. Veel factoren beïnvloeden onze keuze: heel veel keuze in supermarkt, kiezen voor gezond, gemak, lekker? |

Appendix II: workshop brainstorm assignment and cooking assignment evaluations

Groepsopdracht 1: Wat is gemaksvoeding?

Bespreek in de groep waar jullie aan denken bij de term “gemaksvoeding”.

Schrijf / teken / mind-map je bevindingen.

De Kook & Proef vragen:

1. Vond je het leuk om zelf tomatensaus te maken? Ja / nee / geen mening

2. Hoe makkelijk of moeilijk was het om zelf tomatensaus te maken?
   1 = heel makkelijk
   2 = best makkelijk
   3 = niet makkelijk, niet moeilijk
   4 = best moeilijk
   5 = heel moeilijk

3. Wat vond je lekkerder, de zelfgemaakte tomatensaus of de kant-en-klare? Waarom?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

4. Welke zintuigen heb je gebruikt om de tomatensaus te beoordelen?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. Na deze les, wat zou je de volgende keer eerder doen, de saus zelf maken of kant-en-klar kopen? Waarom?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
Appendix III: Hypothetical choice situations

SITUATIE 1:

Je ouders vragen je een maaltijd te maken op een doordeweekse avond voor jullie gezin. Je maakt andijvie stamppot. Maak gezamenlijk een keuze uit de volgende opties (één keuze per rij producten, omcirkel keuze), en bespreek met elkaar waarom je die keuze maakt (schrijf jullie antwoord op de daarvoor bestemde regel).

A.)  B.)  C.)  D.)

Wat voor ingrediënten denk je nog meer nodig te hebben voor andijvie stamppot?

Reden voor keuze?

Reden voor keuze?

Reden voor keuze?
SITUATIE 2:

Je ouders vragen je een maaltijd te maken op een doordeweekse avond voor jullie gezin. Je maakt spaghetti Bolognese. Maak gezamenlijk een keuze uit de volgende opties (één keuze per rij producten, omcirkel keuze), en bespreek met elkaar waarom je die keuze maakt (schrijf jullie antwoord op de daarvoor bestemde regel).

A.)

Reden voor keuze?

B.)

Wat voor ingrediënten denk je nog meer nodig te hebben voor spaghetti Bolognese?

C.)

D.)
SITUATIE 3:

Dit weekend komen er vrienden bij jou eten. Je mag kiezen wat jullie eten en je kiest pizza! Wat heb je hiervoor nodig? Maak gezamenlijk een keuze uit de volgende opties (één keuze per rij producten, omcirkel keuze), en bespreek met elkaar waarom je die keuze maakt (schrijf jullie antwoord op de daarvoor bestemde regel).

Reden voor keuze?

...................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

Of kies je liever voor pizza’s van de pizzeria om de hoek? Waarom wel/niet?

...................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
SITUATIE 4:

Dit weekend komen er vrienden bij jou eten. Je mag kiezen wat jullie eten en je kiest pizza! Je ouders vinden dat goed, mits je er ook een salade bij maakt voor de vitaminen. Maak gezamenlijk een keuze uit de volgende opties (één keuze per rij producten, omcirkel keuze), en bespreek met elkaar waarom je die keuze maakt (schrijf jullie antwoord op de daarvoor bestemde regel).

Reden voor keuze?

-----------

-----------

Als jullie hebben gekozen om zelf een dressing te maken, wat heb je daarvoor nodig en hoe doe je dat?

-----------