AALBORG UNIVERSITY

DENMARK

'SIT STILL!' 'BE QUIET!' 'AND LET'S ENJOY A NICE MEAL TOGETHER…'

EXPLORING AMBIVALENT PERSPECTIVES OF KINDERGARTEN MEALTIME AS A SITUATION OF REGULATION, TOGETHERNESS AND PLAYFULNESS

Hansen, Stine Rosenlund

'SIT STILL!' 'BE QUIET!' 'AND LET'S ENJOY A NICE MEAL TOGETHER…'

EXPLORING AMBIVALENT PERSPECTIVES OF
KINDERGARTEN MEALTIME AS A SITUATION OF
REGULATION, TOGETHERNESS AND PLAYFULNESS

BY
STINE ROSENLUND HANSEN

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED 2016

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

NORDEA
FONDEN

'SIT STILL!' 'BE QUIET!' 'AND LET'S ENJOY A NICE MEAL TOGETHER…'

EXPLORING AMBIVALENT PERSPECTIVES OF KINDERGARTEN MEALTIME AS A SITUATION OF REGULATION, TOGETHERNESS AND PLAYFULNESS

by

Stine Rosenlund Hansen

AALBORG UNIVERSITY

DENMARK

Dissertation submitted

.

ENGLISH SUMMARY

This thesis is concerned with the complexities of everyday mealtime in kindergartens , thus the situation of eating together in a day care facility. The thesis argues that the situation of mealtime can be viewed from many different and ambivalent perspectives simultaneously, thus the thesis does not produce any clear-cut 'truths' about mealtime or clear-cut guidelines about best practices. Instead, it sheds light on some of the established truisms, thus the taken-for-granted practices and aims of mealtime, while also examining how such aims and practices are re-negotiated in everyday life. The aim is to enhance awareness of the many tensions and contradictions that are part of everyday mealtime in kindergartens and to push reflexivity – in future research as well as amongst practitioners. Academically, the thesis contributes with methodological and theoretical discussions related to the study of everyday life situations, particularly relevant to studies of the everyday life of children. The thesis argues that presumptions about differences between child and adult perspectives should be opened for examination, as practices, knowledges and aims are interactionally and situationally constructed. Furthermore, the thesis argues that the nonhuman, such as food and eating materials, as well as discursive norms, are important parts of such constructions.

The study combines a variety of qualitative methods, some traditional, such as participant observation and semi-structured interviews, and some untraditional, such as role-playing and experimenting with the organisation of mealtime. The empirical material is analysed through situational mapping, as suggested in situational analysis (Clarke, 2005), as well as through different conceptual tools gathered from literature within postmodernism, relational materialism and childhood studies.

The first part of the thesis introduces the study. It introduces the aim of the research, including the motivations and the journey through which this aim was constructed. It also introduces central literature that puts the current study in perspective. This includes an introduction to some of the dominant research approaches to food and eating, as well as a general introduction to 'the new social studies of childhood', and some of the important discussions and concepts within these studies that are important in order to understand the arguments and scope of the thesis.

The second part of the thesis introduces the theoretical and methodological grounding of the thesis. This includes an introduction to the three types of elements examined in situational analysis, thus human, material, and discursive elements. The section presents how each of these categories are approached in the study and how they are analysed as situationally interacting and relationally defined. Furthermore, this section introduces the specific methods used and the process of analysis.

The analyses themselves are presented in the papers that form the third part of the thesis.

The first paper, *Studying perspectives on Kindergarten Meals*, discusses methodological issues related to the concepts of child and adult perspectives, and to children's participation in research. The paper takes part in a recent critical discussion of an often taken-for-granted approach to child and adult perspectives as dichotomised categories. Through empirical examples, the paper argues that perspectives should not be approached as either child- or adult perspectives, but as something that is created through situated interactions between human and non-human elements. It argues that perspectives can be studied as constructed from a net of human, material, and discursive elements. In doing so, the paper also questions that children's participation in research can necessarily be assumed as a source for production of knowledge that is more authentic, than that produced by adults (Gallacher & Gallagher, 2008; Lomax, 2012).

The second paper, *Striated agency and smooth regulation*, focuses on kindergarten mealtime, defined as a situation in which humans, materials, and discursive elements are all present and interacting. The paper uses the concepts of striated and smooth spaces, introduced by Deleuze and Guattari (1987), to analyse kindergarten mealtimes as complex everyday life situations, in which processes of regulation and agency are established in children's lives. This is done through a discussion of two opposite, but co-existing perspectives on the everyday meals that respectively emphasise children as future beings, and as here-and-now beings. Through the concepts of smoothing and striation, the paper discusses how these perspectives produce different mechanisms of regulation and agency, and position the eaters differently in the everyday meals. The paper provides insights that emphasise the kindergarten meal as an ambiguous practice that does not offer simple discussions about good and bad meal situations.

The third paper, *Food for Kindergarten children*, discusses two different perspectives on eating practices as sites for contested understandings of food, bodies, and care. It argues that food, bodies, and care simultaneously enact each other in different and contesting ways in the everyday meals. One perspective highlights the bodily experience of eating, while a different perspective emphasizes the relations between food and health. This causes tensions in the everyday meals, as children and adults relate differently to these perspectives. To the adults, the child body is a site for professional socialization, thus the adults feel a responsibility towards managing children's bodies, and they largely do so from a perspective of health and nutrition. Children on the other hand, experience the food and the care through their body and its senses. Thus, the paper argues that adults regulate children's eating practices, and often downplay the meaning of the bodily experiences of eating in favour of a more rational approach that seeks to construct healthy bodies and brains. However, the paper also confuses this sharp division of child and adult perspectives, and argues that the lines between these are blurred in practice.

DANSK RESUME

Fokus for denne afhandling er på måltider i børnehaver og på de kompleksiteter, der er en del af hverdagens måltidssituationer, når børn og voksne spiser sammen i en børnehave. Afhandlingen argumenterer for, at måltidssituationen kan anskues fra mange forskellige og ambivalente perspektiver, og afhandlingen opstiller derfor ikke entydige 'sandheder' eller retningslinjer for bedste praksisser. I steder kaster den lys over nogle af de etablerede selvfølgeligheder, altså praksisser og mål, der fremstår som selvindlysende og indiskutable. Samtidig undersøges også hvordan sådanne praksisser og mål udfordres og genforhandles i de daglige måltider. Målet er, at fremme bevidsthed om de mange spændinger og modsætninger, der er en del af måltiderne, samt at understøtte en refleksiv tilgang til måltider i daginstitutioner – både i fremtidig forskning, såvel som blandt praktikere. Afhandlingen bidrager desuden med metodologiske og teoretiske diskussioner relateret til studier af hverdagsliv, særligt i relation til studier af børns hverdagsliv. Afhandlingen argumenterer for, at forforståelser omkring forskelle mellem børne- og voksen perspektiver skal åbnes for nærmere undersøgelse, eftersom praksisser, viden og mål konstrueres gennem interaktion. Yderligere argumenterer afhandlingen for, at det ikke-menneskelige, såsom mad og spisematerialer, såvel som diskursive normer og strukturer, er vigtige dele af sådanne konstruktioner.

Afhandlingen kombinerer flere forskellige kvalitative metoder, hvoraf nogle er traditionelle, såsom deltagende observation og semi-strukturerede interviews, mens andre er mere utraditionelle, sådan som rollespil og eksperimentation med forskellige måder at spise sammen på. Det empiriske materiale analyseres gennem situational mapping, sådan som det er foreslået i *Situational analysis* (Clarke, 2005), såvel som gennem forskellige konceptuelle værktøjer, der er hentet fra litteratur indenfor postmodernisme, relationel materialisme og barndomsforskning.

Den første del af afhandlingen introducerer selve Ph.d. studiet. Her gives en introduktion til målet for forskningen, herunder motivationen og den rejse som dette mål er blevet til gennem. Denne del indeholder også en introduktion til udvalgt central litteratur, som perspektiverer afhandlingen. Herunder en introduktion til nogle af de dominerende forskningsmæssige tilgange til mad og spisning, samt en mere general introduktion til den såkaldte 'nye sociologiske barndomsforskning' og nogle af de vigtige diskussioner og koncepter inden for denne forskning, som er vigtige for at forstå de argumenter og fokusområder, der er centrale for afhandlingen.

Den anden del af afhandlingen introducerer dens teoretiske og metodologiske rødder. Herunder gives en introduktion til de tre typer af elementer, som er udgangspunkt for analyse i situational analysis, nemlig menneskelige elementer, materielle elementer og diskursive elementer. Afsnittet præsenterer den teoretiske tilgang til hver af disse kategorier, samt beskriver den analysemæssige tilgang. De forskellige elementer

analyseres som situerede og interagerende og som relationelt definerede. Derudover præsenteres de specifikke metoder, der er benyttet, ligesom den analytiske proces gennemgås.

Selve analyserne præsenteres i de tre artikler, der tilsammen udgør den tredje og sidste del af afhandlingen.

Den første artikel, *Studying perspectives on Kindergarten Meals* (At undersøge perspektiver på børnehave måltider), diskuterer nogle metodologiske problemstillinger relateret til koncepterne børne- og voksenperspektiver, samt til børns deltagelse i forskning. I megen forskning tages det for givet, at børne- og voksen perspektiver er dikotomiserede begreber. Artiklen skriver sig ind i en nylig kritisk diskussion af denne opfattelse, og argumenterer, at denne dikotomiserede forståelse af børn og voksne er simplificeret. Gennem empiriske eksempler foreslås det i artiklen, at perspektiver ikke skal forstås som autentiske børne- eller voksenperspektiver, men som noget, der skabes gennem situerede interaktioner mellem menneskelige og ikke-menneskelige aktører. Gennem denne tilgang stiller artiklen også spørgsmålstegn ved, om børns involvering i forskning kan antages nødvendigvis at producere viden, der er mere autentisk end den, der produceres af voksne.

Den anden artikel, *Striated agency and smooth regulation*[1] fokuserer på børnehavemåltidet, der defineres som en situation hvor menneskelige, materielle og diskursive elementer interagerer. Artiklen benytter de teoretiske begreber striated and smooth spaces (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) til at analysere børnehavemåltider som komplekse hverdagslivssituationer, hvor reguleringsprocesser, såvel som processer, der skaber handlefrihed, etableres i børnenes liv. Artiklen identificerer og diskuterer to modsatte, men sameksisterende perspektiver på hverdagsmåltider i børnehaver. Det ene perspektiv positionerer børn som kommende borgere, dvs. understreger deres fremtidighed, mens det andet understreger børn som de mennesker de er her-og-nu. Disse perspektiver indeholder dermed komplekse relationer mellem børn og voksne. Gennem begreberne smoothing og striation diskuteres det i artiklen, hvordan disse to perspektiver udfolder sig i hverdagsmåltiderne gennem mekanismer, der både virker regulerende og skaber plads til individuel handlefrihed, og som positionerer de spisende forskelligt i hverdagsmåltiderne. Artiklen understreger, at måltider i børnehaver er ambivalente praksisser, der ikke kan diskuteres gennem simple forståelser af hvad der er godt og dårligt.

Den tredje artikel, Food for Kindergarten children (mad til børnehavebørn), diskuterer måltidssituationen som en arena for omstridte forståelser af mad, kroppe og omsorg.

---

[1] titlen kan ikke oversættes fyldestgørende, da begreberne *striated* og *smooth* ikke findes tilsvarende på dansk.

Artiklen argumenterer for, at mad, kroppe og omsorg gensidigt skaber hinanden og udfolder sig på forskellige og omstridte måder i de daglige måltider. Artiklen identificerer og diskuterer to forskellige perspektiver på spisning, som er samtidigt eksisterende i de daglige måltider og som er baseret på sådanne forskellige udfoldelser af mad, kroppe og omsorg. I det ene perspektiv fremhæves den kropslige oplevelse af at spise, mens det andet perspektiv fremhæver relationerne mellem mad og sundhed. Sameksistensen af disse perspektiver skaber spændinger i de daglige måltider, som påvirker relationerne mellem børn og voksne, da disse forholder sig forskelligt til de to perspektiver. For mange voksne er barnekroppen en arena for professional dannelse og regulering. De voksne føler et ansvar for at kontrollere børnenes kroppe og dette sker hovedsageligt ud fra et ernærings- og sundhedsperspektiv. Børnene, på den anden side, oplever i høj grad mad og omsorg gennem deres krop og sanser. Voksne regulerer dermed børns spisepraksisser og nedtoner ofte betydningen af den kropslige oplevelse, til fordel for en mere rationel tilgang hvor målet med spisning bliver at skabe sunde kroppe. Dog forvirrer artiklen selv denne skarpe adskillelse af børne- og voksenperspektiverne og argumenterer for, at grænserne mellem disse er flydende i praksis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all of those who have contributed to the research process in the form of guidance, comments, inspiration and personal support.

First, I would like to thank all the children and staff of the kindergartens that participated in my study. Thank you for welcoming me, for committing to my project and for allowing me to disturb your everyday life. And for all the critical, inspiring and encouraging comments along the way.

I would also like to thank my supervisor, Niels Heine Kristensen and co-supervisor, Morten Kromann Nielsen, as well as my colleagues in the FINE research group and at University College Lillebælt for professional guidance and inspiration, and for personal encouragement along the way. A special thank you to Mette Weinreich Hansen who have taken time out of a busy schedule to repeatedly comment and discuss my work. Thank you for constantly pushing, challenging and supporting me!

Also thank you to my colleagues in the FRIDA project – for all the ups and downs we've shared!

Thank you also to my friends, Charlotte and Tanja, for regularly lending me a couch to sleep on during Ph.D. courses and meetings, and for listening to my frustrations and excitements.

Last, but not least, I thank my family for their constant support and for patiently putting up with me in the stressful periods, and giving me time off to write when needed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 1. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROJECT AND MAIN RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The overall aim of this thesis is to study mealtime situations in Danish kindergartens, and conceptualize some of the complex mechanisms that are characteristic of the meals. This is done through an everyday life approach in which the people, the things, and the discursive norms are analysed as elements, whose interactions establish the situation of mealtime. Furthermore, the thesis aims to contribute to the methodological development of the concept of perspective, which is a central concept in the studies of children's everyday life, as well as develop methods for such studies.

In Denmark, kindergarten meals have traditionally consisted of home brought lunch packs. However, due to a change in legislation in 2010, the organization of the kindergarten meal became an issue of tense public debate. The new legislation states that municipalities must develop a lunch scheme arrangement for day care facilities, however, it is decided on a two year basis at local institutional level whether to implement the meal scheme or not. Parents decide this through voting. So far, the home-brought lunch pack is still the most widespread way of providing children in kindergarten lunch, but in 2011, it was estimated that the number of lunch scheme arrangements are slightly increasing (Heyn, Lassen, Christensen, & Sabinsky, 2011). More recent figures that document the development is lacking.

This reconstruction of the kindergarten lunch provided the onset of the research project FRIDA, of which this thesis is part (FRokostordninger I DAginstitutioner, in English: Lunch scheme arrangements in day care facilities). Project FRIDA aimed at creating knowledge about different aspects of lunch scheme arrangements in kindergartens, with the aim of promoting health and food education (FRIDA project description, 2010, p. 2). It consisted of three separate working packages, arranged as three doctoral research projects. The current thesis represents one of these. The two others studied meals from a design perspective and from a public health nutrition perspective respectively. The doctoral research project that this thesis builds upon was supposed to provide a social science perspective on mealtime. More specifically, the initial research aim was to create an overview and elaborated understanding of the many different perspectives on mealtime, as represented by different groups of human actors. Thus, I was supposed to examine a child perspective, a pedagogical perspective, a political perspective, a parent perspective, and so on, and examine how these related and unfolded in the everyday mealtime practices. However, things quickly became more complex as the following will show.

Meals are an extremely broad area of research, and the project has taken many twists and turns in the process of defining the study. Here, I will shortly introduce this process, including some of the research disciplines that have been an inspiration or affected the project in other ways. Thus, this thesis does not place itself within a clearly defined discipline, but draws instead on methodological and theoretical perspectives within postmodernism, relational materialism, childhood studies and ethnography.

One research paradigm that has inspired the study, is the so-called new social studies of childhood (Prout & James, 1997, see section "The new social studies of childhood" for elaboration). Childhood and children's lives have traditionally been explored through the views of their adult caretakers (Christensen & James, 2000), and mainly with an emphasis on children as future beings. However, throughout the last few decades, a "new" paradigm has emerged that views children as social agents that should be studied in their own right as here-and-now humans. Much research within the new paradigm emphasize children's perspectives and their participation in research through participatory methods (Eide & Winger, 2005). This new paradigm has been a major inspiration throughout this doctoral research project in different ways.

As for much research within the new social studies of childhood, the research project was motivated by the fact that children rarely are given the opportunity to express their own views in decision-making processes (Spyrou, 2011). This motivation was further emphasized by the fact that only little research has been carried out on children's experiences of everyday mealtime in day care facilities (James, Kjørholt, & Tingstad, 2009; Wesslén, Sepp, & Fjellström, 2002). I therefore emphasized an aim to represent children's "authentic" perspectives, thus searching for a child perspective that was not seen through adult lenses, and I experimented with different methods that sought to involve children as co-researchers.

However, at the same time, I was also inspired by method literature with an interactionist perspective (Järvinen & Mik-Meyer, 2005), in which the researcher is emphasized as always being part of data and analysis, and I was very keen on trying to be reflexive and explicit about my own role in the production of data. Due to this, I became increasingly aware that my intense focus on child perspectives had led to a tendency to romanticize children's perspectives and agency, while, roughly spoken, reducing adults to a role of restricting children's opportunities. I realized that adult staff are also embedded in complex structures and norms that influence their everyday practices and relations to the children, and that adults and children were not always in opposition. Furthermore, it became obvious that other, nonhuman, elements played an even more active role in mealtime than first anticipated. This meant that I became more aware of material and "fluffy" elements, such as ideas, discourses, concepts, symbols, debates and cultural "stuff" as co-constructers of the meal situation.

But, even with this opening towards a more curious exploration of the adult perspectives, the approach to the concept of perspective itself started troubling me. Thus, it became increasingly difficult to maintain the analytical delimitation of perspectives as belonging to either children or adults. This design was simply not elastic enough to capture the complexities I experienced empirically. For example, not all children shared the same perspective and neither did all adults. However, even more troubling was the fact that individuals did not express a coherent perspective across different situations. They would say one thing in one situation, another in a different, and then do something third later. Coming from a social constructionist and interactionist background, this should not have surprised me. However, I had been so caught up with the idea of seeing children as competent agents, whose voices or perspectives had a right to be heard, that I had forgotten to question the ontological premise of the concepts (perspective and voice). I realized that my research design – the very research question – did not comply with my understanding of and approach to scientific analysis and writing. Thus, I needed to rethink the idea of perspective: what is a perspective, who, or what, does it belong to? An individual? A group of individuals? Or, could it be that perspectives should be approached as something disconnected from individual human beings? Writings within situational analysis, as well as other postmodern writings that argue for the decentring of the subject and the embrace of discourses and materials in the study of social life, became sources of inspiration for dealing with these questions. This led to a new approach to the analysis and re-construction of the research aim.

Thus, as the research process unfolded, the aim of the research changed. It became an ambition to approach mealtime with much more focus on the relational and situational aspects. Thus, the authentic and individualized perspectives that I had been looking for, did not exist. Instead of searching for perspectives that belonged to predefined groups of humans, such as children, staff, parents, etc., I turned to perspectives as something that was constructed from a net of human and nonhuman elements. The motivation thereby became to take a step back, so to speak, and zoom out (Nicolini, 2009) from this narrow focus on predefined groups and their delimited perspectives, and instead approach mealtime as a complex situation (Clarke, 2005) in which ambiguous and multidimensional perspectives were simultaneously constructive of and constructed by the everyday mealtimes.

However, it quickly became clear that mealtime was at least as complex a situation as anticipated, and as I opened up to the inclusion of the nonhuman, the complexities did not become easier to deal with!

Thus, through fieldwork and preliminary analysis, mealtime emerged as a situation that was about people gathering and enjoying each other's company, conversing and bonding. But, it was also about regulation, normalization, conflict, and power struggles. And mealtime did not only involve humans, but also food, chairs, cutlery, and in some places lunch boxes and bins; thus materials that became part of mealtime

and engaged with each other and the eaters in different ways. And it involved voices that were silent or loud, bodies with stomachs that were empty or full, senses that desired the food or not, bodies that needed fuel and nutrients, as well as bodies that were sometimes too tired or too energetic to engage in the meal. And mealtime was about rules, norms, and structures; about professionalism, positions, roles, and relations. About learning, teaching, role modelling, caring, providing service, and solving practical issues. Mealtime was also about individuals with different cultural, religious and social backgrounds, with different home lives and different experiences, values, and beliefs. And these individuals had changing feelings, thoughts, and ideas. And the meal was about… well, for a minute I actually considered writing a list of what the meal was NOT about, since this seemed a lot easier and would save some space!

The point here is of course that it is simply not possible to study mealtime without choosing some sort of focus. As with all other areas of research, choices must be made that centre some areas as more important, while excluding others to the discouraging position of being irrelevant.

But then, how to make this choice? After a nerve-racking period of simply not knowing the answer to this question, I came across a Ph.D. course in Situational analysis (see section "Mealtime as a situation of interaction between humans, materials and discursive norms"). Without claiming this to be the answer to all prayers, it certainly provided me with some practical tools to get a grip on the empirical materials and experiences I had produced so far. Situational analysis suggests the use of maps to visualize the research process, the situations of research and the empirical material. I started drawing such maps, and increasingly gained a comforting feeling of overview. However illusionary this feeling might be, it helped initiating the process of zooming in on specific areas. Bearing with me a huge stack of ideas, thoughts, and apprehensions that I had gathered from reading a diverse set of scientific articles and books, I started making choices.

One issue that had really caught my attention was the regulating, normalizing aspects of mealtime and this interest was increased through the process of mapping. Thus, many relations between the meal elements was about regulation and normalization. Furthermore, there seemed to be so many truisms related to such practices that tricked my curiosity. Why was it beyond questioning that children needed to be silent at the beginning of a meal? Why was it beyond doubt that children would benefit from being pressured into tasting all the served food? Why was it necessarily important that children practiced proper table manners, and what did this even mean? At the same time, I had noticed that such issues regularly caused discussions and conflicts, and sometimes threats, punishments or rewards. In many ways, these issues did not appear to contribute unequivocally to a positive mealtime experience, and I wanted to explore these issues further.

Existing literature has dealt with socialization in relation to family mealtime and to a smaller extend food and meals in schools and day care facilities (this literature will be presented in the state-of-the-art section below). From this literature, we know that mealtime is a situation through which children are presented with and potentially integrated into societal norms (Karrebæk, 2013), as well as being situations for producing and establishing generational relations and positioning (James et al., 2009). However, it is also a situation for opposing and re-negotiating such norms (Dotson, Vaquera, & Argeseanu, 2015). Thus, mealtimes are situations of power, conflicts, regulation and tension, as well as being situations for togetherness, bonding, caring and having fun. However, such processes are much understudied aspect of children's institutional life, since there is not much literature about these issues in relation to mealtime in kindergartens (Dotson et al., 2015). Moss, Clark and Kjørholt (2005) argue that we live in a period where children's participation and voices are emphasized within a discourse of choice, autonomy and citizenship, but at the same time children's lives are governed more than ever through technologies of normalization (p. 12). Thus, incorporation of specific kinds of knowledges, norms, rules and codes of conducts are strong aspects of the everyday life in day care facilities (Gilliam & Gulløv, 2014). This is both formally, as recent years has seen a greater emphasis on standardised nursery curriculums (Kampmann, 2013), and tacitly, as discursive, material, and socio-cultural norms implicitly establish "the normal" and its deviances (Gilliam & Gulløv, 2014; Palludan, 2005). At the same time, democracy is a central value in day care facilities in Denmark that emphasizes children's rights to participation and influence (Einarsdottir, Purola, Johansson, Broström, & Emilson, 2015).

This tension between normalization and "autonomous" individuals seemed quite spot on in relation to the issues I had observed. I therefore wished to explore how different "goods"[2] and "bads", thus different norms, are established in mealtime. However, I also wanted to explore how such norms are negotiated and reconstructed in the everyday meals. As introduced above, the everyday meal is not characterized by one overall aim; rather there are many and often contradicting issues at stake. This thesis aims to capture such difference and complexity, by conceptualizing mealtime through different, co-existing perspectives.

The concept of perspective thereby represents the idea, that eating together in a day care facility entails many different functions and aims simultaneously, and that these are foregrounded differently depending on how, when, and where it is studied. Thus, this thesis study mealtime from different perspectives, however, perspectives are not

---

[2] Good in the plural (Mol 2010) – see section 'Mealtime as a situation of interaction between humans, materials and discursive norms'.

approached as the property of an individual human, but as constructed through interaction between humans and nonhumans.

The thesis thereby explores how different goods and bads are established in everyday mealtime, through the co-existence of different mealtime perspectives, as well as examining how such different perspectives relate to each other. A second aim of the thesis is to contribute to the methodological development of the concept of perspective, as a concept that can capture the complexities and ambivalences of everyday life.

The aim is to increase knowledge of the kindergarten meal as a complex situation, and shed light on some of the social, discursive, and material processes that are part of mealtime, but has not undergone much attention in previous research. Hopefully, this will help practitioners, as well as future research projects, to acknowledge and deal with the contradictions, tensions and ambivalences that characterize mealtime.

1.1. RESEARCH ON CHILDREN AND MEALTIME – A STATE-OF-THE-ART

Normalizing aspects of mealtime, thus processes that define what is considered good and bad, and thereby what ought to be and not to be said and done, is central to this thesis; however, so is an understanding of children and adults as more than recipients of and providers of such regulation. Thus, the following chapter provides an introduction to some of the central literature on mealtime as a situation for normalization, as well as an introduction to the new social studies of childhood, since this literature paved the way for an approach to research, in which children is understood as active agents instead of passive objects. Embrace of nonhuman elements in analysis has also come to be an important influence in this thesis; however, this fuses too much with the theoretical and methodological argumentation to be separated into different sections. The most important literature on this subject is therefore introduced in the theory / methodology section "Mealtime as a situation of interaction between humans, materials and discursive norms".

1.1.1. THE NEW SOCIAL STUDIES OF CHILDHOOD

The thesis can be placed within what is called "the new paradigm for the study of childhood" (Prout & James, 1997). This paradigm emerged in the 1980s and 1990s within sociology and anthropology, but now covers a broad range of disciplines, such as geography and law, and goes by many names, but will here be referred to as "the new social studies of childhood" (Prout, 2011; Tisdall & Punch, 2012). Children's rights is a huge motivation within this paradigm, and there is a close link with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (Freeman, 2007; Tisdall & Punch, 2012). A large body of research within the new social studies of childhood therefore privilege children's participation in decisions concerning their everyday lives, as well as in research about children (Holland, Renold, Ross, & Hillman, 2010; Tisdall & Punch, 2012). This is often referred to as participatory research, which served as a major inspiration in the initial design of this doctoral research project. As already indicated, I ended up being highly critical of some of the epistemological and ontological understandings related to some of the central concepts within much participatory research, such as agency and voice. Many of the issues raised in this thesis therefore talks back to the participatory research tradition and to the new social studies of childhood in general.

The new social studies of childhood emerged in opposition to other dominating understandings of children and childhood, mainly developmental psychology and socialization theories (Tisdall & Punch, 2012). The new social studies of childhood argued that these paradigms too narrowly conceptualized childhood as a precursor to

adulthood, and that children's development towards adulthood was overly emphasized on behalf of children's lives here and now. It was argued that children were approached as incomplete becomings, while adults were understood as finished, rational beings (Lee, 2001; Qvortrup, 1994). Thus, developmental psychology and socialization theories established children as incomplete, and thereby legitimized that children were not considered citizens who should be listened to, but were instead regarded as in need of protection and socialization, in order to become "good" adults (Lee, 2001; Tisdall & Punch, 2012). Furthermore, children were approached as passive objects that merely developed according to predetermined stages depending on age or / and according to their surroundings.

The new social studies of childhood understands children as agentic subjects, meaning that they are active in the construction of their own lives as well as of their surroundings, and not passive receivers of socialization, or merely developing according to biological growth. The new social studies of childhood in general opposes the idea of children as becomings, arguing that this implicitly carries notions of children as not yet fully human. Furthermore, the division of children and adults as respectively becomings and beings has long legitimized adult authority over children. The new childhood studies therefore aim to approach children as beings in their own right, and not only as future adults (Lee, 2001; Prout & James, 1997; Tisdall & Punch, 2012). Relations between children and adults are thereby deconstructed in order to question the idea that adult authority and superiority over children is universal or natural (Lee, 2001). The new social studies of childhood furthermore point out that childhood is not a universal or natural concept, thus denying the idea of a universal child and arguing that childhood does not mean the same across time and place. Instead of studying the norms of development, the new social studies of childhood approach childhood as something that is socially constructed (Prout & James, 1997; Tisdall & Punch, 2012), and aims at gaining knowledge about different children and childhoods.

Much research within the new social studies of childhood seek empowerment of children through the use of concepts such as children's voices or children's perspectives (Tisdall & Punch, 2012). Thus, this research seeks to examine issues of children's life through their own voices in response to a still dominating tendency to silence children in decisions about their lives. This research is often referred to as participatory research, as research projects are designed to involve children in the research. Participatory research covers many different organizations and aims of participation; most commonly, children participate in data production, however some studies also involve children in analysis and representation of results (Holland et al., 2010). A common aim is that children should gain ownership of the research process and that the researcher should facilitate children's own production of knowledge (Gallagher, 2008). Inherent in some participatory research is an idea that the mere participation of children guarantee better results, however this has been heavily questioned lately (Gallagher, 2008; Holland et al., 2010). As already introduced, this

thesis departed in the participatory research paradigm, and ended up taking part in the debate about its ontological, as well as epistemological standpoints. These issues are discussed in the paper "Studying Perspectives on Kindergarten Meals", as well as in the methodological section ("Part two: Methodological and theoretical considerations").

Prout (2011), as well as others (see for example Tisdall & Punch, 2012) argue that, due to its historical emergence as a counter-paradigm, the new social studies of childhood have until recently engaged too uncritically with concepts such as children's voices and children's agency. Thus, in order to oppose existing dominant theories and practices, the new social studies of childhood created mantras about the social construction of childhood and children's agency (Alanen, 2015; Prout, 2011; Tisdall & Punch, 2012). Whereas sociology in general has gone through a process of "decentring the subject" (Prout. 2011, p. 6), this has not been fully embraced by the new social studies of childhood (Prout, 2011; Tisdall & Punch, 2012). However, within the last 5-10 years, this has been changing, and ongoing debates currently complicates and nuances these issues. Critiques have thus been raised within the new social studies of childhood itself. Literature regarding the discussions of voice and perspective is presented in the paper "Studying Perspectives on Kindergarten Meals" and will therefore not be further introduced here. However, agency is a central concept that is not thoroughly reviewed in the papers, and it is used in a slightly esoteric manner, since I chose to focus on other central concepts in the papers. The following therefore introduce central debates of the concept in the context of the new social studies of childhood, as well as drawing on perspectives outside the new social studies of childhood. These discussions are very wide and it is therefore not possible to provide an exhaustive overview of the literature. Instead, I have chosen to refer some selected texts that are the most relevant to how agency is implied in the papers.

1.1.2. AGENCY

Ethnographies of children in day care facilities and schools have provided convincing arguments that children are not passive receivers of adult teaching. Children negotiate, construct, and reconstruct meaning, rules and norms. They manipulate and oppose, as well as adhere and submit themselves to structures, adult instructions, and to peers. They do so in a variety of ways. However, a very wide range of empirical studies emphasize children's agency without critically discussing the nature of this agency, and participatory methods are often unreflexively implied to facilitate children's agency (Holland et al., 2010). Thus, agency is approached as something children can have, or be given, by allowing them participation in research or in decisions, while agency is also implicitly understood as inherently positive. But, as argued above, this simplistic approach to children's agency is slightly changing, as agency is increasingly given critical attention within childhood studies (Holland et al, 2010;

Tisdall & Punch, 2012; Wyness, 1999). Other notions of agency are thereby increasingly applied, such as agency as a relational and discursive phenomenon (Holland et al., 2010).

Outside childhood studies, agency is also differently understood within different schools of thought. Mazzei (2013) argues that a humanist perspective is often applied in which agency is understood as an

> […] innate characteristic of the essentialist, intentional, free subject that enables him to act on and in the world. To ascribe "agency" to someone is to imply that she is a voluntary actor making choices that are willed rather than determined. (p. 733).

In line with this, Asad (2000) argues that the concept of agency has been intrinsically linked with notions of consciousness, responsibility, and a liberalist notion of autonomy. Asad further argues that the concept of agency is closely related to the concept of power, as agency is often taken for granted to be the individual's resistance to power, and such resistance is implicitly understood as a good thing.

> The assumption here is that power is external to and repressive of the agent, that it 'subjects' him, and that nevertheless the agent as 'active subject' has both the desire to oppose power and the responsibility to become more powerful.' (p. 32). Asad goes on to say: 'The paradox inadequately appreciated here is that the self to be liberated from control must be subjected to the control of a liberating self already and always free and aware of his own desires. (p. 33)

Implicitly, agency is assumed to be directed towards so-called positive, moral goals, self-empowerment, responsibility, and constructive action (Asad, 2000; Bordonaro & Payne, 2012).

However, if agency means intention and autonomy, how can we insist that children are agentic subjects, without necessarily keeping them responsible for their actions? How then to deal with situations and childhoods that threaten and challenge the existing moral and social order, such as child soldiers or child prostitutes (Bordonaro & Payne, 2012)? This question is not only relevant in relation to "out of place" childhoods, but raises central dilemmas in relation to the notion of agency in itself. Thus, what kind of self does the notions of agency rely upon? And is exertion of agency necessarily always good?

As will be introduced in the next sections, much research on food, health and children also build upon such notions of agency, in which agency is implicitly assumed to be exerted in ways that corresponds with moralistic notions of self-interest.

Thereby, there are some problems connected to an overly and simplistic emphasis on agency, understood as the free will of an autonomous individual. One of these stems from the tendency to approach children through dualisms such as passive vs. agent and victim vs. perpetrator (Bordonaro & Payne, 2012). As a reaction against thinking children's agency as something that is either there or not, a body of literature now call for childhood studies to open up to the more complex discussions about the relations between structure and agency that has been developed in domains outside childhood studies (Tisdall & Punch, 2012). However, the inclusion of restraining issues, such as structures, in the analysis of children's agency, easily leads to a quantitative notion of agency, resulting in concepts such as "thin agency", "restricted agency", "limited agency" and "tactical agency" (see Bordonaro & Payne, 2012). And again, it is implicitly assumed that the more agency, the better.

> This has made for a confused situation where researchers and international organisations appeal for children and youth's agency and participation, but leave aside any real consideration about how this would transform, in complex, disturbing and profound ways, the moral politics of childhood and the position of these actors in society. (Bordonaro & Payne, 2012, p. 369).

Bordonaro and Payne therefore call for a turn towards examining and discussing what kinds of agency children have in different situations, what kinds are deemed appropriate, and by whom, rather than examining the "amounts" of agency that children have.

In line with this, Asad (2000) argues for an approach in which agency does not imply a free-floating individual, but rather entails people's practical engagement with the world, "including the discourse by which they routinely explain, defend, and excuse that engagement, and therefore of the traditions of argument on which they draw effectively . . . for such purposes." (p. 33). Thus, structure and discourse is not necessarily opposites of agency, but are part of how agency is constructed.

Related to this debate is also an increasing call for inclusion of material, discursive and bodily aspects of agency (Mol, 2008; Mazzei, 2013; Prout, 1999). Prout (1999) for example, argues that agency does not exist as an essential attribute, but is brought about through a network of heterogeneous materials: the discursive, the biological, the technological and so on. He therefore argues for analysis of such networks through which children's agency is produced or not. In these conceptualizations, agency does not stem from an autonomous agent, but from the network of human and nonhuman agents.

Another important question relates to how adults are approached in studies of children's lives. Tisdall and Punch (2012) argue that the large focus on children's agency has been prioritized on behalf of discussions of adult agency. Some childhood studies have argued that adults are also subject to structural and discursive regulation

(Pike, 2008) and that adults are also incomplete, thus in constant state of becoming (Lee, 2001; Tisdall & Punch, 2012). This literature further argues that the focus on individuals and individual agency could beneficially be downplayed on behalf of a more relational approach (Tisdall & Punch, 2012). I will not go further into these debates here, since this is thoroughly discussed in the paper "Studying Perspectives on Kindergarten Meals".

Within childhood studies, a call to engage with the complexities, tensions and contradictions of key concepts such as agency has thus been made recently (Bordonaro & Payne, 2012; Tisdall & Punch, 2012). This thesis parts in this debate by engaging critically with some of the methodological issues related to the use of perspectives and agency, and by emphasizing the situational and interactional aspects of these concepts.

In the following, I turn to another central issue of the thesis, namely mealtime. Thus, as already introduced, this thesis study mealtime in kindergartens, and thereby fuses to overall areas of research, namely childhood studies and studies on mealtime. However, I have not been able to identify much literature specifically focused on mealtime in kindergartens, and the following therefore introduces studies of mealtime more broadly. In the end of the section, I apply a slightly more narrow focus, by tuning in on mealtime in relation to children, including the few studies I have identified on mealtime in day care facilities.

1.1.3. STUDIES OF MEALTIME

There is no overall discipline devoted to the study of mealtime; instead, studies of mealtime are scattered over many different disciplines. Some of the disciplines that have concerned themselves the most with mealtime is public health nutrition. However, interlinks between mealtime and issues of health has become so strong and often self-evident that it reaches far beyond this discipline (and well into this study, as will be discussed in the section "Help! Am I studying health and nutrition?!?"). In the paper "Food for Kindergarten Children", I discuss how some of the central arguments of public health nutrition has become self-evident aims that guide mealtime practices, and I will therefore shortly introduce some of its main arguments and concerns here. Even though public health nutrition covers a range of different studies and approaches, I will treat them in a very (overly) simplistic way in the following, since this is not the time or place to discuss them in detail.

Murcott (2000) distinguishes between two overall approaches in studies of food and health: a structural approach, including fiscal policy, legislation and environmental measures, and a life-style approach, which is centred on the individual and its behaviour.

The intertwining of food, health and life-style can be traced back to the second half of the 20th century, when studies started linking the behaviour of the individual to illness (Armstrong, 2009). Along with this shift followed an aim to change the behaviour of patients, as well as of the population in general.

> Whereas before there were everyday activities such as eating, smoking, exercising, driving, sleeping, drug-taking and breathing, since the closing decades of the 20th century medicine has begun to transform these into the new problems of eating behaviour, smoking behaviour, exercise behaviour, driving behaviour, sleeping behaviour, drug-taking behaviour and breathing behaviour. (Armstrong, 2009, p. 921)

Thus, food and eating has increasingly come to be a medical issue, intertwined with health ideals (Burrows & Wright, 2007; Chamberlain, 2004; Cohn, 2013; Evans, Davies, & Rich, 2008), and finding ways of changing people's eating behaviours has become an aim within both governmental policies, as well as in research. Thus, the individual is promoted as responsible for choosing the proper health-related behaviours, through enlightenment campaigns and projects (Chamberlain, 2004; Fischler, 2011).

With reference to Foucault's concept of governmentality, Coveney (1999) argues that a governmentality of nutrition has aimed to rationalize eating through the elimination of waste and gluttony. The target is the population in general, which is urged to practice self-scrutiny and self-evaluation, as well as subjecting themselves to constant surveillance.

> In this way, modern nutrition is very Kantian in its form and its expression, where the sensuous nature of the body - expressed through pleasure and taste has to struggle with the higher, reasoned and rational principles of moral judgement. In this case moral judgement is established by and against the science of nutrition. (Coveney, 1999, p. 35)

Thus, based on an ideology of personal choice (Gibson & Dempsey, 2015), the initial idea that a truth could be found about causal relations between nutrients and the body, dominated nutritional research, as well as health promotion campaigns. Campaigns further relied upon the assumption that teaching people such knowledge would solve the health problems related to unhealthy eating. However, lately studies seem to conclude that nutrition information and education is not sufficient in explaining how eating behaviours are developed, or how they can be changed (Ristovski-Slijepcevic, Chapman, & Beagan, 2008; Murcott, 2000). Studies have therefore broadened their focus in the search for causal explanations of eating behaviour.

Childhood receives special attention within this approach, since behaviours adopted in childhood is understood to last throughout adulthood, or at least as being highly difficult to change (Gubbels et al., 2010; Mikkelsen, Husby, Skov, & Perez-Cueto,

2014; Mogharreban & Nahikian-Nelms, 1996). Children are the future citizens of their societies and are simultaneously viewed as at risk of societal health "dangers", as well as being dangerous themselves through a tendency to indulge in risky behaviours (Burrows & Wright, 2007; Gibson & Dempsey, 2015). Consequently, early intervention is framed as the key to healthy futures (Burrows & Wright, 2007).

Armstrong (2009) argues that the child became a focus of "the medical gaze" (p. 915) in the early 1920s, with a new discourse on child hygiene that defined the whole child as a health unit. Furthermore, a recent concern about child obesity has led to an unprecedented concern about children, food, and eating behaviours (Burrows & Wright, 2007). Since children spend a large amount of their waking hours in day care facilities, the food and meals they encounter here have gained increased interest among researchers. A vast amount of this research seeks to explore an ever-broader range of components that, in combination, are believed to provide causal explanations of eating behaviours. Thus, within this approach, the key research questions are concerned with determining the components of eating behaviour, in order to gain knowledge of how to alter these. For example, a vast amount of research is concerned with expansion of children's food acceptance and preferences through interventions in day care facilities (Mikkelsen et al., 2014;), thus trying to re-educate children's palates to appreciate a broad variety of foods, since dietary variety is emphasized as a way of ensuring a nutritionally good diet in later life (Martins, 2006). Other studies argue for a possible link between declining food literacy and unhealthy eating, and suggests a broad range of solutions, such as involving children in gardening and cooking. Yet other studies focus on adult-child relations, or on peer relations to examine how these relations influence which foods are eaten and in which quantities, for example through concepts such as role-modelling and feeding style (Hendy, 1999; Hughes, 2007). Some studies have highlighted the mealtime experience as central to developing healthy eating habits. Such studies therefore seek to identify central parameters in creating positive mealtime experiences (Mita, Gray, & Goodell, 2015; Mogharreban & Nahikian-Nelms, 1996). Thus, mealtime and its social, cognitive, sensual and embodied experiences has also been embraced in the search for causal explanations of eating behaviour in a public health nutrition perspective that builds on an ontological understanding of the individual as a health consumer (Chamberlain, 2004).

However, other domains of food studies have taken a different approach to eating, in which causal explanations of eating practices are not the aim. On the contrary, a wide range of research is now concerned with exploration of the complexities, multidimensionality, contradictions, tensions, anxieties and ambiguities related to food and eating (Brembeck et al., 2013; Chamberlain, 2004; Dolphijn, 2004; Gibson & Dempsey, 2015; Habers, Mol, & Stollmeyer, 2002; Mol, 2010, 2013)

Such studies include a very broad variety of topics that explore national and global issues of food policy, food supply, food processing, foodscapes, inequality,

consumption, commensality, meal structure and understandings of proper meals, identity formation and expression, gender, cooking, taste, symbolism, morality, socio-economic factors and their relations to eating habits, and much more.

Studies have also shown that an individual do not have an enduring and unitary attitude toward food, but that preferences and food evaluations, such as disgust and appreciations, are results of situated interaction (Bova & Arcidiacono, 2014; Wiggins, 2001, 2004, 2013).

To look beyond causality in the study of food and eating is therefore not new, however, these studies rarely focus on mealtime in itself, and those that do are mainly concerned with family mealtimes, eating out or festive occasions. Within anthropological literature, everyday mealtime has received a fair amount of interest; however, these studies mainly concern food and eating practices in non-Western cultures. Some studies that do focus on mealtime in Western cultures are commensality studies. Commensality is to eat with other people (Fischler, 2011; Grignon, 2001), and commensality studies examine the ways that people eat together. They cover a diverse set of studies, such as the relations between commensality structure and obesity (Fischler, 2011), commensality as a way of establishing and maintaining social belonging (Fischler, 2011; Simmel, 1997 [1910]) , and commensality as a situation for social positioning (Bova & Arcidiacono, 2014; Ochs & Shohet, 2006). Earlier studies have mainly emphasized religious and ritualistic aspects of commensality (Fischler, 2011). However, commensality studies have not been much concerned with day care facilities. Other researchers have noted a lack of research on mealtime as a social situation in day care facilities as well (Dotson et al., 2015).

Yet other studies have focused on cultural notions of a proper meal (Bugge & Almås, 2006; Douglas, 1972; Murcott, 1982). Murcott (1982) studied notions of a proper meal in South Wales, and found that a proper meal depends on what kind of food is served, as well as how this is prepared. Thus, the proper meal implies a cooked dinner consisting of meat, potatoes, one or more additional vegetables and gravy. The cooked dinner is of major symbolic significance, and there are several rules and proprieties that govern its "making and taking" (p. 682), thus, the components, their order, the manner of preparing, serving and taking the food. Bugge and Almås (2006) studied notions of a proper meal among mothers in suburban Norway, and argue that a dinner is not good or bad in itself, but in relation to the values which it is meant to realize. They found some differences in notions of properness in relation to social class. Thus, urban middle-class women emphasized creativity and novelty, while working-class women emphasized traditional food. They also found social and cultural codes and rules related to temporal and spatial aspects of the properness of food. Thus, some food is considered proper at some occasions, while not at others.

Bugge (2010) equally found that notions of properness was related to Norwegian school food. Thus, she found that a packed lunch consisting of bread with a spread, vegetables and fruit was considered as suitable among adults and young people. However, she also found differences related to gender, as more boys than girls bought their school food from a school canteen or a nearby shop.

These studies of proper meals are mainly concerned with family meals, and the main focus is the kind of food served and the style of preparation and serving, while the commensality, thus the ways of eating together, are only superficially mentioned in these studies.

In the following I will introduce some of the existing literature about mealtime in day care facilities, focusing on mealtime as a situation for normalization and negotiation, in order to gain knowledge about these processes, how they function, what is their aim, and which consequences might they have? Thus, the aim of the section is to introduce existing knowledge about the overall discursive aims of mealtime regulation, as well as the mechanisms through which they function and manifest in the everyday meals. Furthermore, the section examines how such discursive aims are re-negotiated and challenged through every day mealtime practices. The focus is the norms and traditions of eating together (commensality), thus understandings of proper table manners / behaviours (Wesslén et al., 2002), while the food itself, thus what is considered "good, preferred, normal and appropriate food" (Karrebæk, 2013, p. 87), is treated less thoroughly.

Due to my inability to locate much literature specifically on mealtime in day care facilities, literature about mealtime in other situations, mainly families and schools, will be included where this makes sense. It is however, worth noting that schools and day care facilities are much different kinds of institutions in Denmark, differing in both structure and aim. Studies on food and meals in schools might therefore provide interesting hypotheses, but their relevance in a day care context cannot be taken for granted.

1.1.4. CHILDREN AND EVERYDAY MEALTIME: TOGETHERNESS AND "PROPER" TABLE MANNERS

Gibson and Dempsey (2015) argue that "Children's bodies are contested sites, subject to biopolitical modes of governance, parental negotiations, and power relations tied to their various social locations." (p. 47). Day care facilities have increasingly become such arenas for governing of children's bodies (Dotson et al., 2015; Gilliam & Gulløv, 2014). Thus, incorporation of norms, rules and codes of conducts are important aspects of the everyday life in day care facilities. That mealtime entails such processes are thereby well in line with more general developments.

Different concepts are used in different studies to describe everyday processes of normalization during mealtime, and in the following, I will draw on studies of socialization, civilizing processes, governmentality and regulation. These concepts all encompass processes through which children (and adults) are regulated according to discursive and material norms and routines that establish "the normal" and its deviances.

Discursive aims of regulation

In most cultures, sociality is considered an important part of a proper meal (Fischler, 2011), and a strong notion of a traditional family meal, that emphasises intimate conversation and togetherness, serves as an ideal for modern family mealtime (Cinotto, 2006). Even though there are many differences between eating in a family and in a day care facility, such a notion of traditional family mealtime also serves as an ideal of mealtime in day care facilities (Mita et al., 2015). The staff has been found to ideally describe mealtime as nice and cosy, with an emphasis on conversation with the children (Mita et al., 2015; Sepp, Abrahamsson, & Fjellström, 2006). However, these studies, along with other studies of mealtime, also show that this is not always, what characterizes the actual everyday meals. Thus, mealtime is not only about togetherness, it is also about maintaining societal values, traditions and norms, and about construction of moral discourse (Ochs & Shohet, 2006).

Sepp et al. (2006) found that rules and rituals related to the development of children's practical skills were generally prioritized in the everyday meals in Swedish preschools on behalf of creating meaningful conversations, and that the staff often experienced mealtime as stressful. In line with this, Wesslén et al. (2002) found that preschool children mainly associate mealtime in day care facilities with rules and norms, with an emphasis on what they are not allowed to do, and as highly controlled by adults. Studies on mealtime in schools have equally found that lunchrooms are highly controlled by adults, with children having very little influence with regards to the food or the social organization of mealtime (Metcalfe, Owen, Shipton, & Dryden, 2008; Pike, 2008). Studies on mealtime in families equally show that parents generally seek to control children's eating practices, such as quantities, orders and kinds of food eaten (Bova & Arcidiacono, 2014). Thus, studies suggest that incorporation of table manners or codes of conduct tend to dominate aspects of togetherness, conversation and joyfulness in everyday mealtime (Wesslén et al., 2002).

An ongoing debate in relation to commensality is whether structures in eating are changing from traditional family meals to more individualized ways of eating (Cinotto, 2006; Fischler, 2011; Murcott, 2012). However, this hypothesis has been questioned in different ways. Thus, Cinotto (2006) has argued that the ideal of a traditional family mealtime has in fact only been actualized as historical exceptions, and thereby questions the premise of a possible change. In a different perspective, Holm (2001) questions the assumption that current families do not prioritize to eat

together on a regular basis. Thereby, there are no clear-cut tendencies in relation to family meals, neither historically or in present time. In spite of this, there still seem to be constant worries about a possible decline of family commensality (Cinotto, 2006; Fischler, 2011). This is connected with "broader anxieties around the moral condition of youth" (Pike, 2008, p. 416, see also Murcott, 2012), and the decline of family in general (Wyness, 1999). McIntosh, Emond and Punch (2010) argue that schools are regularly seen as key social institutions to supplement or counteract children's food experiences and practices at home. Pike (2008) makes a similar argument, and further argues that the school's role in establishing commensal practices is increasingly emphasized, due to the worries of a possible decline of family meals. Even though this argument is related to schools, it might very well be true to day care facilities as well. As argued in the paper "Striated Agency and Smooth Regulation", it was a very common argument amongst the adults in the study that children do no longer learn the proper mealtime behaviours at home. They therefore argued that the day care facility has an increased responsibility of supplementing or replacing the family for inculcation of commensal values. Thus, the day care meal is construed as an important situation for passing of dominating societal values, enhanced by the idea that such socialization is declining in the context of family. Thus, a change in family mealtime structures, whether this is empirically sound or not, also relates to greater societal concerns about maintenance of culture and norms, which might emphasize the role of day care facilities in mealtime socialization.

Mealtime is thereby not only about producing togetherness, but also about producing sameness (Rossholt, 2012). Thus, discourses of normality are established, based on societal and cultural norms that are interlinked with notions of age-appropriate behaviour and competency. These creates images of proper ways of being an eater at mealtime. Thereby there are strong moral and ideological connotations related to practices of eating together (Fischler, 2011; Pike, 2008).

Thus, mealtime serves a two-fold purpose. It contributes to defining and maintaining social belonging through bonding and togetherness, while it also secures the inculcation of dominating societal values and norms. However, some aspects of commensality, such as togetherness, conversation and bonding, are often overshadowed by norms related to proper codes of conduct or to proper kinds and amounts of food, and mealtime can be stressful and not child-centred (Ochs & Shohet, 2006; Pike, 2008; Turner, Mayall, & Mauthner, 1995).

Several studies have concluded that health is a strong discourse in the everyday meals in day care facilities, schools, and families (Alcock, 2007; Brembeck et al., 2013; Bova & Arcidiacono, 2014; Dotson et al., 2015; Gibson & Dempsey, 2015; Karrebæk, 2013; Ochs & Shohet, 2006). Thus, regulation is interlinked with discourses of health and nutrition to the extend where it sometimes becomes a dominating aim of the meal (Alcock, 2007)

> Even though there are many powers trying to govern children's eating, such as home, friends or commercial actors, the most powerful alimentary power appearing in our study is society's way of coupling child–food–body–health. (Brembeck et al., 2013, p. 85)

Karrebæk (2013) found that teachers in a Danish kindergarten class (thus in a school setting) imposed mainstream understandings of healthy foods on children from heterogeneous cultural backgrounds, by presenting such understandings as self-evident and neutral. Karrebæk further argues that the adult instructions and regulations of children did not show any sensibility towards possible differences in social or cultural notions of health. Other studies have similarly argued that health is related to a Foucaultian sense of governmentality and biopower in the production of normality (Brembeck et al., 2013; Coveney, 1999; Dolphijn, 2004; Gibson & Dempsey, 2015; Pike, 2008).

> The state does not use dietetics only to suppress, to force children to certain food habits, rather through normalisation, stating what is "normal", in creating "universal" norms that are thought to benefit public health. (Brembeck et al., 2013, p. 85).

Thus, health is interconnected with morality and thereby becomes a way of positioning children as respectable or un-respectable through their compliance with norms of healthy and appropriate food.

Mechanisms of regulation

Processes of normalisation unfolds in the everyday meals in varied ways, verbally and non-verbally. Dotson et al. (2015) found that the preschool staff they studied, used different strategies to shape children's consumption, such as avoiding helping children to open up packaging containing sweetened food unless savoury food was eaten first, or using directives, omens and/or embellishments to urge children to eat certain healthy foods. They found that "the underlying message of omens is that something negative would happen to the child if they failed to consume healthful foods, while embellishments exaggerated the health benefits of fruits and vegetables." (p. 373). Both omens and embellishments were thereby based on health-related consequences of eating or not eating certain foods.

Understandings of health also relate to the order in which food is eaten, and Karrebæk (2013), as well as Ochs and Shohet (2006) found that adults often emphasize that children should eat some food before others, on the basis that this food is considered more healthy than the other. "Therefore, whether or not a particular food item is treated as appropriate depends on more than qualities seen as intrinsic, including its position in a socially recognized and normative order." (Karrebæk, 2013, p. 95).

Other studies have found that adults tend to override children's cues of hunger and satiation, and emphasize that children need to eat (Ramsay et al., 2010).

Karrebæk (2013) furthermore shows how such processes of socialization produce unwanted social positions, when children do not correspond with the norms. She found that mealtime is a situation "in which children demonstrate social competence and respectability" (p. 88), or the opposite. As children come from heterogeneous cultural backgrounds, their norms and practices related to food might correspond differently with the institutionalized values.

However, as already introduced, children's agency have been and still is a major area of concern within childhood studies, and many ethnographic studies on children in day care facilities emphasize children's agency in their interactions with care-givers and peers. Thus, children do not act as passive respondents to regulation and normalization, but actively re-negotiate or oppose it. A few studies have made this point specifically in relation to mealtime, and shown that even though adults overly control mealtime, children are not passive receivers of such control and regulation (Alcock, 2007; Dotson et al., 2015).

Dotson et al. (2015) found that children in a preschool use both silent and verbal strategies to subvert adult instructions. However, the use of silent subversion was the most common, "as children understood that when they protested [verbally], the teacher would continue to direct them to eat their food." (p. 370), whereas silent subversion would less often be confronted. Alcock (2007) show how children in a day care facility actively re-shape rules and routines, however, she does so through an emphasis on children's flexible playing with rules. Thus, she found that children engage their "whole physical, intellectual, emotional selves in playing with rules" (p. 290) and they use materials, words, and bodies to exert playfulness into the routinized mealtime, in order to construct togetherness and to make mealtime fun and meaningful.

The power relations between children and adults should thereby not be approached as power possessed by adults and exercised upon children, but as a "continuous circularity of power played out between children and adults in the dining room" (Pike, 2008, p. 417).

1.1.5. A CLOSING REMARK

In the above, I have gone through literature concerning discursive ideals and norms related to mealtime and shown how these act as processes of normalization in the everyday mealtime practices.

A discourse of health and nutrition has been identified as a major impact in the everyday meals in schools and day care facilities. Societal understandings and values related to health self-evidently guide interactions between adults, children and their food, and create positions as respectable or non-respectable. This discourse is arguably so dominant in everyday meal interactions that it regularly overshadows other important aspects of mealtime, such as conversations, taste and feelings of togetherness.

The studies referred to in the above deal with issues of child-adult interactions in different perspectives, but with few exceptions, they do so in a dichotomous perspective, thus an adult vs. child perspective. The categories of child and adult seem to be paramount in the literature on day care meals,

> [I]t is also difficult for a child to pass through the tastescape, the scape of routines or any other scape without being reminded of the fact that he or she is a child, with the specific expectations, possibilities and relations that are attributed to. (Brembeck et al., 2013, p. 83).

However, not much is written about the relations between children and adults beyond such a dichotomous perspective. The literature on mealtime regulation almost solely concerns the regulation of children, whereas adults are either not approached at all, or they are approached as the origins and practitioners of regulation. However, childhood studies in general has raised the issue that adults are also subject to discursive norms and structural restraints, as introduced in the section "Agency". Such more complex and nuanced notions of adults has not been embraced in (the identified) existing literature on day care mealtime. This is also relevant in relation to child agency, as this literature mainly emphasize children's agency in a rebellious perspective, thus implicitly defining child agency as an act of resistance against adult domination. The issues raised in the section "Agency" about different kinds of agency, and agency as a relational concept has thereby not been applied in this literature.

'SIT STILL!' 'BE QUIET!' 'AND LET'S ENJOY A NICE MEAL TOGETHER…'

PART 2. METHODOLOGICAL AND THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In the following, I introduce the methodological and theoretical grounding of the thesis. I introduce the concepts and writings that have served as major influences on the research process and thesis. However, this is indeed a simplified set-up – leaving out all the smaller "flirts" with different theoretical approaches and concepts, methods, and other research projects etc. that I have come across in the process. Though I have not chosen to implement all these explicitly, they have surely left their own footprints in my work, which cannot adequately be considered here.

I initiate the section by introducing the theoretical grounding of my approach to mealtime, as a situation of interaction between humans, materials, and discursive norms. I do so by introducing situational analysis, which has been the main inspiration for this approach, and then elaborate each category, by discussing them separately. I will continuously introduce other concepts and writings that supplement or nuance situational analysis, since this does not stand alone as a "grand theory".

Following this, I introduce and discuss the methods I have used to produce empirical materials. I have used a variety of different qualitative methods, of which some are well grounded in the ethnographic tradition and qualitative method discussions in general, while others are rather experimental and not very widely discussed (or discussed at all) elsewhere. This is reflected in the section as some of the methods are described in much detail and in a descriptive style, where the reader is not expected to be familiar with the method, while others, such as interview and participant observation, are described in a more esoteric manner with references to the main sources of inspiration.

Next, an introduction and discussion of the procedure of analysis follows, in which I introduce the main tools and strategies I have used to analyse the empirical material. This is followed by a discussion of the quality of analysis, and ends with a discussion of legal and ethical considerations that mainly discuss the involvement of children in the project, as well as the use of video recording.

The section ends with a reflection on the role of health and nutrition in the doctoral project. As will be argued, this has acted as a potential "skeleton in the closet", and the section is an attempt to deal with this explicitly.

'SIT STILL!' 'BE QUIET!' 'AND LET'S ENJOY A NICE MEAL TOGETHER…'

2.1. MEALTIME AS A SITUATION OF INTERACTION BETWEEN HUMANS, MATERIALS AND DISCURSIVE NORMS

> The planet is full to overflowing with all kinds of things, including discourses, produced by and consequential for people and for the nonhuman as well. It is time to move beyond "the knowing subject" to also analyse what else is there in social life – materially and discursively. (Clarke, 2005, p. 177).

In spite of the anticipations described earlier, I have maintained an occupation with the concept of perspectives in the thesis. However, as already argued I intend to detach the notion of perspective from the human subject, individual as well as grouped. The concept of perspective thereby represents the idea that eating together in a day care facility entails many different functions and aims simultaneously, and that these are foregrounded differently depending on how, when, and where it is studied. Thus, I study the meal from different perspectives, but attempt to decentre the subject (Clarke, 2005; Lather, 1992), and instead place the notion of perspective in a network of humans and nonhumans. Postmodernism offers the words to do this (which is not surprising, since it was the reading of postmodern literature that helped me construct such an aim in the first place…).

Postmodernism is obviously not one overall coherent approach (see for example Rolfe, 2004), rather it describes a turn within the social sciences and humanities towards an emphasis on complexities and situatedness, a decentring of the subject, and a renunciation of universalities as there is no such thing as universal or everlasting knowledge (Clarke, 2005; Lather, 1992: Martin & Kamberelis, 2013). Clarke (2005) argues that explicit rupture of difference has been a central issue in many postmodern studies, thus examining and challenging "the kinds of knowledges and discourses circulating about differently situated people, things, and issues, often produced by and circulating especially among those situated in positions of greater power, legitimacy, and/or authority." (p. xxv). The movements in the new social studies of childhood is thus well in line with such aims, as these centre the child/children as focus of analysis and as subjects in their own right. Thus, these studies generally examine how children are differently situated, what this means to their everyday lives and opportunities, as well as how they are positioned in relation to adults and societal structures. However, as already discussed, this centring of children risk producing an over-emphasis on the child as an agentic, knowing subject, in order to oppose adult exclusiveness in such positions. Thus, it is only lately that childhood studies have started fully embracing the postmodern notions of complexity and decentring of the subject, and this thesis thereby seeks to contribute to furthering such a process.

Situational analysis is Adele Clarke's (2005) attempt to "push grounded theory more fully around the postmodern turn*"* (p. xxi). Thus, it is not a grand theory, but a methodological approach in which Clarke draws on symbolic interactionism and on arguments from postmodern literature to suggest *situations* as the key unit of analysis, as well as providing some tools for analysis of such. Clarke herself does not insist that situational analysis needs to be the one-and-only approach to analysis, instead it can be combined with other approaches that share its ontological and epistemological standpoints (p. xxxvii).

Clarke grants a kind of agency to situations, as they generate a life of their own, are real in their consequences, and interlink with other situations. Thereby, "a situation is always greater than the sum of its parts because it includes their relationality in a particular temporal and spatial moment" (p. 23). She cites Mead in writing that "situations are organizations of perspectives" (Clarke, 2005, p. 22). As I present in the section "Analysis", I have aimed to analyse perspectives as constructed and organized through the situations I have studied.

Clarke emphasizes that it is the full situation of inquiry that should be taken into account in analysis, thus including not only humans, but the material and discursive elements as well. This means that it is not only corporeal elements or elements which are physically present that matter, but also elements that are spoken off, or which are in other ways influential of the situation, for example discursive norms that implicitly guides practices.

The following is structured on the basis of the distinction between material, discursive, and human elements, since these are the main categories used in situational analysis. These are analytically constructed divisions, since they intertwine in everyday life, and sometimes to an extent where there can be made no meaningful distinction. Thus, Clarke explicitly questions her own binary of human/nonhuman as she argues that the boundaries between these categories are fluent, something which is regularly conceptualized as hybridity, thus entities that are combinations of the human and nonhuman. However, for the sake of maintaining a sense of overview and structure, I will keep this distinction here.

2.1.1. TURNING TO MATERIAL ELEMENTS

Maclure (2013) argues that, in social sciences, language has long been positioned as superior in defining social life, but that lately, a broad range of studies has argued for a non-hierarchical organization

> where discourse and matter are mutually implicated in the unfolding emergence of the world. . . . In these flat and proliferated assemblages, the

world is not held still and forever separate from the linguistic or category systems that 'represent' it. Language is deposed from its god-like centrality in the construction and regulation of wordly affairs, to become one element in a manifold of forces and intensities that are moving, connecting and diverging. (p. 659-660, see also Barad, 2008).

In line with this, Clarke (2005) argues that materiality is simultaneously constructed by and constructive of the situation in which it occurs, thus she ascribes a kind of agency (though not intentionality) to material properties, thereby stating that there is more to these elements than their social constructedness. She states that "Nonhuman actants structurally condition the interactions within the situation through their specific material properties and requirements and through our engagements with them" (p. 63). She elaborates that nonhuman elements "pervade social life, constituting, constraining, and enhancing it, providing opportunities and resources, surveilling and patrolling." (p. 78).

Writings within postmodernism argues for the embrace of the nonhuman, and argue that the human and nonhuman is coconstitutive of each other (Mazzei, 2010; Clarke, 2005). Thus, the idea that humans are what matter the most is heavily questioned.

Even though materiality had long been something I was curious about, it was not until the introduction to situational analysis that I became conscious about the major role that material elements played in the meal and the research process. I therefore decided to embrace a turn towards a research design that explicitly dealt with the nonhuman elements. However, Clarke is not very detailed in her discussions about the relations between humans and nonhuman, or how to go about analysis of such. I have therefore drawn on other scholars as well that I find more clear and detailed in their discussions of the material and corporeal. However, I have not used a specific theory to the study of materials, I have instead found help in theoretical concepts and used these as sensitizing concepts (Clarke, 2005) / openers (Høyer, 2012), thus tools to get a grip on the empirical materials. This is mainly because materiality was not part of the initial research design, but rather sneaked its way in along the way, as already described. I think, however, that it would be interesting to analyse the empirical material through a more comprehensive theoretical approach, such as assemblages (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004), as this would strengthen the analysis of how the material elements are co-constructive of mealtime. Thus, the conceptual framework of assemblages would provide some tools for becoming more detailed in the analysis of human-material relations. However, this must be a future project…

Anne Marie Mol (2010, 2013) has been a major inspiration in the analysis of materiality, and has most clearly shaped my analysis in the paper "Food for Kindergarten Children". Mol (2013) argues that eating is often approached as "more than matter" (p. 380) in the social sciences, which emphasize meals as events. However, she argues that the material and bodily aspects of eating are equally important to attend to. Mol further elaborates that material objects have recently

gained attention in the social sciences in general, but that materialities are sometimes reduced to some stable and essential properties.

> What they lightly skip over, though, is that matter never is "itself" all by itself. Even when it is not being interpreted, matter is never alone. For it may well be that matter acts, but what it is able to do inevitably depends on adjacent matter that it may do something with. Action is always interaction. And it is only in interactions . . . that objects relationally afford each other their (always local, often fluid) "essence". (Mol, 2013, p. 380).

Thus, Mol argues for a relational materialism, in which material agency and "essence" is relationally dependent on with who or what the object interacts.

> Take taste: is that a characteristic of food "itself" or is it in the eye, or rather the mouth, of the beholder, that is to say, the taster? As taste interestingly moves between these sites, improving taste, too, may move between attending to food itself and attending to its appreciation. (Mol, 2010, p. 228).

Thus, Mol (2010) argues that the practice of eating is constituted through complex relations between different kinds of 'good's (good in the plural, thus not referring to commodities) and bads. A food might be nutritionally good, environmentally good, taste good, etc., and even these categories are not at all clear-cut, since they each contain different kinds of goods and bads that often contradict or contest each other. What is good and bad depends upon complex relations between the material/corporeal elements and incorporeal elements. "Materialities and flesh come in different configurations" (Mol, 2013, p. 380).

Building upon these arguments, I do not approach material elements as having essential attributes, however, they are not merely socially constructed either. Bodies and materials interact with other mealtime elements through their diverse attributes. Their different attributes are differently enabled in different relations, and they enable different attributes in the humans and discourses they interact with. In the papers, I therefore regularly refer to materials as active parts of different perspectives.

2.1.2. TURNING TO DISCURSIVE ELEMENTS

> Because we and the people and things we choose to study are all routinely both producing and awash in seas of discourses, analyzing only individual and collective human actors no longer suffices for many qualitative projects. (Clarke, 2005, p. 145).

Clarke (2005) defines discourses as language in use,

Yet discourse is not limited to language but also includes visual images (e.g., art, film, family photos), symbols (e.g., logos, flags, other icons), nonhuman things/material cultural objects (e.g., chairs, coffee mugs, computers, buildings), and other modes of communication (e.g., nonverbal movements, signals, sounds, music, dance). (p. 148).

Thus, she advocates a much broad definition, in which discourses are "communication of any kind around/about/on a particular socially or culturally recognizable theme" (p. 148).

Discourses are part of producing realities and of framing conditions of possibility: "a discourse claims to properly and adequately describe how X is (or should be) in the world" (Clarke, 2005: 150). Thereby, discourses are consequential, some more widely than others, and not in an unchangeable or clear-cut manner. They operate at different levels of scale, such as within families, organisations, disciplines, nation-states, and so on. (Clarke, 2005, p. 153).

With reference to Foucault, Clarke (2005) states that discourses empower certain agents to speak and disempower others, since they produce limits and restrictions on what can be said about a phenomenon, but thereby also enable that something *can* be said (p. 160). And while discourses are influential in defining reality, they should not be regarded as some kind of false consciousness that implicitly controls actions, but as means to make sense of the world (Lather, 1992 makes this point with regards to ideology). Not thereby implying that we freely pick-and-choose between discourses, but that these are not sovereign or unchangeable.

> While we are not the authors of the ways we understand our lives, while we are subjected to regimes of meaning, we are involved in discursive self-production where we attempt to produce some coherence and continuity. (Lather, 1992: 102)

A discourse presents, or seeks to present, a coherence and a way of knowing. In so doing, discourses enable agency as they offer the power of meaningfulness, while they simultaneously subjugate alternative ways of knowing.

I have delimited my analysis of discourses to "the description and interpretation of meaning making and meaning understanding in specific situations" (Clarke, 2005, p. 154). The focus is on how discourses are part of the situations under study, and less on discourses as focus of analysis themselves. Thereby, I have not done discourse analysis as such. Thus, I have not analysed how specific discourses have come to presence, their history or their relations to actors outside the mealtime situation. I have been interested in the effects of discourses, thus how they relate to the other mealtime elements and become part of everyday mealtime. Likewise, I do not seek to analyse how the other elements have come to their present states. It is their current, situated existence and relations that is of interest.

I have identified discursive norms by looking for common sense arguments and postulates, or "self-evident descriptions of social reality that normally go without saying" (Clarke, 2005, p. 154). I have also been looking for practices, based on the understanding that "practices which appear 'normal', or as the only reasonable way of doing things, are regarded as discursively generated." (Pike, 2008, p. 419). Thus, I have not only identified discourses through verbal communication.

However, I have also sought to identify alternatives to the most dominating discursive norms by looking for the ways that norms were re-negotiated or challenged, such as through ruptures of routines, as well as conflicts.

2.1.3. TURNING TO HUMAN ELEMENTS

Humans are often attended to, through a dichotomous division between its body and its mind (Grosz, 1994; Prout, 1999). The body is

> implicitly defined as unruly, disruptive, in need of direction and judgment, merely incidental to the defining characteristics of mind, reason, or personal identity through its opposition to consciousness, to the psyche and other privileged terms within philosophical thought. (Grosz, 1994, p. 3)

However, in "everyday life, there seems to be a manifest connection between the two in willful behavior and responsive psychical reactions." (Grosz, 1994, p. 6).

Within childhood studies, Alan Prout (1999) has been one of the forerunners for turning to an interactional approach that focus on the network between heterogeneous humans and nonhumans, including an attempt to overcome the body-mind dichotomy. He argues that much childhood studies have overemphasized the body as incorporeal, and argues that whether the body is thought of as discursive or biological, such dichotomous thinking produces incomplete or even misleading accounts (Prout, 1999, see also Grosz, 1994). He suggests that bodies should instead be studied from the outset of being both biologically and socially unfinished and changing throughout the life course, a process in which the body and society work on each other. Thus, in line with the relational materialism introduced above, bodies are enacted differently and situationally through processes that are simultaneously discursive and corporeal.

During mealtime, there are hungry or full humans, but these can be hungry for a specific kind of food while not for another; there are humans with specific and unspecific desires, energies and moods; humans that produce as well as sense smells, looks and sounds, and so on. All of these kinds of humans are discursive as well as corporeal. Thus, there are multiple kinds of "eater-bodies" and these cannot be disconnected from "eater-minds".

Mealtime also involves the enactment of child- and adult humans, as is discussed in the papers. Thus, child-humans are enacted through discursive as well as corporeal qualities, as child-bodies are (most often) smaller and younger than adult bodies, as well as being defined according to discourses of playfulness, curiosity, vulnerability, incompleteness, etc. Thus, mealtime involves enactments of humans (mind AND body) in multiple ways!

2.1.4. A CLOSING REMARK

Above I have attempted to line out the theoretical foundation for analysing mealtime as situations of interaction between material, discursive and human elements. I have attempted to maintain what Maclure (2013) calls a non-hierarchical organization of the elements from the outset; however, this does not mean that all elements are always equally influential. Thus, in some situations, specific elements might be more influential in defining the directions of mealtime than others. The papers all deal with such differences in different ways.

The above does not provide a theory to analyse truth or reality in its singular form, but to analyse truths and realities, thus, analysing different perspectives on mealtime. On this basis, questions can be asked about how to value contrasting truths and realities. As argued by Mol (2010) there is no obvious or clear answers to such questions.

> For as soon as one starts to look into it, various goods, in the plural, appear to be relevant to practices to do with food. Food may be nutritious, plenty, or tasty; a meal may be cosy or provide lots of choice; and then there are cleanliness, variation, short waiting times and what not to appreciate. The relations between such goods are strikingly complex. For even if they all have to do with food, the various relevant values tend to predicate different objects: food stuff, a dish, a meal, a kitchen, an atmosphere, and what not. And while values sometimes go together, on other occasions they clash – giving rise to ongoing tensions or a victory of one alternative over the other. (p. 216).

The tensions between different goods are crucial for those who feel these tensions, as they cause frictions in their daily practice (Mol, 2010), and the papers do not provide clear-cut answers to such questions, but aim to present and make visible such tensions in order to promote reflectivity. Thus, the theoretical framing presented above aims to enable complexity to be foregrounded in analysis.

In the following, I introduce the specific day care facilities who have been part of the research, as well as the methods I have used to produce the empirical material.

'SIT STILL!' 'BE QUIET!' 'AND LET'S ENJOY A NICE MEAL TOGETHER…'

2.2. PRODUCTION AND ANALYSIS OF EMPIRICAL MATERIAL

The empirical material for this project has been produced in the period early spring 2011 to winter 2013, and its production took place in three Danish kindergartens through a combination of several qualitative methods. The research process is itself a subject of scrutiny in most postmodern studies (See for example Clarke, 2005; Lather, 1992). Since objectivity and neutrality are disregarded, it is important to be reflective about how and what kind of knowledge is produced. However, the role of the research process and my own role as researcher is already discussed in the paper "Studying Perspectives on Kindergarten Meals", and I will therefore not emphasize such reflectivity here. Instead, I briefly introduce the three day care facilities and how they were selected; following this, I introduce the methods used and reflect on how they contributed to the production of knowledge. Afterwards, I describe and reflect the analytical process, and end the section with a discussion of validity, and of the most central ethical considerations.

2.2.1. THE KINDERGARTENS AND THEIR ORGANIZATION OF LUNCH

The three kindergartens that have participated in the doctoral project are respectively Børnehuset Slåenhaven, located in Odense, Børnehuset Stolpebo, located in Brøndby, and Børnehaven Krogården, located in Smidstrup (see further description below). As introduced, this thesis is part of a larger project FRIDA and this highly influenced the selection of cases. Most influential was the fact that lunch scheme arrangements with food prepared locally in the day care facilities were preselected as a topic of interest in the FRIDA project. The kindergartens were selected on this basis, thus they should have or plan to implement a lunch scheme arrangement in which food is prepared in the institution on a daily basis.

In Denmark, as well as in the other Nordic countries, day care facilities are based on a social pedagogy approach, also referred to as the Nordic model (Einarsdottir, Purola, Johansson, Broström, & Emilson, 2015). The Nordic model is characterized as a local, child-centred and holistic approach in contrast to an early education approach that highlights a more centralising and academic strategy. Democracy is a central value within the Nordic model with an emphasis on children's rights to participation and influence, as well as on equality, respect for others and joint responsibility (Einarsdottir et al., 2015). Thus, these values represents some kinds of goods that influence mealtime, however as elaborated in the papers, these goods are not unambiguous and are furthermore contested by other values.

In Denmark, municipalities manage the kindergartens and it differs between the municipalities how they organize. In some municipalities, each kindergarten has its own manager, whereas others divide kindergartens into larger entities, with an overall manager supplemented by a day-to-day manager locally in each kindergarten. In this project, I do not distinguish between whether the local manager is employed as manager or day-to-day manager, since their role in relation to mealtime is the same. It differs between the municipalities how they are involved with the organization of lunch scheme arrangements. Usually, and this is the case in the three kindergartens in this project, the municipality compose a set of overall guidelines and/or requirements, while the more specific guidelines and the detailed organization is arranged by the local kindergarten management. The municipalities decide on a budget as well, and they can choose to support the lunch scheme arrangements economically. Otherwise these are paid by parents, however, the lunch scheme arrangements are included in the general scheme for subsidies (Dagtilbudsloven § 32).

In the three day care facilities that have participated in the project, the municipalities require that the national recommendations on nutrition are followed (Fødevarerstyrelsen, n.d.) and that the lunch schemes comply with national legislation related to hygiene. Furthermore, the municipalities also urge the day care facilities to use organic products, however, only the municipality of Odense, where Slåenhaven is situated, has definite requirements related to organics (Odense Kommune, 2015).

The local kindergarten management of the three day care facilities describe their role in relation to mealtime as establishing the framework, such as deciding the overall pedagogical and practical issues related to mealtime. They do not participate in mealtime on a daily basis, but they all regularly stand in for pedagogical staff when needed. The kitchen staff has the day-to-day responsibility for planning menus within the budget and guidelines, and for cooking the food within the timely structure of the day care facility. The pedagogical staff is responsible for carrying out mealtime, and the staff is seated at the tables with the children. In all three day care facilities they eat at tables with 2-10 children and 0-2 adults, and mealtime lasts about 30 minutes, sometimes less and sometimes more.

The day care facilities

An overall emphasis in the selection of the day care facilities was that they should be interested in participating in the project, thus I did not want to be imposed on them. In the initial contact, the daily manager represented the day care facility, and he/she consented to the cooperation on behalf of the staff. The initial contact to the daily managers was established through mail correspondence and / or a personal meeting with a municipal manager or coordinator. Due to the interest in locally cooked meals in the FRIDA project, municipalities with a central supply of meals were deselected.

Furthermore, municipalities that explicitly showed a positive interest in the development of lunch scheme arrangements were preferred, as this was expected to heighten the chance to find someone who would engage in the project. The municipal manager/coordinator contacted the relevant day care facilities (thus those who had or had planned to implement a lunch scheme arrangement) by email, and the interested daily managers replied to this email. I had a meeting with the interested day care facilities in each municipality (except in Brøndby where my colleagues in the FRIDA project had this meeting without me, since I was at maternity leave at this time), and then established a cooperation with one of them.

Børnehuset Stolpebo

The day care facility Stolpebo was selected within the FRIDA project and functioned as a common case for all three work packages of FRIDA. The criteria for this day care facility was that it should have had a lunch scheme arrangement for some years, thus they should have some experiences to share. The public health nutrition project further required that the day care facility had not previously had a pedagogical focus on food, and that they were willing to make a rather heavy change in the menu plans. For convenience, the day care facility was to be placed in the Greater Copenhagen area, since two of the Ph.D. students lived there. However, due to the status as a common case it also needed to be a day care facility that were willing to handle the disturbance of having three different researchers "running around" with three different purposes. We therefore approached the recruiting as a situation of finding someone who were willing to choose us, more than us choosing them. This resulted in the cooperation with the day care facility Stolpebo, which is placed in the municipality of Brøndby west of Copenhagen. The children and staff of Stolpebo is organized in three groups, a group of children aged 0-2 years, a group of children aged 2-4 years, and a group of children 4-6 years of age. It is mainly children and adults from the latter group that has participated in the project.

At the time when Stolpebo became involved with the study, they had had a lunch scheme arrangement for four years. The food is prepared on a daily basis in the day care facility, by an unskilled "dinner lady" who is employed part-time. In the period of the study, she had help from a person in job training, thus a position paid by the municipality. They serve rye bread three days a week with different cold cuts and spreads, and some kind of side dish, such as carrot sticks, cucumber and tomato, or leftovers from previous meals. Two days a week, they serve a warm meal. The dinner lady and her helper had both immigrated to Denmark from an Arabic country recently, and they were encouraged by the pedagogical staff to cook food from their original countries, as well as cooking traditional Danish dishes and a variety of other dishes. The warm meals thereby varied between all kinds of food from different food cultures. It eventually entailed pork meat, however as some of the children were not allowed to eat this, they always served an alternative as well.

The pedagogical staff eats their own home-brought food during mealtime. Thus, children and adults eat different kinds of food. However, the pedagogical staff regularly eat very small portions or tastes of the served food, in order to serve as role models if children are sceptical of the food.

Børnehuset Slåenhaven

As a contrast to the common case, I wanted to work with a day care facility that was about to embark upon the implementation of a lunch scheme arrangement, and where I could do fieldwork before and after the implementation. This was not in order to set up a comparative study of home-brought lunch packs and lunch scheme arrangements, since I do not understand the meal as consisting of detachable, separate elements but of interrelated elements. Thereby a change in one element will provide an unpredictable change in the entire dynamics of the meal, and I do therefore not point to any universal consequences of exchanging the lunch box with a common meal. However, I had an idea that it would provide an interesting opportunity to explore some other aspects of lunch scheme arrangements, when studied in the initial phase and in contrast to the home brought lunch.

In addition, I emphasized that the day care facility should be willing to allow experimentation with the organization of lunch, as this was part of my methodological design (see below, "A hodgepodge of methods"), and that they should show interest in the "child perspective" approach. For practical issues I looked for a day care facility not too far from where I lived. This resulted in cooperation with Slåenhaven in the municipality of Odense. They only participated in "my" project, thus they were not involved in the other parts of the FRIDA project. Slåenhaven is placed in the part of Odense called Vollsmose, which is a neighbourhood with a great ethnic diversity, which is also reflected in the group of children that attend Slåenhaven. The day care facility has approximately 50 children between the ages 0-6 years. Children and adults are divided into groups according to children's age: a group of children aged 0-2 years, a group of children aged 2-4 years and a group of children who are 4-6 years of age. It was mainly the oldest group that was involved in the study.

At the time when Slåenhaven became involved with the study, the pedagogical staff cooked a lunch meal for the two youngest groups, while the oldest group brought food from home. As it is mainly the oldest group that has been involved in the study, I will not go into details with this difference. However, the parents had recently voted in favour of the municipal lunch scheme arrangement, which was implemented half a year into my fieldwork. The lunch scheme arrangement entailed food cooked in the day care facility. A trained kitchen assistant was employed, who had previously been employed to cook in the day care facility, since they had had a lunch scheme arrangement several years ago. In the meantime she had been employed in a cleaning

position, thus she was familiar with the day care facility prior to her employment as kitchen staff.

The served food vary between rye bread with a variety of cold cuts and spreads, and warm meals. The serving of pork and halal meat was heavily debated between parents previously to the start-up of the lunch scheme arrangement and it is a recurring theme when new parents enter the day care facility. This involved Muslim parents who were worried that their children might be served pork and non-halal meat, as well as non-Muslim parents who were worried that their child might not be served pork, and who emphasized that this is an important part of Danish food culture. The daily manager and the staff emphasize that they do not want to solve this issue through a vegetarian solution, but instead emphasize that the lunch scheme arrangement should reflect the broad spectra of cultural and ethnic backgrounds of the children. They therefore serve all kinds of meat; however, they always serve an alternative to pork for Muslim children.

Before the lunch scheme arrangement was implemented, some adults were eating their home-brought lunch during mealtime, while other adults did not eat during mealtime. After the implementation of the lunch scheme arrangement, the adults have a "pedagogical meal", thus they are served a small portion of what children are having for pedagogical reasons (such as role modelling). They are free to eat a home-brought lunch; however, this is eaten in their breaks and not during mealtime. During mealtime, children and adults thereby share a common meal.

Børnehaven Krogården

The third day care facility, Krogården, was selected by chance. Initially there was not supposed to be a third case in my project, however, through a cooperation with the research group Mad, krop og læring (Food, body and learning) on University College Lillebælt, I was introduced to a municipality that worked very enthusiastically with food and meals, and who were very keen to be involved with the project. The municipality established contact with a day care facility, who wished to develop the way they worked with food and meals. Amongst others, they wanted to involve the children in meal preparation systematically and they were very interested in the child-focus of my project. I thought this provided an interesting supplement to the other two day care facilities, as neither of these emphasized food or meals in their pedagogical strategies or projects. Thus, this day care facility became a third case in my project, however I did not do fieldwork to the same extend as in the other two day care facilities. I did fewer days of observation and only carried out one kind of activity with children, namely "meal-days" (See below, section "Meal-days").

Krogården is situated in a small village, Smidstrup, just outside the larger city, Vejle. The day care facility has approximately 55 children in the age 3-6 years, divided in

three groups across age. At the time when I met them, they had had a lunch scheme arrangement for several years. This began as an arrangement where they had food delivered from another day care institution; however, a few years ago the kitchen was rebuilt, which made it possible to cook food in the day care facility. Following this, a trained cook was employed. At the time when I met the day care facility, a new cook had recently replaced the first cook, as the former had retired. The new cook had made some changes in favour of healthier food, thus meeting the national nutritional recommendations. The daily leader described this as a shift from much traditional cooking to a more modern approach, thus also entailing a shift towards culturally varied food and the use of ingredients that were non-traditional in a Danish context. This had caused some precautions among the parents, as these were all from a so-called traditional Danish cultural background and living in a rural area, and they were afraid that their children did not want to eat the new food. However, experiences had shown that this was only a matter of a short period of adjustment, and that children now embraced the new food. Thus, at the time of fieldwork, these worries had generally faded.

As in Slåenhaven, the pedagogical staff eats a pedagogical meal with the children.

2.2.2. A HODGEPODGE OF METHODS

As already introduced, the approach to production of empirical material has undergone some twists and turns in this project. Initially the aim was to produce knowledge about different groups of actors' perspectives on mealtime, but I ended up ontologically questioning the existence of such perspectives. Thus, the methods did not contribute to the production of separate and unequivocal perspectives, as initially presumed, but instead produced knowledge about the interdependence, multiplicity and ambivalence of perspectives. Furthermore, the methods were initially designed to empower children, by allowing them to make decisions regarding the design of methods, as well as to provide more "child-friendly" ways for children to engage in the research process. Again, this turned out quite complicated. Thus, the overall conclusion with regard to use of methods is that they did not fulfil the initial aims, but they were highly fruitful in fulfilling others; or more correctly, in constructing new aims. In the following, I will present and discuss the methods used.

Participant observation

Participant observation is a widely used method to do research on children's lives in day care facilities (see for example Gulløv, 1998; James, 1996; Palludan, 2005 and Warming, 2005), and has been one of the central methods for creating empirical data

in this project as well. Thus, in the two first cases (Stolpebo and Slåenhaven) I participated in the everyday lives of the day care facilities in order to gain a sense of confidentiality with the explicit and implicit rules, routines and norms, as well as the people and their roles and relations.

In Stolpebo, I came one or two days a week for half a year, while in Slåenhaven, I came 3-4 days a week for two months. After the implementation of the lunch scheme arrangement in Slåenhaven, I came back a few days and participated in lunchtime. In these periods, I combined participant observation with other methods, discussed below. Thus, some days I would solely participate in the everyday life and the activities that were planned by the pedagogical staff, while at other times I would carry out activities related to my research, such as interviews or activities with children (again, see below). I usually came in the morning and left early in the afternoon.

In Krogården, I visited about 10 days all in all over a period of three months. I mainly participated in lunchtime, thus I did not gain the same confidentiality with the everyday life in general or with the people there.

The role of the researcher when doing participant observation is discussed in the paper "Studying Perspectives on Kindergarten Meals" and in order to avoid repetitions I will not go further into this discussion here.

The participant observation gave rise to many wonderings, which I used to create interview guides, thus during the interviews I asked about things that I had observed. Participant observations thereby created empirical material in itself, as well as producing new questions to probe observed issues.

During participant observation, I regularly made video recordings, mainly of mealtime, in combination with field notes and still pictures. The ethical considerations with regard to the use of video is discussed in the section "Legal and ethical considerations related to children's involvement in the research process", while the aim and methodological implications of using video is discussed in the following.

Filming mealtime

The use of audio and visual methods is widely used within various research disciplines and from a range of different ontological and epistemological approaches. These differ, amongst others, in their view on the relations between the observed situation and the camera, thus whether the camera influences the situation or not, and if so, how this is dealt with (Lomax & Casey, 1998). I will not go into these differences, but shortly discuss my own approach to the filming of mealtime.

Practically, I would set up the video camera wherever possible. In some situations I had brought a tripod, while in other situations, I had to rely on shelfs, tables, window ledges and bookcases. I never tried to hide the camera and the process of placing it often took place while children where present in the room. In some situations, they would help me find good spots and bring me books or Lego bricks to put under the camera to get the best angles. I usually filmed the mealtime situations that I participated in myself, however I also filmed a few situations where I was not present myself. I would (usually) let the camera roll until the last person had left the table. In all, I have filmed 25 meal situations that lasts between 30-45 minutes each.

I chose to film mealtime for several reasons. The main reason was that I wished to include a broader variety and nuances of interactions, than would be possible if using field notes solely. This was mainly due to the ability of catching many details in the interactions between humans, and between humans and materiality that it would not be possible to write down in field notes, or even to be aware of while in the situation. During mealtime, there would often be many interactions going on simultaneously. It was impossible to gain an overview of what was going on, and even less to be able to make choices about what would be more or less relevant. Situations that, at the moment, seemed to happen out of nowhere, such as conflicts or outburst of laughter, suddenly makes sense when watching the film afterwards. As argued by Mandall (1991), I also experienced that children used non-verbal language in their communication and that this could be very difficult to grasp in field notes. This applied to adults as well. Obviously the camera does not catch everything either. It is pointed somewhere on behalf of somewhere else, it has some things in focus and others in periphery, it is limited in time, thus something will always have come before and something is about to follow (Thomson, 2008).

Furthermore, in line with the theoretical approach discussed earlier, I do not view the videorecorder as a neutral "fly on the wall", or as an external object, that influences the situation. Instead, I view it as a part of the situation. However, so are the rest of the research elements (the researcher, the questions, conversations and activities that are created because of the research and the different materials they bring into play). In the paper "Studying Perspectives on Kindergarten Meals" the implications of considering the research process as part of the empirical material are discussed, however, since the use of video camera is not discussed in the paper, I will add some reflections here.

I found that the camera played many different roles. Thus, in its relationship with children, the camera would usually be a much dominating element of the situation in the beginning. When I placed the camera, children would regularly run to it and look at the screen that displayed an image of what it recorded. They would wave to the camera, make funny faces and smile. Some would start to move the camera and loudly announce who was now being filmed. However, after a few minutes, they would often lose interest and the camera slipped into a much more silent role. Once in a while, a

child would wave or smile to it, but this did not happen much. In its relationship to most of the adults, this was not much different, even though the adults did not act out their interest and awareness in the same manner. Thus, they would regularly glace at the camera in the beginning of the research, or they would pay attention not to block its view. After a while, they too seemed to forget about its presence, or at least they did not pay explicit attention to it. However, one adult felt very awkward about the camera and asked specifically not to be caught on video. I respected this, and when participating in mealtime with her, I solely used field notes. That the camera slipped into a more silent role after a while, does not mean that the situation became more natural, or that the participants necessarily had forgotten about its presence, though this is of course a possibility. However, it could also be argued that the camera and I created a new role for the mealtime participants, thus a role of active ignoring, as argued by Lomax and Casey (1998):

> However, it seems reasonable to suggest that participants' 'ignoring' might be interpreted as an active state of not paying attention. It could be that participants, in the presence of the camera and/or researcher have interpreted their research role as one in which 'doing ignoring' was appropriate. (section 2.2)

This role was accentuated as I emphasized that the recordings was mainly made as a way for me to remember what I had seen, thus downplaying its role as something interesting or dangerous. However, I was very aware to allow children to "fool around" with the camera as well, thus trying also to recognize the fun-potential that was part of the camera-child relations.

Lomax and Casey (1998) point to the act of turning on and off the camera as an act that causes specific concerns related to the social situation. I have described how the initial presence of the camera would regularly attract attention; however, this could also be the case in the end. Thus, children finished the meal in different tempos and were generally not required to remain seated until everyone was finished. Thus, at the end of the meal, one or a few children would remain alone at the table, as the adults often started to clean up when most children had left. In these situations, the child(ren) sometimes paid attention to the camera, mainly by looking at it, however this interaction was not as merrily as in the beginning. Some children would seem at unease suddenly being the sole (or one out of a few) target of the camera. If I realized this during the situation, I turned the camera off, as I suddenly felt that it was inappropriate to film. The unease in these situations could be interpreted as an expression of shyness, thus that children did not feel comfortable being in one-to-one interaction with the camera. However, in other non-mealtime situations, the children would regularly fight for such positions, thus pushing each other away or loudly command me to direct the camera at oneself in order to become the focus of the camera. The unease could therefore also be interpreted as stemming from the situation of being alone at the table, indicating a social discomfort and inappropriateness of eating alone. Thus, the presence of the camera exposes and emphasizes some specific

understandings of appropriate mealtime. This again underlines that the roles of the camera were situationally constructed and that these roles could provide new insights in the analysis.

Following this argument, the camera did not always occupy such dominating roles and as the other mealtime elements, it would regularly slip in the background. Thus, the fact that the camera (and the other research-related elements) was part of the studied situations did not mean that they were always the most dominating elements. They interacted with routines, norms, people and materials of the kindergarten and through these interactions, knowledge about mealtime was created.

Interviews

In each day care facility, I interviewed the daily leaders, 1-2 pedagogical staff members, and the kitchen staff. In addition, I performed two interviews with groups of parents of children in Slåenhaven (one interview with 5 parents, and one interview with 2 parents). Prior to the participant observation, I had asked the kindergarten manager to hand out a note to the parents that informed about the research, asked for permission for their children to participate (see section "Legal and ethical considerations related to children's involvement in the research process"), and an invitation to the parents to participate in the group interview. The parents thereby voluntarily signed up for the interviews; however, since two of the parents who volunteered, were not able to make it on the set date, I invited them to do the interview on a different day.

All interviews were semi-structured and with point of departure in the specific day care institution and its meals. However, we also discussed general issues related to the provision of lunch for kindergarten children, pedagogics and family life. I had produced interview guides (see appendix A) that stated selected themes and subtopics that I wanted to explore during the interviews. I started each theme by asking very open-ended, broad, descriptive questions, and asked in more detail as the theme progressed, as well as asking additional questions. Along the interview, new issues would emerge, as answers prompted new questions, and as the interviewed initiated other issues than those probed by me.

The interviews were generally divided in three overall parts: One discussing the arrangement of the meal, including details and practices concerning the meal scheme arrangement; a part discussing mealtime, and a part that asked the adult to imagine being a child in the day care institution, and answer the questions from this position. The latter was in order to push reflections about the positions and roles of child- and adult eaters respectively. In all three parts of the interviews, I asked about overall aims of mealtime, as well as using my observations to ask about specific tendencies,

practices, or routines I had observed. Through these questions, I wished to explore some of the tacit and implicit aspects of mealtime. I also wished to hear their reflections about some of the initial points and analyses I had done. I thereby did not intend to be neutral, but instead aimed to put my current thoughts and assumptions up for discussion with the interviewed. However, I generally attempted to postpone such discussions until well into the interview, and thereby tried to ask somewhat neutral questions in the first part of the interview, since I did not want to steer the interviewed in a certain direction from the beginning, or to limit the scope of their accounts. The interview guides were roughly the same in the three institutions; however, they were adjusted to each case, concerning the different themes and questions that had arisen during my fieldwork there. Furthermore, in the kindergarten Slåenhaven, which implemented a meal scheme arrangement during the project period, I conducted interviews before and after the implementation with the daily manager, the kitchen staff (who were employed in a cleaning position prior to the implementation), and one pedagogical staff. As a supplement to the themes mentioned above, these interviews also asked about expectations to / experiences with the meal scheme arrangement, and the differences it had caused in relation to mealtime.

In the two interviews with parents I aimed at getting the parents to discuss with each other, thus I took more of a facilitator role in these interviews. These interviews were performed prior to the implementation of the lunch scheme arrangement, and I asked about their experiences with the current mealtime, asked about positive and negative comments, how they thought their own child experienced mealtime, and about their opinions and expectations to the coming lunch scheme arrangement.

All the interviews where recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Furthermore, I performed a workshop with the staff of the day care facility Stolpebo together with the two other PhD students in the FRIDA project. The aim was to help the staff move on with some of their ideas and wishes related to mealtime, as well as solve some of the challenges they faced. Furthermore, we wanted to use this as empirical material to inform our own projects. Prior to this workshop, the staff had been given disposable cameras and several copies of maps of the day care facility. We had asked the staff to take pictures and / or mark places on the maps where they experienced challenges related to mealtime, or where they had a positive comment, or a vision. We had set up a small box for them to drop the maps with comments in. Before the workshop, we had the pictures developed and compiled all the mapped comments into one very large map. We presented these at the workshop, and discussed them in plenum. We also presented some "visions" that we had constructed based on the pictures and maps. We asked elaborating questions to some of the comments, asked whether they could recognize the raised issues and the visions, their thoughts and ideas, as well as giving some suggestions or ideas of our own.

After this plenum discussion, we divided the staff into three groups and asked each group to choose a particular vision related to mealtime, and work with this. We gave them some tools, developed in the design project of FRIDA, to prompt creativity. These consisted of small cards that stated "what if…" followed by a scenario, such as "… you had unlimited amounts of money", "… you had unlimited amounts of time", "… you had no children with special needs", "… you had no restrictions in the physical space". They discussed their chosen vision based on these cards. We ended the workshop by each group presenting their chosen vision in plenum and receiving comments from their colleagues and us.

This workshop was thereby much directed towards the ideas and wishes of the staff. However, as we had emphasized visions instead of challenges, the discussions did not only concern the status quo or the practical issues, but also emphasized pedagogy in relation to mealtime. The staff expressed that the workshop had provided an interesting opportunity to delve into such issues, since discussions of mealtime in everyday life usually became reduced to solving practical issues. As empirical material, the workshop provided interesting knowledge that supplemented the observations and interviews, as the discussions between the staff prompted nuances that were not expressed elsewhere. They constantly challenged and / or elaborated each other's narratives and arguments, and forced new reflections. Especially, the workshop provided nuanced knowledge about the aims of mealtime, and the many ambivalences and dilemmas that emerge, when these need to be prioritized and implemented in everyday life.

Activities with children

I wanted to be receptive to differences between children's preferred ways of communicating. I therefore experimented with many different methods and found inspiration in visual methods and participatory methods, especially Clark and Moss' the Mosiac approach (2001). Clark and Moss emphasise the combination of different methods and include both visual and verbal methods in creative ways.

Furthermore, it is argued that children act and communicate differently according to the situation, and that different methods, such as visual and activity-based methods, thereby prompt different aspects of children's perspectives (Langston, Abbott, Lewis, & Kellet, 2004; Mandall, 1991). The initial aim was therefore to develop methods that would help produce different pieces of a puzzle, so to speak. Thus, the reasoning was that the different methods would provide empirical material that together would form finished child perspectives. They ended up doing the exact opposite. Thus, the more different methods I used to explore mealtime, the messier and more ambivalent a picture was constructed.

In the following, I will shortly describe the different activities.

Teddy

In the day care facility Stolpebo I had help from "Teddy". Teddy was a teddy bear that I introduced to the day care facility. I send a letter on behalf of Teddy to the day care facility in which he told the children that he needed a place to stay. He wrote of himself that he was a bear very fond of food, playing, and sleeping, and asked if he could move in with the kindergarten. When I did activities with children, he often participated and when I left the day care facility, he would stay. Teddy was embraced by children (literally as well as metaphorically) and helped maintaining playfulness in the activities, but he was also good at attracting children's interest to the research topics.

Eating together as a method for production of empirical material

I often introduced research activities by asking the children (or sometimes they would ask me) to eat our lunch together in the employee break room. For my part, the aim was to create a chance to talk, relax and have fun in order to gain some confidentiality with each other, before initiating research activities.

Johansson (2012) describes a possible adult role where the adult is included in commonality with children. She argues that this role can happen when children and adults are engaged in activities where age is less relevant and that power relations can change in such situations, as children and the adult can be more on equal terms. In my research, I found such situations happening when I was eating alone with small groups of children. Even though I had found that eating in the day care facilities was much connected to generational order, with expectations on how to behave as a child and as an adult, I also found that children and I could partly escape these roles, or at least tone them down, when we were eating alone. I think this had to do with the fact that we had a common purpose and engagement that did not directly have to do with the research. The act of eating took away the pressure of having to talk, contrary to the interview situation where the mere purpose is to talk. I furthermore experienced that children would regularly tell stories about mealtime and express views that I had not heard them express in other situations, as well as experiment with different rules and routines. Thus, I realized that these situations were in fact rich in so-called data, and the line I had drawn between research activity and non-research activity was not very constructive. I therefore started using these situations of eating together as a method in itself, and started filming or doing field notes about these situations, as I did with the other activities.

Photo elicitation

During fieldwork, I invited children to take pictures and / or video film different aspects of mealtime. Afterwards, we would talk about their pictures and sometimes make a poster or scrapbook.

To use pictures as a way of opening up participant's reflections and engagement in an interview is widely used and is often referred to as photo elicitation (Burke 2008; Harper, 2002), visual sociology (Thomson, 2008) or autodriven interview (Clark, 1999). This can be done with pictures that is chosen and brought by the researcher, or with pictures that the interviewed has taken or chosen themselves. The most common arguments in advance of the method is that photos produce different kinds of information than the spoken word alone, as pictures elicit different aesthetic, emotional and intellectual responses, and provides a shared point of departure for talking between the interviewer and the interviewed (Harper, 2002; Thomson, 2008). Thus, used in this way, pictures are not meant to replace the spoken word or stand alone, but to add an extra value by allowing interaction between word and picture (Burke, 2008; Rasmussen, 1999).

Within childhood studies, photo elicitation is a commonly used method as the mentioned strengths are argued to be particularly good to support communication between adults and children. Furthermore, it is argued that an interview, which is centred on children's own pictures, is more focused on the agendas, stories and interests of the child, than is an interview planned by the researcher. (Clark, 1999; Cook & Hess, 2007; Rasmussen, 1999; Young & Barret, 2001). Thus, the researcher is still the questioner, but children are not left to a role of answering questions, but also act in a role of co-producing the agenda. Thus, this is supposed to help avoid an authoritarian inquiry of children (Clark, 1999; Rasmussen, 1999; Young & Barret, 2001).

Concretely I invited two children at a time to participate in photo elicitation. Children were selected, either by the kindergarten staff or by myself, and children often asked themselves if they could participate. Children were free to say no, which happened a few times if the invited children were immersed in playing when I asked them. However, most of the time, children were very eager to participate. The children were given a disposable camera each and sometimes a video camera to share.

After several considerations of what type of camera I should give the children, I finally chose disposable cameras. The advantage, and main reason for this choice, was because of their cheapness, which made it possible to allow the children complete control of the camera. If I had chosen to use digital cameras, it would force me to constantly follow and monitor the children when photographing. This is due to the obvious risk of destroying the cameras, but also because of risk of deleting pictures or changing the settings so pictures would become of very poor quality. Another problem with digital camera is to distinguish between children's pictures.

The activity was initiated in the employee break room where children were given an introduction to the camera and to the activity. This included time to fool around with the camera and take fun pictures of each other and me. We also had a talk about why I was present in the kindergarten. At this time of fieldwork, they had heard this repeated many times, but many was still curious and uncertain about my purpose of being there. The fact that my job was to learn about food and meals was very strange to them. We also talked why I had asked them to take pictures, and I explained that I was curious about their thoughts and experiences of mealtime in the kindergarten. I asked them to photograph things related to mealtime, including both nice things and not-nice things. Afterwards, the children went around the kindergarten and took pictures. I usually went along, sometimes filming them, and often asking questions about what they photographed and why. Sometimes I would also ask inspirational questions if children came to a standstill with regards to finding things to photograph. In such cases, I would ask "Wh"-questions, such as "where do you usually eat", "where have you tried to eat at other occasions", "who do you eat with", "what do you eat", "what do you like about eating" and so on. Thereby the process of photographing also became a situation for production of empirical material in itself, as we would have conversations about these issues along the way.

After about 10 minutes, we went back into the employee break room. Here, I asked the children to help me find out about potential places for eating or things to do while eating that they thought would be fun/good to try, but did not usually do. Then they went out and took pictures of such places / things. If children ran out of pictures (due to the limited amount of 24 pictures on the disposable cameras), they would get a new camera, but only two all in all due to the expense of cameras and developing of pictures. To most children this was suitable. A few children only wanted one camera and a few children would have liked a third.

Sometimes the photographing would be during lunch, and sometimes it would be before or after lunch. This obviously had a large impact on what the children could photograph. If there were no meals to photograph, children had more difficulties keeping focus on things related to eating. However, at the same time it seemed to be easier for them to think outside the box, when I asked them about alternative ways of eating. In general, though, many children did not stay very focused on photographing things related to meals, and they took many pictures of things that they found funny, beautiful or which had a special meaning to the child.

After having concluded photographing with a larger group of children, I had the pictures developed. However, in order to gain discount, I had to gather several cameras for processing at once. Thereby, those children that participated in the beginning would have to wait almost two weeks, before they had their pictures. This was difficult for many children, who would come up to me almost on a daily basis to ask if I had their pictures with me today. As I became aware how much this meant to

them, I changed my plan for research activities and conducted photographing over a more intense period, in order to accelerate the process and have the pictures sooner.

When the pictures were developed, I met with the children, two and two to discuss the pictures. Later I switched to meet with them one on one, because I found that this made better room for immersion. This took place in the employee break room as well. We started by looking quickly through all the pictures together. Sometimes children would tell stories departing in the pictures. After seeing all the pictures, we took turn to pick a picture and talked about this. The children told me the stories that came to their mind seeing the pictures, and I asked questions related to my interest in meals. I did not insist on them explaining the intentions of the pictures, since I did not expect that the children necessarily aimed to represent certain things through the pictures. Instead, we used the pictures as point of departure for talking about meals and other things that children took up. I asked if they wanted to create a small book or a poster with their pictures (I had put colour pencils, glue, scissors, paper and plastic pockets on the table that they were free to use). Some chose to make a book, others preferred to have their pictures as they were.

Sometimes I combined this approach with pictures that I brought. Harper (2002) suggests that pictures can help shake up the taken for granted if they represent something very different from the everyday lives of the interviewed. For that purpose, I brought pictures that showed different ways of eating in day care facilities, some of which were similar to the children's everyday life and some, which were different (see appendix B). By presenting these pictures to children, I hoped to provoke reflections about their own experiences of mealtime. I used a semi-structured approach in these interviews and asked opening questions such as "What do we see on this picture?"; "Does it look nice?" and "Have you tried to eat like that". I then asked questions that elaborated their answers, such as "why", "what do you think about that" and so on.

In other interviews, I used close-up pictures of children[3] expressing different moods (see appendix C). I started doing so because I experienced that many children did not engage in questions regarding their feelings about mealtime. I suspected that this might be because I was not able to make this relevant to them, and that it might be a bit overwhelming to be asked about one's feelings. When introducing these pictures, I asked questions such as "How do you feel when you think about mealtime" and they would point to a picture. We would then discuss what that picture represented, and I would ask elaborating questions such as "why does mealtime make you feel this way?" I also asked questions such as "Is there something about mealtime that can make you feel like this", and then point to a picture. Again, this would end in a discussion about what and why.

---

[3] The children on these pictures where not familiar to the children in the kindergartens.

The interviews would last until either the child expressed a wish to stop, until I felt that the child became uncomfortable with the situation, or as I judged that we had covered all relevant themes, plus a lot more. Some children did not want to stop the interview, but at some point, I had to end it, to let the next one start. The interviews would last between 11 and 45 minutes, depending on the child's wish to stay or not.

I, along with others (for example Burke, 2005; Young & Barrett, 2001), found that photo elicitation provided a good set-up for conversing with children, and for creating engagement and commitment among children towards the research. The experience was that children generally did not intend to represent particular issues when they photographed, but constructed such intentions through a process of post-rationalization and here-and-now feelings and ideas when discussing pictures with me. Thus, intentionality is an issue often debated in relation to the use of children's own pictures. As introduced above, some argue that allowing children to take pictures enable them to express themselves and to (partly) take control of the interview situation. However, this requires that pictures are taken in order to intentionally represent a specific view, and it is worth considering whether preschool children are able to maintain this intentional visualization of thoughts through cameras, or maybe more relevant, whether they find it relevant to do so. Thus, as argued by Sparrman and Lindgren (2010), children sometimes deviate from assigned tasks, but this "does not necessarily mean they have misunderstood the project, but rather that they are not interested in it or are absorbed by their own ideas" (p. 254). As Thomson (2008) writes, children can be caught up in the process of experimenting with different effects, or the process of producing a beautiful picture. The picturing might not just be a means to an end for children, but an end in itself (The same issues could be raised in relation to adults, but such discussion falls outside the scope of this thesis).

These issues are further emphasised, since I had a particular pre-chosen agenda for the activity, namely to discuss mealtime. Thereby, children were not free to discuss any subject, but were constantly asked to relate to the subject of mealtime. I did not cut children off when they started telling non-mealtime stories, but I did not encourage such stories in the same ways that I did mealtime stories, and I did not pay much attention to these stories as empirical material. Thereby, the potential of the method to allow children to take control and use the pictures as representations, also depends on how predefined the purpose of the research, and thereby the activity, is. It requires a much open research question if children are to set the agenda!

Furthermore, children might not be experienced photographers, and might therefore not be able to see through the process, such as what exactly will be on the picture in the end. The disposable cameras did not have a display, and to see the final motif therefore required children to look through a very small window using only one eye. To shut one eye, while keeping the other open, was difficult for many children, which also makes it more difficult to control the photograph. Thus, even if children did intend to photograph something as a visualization of an issue, this might have been

problematized through the technicalities of using an "old-fashioned" camera type. The same issues concerns the use of flashlight, which was not automatic.

This is clearly a problem with concern to children's expectations and experiences of being involved as photographers, because of the potential disappointment if pictures do not end up how they had imagined. However, in relation to the quality of the empirical material, I did not see this as a problem, since I did not look for any fundamental truths about these pictures, but rather used them as a communication tool. I approached the pictures, not as representations in themselves, but as openers for conversation, thus, materials that expanded the network through which knowledge was produced. It did allow children a very active role in the research, as we took turn to choose the pictures, and children and the pictures told stories together. However, this also meant that only short sections of the interviews were actually about mealtime, whereas much time were spend discussing other aspects of children's everyday lives. In the sections about mealtime, however, the children and the pictures did sometimes point to issues that I had not previously considered, or they nuanced, confirmed, or refused some of the issues that I had gained interest in through some of the other methods.

Another rather important issue concerning the use of cameras is that it is great fun. When working with children it has shown to be a good way of engaging them and making the research process fun for them (Clark & Moss, 2001). Children were very engaged and clearly having a lot of fun during photographing. Furthermore, children were given a copy of their pictures to take home, and they were very proud of their pictures – showing them to their friends, kindergarten staff and parents.

Walking interview

Besides photo elicitation, I also made a different kind of interview with the children that I refer to as "walking interview", inspired by Clark and Moss' tours (2001). The set-up was to act out the interview, instead of merely talking it. Thus, we would walk around the day care facility, sit at the tables, and pretend to be eating while talking. The purpose was to elicit reflections and to make the interview fun, concrete and closely linked to children's everyday experiences. Furthermore, the intention was also to allow children some influence on the interview. Thus, children chose where to go, while I followed them and asked questions. These questions were much similar to those I asked during photo elicitation.

Meal-days

Meal-days describes situations where I asked two children at a time to plan next day's mealtime. Together the two children and I decided what to eat, who should cook,

where to eat, how to arrange the eating interior and the eaters (division into smaller groups), and the rules that should apply for this meal. I aimed to leave many choices to the children, however, they did not have complete freedom, but needed to establish the meal within the boundaries of what was acceptable to the staff (the food needed to stay within budget and should contain options for children that did not eat pork, as well as being fairly healthy), and to me. The next day, children and I prepared the meal (since all children chose to cook themselves in cooperation with me) and carried out the meal as planned.

Through the meal-days, I wanted to explore children's views on meals with a touch of utopia. I wanted to explore how children would prefer to practice mealtime if they were allowed to make more decisions themselves. I suspected that children might prefer to do mealtime in a different way than what was usually practiced, a suspicion partly created by my observations that children were regularly guided, corrected and forced during mealtime. One of the aims of meal-days was thereby to change the power dynamics between children and adults during these meals. Adults (both staff and I) where still fundamentally in charge, but more decisions were left to the children. This method thereby originated in the dichotomized approach to children and adults earlier described.

I had experienced that it was difficult to "get" children to talk about such utopian aspects; in general, they were most keen to talk about their existing experiences. Combined with the wish to supplement abstract talking and visual methods with actions, I tried out meal-days as a way of creating new mealtime experiences with children.

Obviously the data from these meal-days cannot be said to represent a fully utopia perspective on how children would prefer to eat, if they were to decide themselves. They should rather be seen as children and I experimenting with different ways of eating. The fact that we should plan an actual meal, and not just talk about a fictitious one, meant that children had to agree with each other and me, and thereby explicitly argue our case. I used their verbalized conceptions of how to do the meal, as well as their actions when actually performing the meal, as empirical material.

These situations created new possible child-positions, including aspects of hosting or being a more knowledgeable meal participant. Amongst others, the children introduced the food to their fellow eaters and gave instructions about how to eat it, they answered questions about its preparation, encouraged the other eaters to taste and / or corrected other eaters in their mealtime behaviour. They did not only do so in relation to the other children, but to the adults as well (an example is given in the paper "Studying Perspectives on Kindergarten Meals"). Such reconstruction of mealtime positions accentuated the generational aspects of everyday mealtime; however, they also made it impossible for me to close my eyes to the ambivalences and interdependencies of child and adult perspectives. Until these situations, I had

been overly occupied with the way that rules seemed to restrain children and act as a feature of adult regulation and control of children. However, as discussed in the paper "Striated Agency and Smooth Regulation", many children reflected on rules as comforting features of the meal and did not abolish them when planning their meal-days. For example, many children explicitly chose that yelling and loud noises should be prohibited during their meal-day. As argued throughout the papers, I still find that rules are related to adult regulation of children in ways that are not always appreciated by children; however, this is not the only aspect of rules. Thus, this method provided the fatal blow of analysing perspectives as dichotomised and individualised child and adult perspectives, even though it was initially based in the very same dichotomy.

Roleplay

I also used roleplaying as a method, which aimed to create fun situations in which children and I could experiment with mealtime in playful ways. The activity was carried out in the employee break room, which in one day care facility contained a table and a stack of stools, as well as a coffee table and two couches. In the other day care facilities, the room contained couches and a coffee table. Three or four children participated at a time, and in one roleplay a student that was temporarily involved in the project, also participated. In the kindergarten Stolpebo, Teddy would also join in. I had brought different materials in a box and children initiated the activity by unpacking this box under loud shouts of excitement. The box contained many different toy-foods, candles, and a cloth. The children started playing with the food individually or together, and, for a period, I would not interfere with their play. Usually, I was invited to play along, and my role was usually to be cooked for. At some point, I would suggest that we pretended to be eating in the kindergarten, and that some of us should be adults while the others should be children. They usually went along with this and the children divided the roles between them; along the way these roles became very fluent, as both children and I switched between being pretend-adults and pretend-children.

I generally attempted to trigger issues related to rules and norms, and child and adult roles through the roleplays. I did so by breaking rules and norms that I knew normally applied to mealtime, such as yelling loudly for (play)food, overly indulging in (play)food, taking (play)food from the other eater's plates, and so on. Sometimes I did this as pretend-child, as a pretend-adult and sometimes through Teddy. When being an adult in the roleplays I also regularly downplayed my knowledge about how to perform this role. Thus, I asked children what I would do in the different situations as the adult, or I intentionally did not react in ways I suspected that the children expected me to. This triggered interesting discussions and reactions of which some are discussed in the papers.

2.2.3. DISCUSSION OF METHODS

Christensen and James (2000) argue that involving children in the process of making (contrary to talking about a finished product) provides multi-layered forms of communication, facilitated by the product and the process of making it. They therefore suggest that data is seen "as a compilation of content, form and the research process through which they have been produced" (p. 167). This is very well in line with my experiences. In my research, children and I have created various things: meals, pictures, small books, role-plays, table settings and films. Through these processes of making, we discussed children's preferences on a very concrete level. Hence discussions of why, how, what etc., suddenly became very concrete and practical. Furthermore, it enabled me and the children to do something together and thereby gain confidentiality. Photo elicitation and meal-days both provided good set-ups for conversing with children and for creating engagement and commitment among children towards the research.

To create products also helped to maintain focus and engagement, and it provided a legitimate space for bodies. Thus, during the interviews, bodies were often "in the way" as they would move around, touch things, move things, make noises, all of which disturbed the main purpose of the interview: talking. However, when doing activities and making products, bodies were no longer redundant, but had an active and necessary part to play.

The activities with children had in common that they examined the research aims in ways that were concrete, tangible and situated. Thus, instead of talking about abstract issues, all the activities related very specifically to the day care facility, the people, and things. Furthermore, the activities involved doing, as well as talking. All the activities had their own particular advantages and disadvantages, and it differed between children which activities they engaged in the most. Thus, some children engaged enthusiastically in one activity and less in another, while this turned out the opposite for other children. Therefore, I will not make any overall conclusion about one best activity. However, the overall idea of designing activities that make the research concrete and situated was a very constructive approach to produce empirical material with children. As Gallagher and Gallagher (2008) argue, children's participation in research is regularly labelled as empowering, even though much participation is controlled by adults. I have already discussed some of these issues in the paper "Studying Perspectives on Kindergarten Meals", and only add here that the activities I invited children to participate in, should not be confused with any kind of authentic child perspective or with empowerment. They provided opportunities for children and me to shape, discuss, and challenge each other's views, ideas, and thoughts, and encouraged children and me to reflect on, and actively experiment with, a specific part of their everyday life and supported us in such processes. These reflections and experimentations brought up new issues and nuances that informed the construction of multiple, complex and ambivalent perspectives on mealtime.

The activities often accomplished to emphasize the fluidity of power. Thus, as also argued by others (such as Christensen, 2004), I experienced that children regularly took control of a situation, leaving me puzzled about how to react. For example, when they refused to leave the room when an activity had (in my opinion) ended, or when they took the role of questioner and started questioning me about all kinds of matters, such as my private life. I also experienced that children and I shared different kinds of commonality, as already argued; however, this did not solely happen when we were eating together, but in many of the activities, we did together. The fact that we <u>did</u> something together supported such commonality.

Clarke (2005) argues that methods should aim to capture complexities instead of simplifications. The used methods in this project certainly did produce a complex compilation of empirical material! Thus, the many different methods did not each provide a brick that fitted neatly with the others to provide a clear-cut picture of mealtime. However, they were important in pushing the question of how to approach the concept of perspectives forward, as they exposed the interdependencies and multiplicities of perspectives. The methods regularly complicated each other, as knowledge produced through one method questioned and contested knowledge produced through another.

I believe that the greatest strength of the methods I have used is in the combination of both doing and talking, and the fact that such doing and talking was situated in everyday mealtime situations, as well as in situations that disrupted, reflected and challenged the everyday routines. Furthermore, the combination of different researcher roles, thus being both a participant in everyday life and an initiator of activities, supported the construction of different kinds of knowledges.

Thus, through these methods I have attempted to play with the situation of mealtime, so to speak. The methods introduce new materialities and places into the situation of mealtime; they change the roles and power dynamics of the human elements, as well as of the discursive norms and structures. Thus, the methods explicitly use their situatedness to ask new questions, to construct new perspectives, and to nuance previously constructed perspectives. Thereby these methods have become part of the produced empirical material, and do not intend to come as close as possible to mealtime "as it would have been". Rather they open up the phenomenon of mealtime as something to reflect on, discuss, and experiment with.

2.2.4. ANALYSIS

I have aimed at keeping an openness towards complexity and multidimensionality throughout the analytic process, and attempted to overcome dichotomous thinking. The process have been characterized by a constant interplay between various

theoretical conceptualizations, the different empirical materials and the moments where some of these would start to "glow" (MacLure, 2013), thus catch my attention without this being intentional or rationally explainable. Situational analysis and theoretical conceptualizations from other literature have been applied in both early and late phases with different emphasis. Situational analysis has served as the major inspiration for the early phases of analysis by providing some concrete tools to approach the process. In the later phases of analysis I have mainly turned to theoretical conceptualizations derived from other literature and applied these to interact with the empirical material. Thus, I have searched for relevant literature throughout the research process, as this process constantly took new twists and turns that made me enter different areas of research.

The initial phase of analysis – situational mapping

Situational analysis offers some concrete tools for analysis, mainly based on different kinds of mapping. In this project, I have used situational maps (Clarke, 2005, p. 86) and done relational analysis (Clarke, 2005, p. 102) based on these. The mapping is an analytic exercise to move into and around the data and the maps does not necessarily act as final analytic products (Clarke, 2005, p. 83); they have certainly not done so in my project. Thus, the maps seek to construct the situation empirically by visualizing all its identified elements. The idea is to work against simplification as they aim to capture the messiness and complexity of situations.

> What I am grappling toward are approaches that can simultaneously address voice and discourse, texts and the consequential materialities and symbolisms of the nonhuman, the dynamics of historical change, and, also but far from least, power in both its more solid and fluid forms. ... Thick analyses take explicitly into account the full array of elements in the situation and explicate their interrelations. (Clarke, 2005, p. xxiii).

In the following, I will try to explain how I have used the mapping exercises suggested by Clarke. However, first, I want to note that the following might tend to describe the process as more linear, systematic and rational than was the actual process. Thus, I have not been fully able to describe the complexity and messiness of my analytical process and the reader is asked to bear in mind that the following is only an attempt to provide a general impression of how choices were made.

Clarke suggests different kinds of maps, but since I have mainly used situational maps I will only discuss this kind of map. The first kind of situational map suggested by Clarke is a messy version. The aim of this map is descriptively to lay out the most important human and nonhuman elements of the situation, including discursive, historical, symbolic, cultural, political elements. The intention is to provoke analysis of the relations between them and the "messy complexities of the situation" (p. xxxv).

To call this first exercise descriptive might tend to conceal the fact that analysis obviously already begins with these maps. Thus, the array of possible elements to write down is endless, and some have to be deselected – thus analytical choices are already made through this initial exercise.

To begin with, all (chosen) elements of the particular situation is written on a map in no particular order or structure. This messy version functions as point of departure for analysis and further mapping. I have done two different kinds of messy maps, corresponding to what Clarke terms integrative and comparative mapping (p. 176). Thus, integrative mapping is "mapping across all the different data sources together, asking what all of these data sources have to say about the phenomenon of interest" (p. 176). This kind of mapping thereby constitutes all empirical material as one situation. I have made several integrative versions. Some sought to visualize the overall elements of mealtime in general, thus trying to gain some overview of every (chosen) element that is there, while some integrative maps focused on specific issues that I wanted to analyse further.

In comparative mapping, each data source is mapped and analysed separately and then compared. The aim is to identify differences, similarities and silences between the different situations, thus visualizing which elements are present in one data source while not in others; which ones seem important in all or most situations etc. Thus, I have produced situational maps based on each interview, each mealtime situation, and (almost) each activity. Even though I have compared these maps, I have not done so systematically and in order to tone down the comparative aspect, I will name this kind of map separate maps, as they are based on separated situations and data materials. I have worked on the integrative maps and the separated maps simultaneously. I will come back to how I have worked with the maps after shortly discussing some of the challenges and dilemmas in making the messy maps.

How to identify the elements and which to include?

The main difficulty or dilemma in using these maps relate to identification and delimitation of elements to include on the maps. Thus, no matter how thorough the researcher is in making the maps, not all elements can be represented. Clarke does not give any clear guidelines on what to include. She writes that the maps should "at least start out erring on the side of inclusivity." (p. 89), and that all analytically pertinent elements should be explicitly included. However, one does not always know which elements are analytically pertinent when making the maps. She elaborates that saturation is the key to knowing when a map is done, and that this happens when one have worked repeatedly with the map; when it has been a while since any major changes were felt necessary; and when one feels that all the most important elements are there (p. 108-109). I have not been through such a process with every map I have made. Thus, I have drawn the separate maps of specific situations while watching the

video clips / reading the transcripts and I decided which elements to put on the map during this process. I aimed at inclusivity, thus when I was in doubt whether an element was important or not, I would include it. I repeated this process twice and then went on to the next analytical step (quick and dirty relational analysis, described below). I worked more thoroughly with the integrative maps.

The initial messy maps should thus seek to include as much as possible, and this includes elements that would be defined as context in more positivistic research. Clarke argues that context does not exist, instead she argues that "The conditions **of** the situation are **in** the situation" (p. 71). She elaborates that "the fundamental question is 'How do these conditions appear – make themselves felt as consequential – inside the empirical situation under examination?'" (p. 72). Institutional rules, elements related to the research, discourses on children and adults and so on, are thereby to be included.

Another issue relates to silent or invisible elements, thus elements that are not physically present or verbally articulated, yet such elements can still be of great importance. Clarke argues that theory/relevant literature can be used to identify such elements: "Certainly there are expectable elements of any situation that we would consider in the abstract and seek out in their specificities in the concrete – in the empirical data." (p. 72). If these elements turn out not to be important, they will "drop away in later stages of the research process." (p. 89).

Working with the maps – relational analysis and zooming in

After finishing a situational messy map, the next step is to "ask questions based on it and memoing your answers. Relations among the various elements are key." (Clarke, 2005, p. 102). I started exploring the relations between the elements on each map, but obviously not all elements and their relations could be equally explored. I did what Clarke refers to as a quick and dirty relational analysis (p. 102) of the relations between the elements that seemed most important in each situation. This involved reflecting on these relations, based on the empirical material. I did so aloud with a sound recorder and wrote down what seemed the most exiting or important thoughts afterwards. I did so with the separate maps first and thereby gained familiarity with each situation and an elaborated understanding of its elements and relations. I started noticing differences and similarities between the situations and this trigged some new questions and interests. I furthermore did thematic versions of many of the separated maps, thus ordering the elements into different themes.

It was through the quick and dirty relational analysis that I started seriously noting the material elements. Thus, I realized that elements, such as the food or the cutlery, were not just passively being used by humans. Much of the social interaction were co-constructed by material elements. Some discursive constructions also seemed to stand

out as highly influential across different situations, such as notions of proper table manners and healthy food.

New questions were also triggered by differences. For example, I realized that the food was a central nonhuman element in many situations; however, it was as if the same food would become completely different things in different situations and through different relations. Another interesting difference was that the humans and structural elements acted differently in different situations and in their different relationships. Thus, a rule might be applied to a child in one situation, while not enforced on other children in the same situation or on the same child the next day. One day, an adult might be very strict on enforcing quietness, while another day the same adult would tolerate or even encourage much more chaotic situations. This applied to children as well. Some children might be much on guard with the co-eater's aesthetic behaviours, such as correcting them when eating with their mouth open or if making loud noises when chewing, and then shortly after involve in such activities themselves while laughing and smiling.

These quick and dirty relational analyses thereby explicated the relationality of conditional elements, such as rules and child- and adult positions. The separated maps based on the different methods emphasized this further. Thus, many of the methods, such as "eating together", "role-playing" and "meal-days", constructed new situations in which the conditional elements were positioned differently than in the everyday meals. The maps and the relational analyses of these helped nuance how the discursive and structural elements were relationally and situationally enacted.

These findings or attentiveness made me ask questions that became the point of departure for making integrative maps that focused on specific kinds of elements or relations. Thus, I made thematic, integrative maps that zoomed in on a specific interest that seemed particularly influential across different situations or based on some of the differences of which I had become curious. I made such maps with focus on the food, the cutlery, arguments used for corrections and commands, table manners, eating culture and commensality, atmosphere, time, aesthetics, children and constructions of child subjectivities and positions, tasting, senses, play, nutrition, cosiness, rules, pedagogy and professionalism, parents, care, cooking and adult subjectivities and positions.

I made these thematic, integrative maps by looking systematically through all my transcriptions (of interviews as well as of video recordings of mealtimes and activities) and previous memos from the quick and dirty relational analyses, as well as using my intuition and memory. I sorted all my empirical material by copy / pasting all sections from these materials that somehow dealt with the chosen themes into one document. Thus, these thematic documents meant to gather all the empirical material I had produced about the chosen theme. These documents were structured with inspiration from what Emerson, Fretz and Shaw (1995) calls an analytical

commentary. Thus, I literally divided the document in two columns; in the first column, I pasted the excerpt as it appeared in the transcript/fieldnote/memo. In the second column, I wrote analytical comments, such as reflecting how this excerpt related to some theoretical concept, to other excerpts or any other reflections, thoughts and ideas that would seem relevant to consider.

After doing this initial focusing through the themed, integrative maps and documents, I chose some themes to explore in detail. This process is described under "later phases of analysis" below.

Analytical choices were thereby made throughout the process. Clarke regularly use wordings such as "what really matters" (p. 88), "what seemed to be the most significant relations" (p. 103), "The most interesting and important [relations] would be memoed" (p. 103), and so on. Thus, situational analysis does not offer a specific strategy to decide which elements and relations that are the most important to follow. This is up to the analyst to decide, however, the mapping and memoing helps bringing awareness of complexities and multidimensionality and helps asking questions that might not else have been asked.

My curiosity was triggered by conflicts, since these explicate differences and how things could have been otherwise (Clarke, 2005). However, I have also been occupied with the more silent or less obvious kinds of resistance and negotiations that often took place during mealtime, as well as with the non-resistance that implicitly confirms the present. I was looking for truisms and for the processes and arguments through which regulation happened.

The maps have been some very good tools to explore the different empirical materials, since they have visualized some very complex situations, making it easier to temporarily take a narrow focus without losing overview and track of the situation. In that respect I think they are a very good tool for "zooming in and out" (Nicolini, 2009) of the empirical material!

The later phase of analysis

Having chosen, or at least narrowed down my focus, I turned to theoretical discussions related to the chosen themes, thus I started searching for literature that dealt with these or related issues. The development of sensitizing concepts is one of the research tools advocated in situational analysis. Sensitizing concepts are tools to frame and focus the research without jumping to theoretical closure, thus concepts that "suggest directions along which to look" (Clarke, 2005, p. 28). Thus, I did not use one grand theory, but instead found help in different concepts that seemed particularly good at capturing the issues I had chosen. The mapping described above helped me construct such

sensitizing concepts that became analytical tools, whose meanings were situationally analysed in the papers.

The concept of perspective started out as a definitive concept, but ended up a central sensitizing concept in this thesis. I have already reflected this process, and will therefore not repeat it here. The analysis is presented in the paper "Studying Perspectives on Kindergarten Meals". In the paper "Food for Kindergarten Children" I used care as a sensitizing concept to analyse how food became different kinds of matter in the kindergarten meals as it entered into different relations. As already introduced, I also chose to zoom in on the ways that humans, materials and structural/discursive elements created different perspectives on proper or best ways of doing mealtime, and the influence of such perspectives on children and adults. I found the concepts of striated and smooth spaces relevant for doing such an analysis. Thus, the paper "Striated Agency and Smooth Regulation" discuss notions of striated and smooth spaces, but does so, not from closed predefined meanings of the concepts, but with an openness to nuance and discuss these concepts.

With these concepts, I started writing and in the process of writing the analysis, I constantly returned to the empirical material, the maps and the memos. The concepts made me ask new questions and the process is thereby best described as a constant going back and forth between empirical material, the maps and memos and the theoretical concepts and arguments adopted from other literature. The results can be seen in the papers.

A closing comment

Along with so many others, I aim not to fall into an agency-structure binary and a discussion of who/what is superior to the other. To achieve this, I have found the foregrounding of situations very useful as an analytical approach. Thus, analysing perspectives as situationally produced, makes it possible to analyse the relations between humans and nonhumans (including structures) as fluent and situationally constructed, thus humans and structures relate differently in different situations. Sometimes structural elements are key, while human elements are so in others. The papers provide several examples of how perspectives are analysed as results of such interaction and with fluent power dynamics between the elements.

2.2.5. VALIDITY

This research project has not been about *finding* perspectives, but about analytically *constructing* such, thus referring Lather's (1993) distinction between "viewing

ethnographic stories as about "found" versus "constructed" worlds" (p. 675). This means that validity is not a question of judging how "unbiased" the research is or how well the research represents an objective truth.

I have approached the issue of validity through two strategies. One that explicates and reflects the situatedness of the research, thus, I have attempted to establish what Lather (1993) refers to as an acceptable dialogue with readers about reality construction: "It is not a matter of looking harder or more closely, but of seeing what frames our seeing - spaces of constructed visibility and incitements to see which constitute power/knowledge." (p. 675). Such reflections are presented and discussed throughout the thesis and explicitly in the paper "Studying Perspectives on Kindergarten Meals" and I will therefore not repeat them here.

The other strategy relates to what Clarke, as well as others (see for example Lather, 1993), calls a constant and serious engagement with complexity and heterogeneity. Clarke (2005) argues that research should not produce oversimplifications by searching for commonalities or coherence. She argues against the tendency to search for frequency and normality and instead argues that the range of positions, the contradictions and incoherence in a situation should be the aim of analysis. I have aimed to do so by presenting at least two different perspectives on the same issue in each paper and discuss the ambivalences and complexity of these perspectives. However, I do not intend to provide an exhaustive picture of every possible perspective on mealtime. No matter how committed to complexity, one will always have to write stories on behalf of others. There are several possible perspectives that have been silenced in this thesis.

The research has been carried out with a motivation to co-construct subjugated knowledges and alternatives to the dominating discursive norms and understandings through my research. However, I have also attempted not to make simplistic conclusions about dominating perspectives or tendencies that might seem clear-cut at first glance. Thus, I have constantly battled to seek fruitful interruptions (Lather, 1993), thus arguments, episodes, and perspectives that might challenge my own analytical assumptions and question what I thought I knew. Thereby, I have aimed not only to look for alternatives to the most dominating perspectives, but also to foreground contradictions within the dominating perspectives and thereby nuance these.

I have not produced any clear-cut best-practice guidelines. Instead, I have attempted to "frame meaning possibilities rather than close them" (Lather, 1992), by attempting to present discussions of how regulating aspects of mealtime simultaneously support and constrain mealtime participants and can be seen as positive as well as negative features of mealtime. I have used theoretical sensitizing concepts in an interplay with the empirical material to argue why I believe my readings are qualified. It must be up to the reader to decide whether this is done convincingly and transparently.

2.2.6. LEGAL AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS RELATED TO CHILDREN'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE RESEARCH PROCESS

When doing ethnographic research, certain ethical dilemmas emerge, before, during and after the research and these are reflected in the following.

Before the research, the ethical considerations mainly related to children's participation in the research process and their rights and abilities to decide themselves whether or not to participate. There are no clear-cut legislation or guidelines related to young children's involvement in social research. The Danish Social Science Research Council (2002) have formulated guidelines related to ethical considerations in the social sciences in general. They argue that informed consent should be obtained from those who are to participate in the research. This includes explanation of the purpose of the research as well as information about the participant's role in the research process. This should be done without pressuring or misleading the participant. However, they also write that some people have difficulties asserting their integrity or understanding the consequences of participation. In such situations, consent should be given by a guardian. It is not clear what defines such a situation and they do not relate specifically to children.

Thus, ethical considerations concerns a dilemma about how to protect children, while not silencing them. This involves their ability to understand information and their ability to evaluate this information according to personal values and their own interests (Alderson, 2007). However, as argued by Miller and Boulton (2007) the concept of informed consent relies on a conceptualization of research participant as rational individuals and of the research process as fully predictable, palpable and controllable. This is problematic since the research process develops in response to new situations, their people and preliminary analysis. This is particularly relevant in exploratory research. Thus, it is not possible to predict what will be revealed in an interview, especially not an unstructured or semi-structured one, and participants might end up revealing more than intended (Miller & Boulton, 2007). These issues questions whether obtaining informed consent is enough to secure good ethical practices. Miller and Boulton (2007) suggest to approach issues of consent as a process throughout research and not as a static step in the beginning of a research project.

My own way of navigating in these questions and dilemmas was to ask for formal consent by children's parents and the daily manager of the kindergartens, as well as informal and ongoing consent by children themselves.

Parents were asked to sign two different declarations of consent; one stating that their child was allowed to participate in the project and one stating that pictures and / or

video recordings could be used publically. Most parents signed both; a few did not sign the latter. The declarations of consent was designed as a written, brief description of the purpose of the study, children's role in this and the use of video, as well as an email address to contact me for any questions (See appendix D for a translated version)

I furthermore tried my best to inform children about my research purpose in general and of my use of camera and video camera specifically. I introduced my research in plenum as well as in the beginning of activities and through everyday conversations. I also introduced the video camera and I told them that the films I made was mainly to be seen by me, whereas the pictures might be shown to others. I also told them that some of the videos might be shown to others; however, I promised that I would never show unflattering situations of anyone and that they were welcome to tell me if they did not want to be filmed or to have pictures of themselves shown. Furthermore, when doing activities with children I always asked them if they wanted to participate and during activities, I would ask again if I felt insecure about whether or not they still wished to be part of the activity, such as if they seemed at unease. Thus, I tried to let them know that they were always free to end their participation.

During the research, a key issue was the boundary between the private and the public (Aarsand & Forsberg, 2010), thus what was to be scrutinized through the research process and what was reserved as a private matter. In my research, this mainly related to conflicts. Such situations could be embarrassing to both children and adults, such as when people acted different from their own ideas of how they ought to or wanted to behave, or when people had their will completely overruled or incompetence displayed. Thus, conflicts often displayed the fact that here and now feelings are much more influential than we might wish to acknowledge, especially in a professional setting of a day care institution. However, conflicts were part of the everyday life and became an important part of the empirical material. I have sought to deal with this material in ways that secures anonymity, thus not displaying individuals in uncomforting situations and altering names in written presentations. Furthermore, I regularly asked about episodes I had observed and thereby gave the involved persons a chance to reflect and nuance the situation. Issues of anonymity did not only concern situations of conflict, but also situations in which participants told me secrets or otherwise made me part of situations that were not usually allowed public display, such as if rules were broken. I did not tell about such situations to other children or adults in the institution.

These issues, along with others, were emphasized by my use of video camera and sound recorder. Earlier, I have discussed some of these issues in relation to the methodological aspects, however, this is also an ethical issue. Thus, listening and looking involve aspects of power and surveillance, which is highlighted through the permanence of visibility through the camera as well as the scrutiny that it enables (Lomax & Casey, 1998; Sparrman & Lindgren, 2010). This is exactly what makes

video and sound recorders good research tools, but these same issues might cause less positive outcomes for the observed.

This was underlined in an interview with an adult during which I had a sound recorder turned on. I had told her that I would be the only person to hear the recordings and that I would not cite her directly for any problematic issues without seeking her explicit permission, but mainly use the material for overall discussions. During the interview, we talked about problematic issues related to her cooperation with other staff members and her opinions and feelings about these colleagues and the leadership of the day care facility. During these episodes, she often lowered her voice and left sentences unfinished while glancing at the recorder. I reaffirmed how I would use these recordings and she would continue. When the interview was finished, I turned the recorder off, and she then started telling new stories about these sensitive issues, thus indicating that she had felt restrained by the recorder.

Another issue is pointed out by Sparrman and Lindgren (2010) who argue that children are increasingly subject to visual documentation in day care facilities, as video recordings and still photography is regularly made by the staff to offer a chance of reflection and in-depth understanding of children's activities, as well as to report children's everyday activities to parents and politicians. They argue that visual documentation might construct a view of childhood

> in which being looked at, and wanting to be looked at, is a good childhood, and where good children do not resist being looked at. This means that everyday monitoring, evaluation, and surveillance are becoming part of what it means to be a child in a preschool setting, and that children must get used to being under scrutiny and surveillance. (p. 259)

The research project was short termed and Sparrman and Lindgren's arguments are mainly related to the use of visual documentation by preschool teachers. However, both visual documentation in the research process as well as in pedagogical practices can be argued to be part of (and thus reproducing) a discourse in which children are "naturally" subject to adult surveillance and scrutiny. In my study, however, I did not only film children. I made adults equally subject to visual documentation and scrutiny, including myself. However, as mentioned earlier, one adult explicitly asked not to be caught on film, while no child made such request. Whether this was because children did not mind being filmed, whether they did not think of refusal as a genuine opportunity or whether they did not question my right to film them at all will remain open.

A different concern had to do with my relations with children. I gained a very positive relationship with many children; they happily greeted me when I arrived and they shared many feelings and experiences with me. Moreover, I actively sought such close relations in order to produce good research. However, my presence in the day care facility was delimited in time and it is therefore fair to ask if it is justifiable to

purposely seek such close relationships well knowing that it will end shortly after. Children in day care facilities are generally use to adults coming and going. There are commonly substitutes, people in job-training and students who are only in the day care facility for a short time. But the fact that children already experience that relations are built and broken in short time does not necessarily justify the tendency. I do not have the answer to this question. There are many positive aspects of gaining confidentiality with children and it can be argued that this is necessary in order to take their involvement in research seriously; however, I did experience a feeling of letting children down when finishing my fieldwork. Thus, knowledge about how children experience such coming and going of adults would be informative in relation to research as well to institutional practices in general.

To work ethically with visual ethnography, and research into people's lives in general, is also "to critically discuss what is brought into the production of knowledge." (Aarsand & Forsberg, 2010, p. 251) and to work reflexively throughout the entire research process (Christensen, 2004). I have attempted to do so and even though all considerations are no way near exhausted or even mentioned in the above, I hope and believe that the participants of the study generally have felt respected.

2.3. HELP! AM I STUDYING HEALTH AND NUTRITION?!?

As argued by Clarke (2005) along with many others (e.g. Becker, 1967), research and researchers are not free from political or discursive positioning. Even if the researcher does not wish to explicitly position her/himself, the choice of topic and the approach to the study will regularly make others judge us. In my research this has mainly been an issue in relation to health in its particular interlink with nutrition.

I have experienced throughout the research process and in various dissemination activities that people in various positions connect my work with promotion of health and food education (in Danish: Maddannelse – a concept much popular in Denmark and used in a variety of meanings, often very broad, undefined and implicitly linked with health). Thus, my work is commonly used to develop and/or legitimize different strategies to expand children's experiences, knowledges and competences in relation to food and often with strong connotations of morality that implies that some foods are better than other foods.

I am not alone in this experience. In everyday life as well as in research, food and health are highly interpenetrated (Chamberlain, 2004) and food in day care facilities are regularly studied and discussed with an emphasis on health, nutrition and obesity (Mikkelsen et al., 2014; Sabinsky, 2007; Sørensen, n.d.).

> For responsible adults and state-funded researchers, it is almost impossible to speak outside the healthy–unhealthy discourse or conduct a study on children and food that is not explicitly about changing their behaviour in a more healthy direction or implementing healthy regimes. (Brembeck et al., 2013, p. 85)

Thus, whether I want to or not, doing research on mealtime in day care facilities means that I am already dealing with health and nutrition. In the following, I therefore wish to reflect on these issues to make such dealing explicit.

These issues were further stressed by the fact that the overall project, FRIDA, had an explicit aim of supporting healthy eating in day care facilities. Health is implicitly defined within biomedical terms, as the FRIDA project description builds on arguments related to the prevention of overweight and obesity and uses phrasings such as "*Furthermore, precursors to a range of lifestyle diseases that are related to obesity and overweight in adults, can be traced in children as young as 8-10 years.*" (Frida project description, p. 1-2, my translation). Health promotion is thereby reduced to prevention of overweight and obesity in the project, and this has given rise to some dilemmas within my own research.

Coming from a Master's degree programme in which biomedical perspectives on health were critically scrutinized as part of the programme I was schooled to be critical towards the narrow focus on health defined through biomedical terms. This was supported by many readings that argue that a narrow focus on nutrition simplifies much more complex aspects of human's relations to their food (e.g. Haden, 2006). As described in the state of art section, many studies have shown how health can become a much dominant focus in everyday meals that prohibits conversation and togetherness. Others have argued that the approach to eating as a matter of autonomous individual food choices enhance anxieties related to eating and might even lead to increased obesity (Fischler, 2011). Initially I therefore attempted to avoid the issue of health in my thesis, however, after the realization that I would not be able to escape being associated with health promotion, I chose to relate explicitly to it. Furthermore, food and meals are *also* about nutrients, and to ignore this completely would also be to simplify complexity.

I long considered applying a holistic concept of health in which the social and emotional experiences of eating would also be defined as health parameters, thus building on readings such as Antonovsky (1996). Antonovsky (1996) argues that health is about a sense-of-coherence as "a generalized orientation toward the world which perceives it, on a continuum, as comprehensible, manageable and meaningful." (p. 15). Thus, health in this definition is not only the absence of disease and health promotion is not about avoiding risk-factors, but about creating meaningful life situations. This would legitimize the inclusion of issues such as desire, joy, confidence etc. as relevant meal aspects to study. However, I feared that if I attempted to apply a more holistic definition of health in my own work, this would easily end up

contributing to a totalitarian approach to health in which all aspects of life is suddenly about becoming healthy. As already argued, the search for causal explanations of eating behaviour has already embraced social aspects of eating, meal experience etc.. Thus, to expand the definition of health might end up legitimizing health as a goal of life in itself, and my findings would risks being reduced to yet other far-reaching methods to prevent obesity. Furthermore, I did not want health to become the main area of my research. I therefore ended up taking another approach in which I analysed health and nutrition as a perspective on the meal, along with other perspectives. Thus, instead of arguing for a broader or holistic definition of health, I wanted to explore how this present discourse of nutritionism unfolded in the everyday meals. The result can be seen in the paper "Food for Kindergarten Children".

My hope is that this thesis will trigger critical reflection about the ways that nutrition influence mealtime, among its readers and in the field of public food policy and practitioners in day care facilities in particular.

'SIT STILL!' 'BE QUIET!' 'AND LET'S ENJOY A NICE MEAL TOGETHER…'

2.4. CONCLUSIONS AND PERSPECTIVES

With point of departure in the question of how different 'good's and bads are established in everyday mealtime through the co-existence of different mealtime perspectives, this thesis has closed in on two overall themes: a methodological and theoretical development of the concept of perspective, and an empirical examination of co-existing mealtime perspectives. These perspectives are analysed as socially, materially and discursively constructed through the everyday meals, in accordance with the theoretical and methodological framework described in the section "Part two: Methodological and theoretical considerations".

This section sums up on the main points presented in the three papers. It shortly summarizes the overall findings in the three papers and outline some overall conclusions that cut across the papers. The section ends by looking ahead by pointing out some issues that have occurred, but not been thoroughly examined, in this thesis, and therefore would be interesting areas of study in the future.

The papers have in common that they all approach some established truisms - of research or of mealtime, as well as bring about some other perspectives that work as contested opponents or even subjugated perspectives. The first paper *Studying Perspectives on Kindergarten Meals* thus discuss the notion of perspective, and argues that the existence of authentic, child perspectives is taken for granted within some areas of childhood studies. The second and third papers *Striated Agency and Smooth Regulation* and *Food for Kindergarten Children*, discuss different truisms that guide and legitimize mealtime practices.

2.4.1. CONTESTED NOTIONS OF GOOD AND BAD

To the question of how different goods and bads are established in everyday mealtime, the papers *Striated agency and smooth regulation* and *Food for kindergarten children* each provide examples of how goods and bads are constructed and established in everyday mealtime. The papers each present two co-existing mealtime perspectives that in some aspects are each other's opposites. The papers analyse how this causes ambivalences and tensions, as the eaters are unclarified about how to navigate this ambivalence.

The paper *Striated agency and smooth regulation* points out that children's development of skills, which enables them to become self-reliant, as well as children's embodiment of proper table manners, are established aims of mealtime, and are thereby central in defining certain kinds of goods in mealtime. Thus, according to this perspective, which emphasize children's development, a good child-eater conforms to an ideal of willingly engaging in repeated practicing until the defined skills are

achieved. A "bad" child-eater is an eater that does not show interest or willingness in developing such skills. Practices such as "begging" for service or openly confronting this emphasis on development, are especially defined as bad behaviour. However, the analysis also identifies a perspective that emphasizes cosiness as an important kind of good. In this perspective, practices such as conversing and helping each other are defined as goods, while conflicts and arguments are particularly bad in this perspective. This often contradicts with the emphasis on table manners and self-reliance. Thus, the perspective of mealtime as a situation for children's development, regularly causes frustrations and quarrels, since not all children are willing or able to engage in the expected practices. Furthermore, many children needs to concentrate in order to solve the practical tasks of eating and helping themselves, and thereby they are not able to engage in conversation simultaneously. The paper argues that the tensions between these very different perspectives and the much different goods and bads they establish, can make mealtime a difficult space to navigate, for both child- and adult eaters.

The paper *Food for Kindergarten Children* equally identifies two overall perspectives that each establish opposing goods. Thus, in one perspective, eating is constructed as a rational practice with the aim of producing strong and healthy bodies. Through this perspective, goods and bads are established in relation to the food's presumed values as nutrients and energy. Thus, in this perspective goods and bads are established in relation to the food, however, it also entails goods and bads in relation to the eaters. A good eater, in this perspective, happily try out unfamiliar foods and willingly taste them several times, in order to achieve a liking. Thus, taste is defined through this perspective as an issue that needs to be developed according to the definition of good food. The paper also identifies a different perspective, in which the bodily experience of eating establish what is good and what is not. Thus, it is the bodily pleasure or discomfort of eating that defines which foods are good and which are bad. Thereby the definitions of good and bad are not general, but are defined according to each eater's preferences. Similar to the discussions in *Striated agency and smooth regulation* the co-existence of such different perspectives causes tensions and ambivalences in the everyday meals. The paper argues that the eaters navigate these tensions by generally practicing the perspective on eating as a rational practice as a food-for-others perspective, while the sensory centred perspective on eating is practiced as a food-for-me perspective. However, as will be elaborated below, the paper also found that adults and children generally had different responsibilities and opportunities of practicing these perspectives.

The definition of goods and bads in mealtime was thereby found to be constantly changing and negotiated, and the co-existence of much different perspectives regularly caused disagreements, conflicts and ambivalent feelings among the eaters.

2.4.2. CHILDREN OR FUTURE CITIZENS AT THE TABLE?

A tension between defining mealtime as a situation for the constructing of future beings and as a situation that emphasizes here-and-now beings, runs throughout the analysis in the papers *Striated agency and smooth regulation* and *Food for Kindergarten Children*. Thus, the thesis points to a general contradiction in mealtime, which has not been thoroughly dealt with empirically or theoretically elsewhere.

Thus, both papers argue that mealtime is characterized by ideals of a good future life for children, and that current goods are established in accordance with these ideals. Thus, current mealtime is believed to influence who children will become in their future. As introduced above, this concerns children's development of skills (practical skills as well as learning proper codes of conduct), and of healthy eating habits and tastes. Through these perspectives, children are defined as the people they will (or are hoped to) become, rather than the people they currently are. However, both papers also identify a here-and-now perspective, which contests this emphasis on the future. In the paper *Striated agency and smooth regulation* this is conceptualized as an emphasis on cosiness and togetherness, while in *Food for Kindergarten Children* this is conceptualized as a bodily experience of eating, which creates joy or discomfort. Thus, through these issues, the meal is constructed as a situation that is about being.

Thereby, many of the tensions that are analysed in the thesis stems from these conflicting perspectives that defines the meal as a situation for becoming and being respectively. And while the here-and-now perspective is regularly acknowledged by most eaters, the papers each show how the production of future beings often dominates in the everyday meals. Thus, issues related to the becoming of independent, healthy and competent citizens are often emphasized, on behalf of feelings and wishes of the here-and-now beings.

2.4.3. CHILD AND ADULT EATERS

The papers also point out that the relationship between the categories child and adult are quite complex. In the paper, *Studying Perspectives on Kindergarten Meals,* this is discussed on a theoretical and methodological level, and the paper finds that the division of perspectives into respectively child and adult is a construction that masquerades a far greater complexity. The paper instead argues that perspectives are created across, as well as within, these social categories through a shared everyday life, and that the differences between children and adults should be open for examination instead of being presumed.

In *Striated agency and smooth regulation,* the concepts of striation and smoothing are used to analyse how mealtime is simultaneously characterized by norms, rules and

routines that regulate the eaters, as well as entailing opportunities to dismiss or change the norms, rules, and routines in accordance with the eater's individual ideas, needs, and feelings. The paper furthermore argues that, in research, striation is often equated with adult regulation or repression of children. However, through the analysis, the paper finds that many children actively strives towards striation through the implementation of routines and clear rules, since this provides predictability and a feeling of security. Furthermore, the paper argues that striation is not only constraining in relation to children, but also to adults. Thus, mealtime is striated through powerful discourses related to proper eating behaviour, as well as to understandings of adult professionalism and responsibility. Simultaneously, the paper finds that children are not expected to have yet embodied the dominating understandings of proper eating behaviour and can, thereby, adopt a playful approach to food and meals, without risking their child-being to be questioned. Challenging and playing with the rules and norms are not in the same way an option to the adults. Thus, both child and adult agency was constrained as well as enabled through the co-existence of striation and smoothing.

In *Food for kindergarten children,* the two outlined perspectives (a sensory-centred perspective and a rational perspective on eating) are initially analysed as a child- and an adult perspective respectively; however, the paper ends by confusing this division. The paper argues that the two perspectives are rather two co-existing perspectives that individuals relate to in different ways in different situations. However, the paper also finds that children and adults have different possibilities of engaging with these perspectives in practice. Where adults tacitly and inconspicuously can avoid eating the served food, children are explicitly put under pressure to taste and eat healthy food, regardless of whether they feel a desire to do so or not.

Thereby the papers argue in conjunction that children and adults do not necessarily have different feelings, wishes, and hopes for mealtime, and that they are both subjected to discursive and material issues that regulate their individual scope for manoeuvring. However, the papers *Food for kindergarten children* and *Striated agency and smooth regulation*, both point out that adults and children are differently positioned in the everyday meals. Both papers find that adults feel obliged to consider the "becomingness" of children, thus their development into future citizens, since they attend mealtime as a professional person. They act out this professionalism by emphasizing educational and nutritional aspects of mealtime, but they often feel frustrated with the ambivalences and contradictions that this causes in their relations with the children. The children thereby become sites for professional regulation according to ideals of a good future life, whereas children experience mealtime in a here-and-now perspective.

Thereby two overall tensions run through the entire thesis: the tension between "here-and-now" and the future, as well as the positions and roles of children and adults.

Even though children and adults share many of the same perspectives, adults in general were torn between practicing mealtime as a here-and-now situation and a situation that prepares and constructs children as future beings. Many of the ambivalences and tensions that are pointed out in the papers can be traced back to this dilemma. This is further stressed, since children in general did not opt in on this future perspective and thereby contested and opposed this on a daily basis.

The papers do not suggest clear-cut solutions to the problems they point out. Rather, they rely on the hope that subjecting truisms to the scrutiny of analysis, as well as shedding light on the existence of opposing and/or subjugated perspectives, will bring about awareness of how practices are legitimized and that this will push greater reflexivity in the approach to mealtime.

2.4.4. LOOKING AHEAD

Child and adult relations have been scrutinized throughout the thesis and it has been emphasized that children and adults are not necessarily in opposition, and that their shared everyday life cannot be presumed to be experienced through dichotomized perspectives. However, the thesis is also full of examples of how children's wishes and initiatives are overruled by adults through use of adult authority.

In the introduction to the thesis I referred to Moss, Clark and Kjørholt (2005) who argue that we live in a period where children's participation and voices are emphasized within a discourse of choice, autonomy and citizenship, while at the same time children's lives are governed more than ever through technologies of normalization (p. 12). This argument has been supported through the thesis. Thus, the thesis points out many dilemmas and ambivalences that stems from an unclarified position of children as simultaneously people that exist here and now, while also being future citizens. While children are theoretically and ideologically emphasized as here-and-now beings who should "have a say", mealtime is much characterized by societal, moral values related to what children should become.

However, contrary to much research, the thesis does not place this tension in a child / adult dichotomy. Rather, it argues that the emphasis on children as future beings stems from overall discursive and material perspectives in which the eaters navigate differently. If we seriously wish to change the dynamics between the here-and-now and future perspectives, we need to address these issues on a societal level and develop conceptual tools that enables the pedagogical staff in the local day care facilities to ground mealtime in a reflexive pedagogy that takes the here-and-now aspect of children seriously. According to the analysis presented in this thesis, this involves concepts that supports the idea that the bodily experience of eating is a legitimate motivation for eating or not eating, as well as concepts that enables togetherness and

conversation as legitimate mealtime goods. Thus, this thesis supports the idea that we need to strengthen our knowledge about those aspects of mealtime that is not about development of skills, embodiment of proper codes of conduct, or construction of healthy bodies with healthy eating habits.

The thesis has suggested some perspectives to look from, but it does no way near exhaust the area of mealtime as a topic of research. With regards to the development of conceptual tools that enables us to speak more explicitly about the overall goods and bads in mealtime and strengthen our knowledge of mealtime as a situation of here-and-now being, it would be helpful to know more about an aesthetic perspective of mealtime. This includes a deeper knowledge of the material elements and their relationships to the eaters. Thus, aesthetics is not much studied in relation to kindergarten meals; however, this might be one way of approaching the here-and-now aspect of the mealtime. Concepts such as cooking and hosting could also provide interesting approaches to explore mealtime, which could challenge and supplement the heavy role of nutrition in everyday meals, as well as in research- and development projects. How to exert a greater emphasis on curiosity and playfulness in the meals, without creating uncomfortably chaotic mealtime situation is another interesting research question.

Thus, research that wish to continue some of the points addressed in this thesis might examine the social dynamics of mealtime through concepts such hosting, playfulness and aesthetics, as well as continue to explore how different kinds of good and bad are legitimized. This would supplement the current focus of goods and bads as defined through nutrition, self-reliance and table manners, as discussed in the papers.

PART 3. THE PAPERS

This final part of the thesis contains the papers that present the different analytical findings of the doctoral research project.

The papers are left out in this version due to copyright.

LITERATURE LIST

Aarsand, P. & Forsberg L. (2010). Producing Children's Corporal Privacy: Ethnographic Video Recording as Material - Discursive Practice. Qualitative Research, 10(2), 1-20.

Abbots, E.-J., & A. Lavis (2013). Introduction: Contours of Eating: Mapping the Terrain of Body/Food Encounters. In E.-J. Abbots & A. Lavis (Eds.), Critical Food Studies: Why We Eat, How We Eat: Contemporary Encounters between Foods and Bodies (pp. 1-12). Farnham, GBR: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Alanen, L. (2001). Explorations in generational analysis. In L. Alanen & B. Mayall (Eds.), Conceptualizing child-adult relations (pp. 11-22). London: Routledge Falmer.

Alanen, L. (2015). Are we all constructionists now? Childhood, 22(2), 149–153.

Alcock, S. (2007). Playing with rules around routines: children making mealtimes meaningful and enjoyable. Early Years: An International Journal of Research and Development, 27(3), 281-293.

Alderson, P. (2007). Competent children? Minors' consent to health care treatment and research. Social Science & Medicine 65, 2272–2283.

Antonovsky, A. (1996). The salutogenic model as a theory to guide health promotion. Health promotion international, 11(1), 11-18.

Armstrong, D. (2009). Origins of the problem of health-related behaviours: A genealogical study. Social studies of science, 39(6), 909-926.

Asad, T. (2000). Agency and pain: An exploration. Culture and Religion: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 1(1), 29-60.

Barad, K. (2008). Posthumanist Performativity: Towards an understanding of how matter comes to matter. In S. Alaimo & S.J. Hekman (Eds.), Material Feminisms (pp. 120–154). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Becker, H. S. (1967). Whose side are we on? Social problems, 14(3), 239-247.

Bergström, K., Brembeck, H., Jonsson, L., & Shanahan, H. (2012). Children and Taste: Guiding Foodservice. Journal of Foodservice Business Research, 15(1), 84-100.

Bhatia, S. & Ram, A. (2004). Culture, hybridity, and the dialogical self: Cases from the South Asian diaspora. Mind, culture, and activity, 11(3), 224-240.

Bordonaro, L. I. & Payne, R. (2012). Ambiguous agency: critical perspectives on social interventions with children and youth in Africa. Children's Geographies, 10(4), 365-372.

Bova, A. & Arcidiacono, F. (2014). You must eat the salad because it is nutritious''. Argumentative strategies adopted by parents and children in food-related discussions at mealtimes. Appetite 73, 81–94.

Brembeck, H. & Johansson B. (2010). Foodscapes and Children's Bodies. Culture Unbound, 2, 797–818.

Brembeck, H., Johansson, B., Bergström, K., Engelbrektsson, P., Hillén, S., Jonsson, L. , Karlsson, M. A., Ossiansson, E., & Shanahan, H. (2013). Exploring children's foodscapes. Children's Geographies, 11(1), 74-88.

Bruselius-Jensen, M. (2011). Poetiske perspektiver på det gode skolemåltid. Børns muligheder som medskabere af skolens måltider (Doctoral dissertation). Forskerskolen i Livslang Læring, Roskilde University Denmark.

Bugge, A.B. (2010). Young people's school food styles. Naughty or nice? Young 18(2), 223–243.

Bugge, A.B. & Almås, R. (2006). Domestic dinner: Representations and practices of a proper meal among young suburban mothers. Journal of Consumer Culture 6(2), 203–228.

Burke, C. (2005). "Play in Focus": Children Researching Their Own Spaces and Places for Play. Children, Youth and Environments 15(1), 27-53.

Burke, C. (2008). 'Play in focus' - Children's visual voice in participative research. In P. Thomson (Ed.), Doing visual research with children and young people. Routlegde, Oxon.

Burridge, J. (2009). 'I don't care if it does me good, I like it': Childhood, health and enjoyment in British women's magazine food advertising. In A. James, A. T. Kjørholt & V. Tingstad (Eds.), Children, food and identity in everyday life (pp. 192-212). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Burrows, L. & Wright, J. (2007). Prescribing Practices: Shaping Healthy Children in Schools. International Journal of Children's Rights 15, 83–98.

Cairns, K. (2009). A future to voice? Continuing debates in feminist research with youth. Gender and Education, 21(3), 321-335.

Chamberlain, K. (2004). Food and Health: Expanding the Agenda for Health Psychology. Journal of Health Psychology, 9(4), 467–481.

Christensen, P. (2003). Børn, mad og daglige rutiner [Children, food and daily routines]. Barn 2-3, 119-137.

Christensen, P. (2004). Children's Participation in Ethnographic Research: Issues of Power and Representation. Children and society, 18, 165–176

Christensen, P., & James, A. (2000). Childhood diversity and commonality. In P. Christensen & A. James (Eds.), Research with children – Perspectives and practices (pp. 160-178). London: Falmer Press.

Cinotto, S. (2006). "Everyone Would Be Around the table": American Family Mealtimes in Historical Perspective, 1850–1960. New directions for child and adolescent development, 111, 17-34.

Clark, C. D. (1999). The Autodriven interview: A photographic viewfinder into children' experience. Visual Sociology, 14(1), 39-50.

Clark, A., & Moss, P. (2001). Listening to young children. The mosaic approach. London: National Children's Bureau.

Clarke, A. E. (2003). Situational analyses: Grounded theory mapping after the postmodern turn. Symbolic Interaction, 26, 553-576.

Clarke, A. E. (2005). Situational Analysis – Grounded Theory After the Postmodern Turn. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Cohn, S. (2013). Interlude. Eating practices and health behavior. In E.J. Abbots & A. Lavis (Eds.), Why we eat, how we eat. Contemporary encounters between foods and bodies (pp. 75-84). Farnham: Ashgate.

Cook, T. & Hess, E. (2007). What the Camera Sees and from Whose Perspective: Fun methodologies for engaging children in enlightening adults. Childhood 14(29), 29-45.

Coveney, J. (1999). The science and spirituality of nutrition. Critical Public Health, 9(1), 23-37.

Dagtilbudsloven § 32, Bekendtgørelse af lov om dag-, fritids- og klubtilbud m.v. til børn og unge. Retrieved at https://www.retsinformation.dk/forms/r0710.aspx?id=168340#Kap5

Danish Social Science Research Council (2002). Vejledende Retningslinier for Forskningsetik i Samfundsvidenskaberne (Ethical guidelines for research in the social sciences). Retrieved from http://ufm.dk/publikationer/2002/filer-2002/ssf-etik.pdf

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia. London: Athlone Press.

Dolphijn, R. (2004). Foodscapes: Towards a Deleuzian Ethics of Consumption. Delft: Eburon.

Dotson, H. M., Vaquera, E. & Argeseanu, S. (2015). Sandwiches and subversion: Teachers' mealtime strategies and preschoolers' agency. Childhood, 22(3), 362–376.

Douglas, M. (1972). Deciphering a Meal. Daedalus, 101(1), 61-81.

Eide, B. J. & Winger, N. (2005). From the children's point of view: methodological and ethical challenges. In A. Clark, A.T. Kjørholt & P. Moss (Eds.), Beyond listening. Children's perspectives on early childhood services (pp. 71-90). Bristol: The Policy Press.

Einarsdottir, J., Purola, A-M., Johansson, E. M., Broström, S. & Emilson, A. (2015). Democracy, caring and competence: values perspectives in ECEC curricula in the Nordic countries. International Journal of Early Years Education, 23(1), 97-114.

Eldén, S. (2013). Inviting the messy: Drawing methods and 'children's voices'. Childhood, 20, 66-81.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I. & Shaw, L. L. (1995). Writing ethnographic filednotes (1st ed.). Chicago: The university of Chicago press.

EURYDICE (2006). Denmark. In National summary sheets on educational systems in Europe and ongoing reforms. European Commission. Retrieved from http://eng.uvm.dk/~/media/UVM/Filer/English/PDF/081110_summary_sheet_on_danish_education_system.pdf

Evans, J., Davies, B., & Rich, E. (2008). The class and cultural functions of obesity discourse: Our latter day child saving movement. International Studies in Sociology of Education, 18(2), 117 - 132.

Fischler, C. (2011). Commensality, society and culture. Social Science Information 50(3–4), 528–548.

Fosket, J. R. (2002). Breast cancer risk and the politics of prevention: Analysis of a clinical trial. Doctoral dissertation in Sociology, University of California, San Fransisco.

Freeman, M. (2007). Why It Remains Important to Take Children's Rights Seriously. International Journal of Children's Rights 15, 5–23.

Frida project description (2010). Unpublished. Aalborg University Copenhagen.

Fødevarestyrelsen (n.d). Anbefalinger for frokostmåltidets ernæringsmæssige kvalitet til børn i daginstitutioner. Retrieved from http://altomkost.dk/publikationer/publikation/pub/hent-fil/publication/anbefalinger-for-frokostmaaltidets-ernaeringsmaessige-kvalitet-til-boern-i-daginstitutioner/

Gallagher, M. (2008). 'Power is not an evil': rethinking power in participatory methods. Children's Geographies, 6(2), 137-150.

Gallacher, L. A., & Gallagher, M. (2008). Methodological immaturity in childhood research? Thinking through 'participatory methods'. Childhood, 15, 499-516.

Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In Geertz, C. The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays. New York: Basic books.

Gibson, K. E. & Dempsey, S. E. (2015). Make good choices, kid: biopolitics of children's bodies and school lunch reform in Jamie Oliver's Food Revolution. Children's Geographies, 13(1), 44-58.

Gilliam, L. & Gulløv, E. (2014). Making children 'social': Civilising institutions in the Danish welfare state. , Human figurations, 3(1),

Grignon C. (2001). Commensality and Social Morphology : An Essay of Typology. In P. Scholliers (ed.), Food, Drink and Identity : Cooking, Eating and Drinking in Europe since the Middle Ages (pp.23-33). Oxford: Berg.

Grosz, E. (1994). Volatile Bodies: Toward a corporeal feminism. Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin.

Gubbels, J. S., Kremers, S. P. J., Stafleu, A., Dagnelie, P. C., Vries, N. K. & Thijs, C. (2010). Child-care environment and dietary intake of 2- and 3-year-old children. Journal of Human Nutrition and diet, 23, 97–101.

Gulløv, E. (1998). Børn i fokus : et antropologisk studie af betydningsdannelse blandt børnehavebørn. (Doctoral thesis, University of Copenhagen, Denmark).

Gulløv, E. (2011). Welfare and Self Care: Institutionalized Visions for a Food Life in Danish Day-Care Centres. Anthropology in Action, 18(3), 21–32.

Gulløv, E. & Højlund, S. (2003). Feltarbejde blandt børn : metodologi og etik i etnografisk børneforskning. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Gunson, J.S., Warin, M., Zivkovic, T., & Moore, V. (2014). Participant Observation in Obesity Research with Children: Striated and Smooth Spaces.' Children's Geographies, 1–15.

Harbers, H., Mol A. & Stollmeyer, A. (2002). Food Matters: Arguments for an Ethnography of Daily Care. Theory, Culture & Society, 19(5/6), 207–226

Haden, R. (2006). "Pandora's Lunchbox". On Esthetic Education, Children, and Food. Food, culture and society, 9(3), 265–274.

Harper, D. (2002). Talking about pictures – A case for photo elicitation. Visual Studies, 17, 13-26.

Hart, R. (1992). Children's participation: From tokenism to citizenship (Innocenti Essays, no. 4). Florence: UNICEF International Child Development Centre. Retrieved from http://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/childrens_participation.pdf

Heyn, M., Lassen, A. D., Christensen, L. M., & Sabinsky, M. (2011). Evaluering af den ernæringsmæssige kvalitet af madordninger i daginstitutioner. DTU Fødevareinstituttet. Denmark.

Hendy, H. M (1999). Comparison of five teacher actions to encourage children's new food acceptance. Annals of behavioral medicine 21(1), 20-26.

Holland, E. W. (2013). Deleuze and Guattari's A Thousand Plateaus. Readers Guide. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Holland, S., Renold, E., Ross, N. J. & Hillman, A. (2010). Power, agency and participatory agendas: A critical exploration of young people's engagement in participative qualitative research. Childhood, 17(3), 360–375.

Holm, L. (2001). Family Meals. In U. Kjaernes (Ed.), Eating patterns: A day in the lives of Nordic peoples, National Institute for Consumer Research (pp. 199–212). Norway: National institute for consumer research.

Hughes, S. O., Patrick, H., Power, T. G., Fisher, J. O., Anderson, C. B., & Nicklas, T. A. (2007). The impact of child care providers' feeding on children's food consumption. Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics 28, 100–107.

Hunleth, J. (2011). Beyond on or with: Questioning power dynamics and knowledge production in 'child-oriented' research methodology. Childhood, 18, 81-93.

Høyer, K. (2012). Hvad er teori, og hvordan forholder teori sig til metode? In S. Vallgårda & L. Koch (Eds.), Forskningsmetoder i folkesundhedsvidenskab (4th ed., pp. 17-41). Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

Iversen, J. D., & Sabinsky, M. (2011). En undersøgelse af mad- og måltidskulturen i daginstitutioner med forskellige madordninger [An Examination of Food- and Mealculture in Daycare Institutions with Different Meal Scheme Arrangements.] Søborg: DTU Fødevareinstituttet.

James, A. (1996). Learning to be Friends. Methodological Lessons from Participant Observation among English Schoolchildren. Childhood, 3, 313-330.

James, A. (2007). Giving voice to children's voices: Practices and problems, pitfalls and potentials. American Anthropologist, 109, 261-272.

James, A. & James, A. (2008). Key concepts in childhood studies. London: Sage Publications.

James, A., Jenks, C., & Prout, A. (1998). Theorizing Childhood. Cambridge: Polity Press.

James, A., Kjørholt, A. T. & Tingstad, V. (2009). Introduction: Children, Food and Identity in Everyday Life. In A. James, A. T. Kjørholt, & V. Tingstad (Eds.), Children, Food and Identity in Everyday Life (pp. 1–13). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Järvinen, M. & Mik-Meyer, N. (2005). Kvalitative metoder i et interaktionistisk perspektiv – Interview, observationer og dokumenter. Copenhagen: Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Jenks, C. (2001). The Pacing and Timing of Children's Bodies. In K. Hultqvist & G. Dahlberg (Eds.). Governing the Child in the New Millennium (pp. 68–84). New York: Routledge Falmer.

Johansson, B. (2012). Doing adulthood in childhood research. Childhood, 19, 101-114.

Kampmann, J. (2002). "Spisesituationen" i Daginstitutionen. Dansk Pædagogisk Tidsskrift, 1, 36–42.

Kampmann, J. (2013). Societalisation of early childhood education and services. European Early Childhood Education Research Journal 21(1), 1-4.

Kampmann, J., & Nielsen, H. W. (2004). Socialized Childhood: Children's Childhoods in Denmark. In A. M. Jensen, A. Ben-Arieh, C. Conti, D. Kutsar, M. N. G. Phádraig, & H. W. Nielsen (Eds.), Children's Welfare in Ageing Europe, Vol II, (pp. 649–702). Trondheim: Norwegian Centre for Child Research.

Kaplan, E. B. (2000). Using Food as a Metaphor for Care: Middle-School Kids Talk about Family, School, and Class Relationships. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 29, 474-509.

Karrebæk, M. S. (2013). Lasagna for Breakfast. The respectable child and cultural norms of eating practices in a Danish kindergarten classroom. Food, culture & and society 16(1), 85-106.

Komulainen, S. (2007). The ambiguity of the child's 'voice' in social research. Childhood, 14, 11-28.

Langston, A., Abbott, L., Lewis, W. & Kellet, M. (2004). Early Childhood. In S. Fraser, V. Lewis, S. Ding, M. Kellet & C. Robinson (Eds.), Doing research with children and young people. Sage Publications.

Lather, P. (1992). Postmodernism and the human sciences. In S. Kvale (ed.), Psychology and postmodernism (pp. 88-110). London: Sage publications.

Lather, P. (1993). Fertile obsession: Validity after poststructuralism. The sociological quarterly, 34(4), 673-693.

Lee, N., (2001). Childhood and society: growing up in an age of uncertainty. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Lomax, H. (2012). Contested voices? Methodological tensions in creative visual research with children. International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 15, 105-117.

Lomax, H. & Casey, N. (1998). Recording Social Life: Reflexivity and Video Methodology. Sociological Research Online 3(2). Retrieved 11.09.15 at <http://www.socresonline.org.uk.zorac.aub.aau.dk/3/2/1.html>

Ludvigsen, A. & Scott, S. (2009). Real Kids Don't Eat Quiche. What food means to children. Food, culture & society 12(4), 417-436.

Lupton, D. (1996). Food, the Body and the Self. London: Sage Publications.

MacLure, M. (2013) Researching without representation? Language and materiality in post-qualitative methodology. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26(6), 658-667.

Mahmood, S. (2001). Feminist Theory, Embodiment, and the Docile Agent: Some Reflections on the Egyptian Islamic Revival. Cultural Anthropology 16(2), 202–236.

Marshall, D. (2005). Food as Ritual, Routine or Convention. Consumption Markets & Culture, 8(1), 69–85.

Martin, A. D. & Kamberelis, G. (2013) Mapping not tracing: qualitative educational research with political teeth. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26(6), 668-679.

Martins, Y. (2006). Dietary Experiences and Food Acceptance Patterns from Infancy through Early Childhood. Food, Culture & Society, 9(3), 287-298.

Mazzei, L.A. (2010). Thinking data with Deleuze. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 23(5), 511-523.

Mazzei, L.A. (2013). A voice without organs: interviewing in posthumanist research. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education 26(6), 732-740.

McCarry, M. (2012). Who benefits? A critical reflection of children and young people's participation in sensitive research. International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 15, 55-68.

McIntosh, I., Emond, R., & Punch, S. (2010). Discussant piece: food and schools. Children's Geographies, 8(3), 289-290.

Metcalfe, A., Owen, J., Shipton, G., & Dryden, C. (2008). Inside and outside the school lunchbox: themes and reflections. Children's Geographies, 6(4), 403–412.

Metcalfe, A., Riley, M., Barr, S., Tudor, T., Robinson, G., & Guilbert, S. (2013). Food Waste Bins: Bridging Infrastructures and Practices. The Sociological Review 60(2), 135–155.

Mikkelsen, M., Husby, S., Skov, L. R. & Perez-Cueto, F. J. A. (2014). A systematic review of types of healthy eating interventions in preschools. Nutrition Journal, 13(1), article 56.

Miller, T. & Boulton, M. (2007). Changing constructions of informed consent: Qualitative research and complex social worlds. Social Science & Medicine, 65(11), 2199–2211.

Mita, S. C., Gray, S. A., & Goodell, L. S. (2015). An explanatory framework of teachers' perceptions of a positive mealtime environment in a preschool setting. Appetite, 90, 37–44.

Mogharreban, C. & Nahikian-Nelms, M. (1996). Autonomy at Mealtime: Building Healthy Food Preferences and Eating Behaviors in Young Children. Early Childhood Education Journal, 24(1), 29-32.

Mol, A. (2008) I eat an apple. On theorizing subjectivities. Subjectivity 22, 28–37.

Mol, A. (2010). Care and its values. Good food in the nursing home. In: A. Mol, I. Moser & J. Pols (Eds). Care in practice. On tinkering in clinics, homes and farms (pp. 215-234). Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.

Mol, A. (2013). Mind your plate! The ontonorms of Dutch dieting. Social Studies of Science, 43(3), 379 – 396.

Mol, A., Moser, I., Piras, E. M., Turrini, M., Pols, J., & Zanutto, A. (2010). Care In Practice. On Normativity, Concepts and Boundaries. Tecnoscienza. Italian Journal of Science & Technology Studies, 2(1), 73-86.

Mol, A., Moser, I., & Pols, J. (2010). Care: Putting Practice into Theory. In A. Mol, I. Moser, & J. Pols (Eds.), Care in Practice: On Tinkering in Clinics, Homes and Farms, (pp. 7-26). Bielefield: Transcript-Verlag.

Moss, P. (2000). Workforce issues in early childhood education and care. (No. 1). New York: Institute of Education University of London.

Moss, P., Clark, A. & Kjørholt, A. T. (2005). Introduction. In A. Clark, A.T. Kjørholt & P. Moss (Eds.), Beyond listening. Children's perspectives on early childhood services (pp. 1-16). Bristol: The Policy Press.

Murcott, A. (1982). On the social significance of the 'cooked dinner' in South Wales. Social science information, 21(4/5), 677-696.

Murcott, A. (2000). Understanding life-style and food use: contributions from the social sciences. British Medical Bulletin, 56(1), 121-132.

Murcott, A. (2012). Lamenting the "Decline of the Family Meal" as a Moral Panic ? Methodological Reflections. Recherches sociologiques et anthropologiques, 43(1), 97-118.

Nicolini, D. (2009): Zooming in and zooming out: A package of method and theory to study work practices. In S. Ybema, D. Yanow, H. Wels & F. Kamsteeg (Eds.), Organizational Ethnography. Studying the Complexities of Everyday Life (pp. 120-138). London: SAGE.

O'Connell, R. (2010). (How) Is Childminding Family Like? Family Day Care, Food and the Reproduction of Identity at the Public/Private Interfacesore. The Sociological Review, 58(4), 563-586.

Ochs, E. & Shohet, M. (2006). The Cultural Structuring of Mealtime Socialization. New directions for child and adolescent development, 111, 35-49.

Odense Kommune (2015). Frokostordning, Lovgivning. Retrieved from: http://www.odense.dk/borger/familie%20boern%20og%20unge/pasning/borneinstit utioner/frokostordning/lovgivning

Olwig, K. F. (2011). Children's Sociality. The Civilizing Project in the Danish Kindergarten. Social Analysis, 55(2), 121–141.

Osowski, C. P., Göranzon, H., & Fjellström, C. (2013). Teachers' Interaction With Children in the School Meal Situation: The Example of Pedagogic Meals in Sweden. Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior, 45(5), 420-427.

Palludan, C. (2005). Børnehaven gør en forskel (Del 4, pp. 185-219). Århus: Danmarks Pædagogiske Universitets Forlag.

Pike, J. (2008). Foucault, space and primary school dining rooms. Children's Geographies, 6(4), 413-422.

Plows, V. (2012). Conflict and coexistence: Challenging interactions, expressions of agency and ways of relating in work with young people in the minority world. Children's Geographies, 10, 279-291.

Pontecorvo, C. & Fasulo, A. (1999). Planning a typical Italian meal: A family reflection on culture. Culture & Psychology, 5, 313-336.

Prout, A. (1999). Childhood bodies: Construction, agency and hybridity. In A. Prout (Ed.), Body, Childhood & Society (pp. 1-18). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Prout, A. (2000). Children's Participation: Control and Self-realisation in British Late Modernity. Children & society 14, 304–315.

Prout, A. (2011). Taking a Step Away from Modernity: reconsidering the new sociology of childhood. Global Studies of Childhood 1(1), 4-14.

Prout, A. & James, A. (1997). A new paradigm for the sociology of childhood? Provenance, promise and problems. In A. James & A. Prout (Eds.), Constructing and reconstructing childhood (2nd ed., chapter 1). Oxon: Routledge.

Qvortrup, J. (1994). Childhood matters: an introduction. In J. Qvortrup, M. Bardy, G. Sgritta & H. Wintersberger (Eds.), Childhood matters: social theory, practice and politics (pp. 1–24). Aldershot: Avebury.

Ramsay, S. A., Branen, L. J., Fletche,r J., Price, E., Johnson, S. L. & Sigman-Grant, M. (2010). ''Are you done?'' Child Care Providers' Verbal Communication at Mealtimes That Reinforce or Hinder Children's Internal Cues of Hunger and Satiation. Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior 42(4), 265-270.

Rasmussen, K. (1999). Om fotografering og fotografi som forskningsstrategi i barndomsforskning (Employing photography and photos in research on childhood). Dansk sociologi, 10(1), 63–78.

Rautio, P. (2014). Mingling and imitating in producing spaces for knowing and being: Insights from a Finnish study of child-matter intra-action. Childhood, 21(4), 461-474.

Reuter, S. (2002). Doing agoraphobia(s): a material-discursive understanding of diseased bodies. Sociology of Health & Illness, 24(6), 750–770.

Ristovski-Slijepcevic, S., Chapman G. E., & Beagan B. L. (2008). Engaging with healthy eating discourse(s): Ways of knowing about food and health in three ethnocultural groups in Canada. Appetite, 50, 167–178.

Rolfe, G. (2006). Judgements without rules: towards a postmodern ironist concept of research validity. Nursing Inquiry, 13, 7–15

Rossholt, N. (2012). Food as Touch/Touching the Food: The Body In-Place and Out-of-Place in Preschool. Educational Philosophy and Theory, 44(3), 323–334.

Sabinsky, M. S. (2007). Statusundersøgelse om madordninger og mad- og bevægelsespolitikker i dagtilbud og på skoler. Søborg: Fødevareinstituttet DTU.

Sepp, H., Abrahamsson, L. & Fjellström, C. (2006). Pre-school staffs' attitudes toward foods in relation to the pedagogic meal. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 3(2), 224–232.

Simmel, G. (1997 [1910]). The sociology of the meal? In D. Frisby & M. Featherstone (Eds.), Simmel on Culture: Selected Writings (pp. 130–136). London: Sage.

Singer, E. (2005). The Liberation of the Child: A Recurrent Theme in the History of Education in Western Societies. Early Child Development and Care, 175(6), 611-620.

Sobal, J. & Nelson, M. K. (2003). Commensal eating patterns: a community study. Appetite, 41, 181–190.

Sommer, D., Samuelsson, I. P. & Hundeide, K. (2013). Early childhood care and education: A child perspective paradigm. European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 21(4), 459-475.

Sparrman, A. & Lindgren, A. L. (2010). Visual Documentation as a Normalizing Practice: A New Discourse of Visibility in Preschool. Surveillance & Society 7(3/4), 248-261.

Spyrou, S. (2011). The limits of children's voices: From authenticity to critical, reflexive representation. Childhood, 18, 151-165.

Stratigos, T., Sumsion, J., & Bradley, B. (2013). Infants in Family Day Care: Stories of Smooth and Striated Space. Global Studies of Childhood, 3(3), 265–275.

Sørensen, Karsten (n.d.). Evaluering af projekt sund mad i dagtilbud. University College Syd. Retrieved from http://kosmos.ucsyd.dk/fileadmin/user_upload/publikationer/evaluering_Hedensted _kommune_2009.pdf

Taines, C. (2014). Educators and youth activists: A negotiation over enhancing students' role in school life. Journal of Educational Change, 15, 153-178.

Teague, L. (2014). Subjectivity, Agency and Political Pedagogy in the Primary School. Global Studies of Childhood, 4(1), 3-10.

Thomson, P. (2008). Children and young people: voices in visual research. In P. Thomson (Ed.), Doing visual research with children and young people (pp. 1-20). Oxon: Routledge.

Tisdall, E. K. M. & Punch, S. (2012). Not so 'new'? Looking critically at childhood studies. Children's Geographies, 10(3), 249-264.

Turner, S., Mayall, B. & Mauthner, M. (1995). One big rush: dinner-time at school. Health education journal, 54, 18-27.

Uprichard, E. (2008). Children as "Being and Becomings": Children, Childhood and Temporality. Children & Society, 22, 303–313.

Warming, H. (2003). The quality of life from a child's perspective. International Journal of Public Administration, 26, 815-829.

Warming, H. (2005). Erkendelse gennem oplevelse. In M. Järvinen & N. Mik-Meyer (Eds.), Kvalitative metoder i et interaktionistisk perspektiv (pp. 145-168). Copenhagen: Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Warming, H. (2011). Getting under their skins? Accessing young children's perspectives through ethnographic fieldwork. Childhood, 18, 39-53.

Welch, R., McMahon, S. & Wright, J. (2012). The medicalization of food pedagogies in primary schools and popular culture: a case for awakening subjugated knowledges. Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 33(5), 713-728.

Wesslén, A., Sepp, H. & Fjellström, C. (2002). Swedish preschool children's experience of food. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 26, 264–271.

Wiggins, S. (2001). Construction and Action in Food Evaluation : Conversational Data. Journal of Language and Social Psychology 20, 445-463.

Wiggins, S. (2004). Talking about taste. Using a discursive psychological approach to examine challenges to food evaluations. Appetite, 43(1), 29–38.

Wiggins, S. (2013). The social life of 'eugh'. Disgust as assessment in family mealtimes. British Journal of Social Psychology, 52(3), 489–509.

Wyness, M. G. (1999). Contesting Childhood. London: Falmer Press.

Wyness, M. G. (2000). Childhood, agency and education reform. In M. Wyness, Contesting Childhood, London, GBR: Falmer Press.

Wyness, M. (2013). Children's participation and intergenerational dialogue: Bringing adults back into the analysis. Childhood, 20, 429-442.

Youdell, D., & Armstrong, F. (2011). A Politics Beyond Subjects: The Affective Choreographies and Smooth Spaces of Schooling. Emotion, Space and Society, 4, 144–150.

Young, L. & Barrett, H. (2001). Adapting visual methods: action research with Kampala street children. Area, 33(2), 141–152.

APPENDICES

A. Interview guides (adults)
B. Picture of eating
C. Pictures of moods
D. Statement of consent

'SIT STILL!' 'BE QUIET!' 'AND LET'S ENJOY A NICE MEAL TOGETHER…'

Appendix A. Interview guides

The following is a reconstructed version of the interview guides used for interviews with different categories of adults. Thus, I have not enclosed versions of each exact guide, but instead translated the four standardized versions that functioned as basic drafts for interviews with pedagogical staff, daily managers, kitchen staff and parents respectively. These standardized versions were adjusted to each interview. Furthermore, the interview guides only functioned as suggestions of structure and content, thus in the practical interviews, the order and phrasing of questions did not follow the guide slavishly, just like some question would not be asked, while new ones would be formulated in the situation.

Basic interview guide, pedagogical staff.

What is your position and for how long have you been employed in this position?

Part one: the meal scheme arrangement / organisation of lunch

Please describe your role in relation to the meal scheme arrangement

- Do you have an influence on what kind of food is served?

Do you experience any problems in relation to the organization of lunch?

How do you experience the cooperation with the kitchen staff?

- How is the food handed over to you?

Are there any disagreements amongst the staff group in relation to the organisation of lunch?

How do you experience the parent's reaction to the meal scheme arrangement?

- Is it something they ask about?

What is the children's role in relation to the meal scheme arrangement /organization of lunch?

In your professional life – have you experienced any other ways of organising mealtime?

- Lunch packs?

Reflect on what it means to mealtime that lunch is organised the way it is

Is there anything you would like to change about the organisation of lunch?

How would lunch be organised if you had unlimited resources?

Part two: mealtime

Please describe mealtime as it is practiced currently

What is your role during mealtime?

What is the role of the children?

Which rules apply to mealtime? And why?

Do you talk about mealtime in the staff group?

- Which themes / issues?
- Disagreements?

Could you reflect on why you practice mealtime this way – what does the practice originate in?

- professional arguments / reflections?

Do you experience any challenges?

What are the best things about mealtime as it is now?

Is there anything you would like to change?

A section here where I ask about issues specific to the institution based on preliminary analysis,

thoughts and wonderings.

Part three: imagine being a child during mealtime

How do you think that children experience mealtime?

What do you think they like about mealtime the most?

What do you think they dislike the most?

Do you think that mealtime is an important time of day?

What is a good lunch scheme arrangement to children?

Basic interview guide: Daily managers

What is your position and for how long have you been employed in this position?

Part one: the meal scheme arrangement / organization of lunch

What is your role in relation to the organisation of lunch?

- Which values/issues do you emphasise the most?
- Do you look for inspiration?

What the municipal framework for the organization of lunch?

The history

For how long have you had a lunch scheme arrangement??

Were you employed when the lunch scheme arrangement was implemented?

- If so: were there any challenges related to the start-up?

Any major changes in the way lunch is organised?

Has anything surprised you in relation to the lunch scheme arrangement?

The present

Please describe the lunch scheme arrangement as it is organised presently

Do you discuss the lunch scheme arrangement in the staff group?

- Which issues?
- Any disagreements?
- Any changes in the topics and issues of discussion?

What are the two best things about the way that lunch is organized?

And the two worst?

Do you have any unfulfilled ambitions in relation to the lunch scheme arrangement?

A section here where I ask about issues specific to the institution based on preliminary analysis, thoughts and wonderings

How would lunch be organised if you had unlimited resources?

Part two: mealtime

What is your role in relation to mealtime?

- What do you emphasise?
- Are you practically involved in the everyday meals?

What are the aims of mealtime?

How is mealtime related to the pedagogical work in general?

Do you integrate food and meals into the remaining pedagogical work, such as the nursery curriculum?

What should the children gain from participating in mealtime?

Do you discuss mealtime in the staff group – what do you discuss?

Any current challenges in relation to mealtime?

How do you think the pedagogical staff experiences mealtime?

How do you think children experience mealtime?

Which guidelines do you have in relation to the adult's role during mealtime?

- Do they eat the served food
- Any guidelines on how they relate to the served food (taste, talk about etc)

Try to remember the time before you implemented a lunch scheme arrangement – could you then reflect on the most important changes this caused in relation to mealtime?

- Has the atmosphere changed?

Basic interviewguide: Kitchen staff

Please shortly describe your position (tasks, hours etc.)

What is your educational background?

The lunch scheme arrangement and work in the kitchen

What is your role in relation to the lunch scheme arrangement?

How do you plan the menus? (values, practical issues ets)

Has anything surprised you about the lunch scheme arrangement?

Do you experience any problems in the way lunch is organized? Including the preparation

A section here where I ask about issues specific to the institution, based on preliminary analysis, thoughts and wonderings

What are the strengths and weaknesses of the system?

Cooperation

How do you experience the cooperation with the rest of the staff group?

- Do they show interest in your work and the lunch scheme arrangement?
    - Do they ask questions?
    - What about?

- Do they support your work?
- Are there any disagreements among the staff about the lunch scheme arrangement?

How do you experience the parent's reaction to the lunch scheme arrangement?

- Do they ask about it
- What are the subjects?

Involvement of children

Do the children show interest in the food and in the cooking?

Are children present in the kitchen – how, rules etc? [in Danish: Færdes børnene I køkkenet – hvordan]

Do children participate in meal preparation?

- tasks?
- Challenges
- Children's reactions

Why / why not?

Mealtime

What is your role in relation to mealtime? Do you eat with the children and pedagogical staff?

What is the purpose of the meal? What should children gain?

Do you talk about mealtime in the staff group – which issues?

Do you experience any challenges in relation to mealtime?

How do you experience the children's attitudes towards the food?

- Are they eager to taste and eat
- pickiness
- Do they ask questions about the food – which issues?

What is your thoughts about the pedagogical staff's role during mealtime?

- Should they eat the served food along with children?
- How do they relate to the served food? (rolemodels, talking with children about food etc)

Part three: imagine being a child during mealtime

How do you think that children experience mealtime?

What do you think they like about mealtime the most?

What do you think they dislike the most?

Do you think that mealtime is an important time of day?

What is a good lunch scheme arrangement to children?

Basic interview guide: Parents

Could you please state the names of yourself and your child?

Part one: the present

Could you describe mealtime as it is practiced currently?

What are the good things about mealtime?

Is there anything you would like to be done otherwise?

Do you think that there is a great difference between the way mealtime is practiced here and at home?

Part two: future – implementation of the lunch scheme arrangement

What are your thoughts about the coming lunch scheme arrangement?

What do you look forward to?

What do you dread / worry about?

What do you wish of the lunch scheme arrangement?

Do you think you are going to have any influence on the lunch scheme arrangement and do you wish to have an influence?

Will the children eat healthier food for lunch?

How do you experience the staff's attitudes towards the lunch scheme arrangement?

There are children of many different ethnic and cultural backgrounds in Slåenhaven – how will

that influence the lunch scheme arrangement?

What are your thoughts about pickiness in relation to the lunch scheme arrangement?

How did you experience the process of voting?

What are your thoughts about the requirement to use organics?

Part three: imagine being a child during mealtime

Do you think that mealtime is an important time of day for your child?

Is it something they look forward to or something they dread/worry about?

How do you think that your child is going to experience the lunch scheme arrangement?

What will your child experience as the best thing?

And the worst?

What is a good lunch scheme arrangement to your child?

'SIT STILL!' 'BE QUIET!' 'AND LET'S ENJOY A NICE MEAL TOGETHER…'

Appendix C. 'Different ways of eating in daycare facilities'

Appendix D. Pictures of 'moods'

Appendix E. Translated version of statement of consent

Statement of consent – used in the kindergartens 'Slåenhaven' and 'Krogården'

Dear parent

The kindergarten [name of kindergarten] and Aalborg University have entered into a cooperation about the research project, FRIDA - lunch scheme arrangements in daycare facilities. The FRIDA project is divided into three subprojects, of which your kindergarten participates in one, which examines children's, parent's and staff's perspectives on food and eating in the kindergarten. The aim is to point to potential ways of working with food and eating in kindergartens that creates joy and pleasure among children and adults, and enhances the desire to eat new, exciting and healthy food. The FRIDA project is financially supported by Nordea Fonden and is managed by Professor Bent Egberg Mikkelsen of Food & People, Aalborg University, Copenhagen. The subproject in which [name of kindergarten] participates is carried out by PhD student Stine Hansen with help from pedagogue student xx. More information about the project can be retrieved at: http://www.frida.plan.aau.dk/.

As a means to examine how your children experience mealtime in the kindergarten, we would like to ask your permission to involve your child in the project. This includes the child's participation in different activities concerning food and eating, which takes place while the child attents kindergarten. The child is free to say no to participate at any time and will not be forced or pressured into participating in activities he/she does not wish.

Since it is important to our research to examine interactions between children and the pedagogical staff during mealtime, we will take pictures and video recordings during mealtime in the kindergarten, as

well as during other activities related to food and eating. This is done in order for us to be able to remember the situations and thereby have a profound basis for analysis. These video recordings will only be used by the researcher and will be destroyed when the project has ended.

All information will be treated according to the Danish Act on Processing of Personal Data. This means that the information you and your child provides will be treated anonymously.

However, in relation to the results of the project we hope for media coverage; furthermore, we plan to present the project and its findings in relevant forums. We therefore ask for your permission to use selected pictures and film clip publicly. These will only display children in positive situations and no one will be negatively displayed.

In the situation of shared custody, we will gather signatures from both parents.

[The following section was only included on the forms send to parents in 'Slåenhaven']. In order to gain knowledge about parent's attitudes and thoughts about mealtime and the forthcoming meal scheme arrangement, I would like to conduct an interview with those parents who are interested. This interview will take place in the kindergarten and will last approximately one hour.

For any further information, please contact the undersigned on the mail xx.

With kind regards

Stine Hansen

We kindly ask you to fill out the following and return the form to the kindergarten staff by xx the latest. Remember to sign both statements of consent.

Statement of consent: participation and permission to use pictures and film clips publicly

☐ I hereby permit that my child participates in the project "*Lunch scheme arrangements in daycare facilities*".

☐ I do <u>not</u> grant permission.

☐ I hereby permit that pictures and film clips of my child, taken in the kindergarten xx, in relation with the project "Lunch scheme arrangements in daycare facilities*"* is used publicly.

☐ I do <u>not</u> grant permission

☐ I wish myself to participate in an interview about mealtime (this is not a binding registration)

Name of the child

Kindergarten group

Parent/guardian signature

Date

Statement of consent – used in the kindergarten 'Stolpebo' (common Frida case)

Dear parent

The kindergarten Stolpebo and Aalborg University have entered into a cooperation about a multidisciplinary research project, FRIDA, lunch scheme arrangements in day care facilities, which is supported financially by Nordea Fonden. The aim of the project is to enhance knowledge about meal scheme arrangements in kindergartens, focusing on the perspectives of the different users, how design can develop and advance food-experiences, as well as which potential the meal schemes have for children's' food education and food preferences. The project is divided into three parts, which focus on the perspectives of the users, design, and pedagogical tools respectively. More information about the project can be retrieved at: http://www.frida.plan.aau.dk/.
The study in your kindergarten focuses on all three parts of the project and is performed by three PhD students, Stine Rosenlund Hansen (user perspectives), Hafdis Sunna Hermannsdottir (design) and Mette Vang Mikkelsen (pedagogical tools).

We would like to ask your permission to involve your child in the project. This includes the child's participation in different activities, concerning food and eating, as well as testing prototypes developed in the design part of the project. This will take place while the child attends kindergarten and in cooperation with the staff of Stolpebo. The child can at any time say no to participate and will not be forced or pressured into participating in activities he/she does not wish to.

Since it is important to our research to examine interactions between children and the pedagogical staff during mealtime, we will take pictures and video record during eating in the kindergarten, as well as during other activities related to food and eating. This is done in order for us to be able to remember the situations and thereby have a profound basis for analysis. These video recordings will only be used by the researcher and will be destroyed when the project has finished.

All information will be treated according to the Danish Act on Processing of Personal Data. This means that the information you and your child provides will be treated anonymously and it will not be able to identify your names and responses.

However, in relation to the results of the project we hope for media coverage; furthermore, we plan to present the project and its findings in relevant forums. We therefore ask for you permission to use selected pictures and film clip. These will always show children in positive situations and no one will be negatively displayed.
In the situation of shared custody, we will gather signatures from both parents.

For any further information, please contact the undersigned.

With kind regards

Stine Rosenlund Hansen, telephone number: xx, mail: xx
Hafdis Sunna Hermannsdottir, telephone numbe: rxx, mail: xx
Mette Vang Mikkelsen, telephone number: xx, mail: xx

We kindly ask you to fill out the following and return the form to the kindergarten staff by 20/09-12 the latest. Remember to sign both statements of consent.

Statement of consent:

I hereby grant permission to my child's participation in the project: "Lunch scheme arrangements in daycare facilities":

_____
_____

I do not wish to grant permission:

_____
_____

Statement of consent: Publication of pictures and film clips

I hereby permit that pictures and film clips of my child, taken in the kindergarten Stolpebo, in relation with the project "Lunch scheme arrangements in daycare facilities" is used publicly.

_____
_____

I do not wish to grant permission:

_____
_____

Name of the child:

Parent's / guardian's signature:
Date:

Appendix 4: Translated versions of statement of consent

Statement of consent – used in the kindergartens 'Slåenhaven' and 'Krogården'

Dear parent

The kindergarten [name of kindergarten] and Aalborg University have entered into a cooperation about the research project, FRIDA - lunch scheme arrangements in daycare facilities. The FRIDA project is divided into three subprojects, of which your kindergarten participates in one, which examines children's, parent's and staff's perspectives on food and eating in the kindergarten. The aim is to point to potential ways of working with food and eating in kindergartens that creates joy and pleasure among children and adults, and enhances the desire to eat new, exciting and healthy food. The FRIDA project is financially supported by Nordea Fonden and is managed by Professor Bent Egberg Mikkelsen of Food & People, Aalborg University, Copenhagen. The subproject in which [name of kindergarten] participates is carried out by PhD student Stine Hansen with help from pedagogue student xx. More information about the project can be retrieved at: http://www.frida.plan.aau.dk/.

As a means to examine how your children experience mealtime in the kindergarten, we would like to ask your permission to involve your child in the project. This includes the child's participation in different activities concerning food and eating, which takes place while the child attents kindergarten. The child is free to say no to

participate at any time and will not be forced or pressured into participating in activities he/she does not wish.

Since it is important to our research to examine interactions between children and the pedagogical staff during mealtime, we will take pictures and video recordings during mealtime in the kindergarten, as well as during other activities related to food and eating. This is done in order for us to be able to remember the situations and thereby have a profound basis for analysis. These video recordings will only be used by the researcher and will be destroyed when the project has ended.

All information will be treated according to the Danish Act on Processing of Personal Data. This means that the information you and your child provides will be treated anonymously.

However, in relation to the results of the project we hope for media coverage; furthermore, we plan to present the project and its findings in relevant forums. We therefore ask for your permission to use selected pictures and film clip publicly. These will only display children in positive situations and no one will be negatively displayed.

In the situation of shared custody, we will gather signatures from both parents.

[The following section was only included on the forms send to parents in 'Slåenhaven']. In order to gain knowledge about parent's attitudes and thoughts about

mealtime and the forthcoming meal scheme arrangement, I would like to conduct an interview with those parents who are interested. This interview will take place in the kindergarten and will last approximately one hour.

For any further information, please contact the undersigned on the mail xx.

With kind regards

Stine Hansen

We kindly ask you to fill out the following and return the form to the kindergarten staff by xx the latest. Remember to sign both statements of consent.

Statement of consent: participation and permission to use pictures and film clips publicly

I hereby permit that my child participates in the project "Lunch scheme arrangements in daycare facilities".

I do not grant permission.

 I hereby permit that pictures and film clips of my child, taken in the kindergarten xx, in relation with the project "Lunch scheme arrangements in daycare facilities" is used publicly.

I do not grant permission

I wish myself to participate in an interview about mealtime (this is not a binding registration)

Name of the child   Kindergarten group

Parent/guardian signature

                        Date

Statement of consent – used in the kindergarten 'Stolpebo' (common Frida case)

Dear parent

The kindergarten Stolpebo and Aalborg University have entered into a cooperation about a multidisciplinary research project, FRIDA, lunch scheme arrangements in day care facilities, which is supported financially by Nordea Fonden. The aim of the project is to enhance knowledge about meal scheme arrangements in kindergartens, focusing on the perspectives of the different users, how design can develop and advance food-experiences, as well as which potential the meal schemes have for children's' food education and food preferences. The project is divided into three parts, which focus on the perspectives of the users, design, and pedagogical tools respectively. More information about the project can be retrieved at: http://www.frida.plan.aau.dk/.

The study in your kindergarten focuses on all three parts of the project and is performed by three PhD students, Stine Rosenlund Hansen (user perspectives), Hafdis Sunna Hermannsdottir (design) and Mette Vang Mikkelsen (pedagogical tools).

We would like to ask your permission to involve your child in the project. This includes the child's participation in different activities, concerning food and eating,

as well as testing prototypes developed in the design part of the project. This will take place while the child attends kindergarten and in cooperation with the staff of Stolpebo. The child can at any time say no to participate and will not be forced or pressured into participating in activities he/she does not wish to.

Since it is important to our research to examine interactions between children and the pedagogical staff during mealtime, we will take pictures and video record during eating in the kindergarten, as well as during other activities related to food and eating. This is done in order for us to be able to remember the situations and thereby have a profound basis for analysis. These video recordings will only be used by the researcher and will be destroyed when the project has finished.

All information will be treated according to the Danish Act on Processing of Personal Data. This means that the information you and your child provides will be treated anonymously and it will not be able to identify your names and responses.

However, in relation to the results of the project we hope for media coverage; furthermore, we plan to present the project and its findings in relevant forums. We therefore ask for you permission to use selected pictures and film clip. These will always show children in positive situations and no one will be negatively displayed.

In the situation of shared custody, we will gather signatures from both parents.

For any further information, please contact the undersigned.

With kind regards

Stine Rosenlund Hansen, telephone number: xx, mail: xx

Hafdis Sunna Hermannsdottir, telephone numbe: rxx, mail: xx

Mette Vang Mikkelsen, telephone number: xx, mail: xx

We kindly ask you to fill out the following and return the form to the kindergarten staff by 20/09-12 the latest. Remember to sign both statements of consent.

Statement of consent:

I hereby grant permission to my child's participation in the project: "Lunch scheme arrangements in daycare facilities":

_____

_____

I do not wish to grant permission:

_____

_____

Statement of consent: Publication of pictures and film clips

I hereby permit that pictures and film clips of my child, taken in the kindergarten Stolpebo, in relation with the project "Lunch scheme arrangements in daycare facilities" is used publicly.

_____

_____

I do not wish to grant permission:

_____
_____

Name of the child:

Parent's / guardian's signature: Date: