This article was downloaded by: [The University of Manchester]
On: 20 September 2011, At: 01:08
Publisher: Routledge
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Critical Public Health
Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ccph20

Blaming the consumer -- once again: the social and material contexts of everyday food waste practices in some English households

David Evans [a]

[a] Sociology and the Sustainable Consumption Institute, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, M13 9PL, UK

Available online: 17 Aug 2011

To cite this article: David Evans (2011): Blaming the consumer -- once again: the social and material contexts of everyday food waste practices in some English households, Critical Public Health, DOI:10.1080/09581596.2011.608797

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09581596.2011.608797

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Critical Public Health
2011, 1–12

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Blaming the consumer – once again: the social and material contexts of everyday food waste practices in some English households

David Evans*

Sociology and the Sustainable Consumption Institute, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, M13 9PL, UK

(*Received 17 February 2011; final version received 24 July 2011*)

Downloaded by [The University of Manchester] at 01:08 20 September 2011

In public debates about the volume of food that is currently wasted by UK households, there exists a tendency to blame the consumer or individualise responsibilities for affecting change. Drawing on ethnographic examples, this article explores the dynamics of domestic food practices and considers their consequences in terms of waste. Discussions are structured around the following themes: (1) feeding the family; (2) eating 'properly'; (3) the materiality of 'proper' food and its intersections with the socio-temporal demands of everyday life and (4) anxieties surrounding food safety and storage. Particular attention is paid to the role of public health interventions in shaping the contexts through which food is at risk of wastage. Taken together, I argue that household food waste cannot be conceptualised as a problem of individual consumer behaviour and suggest that policies and interventions might usefully be targeted at the social and material conditions in which food is provisioned.

Keywords: everyday life; food policy; food waste; home; material culture; social practice

Introduction

In the 2003 *Critical Public Health* special issue on food, Holm (2003) suggested that the concept of victim blaming – in which responsibility for (bad) individual health is assigned to the (wrong) decisions that individuals make – has relevance beyond critical discussions of public health policies. By way of example she suggests that debates about political consumerism – in which individuals are expected to solve social problems by altering the ways in which they consume – exhibit a parallel tendency to blame the consumer. Debates around the amount of food that is currently wasted by consumers in the UK are a case in point. It is estimated that UK households throw away roughly 1/3 of the food that they purchase for consumption (WRAP 2009) and public debates about food waste certainly appear to blame consumers[1] for their (assumed) profligacy and (imagined) lack of culinary competence.

By way of corrective, the analysis here offers a broadly sociological analysis of household food waste. I take a cue from work that critiques the individualisation of

*Email: david.evans-2@manchester.ac.uk

ISSN 0958–1596 print/ISSN 1469–3682 online
© 2011 Taylor & Francis
DOI: 10.1080/09581596.2011.608797
http://www.informaworld.com

Downloaded by [The University of Manchester] at 01:08 20 September 2011

responsibilities – in public debates and policy interventions – for affecting changes in behaviour and/or consumption. There are identifiable threads of sociological engagement with issues of health promotion (Bunton *et al*. 1995) which provide a welcome rejoinder to approaches (see, e.g. Bettinghaus 1986) that seek to influence health-related behaviours through appeals to knowledge and attitudes. In addition to Foucauldian critiques of bodily discipline and the governmental imperatives of self-regulation (Peterson *et al*. 2010), existing researches have highlighted how 'knowledge-attitude-behaviour' interventions fail to recognise the complexity and dynamics of everyday life. For example, Ioannou's (2005) analysis of smoking, eating, drinking alcohol and exercise suggests that these activities should not be viewed as health-related behaviours but understood in relation to everyday issues. In this spirit, Lindsay (2010) demonstrates the role of food consumption in performing social identities and social relations and argues that informational campaigns do not adequately acknowledge the complex and contradictory concerns that individuals juggle as they make 'food choices' in their everyday lives. In terms of theorising these moves, Delormier *et al*. (2009) suggest that public health interventions in food consumption should conceive of eating not in terms of behaviour but as a social practice. Drawing on Giddens' (1984) structuration theory, they call for greater attention to social structure (rules and resources) in order to better understand the ways in which eating is embedded in the flow of day-to-day life (Delormier *et al*. 2009, p. 217).

Similar issues are being raised in debates around the environmental impacts of consumption and attendant policy approaches to 'behaviour change'. In a recent article, Shove (2010) criticises existing climate change policies for their reliance on individualist perspectives drawn from behavioural economics and social psychology. She suggests that these approaches are grounded in the ABC framework where:

> '"A" stands for attitude, "B" for behaviour and "C" for choice' (Shove 2010, p. 1274).

Against this, a distinctly sociological approach towards sustainable consumption and behaviour change has emerged that is grounded in various strands of practice theory (see Røpke 2009 for a useful overview). The idea here, briefly, is that at any point in time there exists an established set of understandings, procedures and engagements that govern appropriate conduct within a particular practice. In this perspective, consumption is not a practice *per se*; rather it occurs within, and for the sake of, practices and being a competent practitioner (Warde 2005, p. 137). Accordingly, consumption is theorised in relation to the dynamics of everyday life and the social organisation of practices (see, e.g. Shove 2003, Southerton *et al*. 2004, Watson 2008). It follows that initiatives and policies for sustainable consumption should not target individuals and choices; rather, they should focus on the social and material contexts through which practices are ordered and (re)produced (Southerton *et al*. 2009). These insights are taken here as a useful framework through which to discuss household food waste.

The debate about food waste in the UK

It is estimated (WRAP 2009) that UK households throw away 8.7 million tonnes of uneaten food each year and that at least 5.3 million tonnes are avoidable. The annual financial cost of this avoidable waste is estimated at £12 billion (£480 per household)

Downloaded by [The University of Manchester] at 01:08 20 September 2011

and the environmental impact is equivalent to 20 million tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions.[2] Whilst prominent commentators (e.g. Stuart 2009) do not lay the blame solely at the door of consumers; public and policy imaginations are focused disproportionately on domestic waste. Within these debates, recommendations appear to be limited to interventions that target knowledge, attitudes and the behaviours that individuals choose to undertake. For example, Stuart (2009, p. 77) stresses the need to raise awareness of the 'non-financial costs of wasting food' (environmental impacts, world hunger). Similarly, WRAP's lovefoodhatewaste campaign[3] aims to raise awareness about the consequences of food waste and provide information that will help individuals to change their behaviour. These suggestions are refreshingly well-intentioned and non-judgemental; however, they continue to individualise responsibilities for affecting change and so miss the ways in which so-called 'waste behaviours' relate to the dynamics of everyday life. It is this tendency that initiated the study discussed below.

Before turning to the study, a brief note on terminology is required. I view waste as a consequence of how something is disposed as opposed to an innate characteristic of certain objects. In this view, surplus matter is not necessarily the same as waste insofar as it could conceivably be placed in conduits of disposal (Gregson *et al.* 2007) that save it from wastage. It follows that something is wasted when it is disposed of through a trajectory that connects it to the waste stream. The empirical work that informs this analysis found that surplus food was routinely disposed of through the waste stream via the bin (Evans forthcoming) as opposed to being handed down, handed around or otherwise saved from wastage (e.g. through composting).[4] For the purposes of the discussions that follow, then, surplus food is treated as synonymous with food waste. When referring to food, I refer only to that which could have been eaten – I am not referring to things that UK households tend not to eat (such as tea bags or apple cores) nor am I referring to things that are discarded in the preparation of food (such as fruit and vegetable peelings). Finally, for reasons of brevity and consistency – when referring to specific meals, I refer only to evening meals.

The study

The analysis that follows is based on a broadly ethnographic study in which I adopted a material culture approach to the research design (Evans 2011). The fieldwork involved 8 months (November 2009 to July 2010) of sustained and intimate contact with the residents and households encountered on two 'ordinary' streets – pseudonymously called Rosewall Crescent and Leopold Lane – in and around South Manchester. I use the term 'ordinary' to signal that the streets were chosen because, following Miller (2008), I had no particular reason to chose them other than attempting to encounter everyday lives as they are found without recourse to the categories of social/sociological analysis. As a study of material culture, the emphasis was on the logic of stuff itself (the passage of 'food' into 'waste') and not the reasons why particular 'types' of household waste food. Participants were recruited by dropping information leaflets through doors and following this up with successive rounds of door knocking. In total, 19 households participated in the study and whilst this sample is by no means representative, the heterogeneous nature of the areas in which I was working ensured a reasonable spread of income band, age, housing structure, housing tenure and household composition.

The study was undertaken to explore household food waste; however, I anticipated that a narrow focus on disposal would be problematic in terms of recruiting and retaining respondents. Moreover, in order to explore the passage of 'food' into 'waste', I decided to focus on the broader processes, dynamics and relations that accompany this movement. Accordingly, the study explored the ways in which households plan for and shop for food; how they prepare, consume and eat it; how they store it; and ultimately the ways in which they dispose of the food that they do not eat. In terms of carrying out the fieldwork, I utilised a range of qualitative of approaches. I conducted repeat in-depth interviews (Mason 2002) with respondents in which we discussed the various ways in which they shop for, prepare, eat, store and dispose of food. I also spent a lot of time 'hanging out' in respondents' homes, their streets and the areas in which the study took place. Additionally, I adopted a range of less familiar techniques. These included diary records; 'going along' (Kusenbach 2003) with participants as they shop for and prepare food; cupboard rummages and fridge inventories; and kitchen and home tours (Pink 2004).

Downloaded by [The University of Manchester] at 01:08 20 September 2011

Feeding the family

Throughout the study, respondents were found to routinely overprovision food such that they were often left with a certain amount of food that they struggled to then find a use for. Typically, this situation arose when a particular item of food was purchased for a specified purpose but the volume in which it could be purchased exceeded the volume required. For example, Julia is in her early 30s and lives with her husband and two young children on Rosewall Crescent. Talking though the items in her fridge, she explained:

> J: I got that to do a, a cauliflower cheese last week but I didn't need the whole thing um floret [. . .] and if I am honest, I don't really know what I'll do with it or can
>
> I: I see
>
> J: and [laughing] cauli just isn't the same without cheese, none of us really like it on its own without erm, yeah so there isn't anything we do that uses it [. . .] and I worry a lot, not being able to use the food that we have bought.

Such items are at risk of not being eaten and interventions targeted at reducing household food waste are sensitive to this predicament. For example, the lovefoodhatewaste campaign website has a 'recipes' section that gives suggestions on how to find a use for leftover ingredients.[5] For the respondents encountered in this study, however, the problem was not one of lacking knowledge about what to do with the food that needs using up. To the contrary, they had very clear ideas about how leftover ingredients might be saved from wastage, but were unable to put these ideas into practice given the domestic context in which they provision food. For example, Suzanne is a single mother in her 30s who lives on Rosewall Crescent with her two children. Going through her fridge, she discussed a bag of spinach with about ¼ of the contents remaining:

> S: If it was just me, it would be easy enough I would I dunno do something with it like omelette. Something quick that uses it up.
>
> I: If it was just you?

S: Yeah, I mean it would be it doesn't need to be great and I don't have to bother but my lot probably aren't going to be all that impressed if I put I spinach omelette down for their tea [laughs]
I: Why's that then?

S: for a start [laughing] they are fussy buggers [...] well I suppose that they do eat different things but it takes a while to get there as there is a definite, definitely prefer tried and tested recipes that they've had before and know they like.

In common with many respondents, Suzanne's food practices are located in a household context where the culinary repertoire is relatively fixed and provisioning highly routinised (DeVault 1991). It is well-understood that in feeding the family, the work of caring requires those responsible (usually women) to subsume their preferences to those of others within the household (DeVault 1991, Burridge and Barker 2009). Given that Suzanne's family are unlikely to be receptive to new introductions, especially 'improvised' foods that do not constitute a 'proper meal' (on which more below), it is perhaps not surprising that she would go for a 'tried and tested recipe' over something that would use the spinach up. However, as a consequence, this spinach was rendered obsolete and in turn, wasted.

Eating 'properly'

Just as the process of feeding the family is well-understood in terms of practising care and devotion towards significant others, it can also be noted that the provisioning of 'proper meals' has been identified as the appropriate means of doing so (Murcott 1983, Charles and Kerr 1988, Jackson 2009). The empirical material gathered here supports this idea. For example, Sarah lives on Rosewall Crescent and is a married mother of two in her early 30s. Having returned to work as a result of her youngest child starting school, she explained:

S: [b]efore I went back they always had good, proper food and ate well but it becomes a little bit harder to do when I am not at home so much and so what I do is spend Sunday cooking meals for the week ahead [...] and that doesn't stretch the whole week and but a night of junk food is alright and for the rest I try to mix proper things in with easy things.

The imperative to eat 'properly' also emerged in the accounts and experiences of those not living as part of a family (however defined), but in these cases, the emphasis was on healthy living (Peterson *et al.* 2010) and practising an ethic of caring for the self. For example, Pete is in his early 20s and living with 'a bunch of randoms' in a houseshare on Leopold Lane. Talking about how his work takes him 'on the road' a lot, he explained:

P: [i]t would be all to easy when you all over the shop to just pick up a takeaway or, god, there have been times that I've just survived on microwaved stuff from the garage but it's no good. You have to look after yourself, don't you and I don't want to turn into a fat bas- so yeah I now try and eat a bit better.

This of course raises the question of what constitutes 'proper' food and existing researches suggest that it is understood to encompass fresh, healthy ingredients that are used to prepare cooked meals from scratch whilst incorporating a variety of flavours and ethnic cuisines (Douglas 1972, Murcott 1983, Charles and Kerr 1988, Mitchell 1999, Bugge and Almas 2006, Short 2006, Halkier 2009). Again, the empirical material gathered here suggests that respondents recognised these as

Downloaded by [The University of Manchester] at 01:08 20 September 2011

appropriate procedures and engagements with practices of food provisioning. The following excerpt from my field diary is drawn from a Sunday that I spent with Sarah as she prepared meals for the upcoming week:

> *Sarah opens up the fridge and announces that it looks right and good to have all of these fresh ingredients in and she sets about moving some ingredients [peppers, lean steak mince, garlic] over to the chopping board. These are joined by onions and a carrot from the cupboard. She tells me how she is going to cook a lasagne as that can easily be put in the fridge and reheated 'on the night' and served with a salad to create a proper meal in minutes [...] she chops up all three peppers in the packet and I ask if she is planning to use them all in the lasagne to which she replies that she is chopping them ready to be used in a Moroccan dish that she is going to cook later and here she explains that it is important that they have something 'lighter' and 'healthier' in the week and that her children should have exposure to flavours from other cultures.* (Field diary March 2010)

These understandings and definitions of 'proper food' were also recognised by respondents who did not themselves adhere to the attendant procedures and engagements. For example, Ceri is a single mother of three and is in her early 20s. She lives on Rosewall Crescent in a housing trust home. The following extract from my field diary is drawn from an occasion when I accompanied her to the supermarket:

> *As we walk down the frozen food aisle, she tells me that this is where she fills her trolley up. She jokes about how she doesn't really pick up much in the fruit and veg aisle. Various freezer doors are opened and frozen chips, fish fingers, pizzas and pies go into her trolley. She looks at me and tells me that she knows that I think it is all ok but also states that she feels like a 'first rate failure'. I ask her why and she says that she feels like one of those people 'doing it all wrong on the Jamie Oliver show'. With this she tells me that she knows that she should be cooking like he suggests but points out that it isn't 'how her life is' and she can't 'live up to it' [...] Moving down the aisle a little, she picks up lots of frozen vegetables and jokes that even when she cooks right, she cheats.* (Field diary June 2010)

Not only does Ceri define her own food practices in relation to dominant understandings of competence, but she also appears very troubled by not 'living up' to them.

It is instructive to note that biomedical interventions in health promotion – such as healthy living guidelines (Lindsay 2010) – play a role in shaping these definitions of proper food. For example, fresh fruits and vegetables were positioned as good, whilst processed foods that are high in salt or sugar were seen as bad. Without wishing to comment on the legitimacy or nutritional significance of these expectations, they can be viewed as helping to shape the routines in which households end up wasting food. Notably, a lot of 'proper' food is perishable and so at risk of being wasted if it is not eaten within a particular timeframe. Viewed as such, the materiality of foodstuffs themselves assume importance in terms of organising the practices through which they must be used or otherwise wasted.

Materiality and temporality

This section considers waste as a consequence of the ways in which the materiality of food intersects with the broader socio-temporal context of food practices. Where public debates intimate that food waste arises when individuals do not have enough time to cook 'properly', the respondents encountered here reveal a more subtle mismatch between the materiality of food and the rhythms of everyday life.

Downloaded by [The University of Manchester] at 01:08 20 September 2011

Downloaded by [The University of Manchester] at 01:08 20 September 2011

For example, Tamsin is in her mid-20s and lives alone on Leopold Lane. She explained that she tries to eat properly but that this often involves buying '5 different ingredients' for a particular recipe and that these are not available in quantities that are suitable for a single person living on her own. Additionally, she explained how her employment requires her to travel away from Manchester frequently such that she 'does not know where she is going to be from one moment to the next':

> T: So when I go away, right, I simply have no memory um recollection of what's going on in my fridge [. . .] so when I get back into Manchester, the train gets in and all I really know is that I am tired and hungry and in desperate need of food
>
> I: so what do you do?
>
> T: Well, generally one of two things. Either I go for something quick and easy from the local supermarket – perhaps a ready meal and a bagged up salad or if it's the weekend, I can justify a cheeky takeaway [. . .]
>
> I: [. . .] and what about the ingredients that you already had in
>
> T: um, well very often I end up not getting to make anything from them before they are too far gone [. . .] it's actually very hard to stay on top of it all.

The problem of keeping on top of ingredients in various states of decay was not exclusive to persons living alone and managing an erratic work schedule. Respondents who provisioned food within a family context were found to do so at relatively fixed intervals, typically every 7–10 days. Even allowing for the proliferation of 'mini' supermarkets where 'bits and bobs' could be picked up 'as and when', the vast majority of grocery shopping tended to be acquired via a 'big shop' at a large out of town supermarket. Through going along with participants on these shopping trips, I discovered that they tended to buy roughly the same things at each visit. Whilst very few households planned what would be eaten meal by meal, there was certainly a tacit expectation that certain dishes would be eaten (recalling the preference for a relative fixed culinary repertoire) at some point within the period between visits (see also DeVault 1991). However, these habituated routines of food provisioning were easily thrown out of balance by the rather more fluid nature of the ways in which lives are lived. As Julia explained:

> J: There is always something gets in the way of what I was going to d-
>
> I: you plan out what you are going to eat each night?
>
> J: um- I suppose no, not but I think I have a sense of what I might do throughout the week
>
> I: sorry, I just threw you right off [laughing] – you were saying that something always gets in the way
>
> J: oh, um, yeah like if I know I've some greens that need using – I'll think I can do them with some chops or wh- you know one night in the week [. . .] but other things always come up
>
> I: like?
>
> J: oh god, anything like if there is something on at school or one of us has something else on we might not have what I was thinking.

She went on to explain what would happen to the 'greens' that ended up not being eaten:

> J: If they don't get used before a new bag comes in they will go
>
> I: thrown out?
>
> J: bad but they go when the new ones come in

I: why is that?
J: well they didn't get used and I am definitely not going to use them if there is a newer pack that I could, um, need to use before that starts getting old.

In this example, food gets displaced and wasted as a result of a mismatch between the food that is provisioned and the food that is eaten within a given period of 7–10 days. Again, the lovefoodhatewaste campaign is attuned to this situation and gives advice on planning meals such that they mirror more closely the food that is provisioned when going shopping.[6] However, this advice is not sensitive to the temporal dynamics of everyday life nor does it appear to recognise that the materiality of food (and the temporalities of its decay) render it unable to accommodate disruptions to household provisioning routines.

Of course, it might reasonably be assumed that the domestic freezer might operate as a 'time machine' (Shove and Southerton 2000) to help households circumvent some of the tensions created at the intersection of food's materiality and the rhythms of everyday life. However, food that is well-suited to the freezer tended to be viewed as undesirable on the grounds that it does not constitute 'proper' food. For example, in discussing the amount of work she does on Sundays to ensure that her family eat 'properly', Sarah pointed out that:

S: It would definitely be easier if I was one of those Mums that go to Iceland[7] [laughing] you know, getting all that stuff for a fiver . . . god, would save loads of money and I bet I wouldn't ever chuck anything out as that stuff is pumped so full of crap that it never goes off

I: you are never tempted to start doing that?

S: um maybe but I never would, couldn't um I wouldn't give that to my family as it isn't food

I: how would you feel about frozen vegetables then?

S: they are better but really they can't compare to fresh.

In this example – and throughout the study – the refusal of certain foodstuffs extends beyond concerns about eating healthily to incorporate class-based processes of classification and distinction on the grounds of taste in food (Warde 1997). More generally, it is instructive to highlight that the imperative to eat 'properly' (discussed above) leads to the provisioning of foodstuffs that are at risk – against the backdrop of the routines and rhythms discussed in this section – of wastage. Viewed as such, a picture of household food waste as the fall out of everyday life begins to emerge.

Food risk and anxiety

This section picks up on the idea that food waste arises as a consequence of households juggling the complex and contradictory demands of day-to-day living. In addition to the aforementioned concerns about healthy and 'proper' eating; the respondents encountered were found to be negotiating concerns about food safety and storage. Throughout the study, respondents were quite explicit that once food has 'past its best', it is no longer fit for human consumption and as such, should be cast as 'waste'.[8] There is not the space here to discuss the ways in which respondents evaluated food as 'past its best' but suffice to say, the processes and practices varied across households and according to foodstuff. For example, some households observed dates and labels stringently, whilst others rejected them in favour of 'trusting their nose'. Some evaluated food according to its aesthetic qualities

Downloaded by [The University of Manchester] at 01:08 20 September 2011

Downloaded by [The University of Manchester] at 01:08 20 September 2011

('it's gone all wrinkly') whilst others used *ad hoc* knowledge about how long it had been 'kicking about'. Some foodstuffs were positioned as highly risky (meat, poultry, fish and dairy) whilst others were thought to be more 'forgiving' with their riskiness limited to the potential for a decline in quality (onions, herbs and spices). Others still were thought to be salvageable in the sense that signs of being past their best could be removed to prevent the rest of the item being contaminated (e.g. cutting mould out off a corner to rescue a block of cheese). The unifying feature across households and in respect of all foodstuffs was an acute awareness that food harbours the potential to make people ill and that this risk accelerated evaluations of food as past its best. For example, Faye is in her late 20s and living with her boyfriend on Leopold Lane. Narrated retrospectively, she discussed some chicken breasts that they had thrown out the previous week:

> F: It costs doesn't it and well something died for that and we didn't eat it [. . .] such a waste. Not good.
>
> I: how come it didn't get eaten?
>
> F: just kind of forgot about it and to be honest yeah, when I came to it I thought it had been there are while so I thought to check the date
>
> I: was it in date?
>
> F: No it was probably a few something like a few days gone so I ummed and ahhed about it but it's chicken so you've got to be careful
>
> I: uh huh
>
> F: and I wasn't going to risk it as you're going to know about it if you eat bad chicken.

Similarly, Natalie is a divorcee in her mid-40s who lives on Rosewall Crescent with her two teenage children. Whilst talking about the items in her kitchen, I asked her about a saucepan that was on the stove:

> N: That's from stew that I made a few nights ago [. . .] I meant to put it in the fridge after it cooled, you know, and then have it another night [. . .] but it's probably not safe to eat as its been out for a few days now [. . .] crap, I really hate wasting food.

Both Faye and Natalie – in contrast to claims that modern consumers are anomalously profligate – are troubled by their acts of wasting food. More generally, virtually, every respondent informed me that 'it is wrong to waste food' and that they 'felt awful' about the instances in which they end up doing so. However, this section has shown that, again, biomedical interventions in health promotion are also being played out in the everyday lives of the households encountered here. It is instructive to note that throughout this study, discourses of food safety tended to 'win out' over anxieties about wasting food such that the imperative to ensure that unsafe food is not eaten appeared to provide adequate justification for acts of binning and wasting. It is certainly not my intention to question the legitimacy of concerns about food safety and storage, I am simply illustrating how they help create the context in which food is evaluated as past its best and consequently, constituted as waste.

Discussion

The preceding analysis does not dispute that current volumes of household food waste are problematic in a number of registers (developmental, environmental, financial). It does, however, suggest that it is overly simplistic to blame consumers for these problems or individualise responsibilities for solving them. Returning to the

ABC framework it would be wrong, on the evidence here, to suggest that there is a need for attitudinal change insofar as the respondents encountered did not appear to have a careless or callous disregard for the food that they end up wasting. More generally, the analysis has demonstrated some of the ways in which waste is a consequence of the ways in which domestic food practices are socially organised. I have focused specifically on the role of biomedical interventions in health promotion (food safety and storage, healthy eating) but more generally, I have paid attention to the broader social (family relations, socio-temporal context, tastes) and material (domestic technologies, the organic vitality of food, infrastructures of provision) conditions through which food is provisioned. Taken together, it seems somewhat perverse to position food waste as a matter of individuals making negative choices to engage in behaviours that lead to the wastage of food. Indeed, the analysis here suggests that food waste arises as a consequence of households negotiating the contingencies of everyday life and as such, it recalls those who critique biomedical models of health promotion (Ioannou 2005, Lindsay 2010).

It has not been my intention to systematically evaluate existing policies or interventions and the prescription of alternatives based on the small-scale exploratory analysis offered here is necessarily beyond the scope of this article. However, if pushed, I would be inclined to suggest that interventions in the material context of food practices are key. For example, if food was to be made readily available in different quantities (material infrastructures of provision), then the respondents encountered here may well end wasting less. Similarly, there may be some mileage in targeting the material properties of food itself by, for example, finding ways to normalise the provisioning of foodstuffs that are not susceptible to rapid decay. These recommendations are of course mere speculation and the take home message here is that any effort to reduce household food waste could usefully reach beyond the default position of blaming the consumer in order to target the social and material contexts through which food practices might be changed.

Acknowledgements

This research was made possible through funding from the Sustainable Consumption Institute at the University of Manchester. Additional writing was undertaken whilst I was a visiting researcher on the Economic and Social Research Council funded 'Waste of the World' programme (RES000232007). I thank Ulla Gustafsson, Liza Draper and Wendy Wills for their helpful guidance and editorial steer. I also thank the two anonymous referees whose useful and insightful comments have no doubt strengthened this article. The usual disclaimers apply. Above all, I am indebted to those who accommodated my sustained presence in their homes during the course of the fieldwork.

Notes

1. This is not victim blaming insofar as the 'victims' are not UK households but those in less developed countries (Stuart 2009).
2. The same impact as the emissions generated by ¼ of the cars on UK roads.
3. http://www.lovefoodhatewaste.com [Accessed 8 June 2011].
4. I am not claiming that households never do these things; I am simply highlighting the normativity of binning surplus food.
5. http://www.lovefoodhatewaste.com/recipes [Accessed 3 February 2011].
6. http://www.lovefoodhatewaste.com/save_time_and_money/two_week_menu [Accessed 7 February 2011].

Downloaded by [The University of Manchester] at 01:08 20 September 2011

7. Iceland is a food retailer in the UK that specialises in low-cost frozen foods.
8. Or more accurately, it is cast as excess at which point it is deemed appropriate to dispose of it through the waste stream (Evans forthcoming).

References

Bettinghaus, E., 1986. Health promotion and the knowledge-attitude-behaviour continuum. *Preventive Medicine*, 15, 475–491.

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

Bunton, R., Nettleton, S., and Burrows, R., eds., 1995. *The sociology of health promotion: critical analyses of consumption, lifestyle and risk*. London: Routledge.

Burridge, J. and Barker, M., 2009. Food as a medium for emotional management of the family: avoiding complaint and producing love. *In*: P. Jackson, ed. *Changing families, changing food*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 146–164.

Charles, N. and Kerr, M., 1988. *Women, food and families*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Delormier, T., Frohlich, K., and Potvin, L., 2009. Food and eating as social practice – understanding eating patterns as social phenomena and implications for public health. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 31 (2), 215–228.

DeVault, M., 1991. *Feeding the family: the social organization of caring as gendered work*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Douglas, M., 1972. *Implicit meanings*. London: Routledge.

Evans, D., 2011. Beyond the throwaway society: ordinary domestic practice and a sociological approach to household food waste. *Sociology* (awaiting issue). DOI: 10.1177/0038038511416150.

Evans, D., forthcoming. Binning, gifting and recovery: the conduits of disposal in household food consumption. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*.

Giddens, A., 1984. *The constitution of society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gregson, N., Metcalfe, A., and Crewe, L., 2007. Moving things along: the conduits and practices of divestment in consumption. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 32 (2), 187–200.

Halkier, B., 2009. Suitable cooking? Performance and positionings in cooking practices among Danish women. *Food, Culture and Society*, 12 (3), 357–377.

Holm, L., 2003. Blaming the consumer: on the free choice of consumers and the decline in food quality in Denmark. *Critical Public Health*, 13 (2), 139–154.

Ioannou, S., 2005. Health logic and health-related behaviours. *Critical Public Health*, 15 (3), 263–273.

Jackson, P., ed., 2009. *Changing families, changing food*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kusenbach, M., 2003. Street phenomenology: the go-along as ethnographic research tool. *Ethnography*, 4 (3), 455–485.

Lindsay, J., 2010. Healthy living guidelines and the disconnect with everyday life. *Critical Public Health*, 20 (4), 475–487.

Mason, J., 2002. Qualitative interviewing: asking, listening and interpreting. *In*: T. May, ed. *Qualitative research in action*. London: Sage, 225–241.

Miller, D., 2008. *The comfort of things*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Mitchell, J., 1999. The British main meal in the 1990s: has it changed its identity?. *British Food Journal*, 101 (11), 871–883.

Murcott, A., 1983. It's a pleasure to cook for him: food, mealtimes and gender in some South Wales households. *In*: E. Garmarnikow, ed. *The public and the private*. London: Heinemann.

Downloaded by [The University of Manchester] at 01:08 20 September 2011

Peterson, A., *et al.*, 2010. Healthy living and citizenship: an overview. *Critical Public Health*, 20 (4), 391–400.

Pink, S., 2004. *Home truths: gender, domestic objects and everyday life*. Oxford: Berg.

Røpke, I., 2009. Theories of practice – new inspiration for ecological economic studies on consumption. *Ecological Economics*, 68, 2490–2497.

Short, F., 2006. *Kitchen secrets: the meaning of cooking in everyday life*. Oxford: Berg.

Shove, E., 2003. *Comfort, cleanliness and convenience – the social organisation of normality*. Oxford: Berg.

Shove, E., 2010. Beyond the ABC: climate change policy and theories of social change. *Environment and Planning A*, 42 (6), 1273–1285.

Shove, E. and Southerton, D., 2000. Defrosting the freezer: from novelty to convenience. A narrative of normalization. *Journal of Material Culture*, 5 (3), 301–319.

Southerton, D., Chappells, H., and Van Vliet, B., eds., 2004. *Sustainable consumption: the implications of changing infrastructures of provision*. London: Edward Elgar.

Southerton, D., McMeekin, A., and Evans, D., 2009. *International review of behaviour change initiatives*. Available from: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2011/02/01104638/0 [Accessed 7 February 2011].

Stuart, T., 2009. *Waste: uncovering the global food scandal*. London: Penguin.

Warde, A., 1997. *Consumption, food and taste*. Cambridge: Polity.

Warde, A., 2005. Consumption and theories of practice. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 5 (2), 131–153.

Watson, M., 2008. The materials of consumption. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 8 (1), 5–10.

WRAP, 2009. *Household food and drink waste in the UK*. Available from: http://www.wrap.org.uk/retail/case_studies_research/report_household.html [Accessed 7 February 2011].

Downloaded by [The University of Manchester] at 01:08 20 September 2011