



## Understanding Snacking through a Practice Theory Lens

Journal:	<i>Sociology of Health and Illness</i>
Manuscript ID:	SHI-00193-2014.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Subject Area:	Diet < RESEARCH AREAS, Food < RESEARCH AREAS, Health behaviour < RESEARCH AREAS
Abstract:	<p>This article approaches snacking from a practice theory perspective in order to understand how this reframing may afford new insights. In doing so it also contributes to sociological thinking on eating practices and their reproduction as well as reflecting upon the ontological assertions of practice theory and its theory of social change. In particular this article argues that the re-conceptualisation serves to clarify a sociological research agenda for eating practices associated with snacking. It is argued that setting snacking within routine temporalities and spatialities and as bound up in the recursivity between practices and relations is especially important for thinking about snacking sociologically. In common with applications of practice theory in the field of sustainability transitions the aim is to move beyond individualistic assumptions of behaviour change and instead situate snacking as an eating practice with health implications that has emerged within the social, temporal, economic and cultural organisation of everyday life.</p>

## Understanding Snacking through a Practice Theory Lens

### Introduction

Shadowed pejoratively by meanings of unruly, infantile eating and through further associations with excess and 'junk food', the practice of snacking is a complex moralised activity to grasp. To 'graze' implies animalisation, a fall from the 'civilised' structure of bounded meal times. It is difficult to speak of snacking without this baggage. As fears over mooted obesity epidemics have grown in recent decades (Guthman and DuPuis 2006) there is now considerable scientific and health-related literature on snacking which has risen exponentially in recent decades. Eating practices in the UK are now subject to further scientific and policy scrutiny owing to their enmeshment in contemporary concerns over energy and water resources and in urgent interrelated crises of food security and climate change (Lang 2009).

The aim of this article is to take a fresh approach by thinking about snacking using the insights of practice theory. This offers an opportunity to reframe snacking and to think somewhat differently about how the practice is reproduced. Although this article takes a somewhat neutral stance on whether 'snacking' is deserving of its moralised status, practice theory does offer potentially novel modes of intervention that might improve health and other outcomes (see Blue *et. al.* 2014). However this is not the focus of this article which instead is to consider the sorts of research directions that the conceptual work of practice theory might open up in the case of snacking.

1  
2  
3 The aims here are potentially fraught since the conceptual approach of practice theory could  
4 perhaps be seen as just as nebulous as the substantive focus upon snacking practices. As an  
5 approach it draws upon a rich and varied sociological and philosophical heritage.  
6  
7 Nevertheless practice theory has recently begun to coalesce, largely in the context of  
8  
9 European social science work upon sustainability transitions (e.g. Røpke 2009, Shove *et. al.*  
10  
11 2012), into a body of work that does specific ontological labour in its conceptualisation of the  
12  
13 social and is critical of individualistic approaches in its understanding of intervention and  
14  
15 social change. A practice focus on snacking is arguably timely as some of those same  
16  
17 scholars who have used the framework to better understand sustainability transitions have  
18  
19 recently turned their explicit attention to health practices (Blue *et. al.* 2014). Such work  
20  
21 dovetails well with a recent special issue in this journal arguing that social scientists should  
22  
23 switch frames from health behaviours to health practices (Cohn 2014; see also Delormier *et.*  
24  
25 *al.* 2009). Although the special issue failed to engage with the breadth of sustainable  
26  
27 practices literature it shares a desire to comprehend the everyday in sociological terms.  
28  
29 Similarly, this article positions itself against research on snacking understood as an individual  
30  
31 behaviour (e.g. Grogan, Bell & Conner 1997; Weijzen, de Graaf & Dijksterhuis 2009;  
32  
33 Verplanken 2010), instead viewing snacking as a set of eating related practices that emerge  
34  
35 out of the social organisation of everyday life. At the outset it is necessary to outline the  
36  
37 main tenets of practice theory especially for how it can be used to think about food and  
38  
39 snacking practices in particular.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

### 49 **Practice Theory and Eating**

50  
51  
52  
53  
54 Treating practices rather than individuals or institutions as the primary unit of enquiry,  
55  
56 considering how they consolidate and change is the focus of practice theory. Here I follow  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the conceptualisation by Shove *et al.* (2012) of practices comprised of three elements –  
4  
5 *competency, materiality* and *meaning*. Competency refers to skills and know-how,  
6  
7 materiality to the broad array of objects, bodies and technologies that comprise a practice,  
8  
9 and meanings refer to ideas, affect, aspirations, norms and symbolic meanings (ibid. p.14).  
10  
11 This is a simplification of previous definitions (e.g. see Reckwitz 2002: 249) and perpetuates  
12  
13 the practice theory ontological shift that elements are “qualities of a practice in which the  
14  
15 single individual participates, not qualities of the individual” (Reckwitz 2002: 250). In this  
16  
17 posthumanist inflection people are reframed as ‘carriers’ of practices (ibid.). Posthumanism  
18  
19 has been part of the theoretical discussion of the ‘practice turn’ (see Pickering 2005) and is  
20  
21 part of the sociological ontological shift away from the individual in practice theory and other  
22  
23 frameworks such as actor-network theory. Shove *et al.* argue that “practices emerge, persist,  
24  
25 shift and disappear when *connections* between elements of these three types are made,  
26  
27 sustained or broken” (2012: 14-5 original emphasis). All food related practices have  
28  
29 historical trajectories and many become socially recognisable and normative. For example,  
30  
31 in British culture (the main focus of this article) the ‘Sunday roast’ constitutes one traditional  
32  
33 meat eating practice that involves interdependent skills (e.g. preparation, carving),  
34  
35 materialities (an oven, a tray, a dead bird or joint, a butcher or supermarket) and shared  
36  
37 meanings (common aesthetic, affective, moral and cultural understandings) that have  
38  
39 coalesced to form what practice theorists refer to as the *practice-as-entity* (e.g. Shove *et al.*  
40  
41 2012: 7). The actual doing of the practice in everyday life is referred to as the *practice-as-*  
42  
43 *performance*.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 An opening contention is that a practice theory approach to eating is complementary in  
53  
54 certain ways to much scholarship in the social science of food. The above threefold definition  
55  
56 of a practice develops the often repeated assertion that eating is both a material and symbolic  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 activity, further stressing the importance of everyday competences as significant to the  
4  
5 coherence of practice. This is a coherence that is further dependent upon the affective and  
6  
7 political relationalities between carriers of a practice. Practices we are reminded give spatial  
8  
9 and temporal substance to our social fabric (Shove *et. al.* 2012: 133). Such points resonate  
10  
11 with everyday eating practices as this article explores in the case of snacking. In their recent  
12  
13 volume *Why We Eat How We Eat: Contemporary Encounters Between Foods and Bodies*  
14  
15 Abbots & Lavis present a suitably broad frame for understanding eating -  
16  
17

18  
19  
20  
21 “Eating, as a conceptual and a physical act, brings both foods and bodies into view; food...is  
22  
23 placed in the mouth, chewed, tasted, swallowed and digested. Its solidity is thus broken down  
24  
25 and rendered into fragments that both pass through, and become, the eater’s body. This is a  
26  
27 process that concomitantly establishes and ruptures social relations between bodies, whether  
28  
29 those of the food’s producers, retailers, micro-biological components or even of the original  
30  
31 animal sources. Unpacking the encounters between foods and (human and nonhuman) bodies  
32  
33 then, offers a way to take account of the many networks and relations embedded in and  
34  
35 performed by eating” (Abbots and Lavis 2013: 1).  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41  
42 This way of framing eating found in contemporary critical food studies with its stress on  
43  
44 relationalities, multiples scales, affect and the more-than-human is cognate with the  
45  
46 ontological moves of the practice turn. Moreover practice theory recognises the corporeality  
47  
48 of the social by emphasizing how the embodied performance of a practice in multiple sites  
49  
50 reproduces and connects the three elements. Bodies themselves contribute significantly to  
51  
52 the materiality of practice and Reckwitz asserts that “a practice can be understood as the  
53  
54 regular, skilful ‘performance’ of (human) bodies” (2002: 251).  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Practices constitute the mundane habits of everyday life and may disappear from both  
4  
5 immediate reflection and individual control. Yet it is here also that such links may erode,  
6  
7 become detached and ultimately a practice may fade from social life. The case of the Sunday  
8  
9 roast for example may be one such practice that is losing practitioners and is no longer as  
10  
11 central to weekend routines as previously. In the case of snacking an arguably significant  
12  
13 change in the practice has been the emergence of companies producing 'healthy snacks'  
14  
15 constituting an innovation in the practice as performance. It could be anticipated that this has  
16  
17 the potential to erode the prevailing moralistic meanings of snacking and change the practice  
18  
19 entity accordingly.  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 As the unit of inquiry practices are intended to cut across traditional sociological  
26  
27 demarcations of scale such as micro and macro. Thus Shove *et. al.* (2012) orient themselves  
28  
29 to understandings of the extent to which given practices are embedded by arguing that  
30  
31 connections form *between* practices themselves, forming what they term 'bundles', an  
32  
33 example might be snacking and watching television. When such bundles become part of  
34  
35 routine social infrastructure we encounter practice 'complexes'.  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Practice theory is a call to understand the dynamism of elements in a practice. Practices are  
41  
42 constantly changing although new element configurations can create quite abrupt change.  
43  
44 This attention to temporal flow foregrounds the importance of historical analysis for thinking  
45  
46 through the biography of elements, practices, bundles or complexes. Shifting meanings, new  
47  
48 materials and new forms of competency change practices and render some redundant. Such  
49  
50 elements can become reincorporated into new practices such as the disappearance of  
51  
52 'elevenses' and its replacement by cups of tea or coffee throughout the day. Redundant  
53  
54 elements, like niche elements or practices, are potential resources for thinking about  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 processes of adoption and transition. In addition to changing elements, practices can change  
4  
5 when those they may be bundled together with also change.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 Furthermore, although the primary conceptual focus on practices may suggest a posthumanist  
11  
12 decentring of social actors whereby the 'individual' is seen more as a mobile intersection of  
13  
14 practices and relationships, our 'doings', our performances, and so our agency working with  
15  
16 that of other materialities, the networks we form, remain important for understanding practice  
17  
18 transitions. Thus the way in which populations of carriers might change can be important for  
19  
20 the normalisation or the degeneration of a practice. If the lifecourse or 'career' (Shove *et. al.*  
21  
22 2012) of practices play out via links between its elements then traditional sociological foci  
23  
24 upon social relations, questions of power and political economy (see Sayer 2013) remain vital  
25  
26 to understanding the making and breaking of such links and so the waxing and waning of  
27  
28 practice trajectories.  
29  
30  
31

32  
33  
34 In approaching food sociologically and through a practice theory lens we are faced with  
35  
36 various conceptual issues. The simple everyday practice of eating intersects with bundles of  
37  
38 other practices, notably shopping, transport, storage and cooking practices. Eating is part of  
39  
40 the materiality of the social itself featuring clearly in the everyday performance of social  
41  
42 relationships. Eating is also part of doing leisure, doing work, or doing family (Morgan  
43  
44 2011), and shapes and re-shapes meanings of class, gender, sexuality and nation (Probyn  
45  
46 2000: 32). Moreover invisible to most food consumers are the wide array of *production*  
47  
48 practices, modes of distribution shaping and shaped by sets of international standards, trade  
49  
50 relationships, governance and the political economy of food. Eating practices when  
51  
52 examined in this way shape the temporalities and spatialities of everyday life. They are thus  
53  
54 diffuse and multi-faceted. Practice theory via its three way conceptualisation of a practice  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 makes clear that modes of eating such as snacking must be viewed as significantly exceeding  
4  
5 the immediate act of placing food in one's mouth even as it simultaneously wants to highlight  
6  
7 such moments of bodily performance as empirically important. In the area of energy  
8  
9 consumption some practice theorists approach energy not as something used for its own sake  
10  
11 but as part of accomplishing social practices at home, at work and in moving around<sup>1</sup>. Food  
12  
13 arguably is not *quite* as amenable to this framing. Whilst eating practices certainly  
14  
15 accomplish and lend meaning to a wide array of other practices they also have a sensual  
16  
17 aesthetic of their own. Food is a symbolic and material resource. Many snacks are pleasurable  
18  
19 and may be something to look forward to during the day. The materiality of foods also has  
20  
21 agency in the recruitment of practitioners and constitutes part of the social, defined in more  
22  
23 than human terms. This broadening out of the social to include a consideration of  
24  
25 materialities as an important element of practice reflects developments in social theory  
26  
27 acknowledging the way that "social relations are 'congealed' in the hardware of daily life"  
28  
29 (Shove *et. al.* 2012: 10).  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Sociologist Alan Warde has argued that eating practices are difficult to study since they are  
37  
38 not necessarily co-ordinated and regulated in the same manner as other practice entities.  
39  
40 Warde is interested to understand just what sort of practice eating is<sup>2</sup>. He gives the example  
41  
42 that in the UK there is no shared sense of what it means to eat well and there are no shared  
43  
44 standards governing eating practices (2013: 22). The practice of eating varies culturally and  
45  
46 historically because its degree of social organisation shifts within different social and  
47  
48 economic conditions or complexes. Contemporary attempts to create a definition of a  
49  
50 'sustainable diet' could be seen as a new attempt to morally codify eating practices arising  
51  
52 out of tensions between capitalist economic practices and ecological sustainability. Warde  
53  
54 defines the codification of practices as "a matter of specifying the objectives or purposes in  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 view in a domain of activity, and the ways to go about attaining such goals” (2013: 23). Such  
4  
5 codification manifests itself in sociologically interesting phenomena such as manuals, rule  
6  
7 books and formal organisations. He argues these are generally lacking in the area of eating  
8  
9 practices, describing contemporary eating as socially weakly organised (p.25). Certainly the  
10  
11 degree of codification will shape the sort of strategies and methodologies sociologists might  
12  
13 pursue in order to investigate a given practice. However, Warde’s argument is perhaps  
14  
15 overstated and does not disqualify eating from a social practice approach. Importantly he is  
16  
17 not absolutist here, writing

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 “Arguably, the current disorganization of eating is historically specific. Its component  
24  
25 integrative practices have evolved over many decades, even centuries, but have come  
26  
27 together sufficiently for eating to be recognizable, ‘out there’ in performances. In some  
28  
29 circumstances they come together to constitute an entity, which is socially coordinated in  
30  
31 such a manner that an organized nexus can be identified”

32  
33  
34 (Warde 2013: 25).  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 These comments are relevant to an eating practice like snacking. It is hard to think of  
40  
41 manuals or rule books or associations that cohere and codify snacking<sup>2</sup>. It can also be  
42  
43 challenging to define the boundaries of a snack eating event. Yet simultaneously snacking  
44  
45 and snacks *are* socially recognised and are embedded within the everyday eating practices of  
46  
47 most people. Shops often have snack sections and there tend to be socially shared meanings  
48  
49 over what constitutes a snacking event. With so many practitioners and its performance  
50  
51 relatively simple to discern temporally snacking is indeed empirically intelligible. Perhaps  
52  
53 what Warde’s comments capture is that eating practices are constantly changing according to  
54  
55 their complex relationships with other practices. This raises methodological challenges for  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 social science and for the conceptualisation of a specific practice. But practice theory is  
4 exactly a process approach designed to apprehend the dynamics of the social. Difficulties  
5 within the conceptualisation of snacking as a practice may relate then to its contemporary  
6 state of transformation.  
7  
8  
9  
10

### 11 12 13 14 **A Practice Conceptualisation of Snacking** 15

16  
17  
18 The wealth of scientific research into snacking alluded to above features a range of  
19 approaches to defining snacking. Some studies take for granted a common sense temporal  
20 definition of snacking as eating outside meal times (Savidge *et. al.* 2007). Others (e.g.  
21 McCrory and Campbell 2011) acknowledge some definitional complexity around the way in  
22 which foods commonly assumed to be healthy (such as an item of fruit) are also defined as  
23 snacks and how eating practices exhibit significant cultural variability. Some approaches  
24 adopt a food-based classification system based on core food groups and non-core food groups  
25 (MacDiarmid *et. al.* 2009) though this may be confused by material overlap such as snacking  
26 on meal leftovers. A study on the use of 'snack', 'snacking' and 'eating snack food' in the  
27 UK found ambiguous and different uses of these terms and while they all referred more often  
28 to eating outside mealtimes there was more overlap between the use of 'snack' and the meal  
29 of lunch (Chamontin *et. al.* 2003). In using practice theory this article aims to show how this  
30 conceptual issue of definition can be clarified by considering relations between practices,  
31 deconstructing the practice in terms of its constituent elements, situating snacking temporally  
32 and spatially and underlining the historical contexts and emergence of snacking. The  
33 intention is that this can then be of use to empirical work on everyday eating practices  
34 associated with snacking.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Food sociologists point to the potential social weakening of formal meal times via a process  
4 of informalisation (Southerton 2006: 439) or deconstruction (Warde and Yates 2014,  
5 Mestdag 2005). Deconstruction refers to a loss of temporal fixity of eating events, a spatial  
6 diversification of eating sites and a social deconstruction with an increase in solitary eating  
7 events (Mestdag 2005). Empirical support for this thesis (e.g. Jackson 2009: 10) points to  
8 snacking as a new and significant eating practice. As further possible evidence we could look  
9 to the erosion of the meal by snacking in terms of a process of 'practice colonisation' in some  
10 contexts. In some daily routines breakfast and lunch could increasingly be described as  
11 'snack like' calling into question a simplistic relational definition of snacking vis-à-vis the  
12 meal. It is common for lunch to be consumed in the office in front of the computer as a  
13 material assemblage of snacks such as a sandwich, drink and so on. Indeed a sandwich has a  
14 liminal quality as to whether it is seen as a snack or a meal which may depend upon whether  
15 it is accompanied by other foods. Cereal companies have diversified their products into  
16 snacks so that breakfast can be mobile, consumed during the morning commute or as one  
17 arrives at work. Examples include the breakfast bar by Jordans and breakfast biscuits by both  
18 Belvita and Kellogg's. This represents a marketing strategy by these companies presumably  
19 aimed at consumers lacking in the time resources or inclination to sit down for breakfast.  
20 These 'breakfast snacks' have come under some media criticism for their high sugar and fat  
21 content illustrating also perhaps how the transgression of the boundary between 'meal' and  
22 'snack' risks exposure to the latter's cultural moralisation<sup>3</sup>. Framed in terms of practice  
23 theory this degree of definitional overlap between 'meal' and 'snack' takes place via an  
24 innovation in the materiality of food itself and a subversion of the temporally normative  
25 meaning of the snack away from its common sense understanding as taking place *outside*  
26 meal times. This could be contrasted with the tendency for some to have cereal late at night  
27 as a snack which retains the materiality of the breakfast but sees it become a snack due to its  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 temporal shift. Part of deconstruction may also be an erosion of the normative culturally  
4 situated practice of eating three meals a day. Those who skip breakfast may focus on two or  
5 even one main meal a day augmented by other eating events. There is cultural variation here,  
6 for example, some people in French society eat a small fourth meal consumed between  
7 traditional lunch and dinner times called a *goûter* (McCrorry and Campbell 2011: 145).  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 It is helpful to think about the conceptualisation of snacking by thinking in more detail about  
17 the three elements that make up the practice. Firstly, in considering the wide array of  
18 *meanings* of snacking something of the moralisation and temporal norms of the practice have  
19 already been noted. A snack has typically been seen as less nutritionally adequate than a  
20 meal. Thinking a little more closely about the temporal relationality between snacks and  
21 meals a snack is sometimes thought of as providing a bridge between meal times which is a  
22 more positive meaning. Moreover snacking is strongly associated with pleasure but perhaps  
23 also a wider affective experience including guilt, anxiety or jealousy. Doing particular sorts  
24 of snacking might be bundled with more healthy sporty practices as much as with more  
25 sedentary habits. A substantial amount of snacking research looks at the co-location of  
26 snacking with such practices as television viewing or gaming. Yet other snacks may evoke  
27 meanings of cultural (be)longing or suggest childhood memories. As well as the surfacing of  
28 a healthy snacking industry some snacks may attempt to carry meanings related to forms of  
29 ethical consumption such as reduced environmental impact.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Secondly, the *materialities* of snacks are smaller, portable, often packaged and available from  
50 a wide range of shops. Particular forms, such as some healthier snacks, may be found in  
51 more specialist retail infrastructure. Snacks can be sweet or savoury. Drinks interestingly are  
52 not usually referred to as snacks unless accompanied by food. Sweet snacks are more likely  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 to be seen as a 'treat', perhaps a special kind of snack often couched in terms of self-reward.  
4  
5 Here the role of manufacturers in the development of taste and its cultural circulation and  
6  
7 stratification in interplay with human corporeality should not be discounted from thinking  
8  
9 about the sensual enrolment of new practitioners in a wider range of snacking practices. The  
10  
11 whole production complex of snacks, their design and distribution are vital to the everyday  
12  
13 performance of snacking. Historically snacking has also had its own specific materialities  
14  
15 especially in the form of the vending machine. Although certainly a material element shared  
16  
17 by many (non-food) practices, the proliferation of the vending machine throughout the  
18  
19 twentieth century co-evolved with new institutional spaces and transport hubs and may  
20  
21 arguably be tied to less temporal and spatial structure in eating practices. Snacking practices  
22  
23 are also dynamically in relation with the materiality of meals. If meals are composed in such  
24  
25 a way so as not to be experienced as filling then this could increase the likelihood of  
26  
27 snacking. Similarly the bundling of eating practices with others that require significant  
28  
29 energy expenditure may shape the practice of snacking. For example, there is a subset of  
30  
31 high sugar snacks that are marketed at people involved in sports and exercise.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 Thirdly, snacking *competences* are less clear than the other two elements of the practice. This  
40  
41 is because the design of the snack is to build competence into the materiality of the food  
42  
43 itself. Although there are niche innovations in the practice to make homemade snacks the  
44  
45 rationale for most snacks is that they are time saving, convenient and ready to eat. The know-  
46  
47 how required to practice snacking is thus limited in most cases to knowledge of sources and  
48  
49 of new snacking innovations. Forms of *social* competency around when, where and with  
50  
51 whom it is normatively appropriate to snack are also important and form an important link  
52  
53 between competency and meanings.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Having considered the elements of snacking we can add some further depth to this discussion  
4  
5 by thinking about snacking in relation to recent work on practices and temporality  
6  
7 (Southerton 2006, 2012). Unlike other practices that are also frequent and repeated the  
8  
9 periodicity (Southerton 2006) of eating practices is in a sense inescapable. However the  
10  
11 temporal organisation of eating practices is open to much elaboration. Temporality is  
12  
13 intuitively important to thinking about snacking. It is not only the case that the snack is  
14  
15 defined by being materially smaller than the meal but that it takes place at times not normally  
16  
17 seen as meal times. Thus although as I have argued we should not be content with a  
18  
19 simplistic temporal dichotomy between meal and snack, empirically certain times of the day  
20  
21 – mid-morning, mid-afternoon and later at night – are most likely be those times at which  
22  
23 most snacking practices take place. However we can also point to a certain temporal  
24  
25 ambiguity. For example, if a sweet foodstuff is consumed perhaps ninety minutes after  
26  
27 dinner can it still be claimed as a dessert linked to a meal or has it become a snack?  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 In the practice theory literature practices are often described as ‘routines’ or ‘habits’ though  
35  
36 without further specification of what that might mean. Sociologist Dale Southerton aims to  
37  
38 add analytical rigour in order that we better grasp temporalities and the reproduction of  
39  
40 practices. He argues simply that,  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 “Habits and routines reflect stable practices as entities that permit and are reproduced  
46  
47 through recurrent, non-reflexive and culturally shared actions. Explained this way habits and  
48  
49 routines are the observable patterns of action that result from the reproductive performances  
50  
51 of stable practices” (Southerton 2012: 15/6).  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 This is important to practice theory overall since it helps to underline its opposition to  
4 theories that may conceptualise social actors as always self-knowing and rational. Southerton  
5 further specifies habits and routines by outlining three forms of action that are generally  
6 evoked by the terms. These are  
7  
8  
9  
10

11  
12  
13  
14 “dispositions – the tendency to perform practices according to culturally derived  
15 orientations; procedures – tacit knowledge and embodied skills; and sequences – the ordered  
16 performances of practices through material, infrastructural and institutional forms”  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 (Southerton 2012: 16).  
22  
23

24  
25 Dispositions are intended to capture how different groups in society are differently disposed  
26 toward practices, the importance that might be endowed in a practice and thus the time spent  
27 performing it. This includes a consideration of economic and cultural capital and also the  
28 observation that some social groups may also hold a different relation to time itself, for  
29 example, everyday schedules that exhibit a high degree of planning and busyness. If one is  
30 generally enmeshed in rushed schedules one may be more likely to be recruited to snacking  
31 practices. Southerton also points out that if a particular practice comes to provide meanings  
32 of self-actualisation carriers of that practice may come to organise their lives in order to  
33 devote greater time to it (2012: 12/3). Practices that make one miss meal times may be those  
34 which open up time for snacking. One’s disposition may shape the type of snacks one  
35 consumes but also as important the sort of neighbouring practices one performs which may  
36 be bundled with snacking. This is important if snacking is a practice that is rarely done in  
37 isolation from other practices.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Temporal procedures evoke tacit knowledge around, for example, how long practices are  
4 socially expected to last (such as breakfast during the week being a relatively quick meal) or  
5 the order in which they are expected to take place (breakfast, lunch, dinner). For Southerton  
6  
7 “such temporal regularities coordinate and hold practices stable in ways that generate  
8 procedures of action” (2012: 14). Changing eating practices may involve opening up such  
9 tacit procedural knowledge to reflexive scrutiny in terms of the way in which temporal  
10 procedures are important in the regular reproduction of practice and to the way in which other  
11 practices may subtly effect change upon them. Other practices compete with eating for time  
12 and we could point to the way in which food preparation time has been squeezed and more  
13 processed foods have emerged recursively with this. If meals are becoming shorter events  
14 then perhaps this is another way in which meals and snacks become less bounded. Snacking  
15 as indicated above has its own temporal procedures guiding when and for how long it is  
16 expected to take place. If one consistently snacked at ‘mealtimes’ this would likely be  
17 deemed against prevailing food and nutritional norms. Snacks allow creativity in the  
18 everyday performance of the temporal procedure of eating events and in as much are  
19 productive, allowing for negotiation in everyday time management. Snacking is also  
20 assumed to be an eating practice of short duration. We can see here how a subversion of its  
21 own temporal procedure would likely bring snacking into clearer conflict with moralised  
22 meanings around norms of ordered and healthy eating.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 Sequences are intended by Southerton to capture the way in which performances are shaped  
48 by material objects, infrastructure and institutionally timed events (2012: 14/5). We might  
49 think of the embodied performance of following a recipe and interacting with various  
50 technologies as an example of this, or how kitchen technologies such as the freezer,  
51 microwave or the food processor speed up performances. Processed snacks clearly benefit  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 from technological innovations in production and distribution. Snacking practices also  
4  
5 emerge within institutionally timed events such as the end of the school or work day, in  
6  
7 designated break or play times via access to local shops or catering vans and during leisure  
8  
9 time. Different modes of workplace catering infrastructure including the presence of  
10  
11 vending machines or canteens also allow for flexibility over the timing of snacking  
12  
13 performances.  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 Shove *et al.* and Southerton's conceptual framework give a closer account of the  
19  
20 interrelationship between practices and temporalities, a better vantage point to consider how  
21  
22 practices compete for time, how everyday performances take place within complex  
23  
24 interweavings of practice and time, how practices configure temporalities and how  
25  
26 temporalities shape practice (Shove *et al.* 2012: 127-130, Southerton 2012: 16). Shove *et al.*  
27  
28 suggest that rather than straightforwardly competing against each other for time, "time is  
29  
30 something that practices 'make'...experiences of time are part and parcel of the experience of  
31  
32 practice" (2012: 129). Experientially this is a compelling framing as we come to grasp time  
33  
34 through socially conventional everyday doings. The idea that practices have 'careers' adds  
35  
36 to Southerton's work on temporality, recognising that "at any one moment, 'a practice'  
37  
38 consists of a composite patchwork of variously skilled, variously committed practitioners  
39  
40 enacted and reproduced by beginners and old-hands alike" (Shove *et al.* 2012: 71). This  
41  
42 helps capture the dynamism of a practice and is suggestive for research that might target  
43  
44 differently positioned practitioners within the practice entity. For example, how might the  
45  
46 emergence of childhood snacking differ within society (and between societies) and under  
47  
48 what conditions do children transition to healthy snacking? I have already suggested that  
49  
50 there is an element of time competition and colonisation between 'meals' and 'snacks'.  
51  
52 Snacking can also 'make time' when it is used to break up the morning or afternoon and  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 structure the working day. These temporal considerations greatly enhance the  
4  
5 conceptualisation of snacking. However they require empirical research in, for example, the  
6  
7 complex sites of family and workplace and their associated relationships. I briefly consider  
8  
9 such research below.  
10

### 11 12 13 14 **Researching Snacking** 15

16  
17  
18 First, it is worth noting how those with a commercial interest in reproducing and broadening  
19  
20 the practice of snacking, the snacking industry, are interested in extending the practice in  
21  
22 order to maximise sales. Indeed they have a degree of literacy around the relationship  
23  
24 between eating and temporality. Every year the Snack Food Association (SFA), an  
25  
26 international trade association formed in 1937, organises the annual SNAXPO ‘The world's  
27  
28 largest, most comprehensive trade show devoted exclusively to the international snack food  
29  
30 industry’<sup>4</sup>. In 2014 Sally Wyatt from Information Resources Inc. (IRI) presented on the  
31  
32 current state of the snack food industry -  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 “Wyatt stressed the impact of today’s busy consumer who is increasingly eating more  
40  
41 frequent, but smaller, meals throughout the day. While indulgent snack sales are still strong,  
42  
43 she said sales of healthier-for-you snacks are continuing to increase. Wyatt advised snack  
44  
45 manufacturers to take advantage of all day parts, tailoring products to the types of occasions  
46  
47 they wish to target, from early morning to late at night, keeping in mind the snacking habits  
48  
49 of age groups and other demographics”<sup>5</sup>  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 This extract is interesting not only for the distinction made between ‘indulgent’ and  
55  
56 ‘healthier-for-you’ snacks which acknowledges the growth in the latter category but also for  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the temporal awareness of the snack industry as they divide up the day (not unlike a  
4 quantitative time use approach) and target particular time slots which can potentially inhere  
5  
6 in the materiality and meaning of the snack product.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 This work on a practice conceptualisation of snacking begins to suggest empirical directions.  
12  
13 From this extract one could begin to investigate how the marketing of snacks frames eating  
14 practices. Practice theory as a theory of process is obviously interested in historical  
15 approaches to understanding the dynamism of elements, practices, bundles and complexes.  
16  
17 As part of a larger aim to understand the emergence and history of snacking, an important  
18 empirical project could be to research the emergence of bodies like the SFA and the role they  
19 may have played in further bringing together the elements of the practice. Another approach  
20 in this vein is to look at the history of specific food companies or food commodities, notably  
21 sugar (Abbott 2010; Mintz 1986) and salt (Kurlansky 2003), in order to trace their emergence  
22 and normalisation within everyday eating practices. This is further necessary in order to  
23 embed understandings of eating practices within a timeline of transnational political economy  
24 and political ecology, to keep relations of power at the forefront of the analysis of everyday  
25 (but not reducible to a micro scale) food performances and practices.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 A historical approach to elements of a practice or to the forms of action in habitual  
44 performance offer further points of possible empirical research. This could include a history  
45 of potato crisps, chocolate bars, charting the more recent history of healthier snacks or indeed  
46 a material history of the aforementioned vending machine. This latter suggestion reminds us  
47 to retain a focus on the spatiality of practice alongside the focus on temporality. This adds to  
48 our understanding of both the meanings and sequences of performances. Institutional spatial  
49 norms are important here. For example, many though by no means all workplaces afford  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 opportunities to snack with a great deal of flexibility. Some schools also allow a more  
4  
5 limited degree of food or drink consumption outside meal times. As a practice is allowed to  
6  
7 be performed in new spaces its normalisation becomes more secure. Working alone in an  
8  
9 office would be one example that affords such freedom and largely removes one from the sort  
10  
11 of activities or micropolitics of the work environment that could constrain personal food  
12  
13 autonomy. The tendency for people to lunch in their office perhaps due to time constraints  
14  
15 also reinvents the workspace as a site of food consumption where potentially less healthy  
16  
17 snacks or snack-like meals are more likely to be consumed largely alone.  
18  
19

20  
21  
22 This is an example of the way in which practices not only 'make time' but also "re-make  
23  
24 space" (Shove *et. al.* 2012: 133). If there has been a partial deconstruction of the meal this  
25  
26 may be accompanied by various spatial elaborations of eating events to different rooms in the  
27  
28 house and within the rise of eating out. With such shifts we might expect materials  
29  
30 associated with the family meal such as the dining table to take on new meanings, uses or  
31  
32 indeed disappear (see Curtis *et. al.* 2010: 292). A consideration of space also clearly sets up  
33  
34 potential sites for empirical investigation. Family households, workplaces, school spaces and  
35  
36 spaces of mobility where people snack on the move, sites of leisure spectatorship are all  
37  
38 obvious sites to target. Expanding markets have also allowed particular snacking practices to  
39  
40 extend across space and to be performed transnationally. At any one time many people are  
41  
42 performing snacking and constitute the same "practice-space" in spite of their dispersal  
43  
44 (Shove *et. al.* 2012: 133). Yet if snacking is a practice that is especially bound up with others  
45  
46 it is important not to decontextualise it from its neighbours but to think about the co-location  
47  
48 of specific practice bundles that reproduce the practice entity.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Considering space can serve to refine the ontological focus of practice theory. Although it  
4 may be implicit (because practices are self-evidently social) it is arguably more accurate to  
5 posit the social as constituted by practices *and* relations. It is people and their spatial  
6 networks that perform practices and bring together or prevent the important links forming  
7 between different elements of a practice. This is not meant as a humanist reassertion but as  
8 recognition of everyday human doings (relationally with the nonhuman) enmeshed in the  
9 reproduction of practices. Communities of practice are thus important for both verifying  
10 performance and innovating within and between practices (Shove *et. al.* 2012: 66/7 & p.160),  
11 for exposure to new meanings and material forms and for learning new competences.  
12 Conversely, people and networks may act to block new practices by staying loyally with pre-  
13 existing ways of doing and devaluing or blocking new niche innovations. Making relations  
14 explicit is also important for holding onto understandings of how power operates socially  
15 through the performance of practice and the deepening of practice entities in the context of  
16 sophisticated practice complexes.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 It is possible to illustrate the interplay of relations and practice by returning to snacking and  
37 focussing upon one site, the family home. Unlike other eating practices most people practice  
38 snacking. It has successfully become a normal everyday eating event. The practice  
39 diversifies in terms of frequency, generation, timing, duration, location and material content.  
40 Snacking may also vary over the life course and in relation to disposition. Although 'family'  
41 households clearly reflect much diversity, research on families and food can be instructive for  
42 exploring further the interplay of familial relations and the practice of snacking.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 Eating practices change as familial arrangements do (Jackson 2009: 3) such as a rise in single  
55 person households or in dual earner families (Brannen *et. al.* 2013). The dynamism in  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 familial arrangements is in turn bound up in changing patterns of employment and in shifts in  
4  
5 gendered social expectations and meanings in family and work life. A focus on children's  
6  
7 eating practices illustrates how food is intimately part of the micropolitics of control within  
8  
9 and between familial relations. This focus is important because it is often children's as  
10  
11 opposed to an adult's or parent's snacking that is subject to moralisation. Researching  
12  
13 children's eating practices can relate in turn to understanding further particular forms of  
14  
15 'doing family' (Morgan 2011: 5) and parenting modes (O'Connell and Brannen 2013), the  
16  
17 threat that children's snacking might pose to the family meal, and to a particular ideology of  
18  
19 'family' as revolving around formality, hierarchy and traditional food (Curtis *et. al.* 2010).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 The family home has long been seen by social scientists as an important site for social  
26  
27 reproduction but translated into the terms of practice theory we can begin to specify how  
28  
29 elements of a practice may circulate. If eating practices are part of doing family more  
30  
31 specifically they can also be seen as part of the performances of childhood, parenthood and  
32  
33 grandparenthood and they figure strongly in these negotiated everyday relationships.  
34  
35 Relations are important for the circulation of dispositions, the reproduction of practice and its  
36  
37 elements. Parents normalise the regular food materialities and meanings that a child first  
38  
39 encounters and directly or not teach a child various food competences such as nutritional  
40  
41 knowledge and by displaying their own eating performances (Marshall *et. al.* 2007: 168).  
42  
43 These may be most conflicted in differences between children and grandparents reflecting  
44  
45 generationally embedded moral assumptions about certain foods or eating events. Food  
46  
47 performances may be especially salient in families co-produced by migration as elements also  
48  
49 bundle with the performance of ethnicity and nationhood and are shaped by meaningful  
50  
51 memories. Relations are inevitably about affiliation and power and so eating practices are  
52  
53 also demonstrative of care and affection (Punch *et. al.* 2010: 227) and figure in conflict and  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 control between parents and children (O'Connell and Brannen 2013). Snacking may be  
4 closely controlled by parents and may vary by their investment in meanings of healthy food.  
5  
6 Children may snack at those times such as after school when they may be indulged or less  
7 likely to be observed or supervised.  
8  
9  
10

11  
12  
13  
14 Research that focuses on the perspectives of children has uncovered their role in shaping  
15 family eating practices and made clear their agency in securing snacks through request or  
16 even subterfuge as well as explicating examples of snacking bundling, perhaps most notably  
17 with TV viewing (Marshall *et. al.* 2007: 171-2). As we might expect from the earlier  
18 discussion on temporality research that focuses on time, food and family life is revealing for  
19 understanding the social organisation of eating events. In their study of meal times in British  
20 dual earner families Brannen *et. al.* revealed the complexity around attempts to perform a  
21 synchronous 'family meal'. They exposed important issues such as work time schedules,  
22 children's participation in extra-curricular activities, the ages of children and the coordination  
23 of differing family food preferences in making the family meal during the working week  
24 difficult to achieve consistently (2013: 429). What exact implication a lack of meal  
25 coordination may have on the nature of snacking events is a question for further research.  
26  
27 This study demonstrates what Valentine has discussed as the connection between the home  
28 and other spaces (1999: 514) whereby domestic (food) practices may be the result of  
29 elements that have 'travelled' from elsewhere (such as new foodstuffs or meanings or  
30 techniques) and are shaped by the often rather fixed temporal sequences of the workplace or  
31 of leisure commitments.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52  
53  
54 This section briefly summarised various ways in which an analysis of one site, in this case the  
55 family household, can yield a closer understanding of the interplay of practices and relations,  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 whilst at the same time recognising that no one site is bounded off from the broader dynamics  
4 of social practice. Alongside the historical approaches outlined earlier and the proposed  
5 analysis of the snacking industry this sort of social science research represents a third  
6 direction of inquiry informed by a practice theory approach. It underlines the need for in situ  
7 empirical social research to better comprehend the nuances of eating practices within and  
8 between social relations.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

## 20 **Conclusion**

21  
22  
23  
24  
25 In considering what a practice theory approach might have to offer, this article has outlined  
26 the various ways in which the framing affords a new conceptualisation of snacking. The  
27 performance of snacking emerges not out of unruly behaviour but through the recruitment of  
28 practitioners to a type of eating event that has emerged in the social, temporal, economic and  
29 cultural organisation of everyday life.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 Viewing snacking in terms of the three elements of practice – materialities, meanings and  
39 competences – it is possible to grasp the dynamism of the practice and to begin to consider  
40 how these elements have come to cohere in everyday recognisable ‘normal’ performances.  
41 This framing also partly addresses the definitional complexities that many have commented  
42 upon in the snacking literature. If a snack is partly a practice in temporal and material  
43 competition with the meal we can see its role in the proto deconstruction of the meal as lunch  
44 and breakfast begin to take on snack-like material form and meaning. This element of  
45 categorical ambiguity seems to add methodological credibility to approaching everyday  
46 eating as a series of eating events or at minimum refraining from imposing categories upon  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 the practices of the researched. To do so would be to risk missing out on innovative  
4  
5 performances even though there remain normative temporalities and materialities to many of  
6  
7 our everyday eating practices.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 The practice approach also underlines the importance of historical research in order to learn  
13  
14 more about how a practice entity emerges and several research avenues informed by the  
15  
16 approach were suggested. Corporate practices for both framing and embedding snacking  
17  
18 were suggested as especially important areas for research. Work around temporality and habit  
19  
20 was presented to make clear that eating practices cannot be reduced to wholly autonomous  
21  
22 rational choices but are embedded within relatively stable practice interdependencies.  
23  
24 Southerton's elaboration of habits and routines as stable reflections of practices informed by  
25  
26 dispositions, procedures and sequences afforded further conceptual gains in understanding  
27  
28 the reproduction of snacking performances. With the intention of suggesting further  
29  
30 empirical directions the importance of the interplay between relations and practices was  
31  
32 explored through the example of the familial household.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 Whilst practice theory is keen to stress how *practices* constitute the social they do so  
40  
41 recursively with and through relations. Bringing together recent practice theory with the  
42  
43 sociology of the family is a worthy intellectual development given that the latter has over the  
44  
45 past twenty years conceptualised families as practices and dynamic performances (e.g.  
46  
47 Morgan 1996, Curtis *et. al.* 2009: 94/5). It is within such highly porous social sites that locate  
48  
49 the doing of work, education and family, and within the material practices of food  
50  
51 manufacturers and retailers that we can begin to better understand the practice of snacking, its  
52  
53 reproduction and, if appropriate, points of intervention.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> This is the strapline of the UK DEMAND centre which investigates practices relevant to energy consumption, see <http://www.demand.ac.uk/>

<sup>2</sup> Although there do exist industry associated organisations such as the Snack Food Association (<http://sfa.org/>) and the European Snacks Association (<http://www.esa.org.uk>).

<sup>3</sup> “‘Healthy’ breakfast bars? You might as well eat a Hobnob! Research reveals shocking levels of fat and sugar in ‘on-the-go’ snacks and low-fat yogurt”, Daily Mail, 27 October 2012 <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2224189/Healthy-breakfast-bars-You-eat-Hobnob-Research-reveals-shocking-levels-fat-sugar-snacks-low-fat-yogurt.html#ixzz32LeiN7fW>

<sup>4</sup> See <http://www.snaxpo.com/>

<sup>5</sup> See <http://www.iriworldwide.com/NewsEvents/PressReleases/ItemID/1868/View/Details.aspx>

## References

Abbots, E. and Lavis, A. (eds.) (2013) *Why We Eat How We Eat – Contemporary Encounters between Foods and Bodies* Farnham: Ashgate.

Abbott, E. (2010) *Sugar: A bittersweet history*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Blue, S., Shove, E, Carmona, C. and Kelly, MP. (2014) Theories of Practice and Public Health: understanding (un)healthy practices, *Critical Public Health*, published online 12 Nov 2014.

Brannen, J., O'Connell, R. and Mooney, A. (2013) Families, meals and synchronicity: eating together in British dual earner families, *Community, Work and Family*, 16, 4, 417-434.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Chamontin, A., Pretzer, G. and Booth, D. (2003) Ambiguity of 'snack' in British usage,  
6  
7 *Appetite*, 41, 1, 21-29.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Curtis, P., James, A. and Ellis, K. (2010) Children's snacking, children's food: food moralities  
13  
14 and family life, *Children's Geographies*, 8, 3, 291-302.  
15  
16

17  
18  
19 Delormier, T., Frohlich, K.L. and Potvin, L. (2009) Food and Eating as Social Practice –  
20  
21 understanding eating patterns as social phenomena and implications for public health,  
22  
23 *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 31, 2, 215-228.  
24  
25

26  
27  
28 Grogan, S, Bell, R. and Conner, M (1997) Eating Sweet Snacks: Gender Differences in  
29  
30 Attitudes and Behaviour, *Appetite*, 28, 1, 19-31.  
31  
32

33  
34  
35 Guthman, J. and DuPuis, M. (2006) Embodying neoliberalism: economy, culture, and the  
36  
37 politics of fat, *Environment and planning D*, 24, 3, 427-448.  
38  
39

40  
41  
42 Jackson, P. (ed) (2009) *Changing Families, Changing Food*. Basingstoke: Palgrave  
43  
44 Macmillan.  
45  
46

47  
48  
49 James, A., Kjørholt, A-T. and Tingstad, V. (eds) (2009) *Children, Food and Identity in*  
50  
51 *Everyday Life*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.  
52  
53

54  
55  
56 Kurlansky, M. (2003) *Salt: A World History*. London: Vintage.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Lang, T. (2009) Reshaping the Food System for Ecological Public Health, *Journal of Hunger*  
4  
5 *and Environmental Nutrition*, 4, 3-4, 315-335.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 Macdiarmid, J., Loe, J., Craig, LCA. and Masson, LF. *et al.* (2009) Meal and snacking  
11  
12 patterns of school-aged children in Scotland, *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 63, 11,  
13  
14 1297-1304.  
15  
16

17  
18  
19 Marshall, D., O'Donohoe, S. and Kline, S. (2007) Families, food, and pester power: beyond  
20  
21 the blame game?, *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 6, 4, 164-181.  
22  
23

24  
25  
26 McCrory, MA. and Campbell, WW. (2011) Effects of eating frequency, snacking, and  
27  
28 breakfast skipping on energy regulation: symposium overview, *The Journal of Nutrition*, 141,  
29  
30 1, 144-147.  
31  
32

33  
34  
35 Mestdag, I. (2005) Disappearance of the traditional meal: temporal, social and spatial  
36  
37 destructuration, *Appetite*, 45, 1, 62-74.  
38  
39

40  
41  
42 Mintz, S. (1986) *Sweetness and Power: the place of sugar in modern history*. New York:  
43  
44 Penguin.  
45  
46

47  
48  
49 Morgan, D. (2011) *Rethinking Family Practices*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.  
50  
51

52  
53  
54 O'Connell, R. and Brannen, J. (2014) Children's food, power and control: Negotiations in  
55  
56 families with younger children in England, *Childhood*, 21, 1, 87-102.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Pickering, A. (2000) Practice and Posthumanism: social theory and a history of agency. In  
4  
5 Schatzki, T, Knorr Cetina, K. & von Savigny, E. (eds) *The Practice Turn in Contemporary*  
6  
7 *Theory*. London: Routledge.  
8

9  
10  
11  
12 Probyn, E. (2000) *Carnal Appetites: FoodSexIdentities*. London: Routledge.  
13

14  
15  
16 Punch, S., McIntosh, I. and Emond, R. (2010) Children's food practices in families and  
17  
18 institutions, *Children's Geographies*, 8, 3, 227-232.  
19

20  
21  
22  
23 Reckwitz, A. (2002) Toward a theory of social practices, *European Journal of Social Theory*,  
24  
25 5, 2, 243-263.  
26

27  
28  
29  
30 Røpke, I. (2009) Theories of practice - New inspiration for ecological economic studies on  
31  
32 consumption, *Ecological Economics*, 68, 10, 2490-2497.  
33

34  
35  
36 Savige, G., MacFarlane, A., Ball, K. and Worsley, A. *et al.* (2007) Snacking behaviours of  
37  
38 adolescents and their association with skipping meals, *International Journal of Behavioral*  
39  
40 *Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 4, 36.  
41

42  
43  
44  
45 Sayer, A. (2013) Power, Sustainability and well being: an outsider's view. In Shove, E. and  
46  
47 Spurling, N. (eds) *Sustainable Practices: Social Theory and Climate Change*. London:  
48  
49 Routledge.  
50

51  
52  
53  
54 Schatzki, T. (1996) *Social Practices: A Wittgensteinian Approach to Human Activity and the*  
55  
56 *Social*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Southerton, D. (2006) Analysing the temporal organization of daily life: Social constraints,  
6 practices and their allocation, *Sociology*, 40, 3, 435-454.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Southerton, D. (2013) Habits, routines and temporalities of consumption: From individual  
12 behaviours to the reproduction of everyday practices, *Time and Society*, 22, 3, 335-355.  
13  
14  
15  
16

17  
18  
19  
20  
21 Valentine, G. (1999) Eating in: home, consumption and identity, *The Sociological Review*,  
22 47, 3, 491-524.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 Verplanken, B. (2010) Beyond frequency: Habit as mental construct, *British Journal of*  
28 *Social Psychology*, 45, 3, 639-656.  
29  
30  
31

32  
33  
34 Warde, A. (2013) What sort of a practice is eating?. In Shove, E. and Spurling, N. (eds)  
35 *Sustainable Practices: Social Theory and Climate Change*. London: Routledge.  
36  
37  
38

39  
40  
41 Warde, A. and Yates, L. (2014) Understanding Eating Events: Snacks and the British Meal  
42 Pattern, forthcoming in *Appetite*  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 Weijzen, PLG., de Graaf, C. and Dijksterhuis, GB. (2009) Predictors of the consistency  
48 between healthy snack choice intentions and actual behaviour, *Food Quality and Preference*,  
49 20, 2, 110-119.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review