Looking Through the Kitchen Window:

A Critical Discourse Analysis of Domestic Foodwork Research and Oppression

by

Faith Saeerah

Department of Food Systems and Society

Marylhurst University

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of

Master of Science in Food Systems and Society

June 4, 2018

Thesis Advisors: Patricia Allen, Sean Gillon

Table of Contents

This thesis is dedicated to two of my heroes: Sylvia Rivera and Marsha P. Johnson—two trans women of color who paved the way for queer rights and the beginning of queer liberation as we know it today. Marsha and Sylvia defied restrictions of gender and sexuality imposed on them by greater society, and despite the transphobia, racism, and classism exhibited by the gay and lesbian community at the time, remained committed to supporting low-income trans people of color. Their work in developing and managing the Street Transvestite (now Transgender) Action Revolutionaries (STAR), a group that focused on aiding homeless transgender youth and the specific issues that they faced because of their gender identity and class, reminds us of the importance of addressing all facets of an individual's identity and struggle. Both experienced systemic and individual acts of violence as a result of their identities, which Marsha eventually paid for with her life. This thesis' focus on intersectionality and the way that silence creates the space for violent and oppressive acts is deliberate, as we remember those before us.

Acknowledgements

I am profoundly grateful for the guidance, encouragement, and never-ending patience of Patricia Allen and Sean Gillon. Their work and tutelage in the Food Systems & Society program is unlike any other and I am so thankful to have been able to work with them over the past two years. To my cohort, it has been a pleasure conversing with you all about very difficult topics while sharing our experiences and learning together. Meg and Monicka, I am so grateful to have found two lifelong friends in this program and I owe it to you both for seeing this research to completion. To my parents, thank you for always supporting me and always loving me, even from across the world. Lastly, this research would not have been possible without the endless support and love from my partner Jes. Thank you for believing in this work and for being my inspiration always.

Abstract

Domestic foodwork research has been a way for researchers to better understand the intersections between food, gender, and power. This thesis unearths how domestic foodwork discourse maintains the status quo and/or contributes to its transformation by interrogating the inclusivity of existing research in reference to queer, ethnoracial, and class identities using critical discourse analysis. Research samples that reflect dominant identity norms of cisgender, heterosexual, white, and middle-class narratives work to maintain oppression through cultural imperialism. Intersectionality theory which acknowledges how individual identities intersect to create a multitude of experiences, is applied to the way that identities are discussed and acknowledged within research. My recommendations for future research include 1) using gender neutral language, 2) employing scales or spectrums instead of rigid dual categories when referring to gender, 3) acknowledging the identities of research subjects, and 4) employing a greater focus on how power and socioeconomic status drive power and inequity.

Keywords: intersectionality, domestic foodwork, oppression, identity, gender, race, class

Chapter One

Introduction

The kitchen has long been a site of study and contention within academia as a means to understand the intersections between food, gender, and power in the domestic realm. Feminist theorists, anthropologists, sociologists, and food researchers among others have most often used foodwork in the home as an avenue for highlighting gender oppression in what I call domestic foodwork discourse. Foodwork is defined by Bove and Sobal (2006) as "the labor involved in making meals" (70), which can include meal planning, shopping, preparation, cooking, clean-up, and the emotional labor associated with providing food for family. Domestic foodwork has been used to highlight the subordination of women, but in its desire to do so has often reinscribed oppression through the exclusion of race, class, and gender identities that do not fit the dominant narrative.

The dominant narrative of the middle-class, white and cisgender bodies, and their subsequent heterosexual relationships are created by discourse which involves both the language we use and the way that we use it to create our social world. Discourse is inherently tied to social justice as it dictates how we think, talk about, and define oppression, justice, and liberation. This normalization of a dominant identity prevents conceptualizations of different types of inclusive research. Thus, the following research will address how the microcosm of domestic foodwork discourse confronts the oppression of intersectional identities because I want to illuminate how discourse can work to highlight or reproduce oppression so that we may think more deeply about its impact on society.

To demonstrate how domestic foodwork discourse can highlight or exclude the oppression of intersectional identities this thesis will ask:

1. In what ways has domestic foodwork research addressed categories of oppression?

2. What research approaches and strategies would facilitate greater inclusion within domestic foodwork discourse?

To answer the above questions, an understanding of discourse, oppression, and intersectionality are needed, which are both defined in the Background and Significance section. The definition of social groups, cultural imperialism, and violence are also shared to further develop the framework of this research. The Methods and Methodology section outlines how critical discourse analysis, queer theory, and theories of doing, undoing, and redoing gender will be used to critically analyze domestic foodwork discourse and its conceptions of gender, race, and class. My positionality as a bisexual woman of color is also outlined in this section, revealing the personal importance of this research.

To address how domestic foodwork research has addressed categories of oppression, the Results, Analysis, and Contribution section firstly uses Kemmer's (2000) critique of domestic foodwork research to highlight improvements and gaps in research during and since that time. Nuclear families, men and masculinity within foodwork, geographical location, and class are all discussed referencing past research. It is found that despite improvements, there are large gaps regarding the inclusion of ethnoracial and queer identities. The next portion discusses how queer inclusion is negated by heteronormativity, homonormativity, and opposing binary language such as man vs. woman and masculinity vs. femininity. Ethnoracial and class inclusion are additionally discussed in relation to the illusion that white and middle-class experiences are the norm, making the experiences of low-income people and people of color invisible.

To address how greater inclusion can be facilitated within domestic foodwork discourse, the way that existing research has progressed is discussed. The way that studies use pluralization

of masculinities and femininities, degendered language, and spectrums or scales as opposed to rigid categories to decentralize gendered narratives are explored. The limited instances of class and ethnoracial inclusion and discussion are also considered for their effectiveness. After acknowledging the creative ways that research was inclusive, gaps and potential research topics are considered.

With this in-depth analysis of how research does and does not include intersectional identities, I finally make a series of recommendations to improve discourse that more effectively addresses intersectional identities and oppression. These recommendations are 1) using gender neutral terminology that avoids binary thinking, 2) using a scale or spectrum instead of opposing dual categories when referencing gender roles, 3) acknowledging the identities of research subjects, and 4) employing a greater focus on how power and socioeconomic status drives inequity and oppression.

Chapter Two

Background and Significance

Domestic foodwork discourse provides a unique perspective for analyzing how the oppression of social groups and identities of gender, race, and class is either addressed or ignored. Although the gender oppression illuminated in this work represents but a small piece of the wider range of oppression that victims experience and that perpetrators commit, this microcosm allows a specific narrow example for how discourse can impact our framing of society. To better understand this work, this section will define discourse, oppression, intersectionality, social groups, cultural imperialism, and violence. Together these definitions will create the framework for which this research is based.

Discourse is often used to refer to language itself—the diction and syntax we use to ascribe meaning to objects, ideas, and theories. This research however, will use Foucault's interpretation of the term discourse as described by Hall (2004) "as a system of representation" whereby language and its use embedded in historical context is understood to produce meaning and knowledge (345-7). Thus, not only will the language in domestic foodwork research be analyzed, but also "its practice and institutional regulation" (348). In addition to this, the historical context of domestic foodwork research must be acknowledged as Foucault believed that "forms of power/knowledge [are] always rooted in particular contexts and histories" (348). Discourse is inherently important to the existence of oppression which is discussed next.

The idea of oppression in this thesis will follow the framework of Young's (1990) "Five Faces of Oppression", that defines oppression as an injustice experienced by social groups that functions as an aspect of daily social life that includes both individual and systemic acts. In this way, oppression is maintained and reproduced by "the normal processes of everyday life"

including the "assumptions and reactions of well-meaning people… media and cultural stereotypes, and structural features of bureaucratic hierarchies and market mechanisms" (56). Young defines the fives faces of oppression as exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, and violence, in order to avoid a singular faceted definition that fails to acknowledge the ways that different groups are oppressed similarly and/or differently. For this thesis, cultural imperialism and violence will be specifically discussed in relation to domestic foodwork discourse. Before delving into these definitions however, social groups and individual identity, which are both deeply tied to each other and formulated by discourse, must be discussed in order to understand oppression fully.

Social groups are defined by Young (1990) as "a collective of persons differentiated from at least one other group by cultural forms, practices or ways of life" (57). The relational context of social groups is important to remember when understanding oppression, as oppressed groups cannot exist without privileged groups. With this in mind however, it must also be recognized that although groups may obtain privilege through another group's oppression, oppression as understood today is not the cause of a privileged group's conscious coercion, but a result "of the everyday practices of a well-intentioned liberal society" (56). Individual identity is similarly created in a relational context "as a product of linguistic and practical interaction" (59). Thus, groups and individual identity, along with the norms and stereotypes they produce and maintain, can be understood as being created by discourse. This particular research will mostly focus on queer, ethnoracial, and class identity, although it should be noted that there are many more identity factors such as age, ability, and immigration status that can impact a group or individual's experience with oppression. In addition to these definitions, it is also important to acknowledge the intersectionality of groups.

Intersectionality theory, coined by Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, was created within the context of antidiscrimination and social justice movements to challenge the idea of "single axis thinking" that can ultimately undermine "disciplinary knowledge production and struggles for social justice" (Cho, Crenshaw, and McCall, 2013, 787). In this paper's discussion of social groups, identity, and oppression, intersectionality provides a key framework for highlighting differing identities within oppressed social groups that mark out a variety of experiences. Young (1990) acknowledges this stating that social groups are not "homogenous" but are "differentiated by age, gender, class and sexuality… any of which in a given context may become a salient group identity" (60). Thus, to avoid this "single axis thinking" both in our understanding of oppression and social groups, the framework of intersectionality asserts that discourse must acknowledge how individual identities intersect with each other to create a multitude of experiences. The importance of this is made clear by Young's (1990) descriptions of cultural imperialism and violence.

Cultural imperialism as defined by Young (1990) "involves the universalization of a dominant group's experiences and culture, and its establishment as the norm" thus making the experiences of outside groups both invisible and marked as 'Other' (66). In this thesis, cultural imperialism will highlight how domestic foodwork discourse utilizes dominant narratives to render invisible the identities of oppressed groups. Although the illumination of these oppressed identities in dominant discourse is essential, the intersectionality of these identities as described previously is also necessary. Acknowledging how identity can intersect with race, ethnicity, age, gender, class, sexuality, nationality, and ability function to portray a more complete picture of oppression that is vital to avoiding the erasure of these stories from the dominant narrative. A

prime reason for advocating for this inclusion is directly related to Young's (1990) description of violence.

Violence can be understood as being inherently tied to cultural imperialism, as it is the otherness and invisibility of the groups that suffer this type of oppression that make violent acts against them acceptable. As Young (1990) argues "what makes violence a face of oppression is less the particular acts themselves… than the social context surrounding them, which makes them possible and even acceptable" (68). This violent erasure embodied by discourse is further elaborated by McCann (2016):

> To "settle" on a subject category, then, is to reinscribe a fixity that excludes some,
>
> often in violent ways (for example, those who are literally erased because their
>
> bodies do not conform to a discrete binary). (231-232)

McCann in this example is referring to how the dichotomy of the gendered subjects "man" and "woman" operate to erase queer bodies whose genders do not fit into these distinctions. A lack of acknowledgement within discourse therefore creates a social context where violence against differently gendered or ungendered individuals is made more acceptable. There are a multitude of examples like this for different social groups, such as hooks' (1994) description of how Standard English dominates academia despite there being other ways of speaking and knowing, such as in black vernacular speech (167-174). In sum, I hope to demonstrate how cultural imperialism impacts dominant foodwork discourse, while normalizing the social context that makes violence against oppressed groups possible.

This research will address how the microcosm of domestic foodwork discourse confronts the oppression of intersectional identities because I want to illuminate how discourse can work to highlight or reproduce oppression so that we may think more deeply about its impact on society. To address this, my thesis asks:

1. In what ways has domestic foodwork research addressed categories of oppression?

2. What research approaches and strategies would facilitate greater inclusion within domestic foodwork discourse?

To answer these questions, I will investigate how queer theory, the concepts of doing, undoing, and redoing gender; feminist critique, and intersectionality theory are applied to existing domestic foodwork research. The methodology and methods section outlined next, will demonstrate how a framework of critical discourse analysis will bring to light how discourse is used within domestic foodwork research to combat or recreate oppression.

Chapter Three

Methods and Methodology

To understand how domestic foodwork discourse can be reimagined through an intersectional lens of identity including queer, ethnoracial, and class identity, the following section will illustrate the methodologies and methods that will be applied to existing research. Critical discourse analysis will be the primary operating framework for analyzing how domestic foodwork research limits oppression or inclusivity. Additional theories including queer theory, the original and reimagined concepts of 'doing gender', in addition to feminist critique and intersectionality theory will be used to analyze discourse. These theories and concepts were specifically chosen to reflect my positionality as a bisexual woman of color who is in a relationship with a genderqueer individual.

Research exploring the intersections of food, gender, and power, regularly employ heteronormative and binary language, categorizations, and methods; leaving out the valuable and important experiences of queer people such as myself. 'Queering' foodwork research has become a way to, as McCann (2016) says, "endure the challenges of identifying as queer in a world where queer is violently targeted and obscured" (233). The invisibility of bisexual and transgender identities in both heteronormative and queer domestic foodwork research holds particular importance for me, as it demonstrates that individuals with identities like my own and my partner's, and the relationships that people like us have with each other, are not concerned in examinations of foodwork discourse. Individuals who identify as bisexual are known to have "high rates of being ignored, discriminated against, demonized, or rendered invisible by both the heterosexual world and the lesbian and gay communities (LGBT Advisory Committee, 2011, 1). Transgender individuals (and the plethora of identities that can fall under this label such as

genderqueer, nonbinary, and/or genderfluid) additionally experience excessively high rates of discrimination due to a lack of state protections and targeted abuse[1]. Highlighting the absence of these identities and individuals within research is thus incredibly important, as I wish to see individuals like myself and my partner recognized in academic literature and discourse in general.

The intersection of queer identity with race and class background is also personally important to me, as I yearn for all parts of my identity to be represented and acknowledged in the communities that I am a part of. I am often unable to address racial bias or discuss my multiracial identity in queer spaces, while also being unable to address queer bias or my queer identity with a large part of my family due to homophobic norms. Despite these struggles, I also recognize the benefits that my class and wealthy upbringing has had on my education, class, and employment status. The continued omission of an acknowledgement of how race, class, and queer identities intersect with each other to provide different experiences within domestic foodwork discourse serves to reify these identities as wholly separated or completely invisible: a perfect example of cultural imperialism. The following methodology highlights how research can serve to include these intersectional identities through usage of queer theory, theories of 'doing gender', and intersectionality theory.

Methodology: Queer Theory, 'Doing Gender', and Intersectionality

Critical discourse analysis will provide the primary framework for conducting this research. Critical discourse analysis according to Van Dijk (2005) "studies the way social power,

---

[1] For more information see *Injustice at Every Turn: A Report of the National Transgender Discrimination Story* (Grant et al. 2011).

abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context" (352). In addition to this it is important to acknowledge that research can never be unbiased, and to truly address social justice issues one must take positionality into account. Discourse, as described previously, refers not only to the language that we use but its practice—in this case within research and academia concerning domestic foodwork. My purpose for using critical discourse analysis lies in how discourse "is constitutive both in the sense that it helps to sustain and reproduce the social status quo, and in the sense that it contributes to transforming it" (Fairclough & Wodak, 2004, 357). Thus, this research intends to unearth how domestic food discourse maintains the status quo and/or contributes to its transformation. As Fairclough & Wodak (2004) affirm, "every instance of language use makes its own small contribution to reproducing and/or transforming society and culture… that is why it is worth struggling over" (362). Because of this, analyzing how language and its use can oppress queer individuals through the use of queer theory is incredibly important.

Queer theory will dictate the methodological approach for understanding how discourse influenced by heteronormativity and binary language influence the inclusion of queer identity in domestic foodwork. Queer studies involve exploring "the relationship between and among sex, sexuality, and gender without reproducing heteronormativity," in addition to how norms are "made, circulated, lived, desired, transformed, and resisted," (Wiegman, 2007, 218). Just as early domestic foodwork research brought women's subordination to light by demonstrating how oppressive gender roles are enacted, I hope to highlight how queer identity can transform and resist gender norms in existing and future research through changing discourse. Queer theory additionally functions to "interrogate and deconstruct the binaries of male versus female, homosexual versus heterosexual, feminine versus masculine," (Goldberg, 2013, 87). Thus, queer

theory will take a central part in highlighting how rigid dichotomies of gender and sexuality used in the categorizations and language of domestic foodwork discourse function to limit the scope and breadth of findings. Although deconstructing the gendered subjectivities that both define and limit us will play a substantive role in this thesis, it must be acknowledged that these same subjectivities also serve as the method through which we encourage "political transformation" (McCann, 2016, 238). Therefore, an exploration of how gender is both created and maintained through social interaction is still necessary to explore.

The concept of "doing gender" coined by West and Zimmerman (1987) and more current conceptions of "undoing" (Deutsch, 2007) and "redoing" gender (Kelly & Hauck, 2015), have been used to describe both queer and non-queer divisions of domestic food labor. In its original form, "doing gender" contends that "gender is not a set of traits, nor a variable, nor a role, but the product of social doings… and constituted through [social] interactions" (129), much like the notion of individual identity described earlier. In non-queer texts, this theory is often used to describe how gender is created through interactions among families and/or between individuals in relationships in the domestic sphere. Furthermore, it acts as the basis for how gender roles persist through the actions of everyday life encompassing foodwork and domestic labor. Several authors have found this theory of doing gender to be quite limited and have come up with alternative theories.

Doing gender is a useful, but limited theory, in that it inherently assumes individuals to be heterosexual and cisgender, while making it seem like the social structure of gender is incapable of changing. "Undoing gender" by Deutsch (2007), acknowledges the importance of the theory of doing gender, but notes how "it has become a theory of gender persistence and inevitability of inequality" (106), thus requiring a reframing for how we can undo gender.

"Redoing gender" takes this a step further by queering it, "challenging normative gender roles or creating alternatives for how gender organizes social life," such as through "enacting an egalitarian division of labor" (Kelly & Hauck, 2015, 438). To better understand how research is addresses queer identity, the above theories must be explored and valuated for their effectiveness at doing so within research.

Feminist critique has identified how research can be more inclusive of women and feminist thought through addressing the historical subordination of women in foodwork. Gender inequity and women's subordination can be seen as a reason for studying how queer relationships navigate domestic labor (Carrington, 2012; Kelly & Hauck, 2015; Goldberg, 2013). For example, Kentlyn (2007) notes how lesbians in their study were conflicted by "the need to acknowledge the value of 'women's work' whilst also seeing it as symbolic of women's oppression and position of subordination within gendered relations of power" (120). Understanding how gender inequity and women's subordination translates to queer relationships and identity can potentially demonstrate how gender roles affect individuals of all sexual orientations and gender identities. Although these understandings of identity are important, they lose value if their intersection with other identities such as race and class are not considered.

Women of color have critiqued mainstream feminism since its inception "to expose and interrupt the solipsistic agendas, experiences, and ideas of middle-class white women that were masquerading as concerns of the universal women in feminism" (Clark Mane, 2012, 71). These critiques remain well-founded today as Clark Mane points out, "syntaxes of whiteness… allow racial critique and diverse voices to be included while simultaneously being contained and diluted," or in other words, prioritizing white privilege over a true "racial overhaul" (92). This is a classic example of Young's (1990) definition of cultural imperialism where the dominant

narrative obscures the oppressed. Thus, intersectionality theory and its commitment toward understanding the multiple and diverse nexuses of identities and experiences is made even more important in this research. The impact that intersections of gender, sexuality, race, class, income, and even ability and citizenship status, has on the experience of individuals and families within domestic foodwork discourse is paramount to explore.

Methods

In what ways has domestic foodwork research addressed categories of oppression?

To answer this question, critical discourse analysis and queer reading practice will be applied to academic articles about domestic foodwork that discuss gender to highlight how intersections of queer, ethnoracial, and class identities are confronted. Because so little research exists on queer individuals and families doing foodwork, some articles that more broadly focus on domestic labor were chosen for the purpose of analyzing how these studies could be used to make foodwork discourse more inclusive. An inclusive and intersectional lens will require an investigation on whether research includes non-dominant narratives of sexuality, gender, race, ethnicity, and class. First, I will examine if queer, non-white, and/or underclass/working-class individuals were included in either the research sample or discussion. Terminology used to distinguish these identities will be determined through a diction analysis of articles to understand how language can create inclusion or exclusion of specific social groups. Lastly, the different categorizations that are used to define individuals and/or foodwork tasks, such as masculine versus feminine, will be analyzed for their usefulness and appropriateness.

What research approaches and strategies would facilitate greater inclusion within domestic foodwork discourse?

Determining how existing domestic foodwork discourse addresses oppression in queer, ethnoracial, and/or class identities, will create the starting point for making future recommendations that can lead to greater social change. As described earlier, the historical context must always be considered when discussing discourse. Acceptable ways of discussing social groups, particularly those who are not part of the dominant narrative or who are actively marginalized or made powerless, are constantly changing in an ebb and flow of terminology revisions, updated research, and changes in acceptance levels. Existing research will be analyzed based on these changes, with recommendations on how oppression can be better addressed. Research that focuses on the hegemonic identities of Anglo-American, white, cisgender, middle-class, and heterosexual individuals, will be reimagined in their research scope and discussion to better understand how neglecting oppressed identities has implications for current work and future change. Studies that do acknowledge identities outside of the dominant representation, will be analyzed for their effectiveness at portraying the fluid and complex conceptions of intersectional identities.

The mentioning of identities without greater discussion regarding its effects or impacts, the employment of dimorphic categorizations and assumptions, and the use of exclusionary and/or outdated language are a few aspects I hope to shed light on. The Results, Analysis, and Contribution section demonstrates that although research is moving in the right direction, there are many improvements that still need to be made.

Chapter Four

Results, Analysis, and Contribution

This thesis analyzes domestic foodwork discourse in relation to the social problem of oppression created by dominant identity norms of gender, sexuality, ethnicity, race, and class, and how discourse can render these other groups as invisible. The way that these identities, including queer, ethnoracial, and/or class, are both created and maintained through dominant discourse represents the main research problem of this paper. To address these issues the research questions that will be asked are:

1. In what ways has domestic foodwork research addressed categories of oppression?

2. What research approaches and strategies would facilitate greater inclusion within domestic foodwork discourse?

These questions will primarily illuminate how domestic foodwork discourse has included and discussed identities outside of the dominant norms of straight, cisgender, Anglo-American, white, and middle-class, while addressing how discourse can be more representative. Secondly, these questions will prioritize and foreground the importance of identities that as a result of cultural imperialism, are not often discussed within academia, specifically transgender, nonbinary, and bisexual identities. By focusing on the potential of research to progress and improve, this thesis remains hopeful that new ways of language use and practice that work to illuminate the multitude of experiences that oppressed individuals face is possible. Lastly, although the results and analysis of this section function to heavily critique existing research, it should be acknowledged that academia, and particularly the realm of social identities, are constantly being updated and changed. Thus, critique of existing research and calls for a change in the dominant discourse can be seen as a continual process as opposed to an end goal.

RQ1: In what ways has domestic foodwork research addressed categories of oppression?

To understand how domestic foodwork research has addressed categories of oppression, its inception, critique, and progression to more inclusive discourse will be described in the next section. Domestic foodwork research was initially started as a way of discovering how gender roles and relations shape foodwork in the home and the food system. The influential study *Feeding the Family* by sociologist DeVault (1991) for example, demonstrated how everyday activities of feeding work create positions of dominance and subordination that oppress women through their caring work. Additional research conducted by Murcott (1982) and Charles and Kerr (1988) both explore the gendering of food in the private domestic realm in comparison to the public economic realm. Both studies share similarities in that they were carried out in Great Britain, the first in South Wales and the latter in Northern England, and that they studied women who were pregnant and/or had children. Murcott, Charles and Kerr, and Devault's work all observed women to be subordinate providers to the dominant food needs of their wage providing husbands, thus emphasizing the gender roles of women as food preparers and men as wage earners. Although this research was influential for its time, they have severe limitations outlined by Kemmer's (2000) research note concerning the gendering of domestic foodwork in academic literature.

Kemmer's (2000) critique provides a convenient benchmark for demonstrating how later research has both improved and failed to move forward in the two decades since their suggestions. From this analysis of Murcott's (1982) and Charles and Kerr's (1988) work, I have summarized a list of four recommendations made by Kemmer below:

1. Emphasize household structures other than "the nuclear family with dependent children" (330).

2. Focus domestic foodwork research on men in addition to women (330).

3. Employ greater geographical context (325).

4. Conduct comparative research that evaluates "the effect of social class" (326).

These four points will be utilized to provide a background for how research during and since Kemmer's (2000) article have progressed.

Domestic foodwork discourse still overwhelmingly emphasizes studies on individuals in nuclear family structures and relationships, demonstrating how this notion is part of a larger dominant societal narrative. The nuclear family as a "cultural norm" within research fails to demonstrate how households typically operate foodwork (Kemmer, 2000, 330). Fortunately, research has moved beyond just documenting the life stages of childbearing and/or childrearing that nuclear families are assumed to experience. A number of studies concerning foodwork during early marriage (Kemmer et al. 1998; Kemmer, 1999; Bove & Sobal, 2006) and seniority (Sidenvall, Nydahl, Fjellström, 2000; Hughes et al., 2004; Sydner et al., 2007) for example, have brought to light how foodwork can adapt through lifestyle changes including marriage, aging, and widowing. A few research accounts further include individuals in other living situations such as living alone, with parents, or with roommates among other variations in their research samples (Szabo, 2012, 2013, 2014; Hughes et al., 2004). Unfortunately, foodwork research that specifically includes household structures such as those composed of multiple families, multiple generations, or unrelated individuals excluding romantic couples, is almost nonexistent. Unlike the continued prevalence of studies concerning nuclear family structures, research that specifically focuses on men and masculinity in the discourse surrounding domestic foodwork has risen.

Since Kemmer's (2000) critique, masculinities and men's roles in foodwork have been given the spotlight in multiple contexts. The concepts of both singular and multiple masculinities are used in Sobal's (2005) analysis of men, meat, and marriage, where they describe the ways men "do gender" via food consumption and how this is navigated to construct masculinities within and outside of marriage. Aarseth and Olsen (2008) analyze how men's participation in foodwork represents a stepping stone to greater social change where food preparation and domestic work is shared as a joint family project. Lastly, Szabo (2012, 2013, 2014) has conducted multiple studies after finding that little research focused on men with consistent cooking responsibilities or assumed men to only partake in food preparation as leisure. In all accounts, Szabo observes how assumptions about men and food preparation fail to address the various, nuanced ways that men participate in foodwork and treat it as a combination of work and leisure instead of one or the other. Although this increased presence of research focusing on men is enlightening, its progress means little if it does not also include greater geographical context in addition to greater diversity of research samples.

More studies have thankfully come to light concerning a more global and cross-cultural approach to domestic foodwork. In addition to Kemmer's (2000) emphasis on the need for studies to have greater geographical contexts, I also argue for the importance of greater ethnic and racial diversity within research. Beagan et al. (2008), Ristovski-Slijepcevic et al. (2010), and Meah (2014) all examine various ethnocultural groups in cross-cultural comparative studies to highlight the ways that culture and ethnicity can impact the effects of power and gender within foodwork division and practice. These studies note how primarily Caucasian/Western populations were studied in existing research on foodwork and food choice, and that studies comparing ethnocultural and geographical location's effect on this were needed. Meah's (2014)

study in particular holds interest as it aims to "decent[er] Anglo-American understandings of the relationship between gender, power, and domestic kitchens" while highlighting migrant and minority women, bringing their experiences to the forefront (672). Both Beagan et al. (2008) and Ristovski-Slijepcevic et al. (2010) combine the study of geographical location and ethnocultural groups through including research subjects from different Canadian regions and three different ethnocultural groups. Lastly, Szabo's (2012, 2013, 2014) research on men's food roles comprises of a diverse research sample where approximately 50% of the individuals studied include men of color. More research that focuses and/or compares a diversity of geographical locations and ethnoracial groups is needed; however it is of utmost importance that class is also recognized and studied in conjunction with gender/sexuality and ethnoracial background.

Kemmer (2000) notes how different findings on domestic foodwork research over time may be connected not only to social progress, but to social class differences (326). Although class is occasionally mentioned (Cairns et al. 2010, Lupton 2000, Mellor et al. 2010), it is rarely discussed or even acknowledged in a large portion of foodwork studies. In the same way that Kemmer (2000) laments how focusing on only one geographical location fails to represent gender divisions in foodwork as a whole, only focusing on middle-class individuals and families fails to represent how other class-related factors may exacerbate or relieve the occurrence of gender roles within foodwork. For example, in Bove and Sobal's (2006) article concerning foodwork among newly married couples, the discussion of how purchasing a home after marriage led to "increased interest in eating at home" due to "larger foodspaces and more pleasant eating places" (82) can be connected to the higher social class and expendable income of the individuals studied. Despite this, the class of the research subjects is never actually mentioned. Kemmer's (20000) suggestion to have greater comparative research that discusses

the effects of social class still needs to be embraced when studying domestic foodwork, particularly when combined with other factors such as race, ethnicity, gender, and geographical location.

Although Kemmer's (2000) suggestions provide a nuanced view for how research could stand to be more encompassing of a wider variety of people and household structure, several other identity factors were left out. As mentioned earlier, although geographical context is mentioned, the consideration of race and ethnicity in conjunction with this is excluded. The inclusion of queer identities is further not mentioned among these suggestions, and as this thesis will go on to point out, are rarely acknowledged or explicitly researched in domestic foodwork studies. Race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, and class are all crucial factors to include if researchers wish to better understand how different backgrounds and composite identities can work to create differing experiences within domestic foodwork. The following section will underline how intersectionality should be further explored within domestic foodwork discourse.

To truly understand the impact of gender, sexuality, race, and class, among other factors, intersectionality theory needs to be addressed. Intersectionality as described previously, is the idea that social groups need not be homogenous and rigidly categorized but can instead comprise of differing identities that compose a multitude of experiences. The idea that women are oppressed in the same way for example, fails to acknowledge the ways that a woman's age, ability, race, class, sexuality, and nationality, may cause their experience of oppression to differ from that of the dominant narrative. This rigidity is apparent not only in domestic foodwork discourse, but in some definitions of oppression. Young (1990) acknowledges this in their work whereby they seek to avoid categorizing "separate systems of oppression for each oppressed group: racism, sexism, classism, heterosexism, ageism, so on" as this method of viewing

oppression "fails to accommodate the similarities and overlaps in the oppressions of different groups" and "falsely represents the situation of all group members as the same" (69). Thus, domestic foodwork research that neglects the intersection of queer, ethnoracial, and class identities, function to erase important stories and lessons for how gender and food roles can be constructed from a multiplicity of intersecting factors.

The importance of exposing gender roles within domestic foodwork and how they have developed and/or changed over time, continue to be an important rationale for conducting domestic foodwork studies. However, the heteronormative discourse used within this research results in the erasure of other forms of oppression. The tendency of articles to focus on particular categories of gender, race, and class give us a limited view of how foodwork is organized in a wide range of households, while rendering the diverse experiences of others invisible. This neglect of queer, ethnoracial, and class identities within research reflects the oppression of these identities in society, revealing the current dominant discourse to be a social problem. The erasure of individuals who do not fit the Anglo-American, white, heterosexual, cisgender, and middle-class mold limits the ability of researchers to both accurately portray how domestic foodwork is done and how discourse within research and in general can move forward to be more inclusive and equitable for those involved.

Queer Inclusion: A focus on Heteronormativity, Binary Categorizations, and Language

The vast majority of articles examined utilized heterosexual individuals in their research to understand different meanings and ways of doing associated with domestic foodwork. This is hardly surprising given the background of domestic foodwork research as a largely feminist undertaking toward understanding how women's oppression and gender inequality is reproduced

and maintained in the private sphere and everyday activities of the home. Although some studies acknowledge that only heterosexual participants were included (Bove & Sobal, 2006; Lupton, 2000; Meah, 2014), a number of them failed to mention this limitation of their research sample (Aarseth & Olsen, 2008; Bahr Bugge & Almas, 2006; Mellor et al., 2010; Ristovski-Slijepcevic et al., 2010; Sydner et al., 2007). By not specifying the dominant sexuality included in research, heterosexuality is solidified as an unquestioned norm, rendering the existence and experiences of queer identities invisible. The underlying assumption that research concerning domestic foodwork should solely regard heterosexual identities is summarized by the concept of heteronormativity.

To better understand the importance of queer inclusion, the concept of heteronormativity, defined by Haywood et al. (2017) as a social system of boundaries that deems how "gender is organized, structured, and maintained" (110) must be explored. As demonstrated above, heteronormativity is prevalent in domestic foodwork discourse, particularly with the types of individuals that are recruited for study. It can also be represented however, in the way that categorizations and language used by researchers often insist on dimorphic generalizations based on the gender binary of man/woman. Although the categorizing of research results into neat opposing categories helps us to more easily catalogue and understand roles and ways of doing gender, these strict binaries fail to accurately portray the spectrum and complexity of gender itself and the existing roles in relationships surrounding foodwork.

Ways of doing gender are often tied to binary separations of masculine and feminine (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Szabo's (2014) account of men nurturing through food for example, categorizes men as enacting "traditional culinary masculinities" and "traditional culinary femininities", with the former representing cooking as a skill, leisure, and/or seduction,

and the latter representing cooking as care-oriented (21). Dichotomies used in other senses such as public (male)/private (female) (Murcott, 1983), and leisure (male)/care (female) (Cairns et al. 2010) can also be seen as reinscribing the gender binary and limiting our conceptions of doing gender to either/or categorizations. Haywood et al. (2017) describes how heteronormativity can be symbolically violent through language, particularly through the use of queerphobic derogatory terms (103). Although the use of these terms is thankfully not present within research, binary classifications within common discourse do function to erase individuals who identify with a number of different genders and gender expressions, such as transgender, two-spirit, nonbinary, genderfluid, and genderqueer, among others. Restricting research categorizations and assumptions in this way can "reinscribe a fixity that excludes some often in violent ways [such as] those who are literally erased because their bodies do not conform to a discrete binary" (McCann, 2016, 231-232). As explained earlier, cultural imperialism through making groups both invisible and marked as other, creates the space to make violence socially acceptable and/or dismissed when it occurs.

Some researchers do attempt to move beyond these dualistic categories and/or recognize the limited nature of separating results into opposing classifications. In their discussion of foodie discourse for example, Cairns et al. (2010) refuse to categorize the ways that gender is challenged and reinforced as progressive or traditional, but "present them as collective evidence of the particular ways that foodie discourse offers opportunities to do and redo hegemonic gender norms" (598). The blurring of categories is emphasized by Meah's (2014) discussion of power and gender in cooking spaces, where they describe how the home does not reflect "a neatly demarcated boundary between public and private," but a space that is inherently political, where "gendered relations are both lived out and relentlessly reinforced, producing and reproducing

gender-based subjectivities" (674). The dichotomy of men's foodwork as leisure and women's foodwork as care-work is also challenged by research. Szabo (2012) emphasizes how men in their research "Foodwork or Foodplay?" experienced cooking as "work-leisure", while Cairns et al. (2010) illustrates how women challenge gender assumptions that "men seek pleasure through food while women… achieve pleasure only by serving food," through emphasizing their own pleasure via a foodie identity (598). Lastly, although Szabo's (2014) iteration of "traditional culinary masculinities and femininities" is a binary category in itself, the pluralization of the terms to better represent "the range of behaviors and feelings" and the "tensions between different masculinities and femininities" within different contexts (21), can be seen as a way to go beyond binary thinking. Another way that researchers attempt to declassify the gender binary in research is through what can be understood as a degendering of foodwork roles.

It cannot be argued that domesticity and foodwork is historically associated with femininity and women's care work, however moving towards a reality where all genders can occupy different domestic roles and spaces fluidly, seems limited through the continual categorization of different spaces and/or tasks as "masculine" or "feminine". Several research studies combat this through classifying foodwork roles based on their actual components and related responsibilities, rather than the genders they are traditionally associated with. Bove and Sobal (2006) for example, associated partners as occupying a "primary foodworker" role, "assistant or sous-chef role" and/or "primary food-shopping role" (76-79). They furthermore acknowledge that some partners equally share the role of shopping and/or clean-up. Lupton (2000) on the other hand, creates categorizations based on the perceptions of the participants themselves, asking what percentage they cooked in comparison to their partner, then letting them justify the results with each other. In this way, partners were categorized by one partner that

cooked more than the other, both partners sharing foodwork somewhat equally, or having other

foodwork options such as both partners cooking for themselves (178). The research examined

above reflects a focus on heterosexual identities and assumptions, however research that focuses

on queer individuals and relationships can also contain limiting discourse in regard to research

samples, language, and categorizations.

The exclusion of queer identities caused by heteronormativity can also occur in what

some scholars describe as homonormativity. Homonormativity can be understood as the

normalization of gay identities within the context of a heteronormative culture and the

assumptions that go along with it. Although normalization itself can be regarded as positive,

homonormativity limits societal understandings of queer identities through a heteronormative

lens that can lead toward erasure. As Van Eeden-Moorfield et al. (2011) caution, "by positioning

lesbian couples and families as just like heterosexual couples and families, the ways in which

these couples may have experiences different than those of heterosexual couples are made

invisible and unexamined" (563). Duggan (2003) further emphasizes this, stating that

homonormativity "does not contest dominant heteronormative assumptions and institutions, but

upholds and sustains them" (50). Very few articles investigated solely queer individuals in their

research (Goldberg, 2012; Kentlyn, 2007; Kelly & Hauck, 2015), with only one focusing

explicitly on queer individuals and foodwork (Carrington, 2012). The way that these articles

contest heteronormative ways of inclusion and categorization, while still drawing from dominant

heteronormative conceptions through homonormativity will be discussed next.

Existing research focusing on queer individuals and families doing foodwork and/or

domestic labor can still include binary and exclusive discourse that can result in the erasure of

queer identities and experiences. When referring to queer couples, the term "same-sex" for

example, is frequently used in research (Goldberg, 2012; Kentlyn, 2007), which disregards the existence of transgender and nonbinary identities. Furthermore, studies like Carrington's (2012) and Kentlyn's exclusively focus on lesbian and gay identities, neglecting a focus on bisexual identifying participants. The term "lesbigay" used by Carrington (2012) could be seen as being more inclusive, but it is unclear whether the term is meant to combine the terms lesbian and gay, or lesbian, bisexual, and gay. The lack of explicit mentioning of bisexuals in this particular study, where lesbians and gays are specifically mentioned, supports the former assumption. This is further elaborated by Goldberg (2012) who recommends further research concerning the experiences of bisexual individuals (99-100). Emphasizing a focus on the language of existing research highlights both the gendered way domestic foodwork is discussed, and the overall lack of inclusion in the study of food roles overall.

Another way that heteronormativity can impact research is through the assumption that queer couples reflect heteronormative relationships. Kentlyn's (2007) research on same-sex couples' divisions of housework in Queensland plays on this heteronormative assumption through their article's title "Who's the Man and Who's the Woman?", an invasive question that many queer couples are familiar with. Van Eeden-Moorfield et al. (2011) describe why this is dangerous:

> This assumption not only masks the complexity and diversity of same-sex families, but it also limits our understanding of their unique experiences and needs, including our understanding of experiences not considered ideal from a heteronormative standpoint, such as nonmonogamy" (563).

Studies by Sobal (2005) and Bove and Sobal (2005) both reference Carrington's (2012) study (first published in 1999) to confirm alignment between heterosexual and queer patterns of

domestic foodwork. The former writes how similar patterns in their study "may also apply to homosexual unions"[2] (141), while the latter bring up how "other work suggests that homosexual couples have similar housework patterns" (86). Although there is no denying that a similarity of patterns could exist, Carrington's research is unfortunately the only study that explicitly documents feeding work in queer families that is frequently referenced in existing research. The referencing of a singular study that is now almost two decades old to confirm similarities should be viewed with concern, particularly when this could further justify the lack of research involving queer individuals if we are concluded to all be the same.

Through the above examination, it is apparent that future research must be more explicit concerning the heteronormativity of their research and take greater steps to seek out research samples that include queer participants. Investigation of existing queer research demonstrates that 'gaystream' inclusion is not enough. All queer identities, particularly those of transgender and bisexual individuals require further research. The inclusion of greater diversity of genders and sexualities in domestic foodwork discourse would be remiss without consideration of how gender and sexuality are additionally impacted by race and class.

Ethnoracial and Class Inclusion: Invisible Whiteness and the Invisible Middle-Class

Much like how research was found to not include, and in some cases even acknowledge, the heterosexuality of their research samples, the majority of studies examined fail to include individuals that are non-white and/or outside of the middle class. As Meah (2014) notes, scholars

---

[2] According to GLAAD's "Glossary of Terms", the term homosexual is considered offensive "because of [the term's] clinical history… it is aggressively used by anti-LGBTQ extremists to suggest that people attracted to the same sex are somehow diseased or psychologically/emotionally disordered".

often make assumptions "premised on an understanding of the world which takes a White, middle-class, Anglo-American standpoint as the norm" (676) of which domestic foodwork discourse is no exception. Feminist thought in its early (and some may say) current stages, has left these norms largely unquestioned, ignoring the concerns of queer women and/or women of color in what many call 'white feminism'. Women of color have long critiqued this brand of feminism where the "experiences and ideas of middle-class white women [are masqueraded] as concerns of the universal woman" (Clark Mane, 2012, 71). This masquerade is not easily located however, as demonstrated by Clark Mane through their description of "syntaxes of whiteness" (73). Paraphrasing Shome (2000), they note how whiteness is a "rhetoric of deflection and evasiveness…[that] refuses to name itself" and thus "it deters from acknowledging the larger issue of how the everyday organization of social and cultural relations function to confer benefits and systemic advantages to whites" (367). This "racially structured nonknowing" (74) will be analyzed in not only whether articles included non-white and non-middle-class participants, but how they are discussed in research.

The ethnicity and/or race of participants is not mentioned in a disappointingly high number of studies (Aarseth & Olsen, 2008; Bahr Bugge & Alma,s 2007; Hughes et al., 2004; Kemmer & Anderson, 1988; Kemmer, 1999; Mellor et al., 2010; Sellaeg & Chapman, 2008; Siddenvall et al., 2000; Sydner et al. 2007). Others admit that the ethnoracial makeup of their participants is largely Caucasian/White (Bove & Sobal, 2008; Lupton, 2000). Although Beagan et al. (2008) and Ristovski-Slijepcevic et al. (2010) wrote about different subjects, both used the same research sample of Punjabi Canadians, African Canadians, and European Canadians from British Columbia and Nova Scotia to provide a diverse cross-cultural understanding of their topics. Similarly, Szabo uses the same research sample of men in three different articles (2012,

2013, 2014), which were composed of men who were half white or European ancestry and half composed of Asian, Afro-Caibbean, Hispanic, or mixed backgrounds (2014, 22). Mentions and more in-depth descriptions of class are treated similarly to ethnoracial background.

Just as whiteness is made invisible by discourse that fails to acknowledge the identity of their research subjects, the existence of the middle class is also made into an unquestioned norm. As hooks points out: "most American citizens do not acknowledge the reality of class difference, of class exploitation, and they continue to believe that this is a classless society" (156). This belief in classlessness is demonstrated in the many articles that disregard the importance of acknowledging the class of their research sample and its potential impact on their research results. Studies either do not mention class at all (Bove & Sobal, 2006; Kentlyn, 2007; Ristovski-Slijepcevic et al., 2010; Hughes et al., 2004) or acknowledge a focus on middle-class participants (Aaarseth & Olsen 2008, Mellor et al. 2010, Kemmer & Anderson 1988, Kemmer 1999, Szabo 2012, 2013, 2014). In some cases, class factors such as employment and income are discussed without recognition of how this relates to the class identity of those studied (Beagan et al., 2008; Lutpon, 2000). In other instances where class is not mentioned, it is apparent that participants were well off such as through Bove and Sobal's (2006) description of how participants had "increased interest in eating at home" due to "larger foodpsaces and more pleasant eating places" (82). Goldberg (2012) additionally notes how "research on same-sex couples has tended to focus on middle-class couples, which may be in part responsible for the tendency to characterize same-sex couples as almost universally egalitarian" (977).

Race and class acknowledgement in joint discussions with gender identity and sexuality should be the norm in domestic foodwork discourse. Unfortunately, as demonstrated above, much of the research examined did not provide comprehensive views of how domestic foodwork

is impacted by race, class, and gender in conjunction with each other, if at all. hooks (2000) emphasizes that "it is no accident that outspoken critiques of race and gender inequities are often about class… for class touches us all in the places where we live, whether we are economically advantaged or disadvantaged" (160). To move forward to make this a reality, the next section will outline how articles were successful in their inclusivity and provide suggestions for improving discourse surrounding domestic foodwork.

RQ2: What research approaches and strategies would facilitate greater inclusion within domestic foodwork discourse?

Domestic foodwork discourse should recognize domestic foodwork as a place for diverse individuals to express agency, enjoyment, and fulfillment, and should not be limited to a narrow scope defined by the dominant identity norms of our society. The effects of cultural imperialism are incredibly apparent in the research investigated above, which most often regarded white, cisgender, heterosexual, and middle-class individuals and families without question. Despite Butler's (1990) description of how "gender intersects with racial, class, ethnic, sexual and regional modalities of discursively constituted identities," making it "impossible to separate out 'gender' from the political and cultural intersections in which it is invariably produced and maintained" (6), much of the research examined attempts to consider gender without including these other factors. This adherence to a dominant narrative not only excludes individuals from different backgrounds but can serve to mark their experiences as invalid or 'other'. Although many of the articles investigated were flawed in their terminology and research methods, several studies demonstrated progress in the right direction.

Gender Categories

The dualism of gender in discourse inherent in this research including what types of people were studied, how habits were categorized, and how language was used to describe research has much to improve upon. Moving beyond the gendered subjectivities of foodwork and foodwork spaces to embody new fluid roles is made exceedingly difficult when research categories continue to limit individuals, including those outside the gender binary, to rigid dualistic conceptions of gender. Gender, not just in domestic foodwork, but throughout society, is discussed relationally, where men and women are viewed as counterparts that perform gender both in tandem and in contrast to each other, leaving experiences outside of these identities invisible and inaccessible. Kelly and Hauck (2015) reject this notion, arguing that same-gender couples cannot "rely on sex category to divide up housework" and that "queer couples don't always view their specialized divisions of labor as heteronormative or reproducing masculine and feminine roles" (460). The following articles represent ways that researchers discussed gender in ways that did not adhere to heteronormative norms including the gender binary.

Research that made steps toward being more inclusive about gender include the use of masculinities and femininities, degendered categories, and using a scale instead of categories to describe foodwork division. As mentioned earlier Szabo's (2014) use of "traditional culinary masculinities and femininities" acknowledges that there is not a singular masculine or feminine category that individuals can fall under. These categories thus represent a greater "range of behaviors and feelings" (21) and furthermore do not limit men and women to fall under their respective categories. Despite this, these dichotomized categories still manage to remind its audience of gendered associations with foodwork, which can bog us down when seeking liberation from these gendered roles.

Degendered categories do a better job at not assigning habits and behaviors to the gender that has historically been assumed to engage with them. Examples of this include Bove and Sobal's (2006) use of "primary foodworker", "assistant or sous-chef role", and "primary food-shopping role (76-79) to describe how participants engaged in foodwork roles. Other studies (Lupton, 2000; Kelly and Hauck, 2015) neglect to use gender in associations with labor distribution, opting to instead use percentages of division such as "would you say it's 50/50, 60/40, 70/30…?" (446). Kelly and Hauck (2015) furthermore provide specific examples of how gender roles are justified among its queer participants in relation to power and redoing gender to demonstrate the multitude of rationales there are as opposed to seeking out a common category to lump individuals and families in to. As Carrington (2012) describes "feeding activities can vary dramatically from one household to the next and often reflects the influence of socioeconomic factors like social class, occupation, and gender, among other" (187). Thus, the use of a scale to describe foodwork distribution may make the most sense.

Kentlyn (2007) uses both degendered categories and a degendered scale of treble and bass to describe how queer couples and families engage in domestic labor. Kentlyn's categories for styles of sharing work include Responsibility-Help (similar to primary foodwork and assistant foodwork described above), Ownership, Alternation, Fluid Shifts, Together, and Outsourcing. Not only does Kentlyn's study provide the most options for styles of sharing among couples, but also acknowledges that relationships may encompass more than one style, indicating the fluidity and complexity of this type of work. In their findings, Kentlyn discovered that although couples were the same gender, "gender [was] still produced, even if it [did] not take the form of conventional understandings of masculinity and femininity" (118). To illustrate this Kentlyn describes how individuals can turn up the 'treble' (femininity) or the 'bass'

(masculinity) through typical processes of doing gender such as gender presentation via clothing and voice pitch. Overall, they recognized how queer individuals may present as both masculine and feminine, and furthermore that "these same people may adjust the balance of masculine and feminine behaviors in different contexts, such as work or sport, and in relation to other people" (119). Although the treble/bass scale is obvious in its relation to masculine/feminine through our association with high-pitch as female and low-pitch as male, this method represents a different way of describing gender roles that employs creative terminology and the use of a scale to avoid rigid and limiting categorizations.

The above research has made strides towards more inclusive discourse in the domestic foodwork arena, but there are still areas that remain unexplored. In the avenue of gender, it is apparent that updated research on queer individuals and families, and new research on transgender people and bisexuals is still needed. Goldberg (2013) explains how the way "bisexual individuals experience the negotiation and division of housework differently in [different-gendered][3] relationships" is of interest, particularly in discovering whether "they experience their own gender and gender identity differently in these… [different][4] relational contexts" (100). As this is something that I have directly experienced in my own relationships, I am interested in how others navigate domestic foodwork based on their own gender identity and the gender identity of those that they live with. Kelly and Hauck (2015) also advise for more research that highlights both transgender and non-binary genders in relationships, as "these couples provide unique contexts for exploring these experiences" (461). Highlighting how

---

[3] "same-sex versus heterosexual" was replaced with "different-gendered". The definition of bisexuality is the attraction to two or more genders, thus using the term "same-sex" and "heterosexual" does not represent all bisexuals' experiences of attraction. The term "same-sex" furthermore erases individuals who identify with nonbinary genders such as genderqueer.
[4] "two" was replaced with "different" as using "two" evokes a binary conception of sexuality (heterosexual vs. homosexuality) which this research aims to deconstruct.

transgender individuals have unique experiences and relationships to domestic foodwork would aid us in understanding how oppression functions differently for different groups and how different groups subvert or resist specific norms to create more equitable experiences.

Ethnoracial and Class Categories

Ethnoracial and class context is additionally prudent to explore in both national and global contexts. As demonstrated in this thesis, investigated research for the most part did not explore intersectional identities and in most cases disregarded or minimally acknowledged the dominant norms of whiteness and class privilege within their research samples. Thankfully, several authors did call for future studies to be more diverse, such as Meah (2014) who suggested greater inclusion of "diverse social and ethnic groupings in the Global North and South" in addition to calling for a greater range of qualitative and ethnographic methods (685). Ristovski-Slijepcevic et al. (2010) and Beagan et al. (2008) additionally provide an excellent framework for doing cross-cultural study that encompasses both ethnic, racial, and locational differences in their groups of African, Punjabi, and European Canadians in two different locales. More research that falls under this vein or explicitly studies groups outside of the dominant narrative would greatly benefit domestic foodwork discourse overall.

Despite not including working-class individuals or families, some studies that explicitly focused on middle-class participants still had valuable insights as to how class can impact gendered foodwork. Mellor et al. (2010) describes how middle-class families use the dinner party as a means of regulating class boundaries and creating social and cultural capital, a job that is overwhelmingly maintained and reproduced by women. Cairns et al. (2010) have perhaps the most in-depth discussion of how the privileged class positions of the participants in their study

enabled them to occupy the identity of 'foodie'. Most importantly, they discuss how "foodies may reinscribe class boundaries even as they contest normative ways of doing gender" (599). This middle-class privilege is highlighted in other work.

There is evidence in multiple studies how socioeconomic status can have great effects on the equitable distribution of housework and that many so-called egalitarian relationships around domestic labor exist because the individuals and families have middle-class privilege (Cairns, 2010; Carrington, 2012; Kelly & Hauck, 2015). The ways that income, free time, and food access and security impact the ability of families to engage in foodwork and the emotional responsibility that goes along with it would be an illuminating area to explore for example. Through my work as the coordinator of a food pantry and soup kitchen, I have heard many stories from low-resource clients about how they navigate securing food including applying (and staying on) food stamps, 'pantry hopping', and knowing where they can obtain cost-free/reduced-price food. This navigation of resources that includes knowledge of accessible food resources, limitations including restrictions and times that resources are open, and limited transportation, all directly translate into how families are able to engage in foodwork at home. This represents just one example of research that would discover how oppression affects those of lower socioeconomic status in a gap in domestic foodwork discourse.

Recommendations

After analyzing the above research and how articles both highlighted and reified oppression, my suggestions for research include the following.

1. Employing gender neutral terminology that avoids binary thinking*:* Ways that this can be done include assigning roles that are descriptive of behavior instead of gender (e.g. meal

planner, dish washer, leisure-oriented, care-oriented). When roles are assigned, great care should be further taken to not make assumptions over whether roles are more feminine or masculine than others, as the case of Szabo's (2012) research where it was found that leisure is associated with masculinity, and care with femininity. This example disregards the capacity of men to do care work, women to engage in leisure, and for all individuals to engage in both care and leisure roles in their daily lives.

2. Using a scale or spectrum instead of opposing dual categories better represents the range of stances individuals and behaviors can represent. A spectrum further acknowledges that doing gender is not stagnant and is directly related to time, space, and circumstance. Thus, researchers can better pinpoint the ways that doing gender can change among individuals and families engaging in domestic foodwork. Spectrums are frequently used in the queer community to describe sexual and romantic attraction and gender, so it makes sense to employ this type of model to domestic foodwork discourse that acknowledges queer relationships.

3. Acknowledging the identities of research subjects. As discussed above, many articles were not explicit in naming whether their research only focused on dominant categories of representation. Although there is no doubt that research that failed to acknowledge their research subjects' identities still held valuable insights into domestic foodwork division and enactment, rationales should still be developed as to why specific groups and/or identities are studied or acknowledged over others. If a study focuses on only heterosexual and white individuals for example, the research should be explicit in stating so along with appropriate reasoning. If it is not possible within a study to fully interrogate multiple aspects of identity such as race, class, sexuality, and ability, it should at least be acknowledged that gaps may exist because of this and that greater research still needs to be done.

4. A greater focus on how power and socioeconomic status drives inequity and oppression. This involves the inclusion of vulnerable class and ethnoracial groups and the specific ways that they encounter oppression. The way that citizenship status can impact an individual's greater participation in housework because they are unable to legally work for example, points to how the larger power structure of borders and statehood impact relationships within domestic foodwork (Kelly & Hauck, 2015). The way that food insecure families navigate resources such as food stamps, food banks, and soup kitchens to feed themselves and how this work is divided could be another example of this. Such a study would offer huge insights for example, into how the lack of state provisions and the bureaucracy of the welfare state create oppressions and prevent families from escaping poverty and food insecurity. The number of potential studies is limitless. Thus, I encourage academics to use their frames of study to acknowledge how global power structures of racism, classism, sexism, and heteronormativity impact the oppressed, and further, how discourse can reify oppression within research and society.

Chapter Five

Conclusion

This research has aimed to bring to light the individuals and relationships that are frequently left out of research on domestic foodwork including queer people, people of color, and low-income/working-class individuals in order to reimagine how domestic foodwork discourse can be more inclusive and less restricted by gendered, classed, and racist subjectivities. Unfortunately, much domestic foodwork research to date exhibits singular-faceted understandings of identity and the existence of intersectional identities is frequently unacknowledged. Although some studies demonstrated greater inclusivity toward a multitude of identities, large research gaps concerning people of color, bisexuals, transgender individuals, and low-income individuals were found to still exist.

The ways in which populations have been rendered invisible in examinations of existing research is a prime example of cultural imperialism, whereby dominant narratives obscure the experiences of those outside of these norms. To engage in social change and move toward functional and egalitarian imaginings of how domestic foodwork can be enacted and divided, these invisible identities must be addressed. Furthermore, the way that these identities are discussed must be done with care and continually updated to reflect current and appropriate terminology. My recommendations for pursuing future research include 1) using gender neutral language, 2) employing scales or spectrums instead of rigid dual categories when referring to gender, 3) acknowledging the identities of research subjects, and 4) employing a greater focus on how power and socioeconomic status drive power and inequity.

I hope the revealing of research gaps and the connection of discourse to oppression will inspire individuals to think more deeply about how the language we use and the way we use it

can be the difference in creating space for social change or creating space for violence. My method of using domestic foodwork research as a microcosm for exploring oppression and discourse demonstrates that others can do the same. I encourage researchers to use their topics of expertise to highlight how discourse within their area of study can either reinscribe, acknowledge, or resist oppression and incite social justice. By changing discourse, we as a society can continue to move forward in creating a world where everyone's holistic identities and experiences are not only acknowledged but celebrated.

References

Aarseth, Helene and Bente Marianne Olsen. 2008. "Food and masculinity in dual-career couples." *Journal of Gender Studies* 17(4): 277-287.

Allen, Patricia, and Carolyn Sachs. 2007. "Women and food chains: The gendered politics of food." *International Journal of Sociology of Food and Agriculture* 15(1): 1-23.

Bahr Bugge, A. and Reidar Almas. 2006. "Domestic Dinner: Representations and practices of a proper meal among young suburban mothers." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 6(2): 203-228.

Beagan, Brenda, Gwen E. Chapman, Andrea D'Sylva, and B. Raewyn Bassett. 2008. "It's just easier for me to do It': Rationalizing the family division of foodwork." *Sociology* 42(4): 653-671.

Bove, Caron F. and Jeffery Sobal. 2006. "Foodwork in newly married couples: Making family meals: *Food, Culture & Society* 9(1): 70-89.

Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.

Cairns, Kate, Josée Johnston, and Shyon Baumann. 2010. "Caring about food: Doing gender in the foodie kitchen." *Gender & Society* 24(5): 591-615.

Carrington, Christopher. 2012. "Feeding lesbigay families." In *Food and Culture* by Carole Counihan and Penny Van Esterik, 187-210. New York: Rutledge.

Charles, N. and M. Kerr. 1988. *Women, Food and Families*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Cho, Sumi, Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw and Leslie McCall. 2013. "Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Applications, and Practice." *Signs* 38(4): 785-810.

Clark Mane, Rebecca L. 2012. "Transmuting grammars of whiteness in third-wave feminism: Interrogating postrace histories, postmodern abstraction, and the proliferation of difference in third-wave texts." *Signs* 38(1): 71-98.

Deutsch, Francine M. 2007. "Undoing gender." *Gender & Society* 21(1): 106-127.

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

Fairclough, Norman and Ruth Wodak. 2004. "Critical Discourse Analysis" In *Social Research Methods: A reader* by Clive Seal, 357-365. London and New York: Routledge.

GLAAD. "Glossary of Terms- Lesbian / Gay / Bisexual / Queer" In GLAAD's *Media Reference Guide*. https://www.glaad.org/reference/lgbtq

Goldberg, Abbie E. 2012. "Doing" and "undoing" gender: The meaning and division of housework in same-sex Couples." *Journal of Family Theory & Review* 5(June 2013): 85-104.

Goodman, David, and Michael Redclift. 1991. "Food into freezers, women into factories," in *Refashioning Nature: Food, Ecology, and Culture*. New York: Routledge: 1-46.

Grant, Jaime M., Lisa A. Mottet, Justin Tanis, Jack Harrison, Jody L. Herman, and Mara Keisling. 2011. *Injustice at Every Turn: A Report of the National Transgender Discrimination Survey.* Washington: National Center for Transgender Equality and National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.

Hall, Stuart. 2004. "Foucault and Discourse" In In *Social Research Methods: A reader* by Clive Seal, 357-365. London and New York: Routledge.

Haywood, Chris et al. 2017. *The Conundrum of Masculinity*. Routledge: New York, NY.

Hollows, Joanne. 2003. "Feeling like a domestic goddess: Postfeminism and cooking." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 6(2): 179-202.

hooks, bell. 2000. "Living Without Class Hierarchy" In *Where We Stand: Class Matters* 156-164. New York: Routledge.

Hughes, Georgina, Kate M. Bennett, and Marion M. Hethering. 2004. "Old and alone: barriers to healthy eating in older men living on their own." *Appetite* 43(2004): 269-276.

Kan, Man Yee, Oriel Sullivan, and Jonathan Gershuny. 2011. "Gender convergence in domestic work: Discerning the effects of interactional and institutional barriers from large-scale data." *Sociology* 45(2): 234-251.

Kelly, Maura, and Elizabeth Hauck. 2015. "Doing housework, redoing gender: Queer couples negotiate the household division of labor." *Journal of GLBT Family Studies* 11:438-464.

Kemmer, Debbie. 2000. "Research note: Tradition and change in domestic roles and food preparation." *Sociology* 34(2): 323-333.

Kemmer, Debbie. 1999. "Food preparation and the division of domestic labour among newly married and cohabiting couples." *British Food Journal* 101(8): 570-579.

Kemmer, Debbie, A. S. Anderson, and D.W. Marshall. 1998. "Living together and eating together: changes in food choice and eating habits during the transition from single to married/cohabiting" *The Editorial Board of the Sociological Review* 48-72.

Kentlyn, Susan. 2007. "Who's the man and who's the woman?" Same-sex couples in Queensland 'doing' gender and domestic labour." *Queensland Review* 14(2): 111-124.

LGBT Advisory Committee. 2011. "Bisexual Invisibility: Impacts and Recommendations". *San Francisco Human Rights Commission.* http://sfhrc.org//sites/default/files/Documents/HRC_Publications/Articles/Bisexual_Invisiblity_Impacts_and_Recommendations_March_2011.pdf

Lupton, Deborah. 2000. "Where's me dinner?': Food preparation arrangements in rural Australian families." *Journal of Sociology* 36(2): 172-186.

McCann, Hannah. 2016. "Epistemology of the subject: Queer theory's challenge to feminist sociology." *Women's Studies Quarterly* 44(3/4): 224-243.

Meah, Angela. 2014. "Reconceptualizing power and gendered subjectivities in domestic cooking spaces." *Progress in Human Geography* 38(5): 671-690.

Mellor, Jody, Megan Blake, and Lucy Crane. 2010. "When I'm doing a dinner party I don't go for the Tesco cheeses': Gendered class distinctions, friendships and home entertaining." *Food, Culture & Society* 13(1): 115-134.

Murcott, Anne. 1982. "It's a pleasure to cook for him: Food, meal times and gender in South Wales households". In E. Gamarnikow *et al.* (eds.), *The Public and the Private*. London: Heinemann.

Murcott, Anne. 1983. "Cooking and the cooked: A note on the domestic preparation of meals" In Anne Murcott (ed.), *The Sociology of Food and Eating.* Aldershot: Gower.

Nash, Meredith and Michelle Phillipov. 2014. "Introduction to the special issue: Eating like a 'man': Food and the performance and regulation of masculinities. *Women's Studies International Forum* 44(2014): 205-208.

Ristovski-Slijepcevic, Svetlana, Gwen E. Chapman, and Brenda L. Beagan. 2010. "Being a 'good mother': Dietary governmentality in the family food practices of three ethnocultural groups in Canada." *Health* 14(5): 467-483.

Rubin, G. 1997. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the "Political Economy" of Sex." In Nicholson, L. ed. *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory.* New York: Routledge 27-62.

Siddenvall, Birgitta, Margaretha Nydahl, and Christina Fjellström. 2000. "The meal as a gift— The meaning of cooking among retired women." *The Journal of Applied Gerontology* 19(4): 405-423.

Sobal, Jeffery. 2005. "Men, meat, and marriage: Models of masculinity." *Food and Foodways* 13(1-2): 135-158.

Sydner, Y.M., Christina Fjellström, Margret Lumbers, Birgitta Sidenvall, Monique Raats. 2007. "Food habits and foodwork: The life course perspective of senior Europeans." *Food Culture & Society* 10(3): 367-387.

Szabo, Michelle. 2014. "Men nurturing through food: Challenging gender dichotomies around domestic cooking." *Journal of Gender Studies* 23(1): 18-31.

Szabo, Michelle. 2013. "I'm a real catch': The blurring of alternative and hegemonic masculinities in men's talk about home cooking." *Women's Studies International Forum* 44(2014): 228-235.

Szabo, Michelle. 2012. "Foodwork or foodplay? Men's domestic cooking, privilege and leisure." *Sociology* 47(4): 623-638.

Van Dijk, Teun A. 2005. "Critical Discourse Analysis" In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* by Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi E. Hamilton, 350-371. Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Carrington, Christopher. 2012. "Feeding lesbigay families." In *Food and Culture* by Carole Counihan and Penny Van Esterik, 187-210. New York: Rutledge.

West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing gender." *Gender & Society* 1(2): 125-151.

Wiegman, Robyn. 2008. "The Desire for Gender." In *A Companion to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Studies* by George E. Haggerty and Molly McGarry, 215-236, Malden: Blackwell.

Young, Iris Marion. 1990. "Five Faces of Oppression" In *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. 39-65. Princeton: Princeton University Press.