



**Family practices and temporality at breakfast: hot spots, convenience and care**

Journal:	<i>Sociology</i>
Manuscript ID	SOC-Mar-2019-ARTC-073.R4
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	breakfast, hot-spots, Italy, convenience food, doing family

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## Family Practices and Temporality at Breakfast: Hot Spots, Convenience and Care

Daniela Pirani, University of Liverpool, UK

Vicki Harman, University of Surrey, UK

Benedetta Cappellini, Durham University, UK

### ABSTRACT

Drawing on 34 semi-structured interviews, this study investigates the temporality of family practices taking place in the hot spot (Southerton, 2003). It does so by looking at how breakfast is inserted in the economy of family time in Italy. Our data show that breakfast, contrary to other meals, allows the adoption of more individualised and asynchronous practices, hinged on the consumption of convenience products. These time-saving strategies are normalised as part of doing family. Although the existing literature suggests that convenience and care are in opposition, and consumers of convenience products can experience anxiety and a lack of personal integrity, such features were not a dominant feature of our participants' accounts. These findings suggest that the dichotomies of hot/cold spots and care/convenience are not always experienced in opposition when embedded within family practices. Hence, this study furthers understandings of family meals, temporality and the distinction between hot and cold spots.

Key words:

breakfast, hot spots, convenience food, doing family, Italy

### Corresponding author:

Daniela Pirani, The University of Liverpool Management School, Chatham Street, Liverpool L69 7ZH, UK.

Email: [d.pirani@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:d.pirani@liverpool.ac.uk)

## Introduction

This paper investigates how family life is practiced and accounted for during time pressed meals, by focusing on 34 interviews with Italian participants on their experience of breakfast. Following Morgan's seminal works on family practices (1996; 2011: 6), we investigate 'doing family' during a mundane activity which 'appears to be trivial or meaningless' but which can provide a valuable understanding of the sense of the everyday, the 'doing' and the effort that individuals invest in re-producing and maintaining family life. As well as looking at what is done during family practices, it is also useful to see how such practices are accounted for, that is how they are explained by participants. Breakfast is one of the family practices that 'seems unremarkable, hardly worth talking about' (Morgan 2011:6), as shown by the very limited studies dedicated to this neglected meal. Most of the literature on family meals refers to dinners and to lunch, the meals mostly consumed together (Yates and Warde, 2017, Brannen et al., 2013, Milani and Pegoraro, 2006). This silence is important in itself, revealing the way in which much existing research tends to implicitly perpetuate the idea of lunch and dinner as the quintessential family meals, overlooking other eating occasions.

Responding to this scant attention, this study explores the link between eating and standards of care at breakfast. Thus it contributes to an understanding of less studied family practices as well as providing insight into the relationships between meals, temporality and moral accounts. In looking at such relationships we take inspiration from Warde's (2016) understanding of mealtimes where he argues that through their necessity and frequency, meals offer a useful window through which we can gain a deeper understanding of family life. As he says:

“Meals have considerable analytic potential because they pull together social aspects of household organisation, temporal rhythms, practical priorities, social (and actor) networks, social convention and rituals” (2016: 20).

In understanding the analytical potential of breakfast for investigating family life, we look at how people organise their morning routines around ideals, temporal rhythms and priorities.

1  
2  
3 The Italian context is particularly relevant since breakfast is a relatively recent meal, heavily  
4 shaped by marketplace representations of convenience bakery products which were  
5 positioned around the exclusionary ideal of the middle-class and patriarchal 'cereal packet'  
6 family (Maestri and D'Angelo, 1995; Arvidsson, 2003).  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Drawing on interviews on breakfast with participants from various family arrangements, this  
12 study engages with the literature on family meals and temporality. Amongst the works on  
13 temporality, the notion of hot spots (Southerton, 2003) was particularly relevant for  
14 informing our analysis of domestic breakfast. According to Southerton (2003: 19) who  
15 coined the term, hot spots are predictable moments during the day 'characterised by a  
16 compression of tasks into specified time frames so that 'time' was 'saved' for more  
17 'meaningful' social activities'. These are alternated with 'cold spots' which may also be  
18 called 'quality time', 'potter time', 'chill time' and 'bonding time', and are usually 'devoted  
19 to interaction with significant others' (Southerton, 2003: 19). Daily experience of time is  
20 thus characterised by a sequence of hot and cold spots. In his theorisation of hot and cold  
21 spots, Southerton (2003: 21-22) points out that:  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 'Hot and cold spots are metaphors for the tensions between care and convenience, or  
33 concerns about maintaining social standards and personal integrity. [...] Hot spots not  
34 only refer to a density of practices allocated in time frames that intensify senses of  
35 haste; in addition, and because hot spots often involve the use of convenience devices  
36 and services, they also magnify anxieties that a lack of time leads to a compromise of  
37 normative social standards expressive of care'  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 The notion of the hot spot (Southerton, 2003) is useful for understanding the temporality of  
44 family practices since it refers to moments of the day in which the goal of completing tasks in  
45 a limited and fixed time frame, such as having breakfast in a rush, often causes feelings of  
46 time shortage. Thus, harriedness is generated from the need to designate time frames in which  
47 to schedule activities, in order to free-up cold-spots for quality time and care (*ibid.*).  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 According to Southerton, during hot spots normalised standards of care are compromised and  
54 harriedness is supplemented by anxiety. To support scheduling, convenience devices and  
55 services are used, resulting in a feeling of having compromised in relation to care (*ibid.*) and  
56 the ideals of a proper family meal, which will be illustrated further down. This is contrasted  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 with cold spots, which are seen as quality time in which social standards of care are  
4 maintained within family practices (Southerton, 2003). Thus, sustaining acceptable standards  
5 of care is linked to morality, as these standards reflect an ideal of how functional families  
6 should behave. Not respecting these standards is therefore seen as necessarily triggering  
7 anxiety. Our findings critique the notion that using convenience food when time is short is  
8 associated with anxiety. Instead we illustrate more nuanced experiences of convenience food,  
9 care, and time management.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 Our findings show that breakfast is part of the family time economy (Maher et al., 2008),  
18 commonly as a hot spot where expectations around synchronicity and presence around the  
19 table are negotiated without questioning togetherness. Participants experience breakfast as an  
20 informal, routinised food occasion in which care is enacted via individualised consumption of  
21 convenience food without being associated with 'a dereliction of familial duty' (Jackson,  
22 2018: 2517). The lack of conviviality and synchronicity does not appear to cause anxiety  
23 amongst our participants, who imply that breakfast is a 'different' meal which does not  
24 follow the same standards which are applied to other meals. Theoretically this paper extends  
25 our understanding of family meals and temporality by showing that a clear-cut distinction  
26 between hot and cold spots does not represent the complexity of family life, since care is  
27 enacted in moments of harriedness through the consumption of convenience food. The  
28 findings also show that breakfast practices where individual priorities prevail over  
29 commensality do not necessarily cause anxiety. We argue that this is because they are not  
30 seen as lacking care.

### 41 42 43 **Family practices and temporality**

44 The concept of family practices (Morgan, 1996) provides a tool that allows us to foreground  
45 mundane routines and habits through which we make sense of and produce/reproduce family  
46 as a set of relationships (Morgan, 2011). By focusing on what families do, the family  
47 practices concept intervened at a moment when substantial attention was focused on family  
48 structure (Morgan, 1996). While the term conveys a sense of routine, family practices operate  
49 on a number of levels from the everyday to the occasional, from the mundane to the more  
50 spectacular (Morgan, 1996). Analytically, the concept 'opens up the possibility of movement  
51 between the perspectives of the observer and the perspectives of family members', and allows  
52 the wider contexts of history and biography to be part of the analysis (Morgan, 2011: 6). In  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *Rethinking Family Practices*, Morgan (2011:80) highlights that ‘family practices are  
4 conducted within time and space and involve the *use* of time and space’ (emphasis original).  
5  
6  
7

8 Family life unfolds and evolves through events and rituals which mark the passing of the  
9 days and seasons (Morgan, 2011). Meal times help to structure the day but also provide a  
10 sense of the passing of time through celebrations such as Christmas and Thanksgiving. Maher  
11 et al. (2008) employ the term ‘family time economy’ to illuminate the ‘interrelated and  
12 complex temporalities of work and care in contemporary family life’ (2008: 547). Family  
13 time is not infinite, given the limited hours in the day and the juggling of aspects of family  
14 life with other commitments such as work, school and leisure (Maher et al., 2008; 2010).  
15 Families with children may be negotiating and splitting time between paid work, school  
16 schedules, travel and extra-curricular arrangements for children to name a few (Maher et al.,  
17 2008). When exploring family temporality, we refer to scheduling and commitment, two  
18 measures of co-ordination of family timetables (Morgan, 2019). Scheduling refers to the  
19 allocation of practices to a time-frame (Southerton, 2003), and it implies the effort of co-  
20 ordinating everyone’s schedules (Southerton and Tomlinson, 2005). Personal commitment is  
21 the effort of doing that activity *together*, synchronising schedules (Morehead, 2001).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 The trade and supply of family time can generate tensions, such as a feeling of ‘chasing time’  
35 in the effort to preserve some ‘free’ time dedicated to care and presence (Maher et al., 2010).  
36 This is particularly exacerbated for working mothers given the gendered expectations around  
37 care and domestic work, combined with the way in which the timetables for schools do not  
38 reflect those of the workplace (Maher et al., 2008). Such tensions can be related to the  
39 subjective experience of time, as shown by mothers who synchronise the linear time of work  
40 with the cyclical time of care even when at home (Morehead, 2001), or by children who  
41 prefer ‘mush time’ - free time uninterrupted by external timetables, intrusions or demands -  
42 which involves being together in a relaxed way while apart in the home (Baraitser, 2013).  
43 Maher et al. (2010) argue that there is the need for further analysis of family time schedules  
44 beyond time use, in order to understand family pressures in contemporary family life. We use  
45 hot and cold spots (Southerton, 2003) to understand such a pressure during breakfast as a  
46 morning family meal.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Family meals

Defining 'family meals' is a slippery exercise since both terms – family and meals - are problematic and complex. As an essentialist view of family is inadequate to capture the complexity of family forms, we adopt an approach which sees family not as a 'naturally occurring collection of individuals' but rather a social unit which is formed and re-formed through everyday activities including the preparation and eating of meals (Jackson et al., 2009). Defining what constitutes a meal is also challenging since it implies engaging with interpretations of meal propriety, including moral accounts of what constitutes 'appropriate' food, and the broader notions of care and feeding, as care needs to be expressed in a way that is morally acceptable. If some have engaged with a structural approach looking at the composition and sequencing of dishes (Douglas, 1972), others have gone beyond and looked at the symbolic meanings around the materiality of the meal (see for example, Valentine 1999). Indeed, commensality round the domestic dining table (Fischler, 2011) and the sharing of the same food are part of a powerful symbolic myth - the myth of the family meal – propagated in the marketplace by brands, products and media around the mantra that 'good families eat together and stay together' (Pirani et al., 2018). Through everyday practices such as food consumption and preparation, family is constantly reproduced (Morgan, 1996). Commensality produces bonding (Fischler, 2011), and eating together as a family, sharing the same table, time and food, reproduces the togetherness of family (Brannen et al., 2013). Studies confirm that the dining table is an 'important symbol or even metonym of the family' (Lupton, 1996: 39). The valorisation of family mealtimes around the table is considered a measure of doing family well (Gillies, 2011), a discourse consolidated by advertising representations of happy families consuming breakfast together (Pirani et al., 2018).

Reflecting on the normative power of the 'happy family' meal, Wilk (2010) remarks how this ideal is connected to the middle-classes. As studies adopting a Bordieusian perspective have shown, middle-class families often see the evening meal as an opportunity to transmit an extensive culinary taste involving a particular appreciation for healthy options to their children (Wills et al., 2011). Likewise, Italian middle-class family meals are used to educate children over food appreciation, leading children to interiorise a focus on nutritional content and table manners (Oncini, 2020). Taking one's time is part of the picture of what is seen as an acceptable culinary habit in Italian middle-class households, as 'feeding oneself is

1  
2  
3 secondary to the fact of doing it in the way that is believed the most culturally appropriate  
4 (sat at the table, with no rush)' (Sassatelli et al., 2015:101).  
5  
6  
7

8 Consuming a family meal regularly remains 'a goal that most parents would like to achieve,  
9 not only because it is a way of 'doing family' but also for practical and budgetary reasons'  
10 (Brannen et al., 2013: 428). The ideal of regular family meals consumed together is met with  
11 the fear of losing such tradition, although it has been noted that this is based on an illusion of  
12 the past rather than empirical evidence (Mestdag, 2005), and eating together is still  
13 remarkably common (Yates and Warde, 2017). Research has shown how the ideal of a  
14 cooked meal eaten together increases women's time and labour in feeding the family in  
15 accordance with conventions (Brannen et al., 2013; Moisio et al., 2004, Bugge and Almas,  
16 2006; Pirani et al., 2018). Literature suggests that this effort is sustained because the  
17 prioritisation of individual meals can be seen as a source of 'shame' (Brannen et al.,  
18 2013:426), as solitary or asynchronous eating is perceived more negatively than eating  
19 together as a family (Fischler, 2011). This study shows how breakfast is one meal where  
20 eating asynchronously and consuming convenience food seems to be acceptable and does not  
21 open up spaces for negative moral judgement.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Considering the pervasive ideal of eating together, it is not surprising that parents feel harried  
35 and anxious to prepare and share meals 'on time' (Bugge and Almas, 2006; Brannen et al.,  
36 2013). As previously mentioned, Southerton (2003) sees daily life as comprised of a  
37 sequence of cold and hot spots and the routinely family meal is an example of the latter.  
38 Following Southerton certain meals can be seen as hot spots when they are inserted before  
39 timed events that take priority, such as a rushed breakfast before morning routines. These  
40 meals, in which quality time and care is not a priority, are contraposed to other activities  
41 which are moments of the day wherein care is exchanged. The use of convenience foods has  
42 been considered by scholars as compromising standards of meal propriety and care (Bugge  
43 and Almas, 2006; Moisio et al., 2004). This is also the view of scholars including Warde  
44 (1997) whose work on the dichotomy of care versus convenience has influenced many  
45 studies on domestic food routines. The consumption of convenience products is a typical  
46 strategy that many adopt to cope with the anxiety of time shortage, although people may  
47 worry they will be criticised for compromising '*normative social standards expressive of*  
48 *care*' (Southerton, 2003:22). Further literature evidenced the way in which convenience is not  
49 always seen as an acceptable short cut, raising concerns about the affect and morality of the  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 consumption of convenience products (Jackson, 2018; Carrigan and Szmigin, 2006). Using  
4 convenience food to save time can lead to a sense of guilt because it feels like ‘cheating’  
5 given the dominant cultural script of the homemade family meal (Moisio et al., 2004).  
6 Recently some have criticised the negative and moralising connotation that convenience food  
7 has received in the literature (Meah and Jackson, 2017). Others have shown that in many  
8 families, convenience food is combined with fresh products and participants do not make a  
9 distinction amongst different types of food (Carrigan and Szmigin, 2006). Meah and Jackson  
10 (2017) have also highlighted how many see convenience food as caring food, since through  
11 providing such products parents enact care for their children.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 In reviewing the scant literature on breakfast conducted in different geographical contexts,  
22 studies have illustrated how the consumption of convenience items have often replaced the  
23 consumption of a cooked breakfast (Schneider and Davis 2010; Green 2007). Squeezed  
24 between inflexible working and schooling schedules (Veeck *et al.*, 2016), breakfast is  
25 considered an important meal of the day (Marshall, 2005), but skipping it or reducing it to the  
26 consumption of snacks is a common trend across different geographical contexts (see for  
27 example Le Pape and Plessz, 2017; Pirani et al., 2018). Unless there are children in the  
28 household, breakfast is a quicker and more solitary meal in comparison to those consumed  
29 later in the day (Yates and Warde, 2017, Mestdag, 2005). As such, commensality at breakfast  
30 is unusual (Le Pape and Plessz, 2017). Some research suggests that parents try and enforce  
31 breakfast for their children even though they may end up skipping it themselves (Le Pape and  
32 Plessz, 2017). In Italy this meal is still in its infancy. What is today known as the ‘Italian  
33 breakfast’ is a relatively recent meal and it consists of hot milk with coffee and pastries,  
34 biscuits and other confectionaries (DOXA-AIDEPI, 2015, Milani and Pegoraro, 2006; Pirani  
35 et al., 2018). Scholars report that people are gradually introducing breakfast into their daily  
36 routines, especially in households with children (Mortara and Sinisi, 2016). Considering how  
37 breakfast differs from other meals and how a more complex relationship between care and  
38 convenience might happen within this meal, it is surprising to see how little research has been  
39 conducted on it.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

## 55 Methodology

56  
57 This paper draws upon the dataset of a larger project that collected semi-structured interviews  
58 with 34 participants conducted between November 2016 and May 2017. Participants were  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 recruited from two towns in the same region of the North of Italy using snowball sampling  
4 techniques (Silverman, 2001). A diverse definition of families was adopted, based on  
5 marriage, civil partnerships and long-term relationships, with or without children. The sample  
6 evenly comprised both heterosexual and lesbian families (Carrington, 2013), with a majority  
7 of participants being female (23). The sample was predominantly white, with an average age  
8 of 41 years old and they generally self-identified as middle-class. Interviews were carried out  
9 individually, with the majority of participants coming from different families, in order to  
10 focus on individual accounts of collective practices and meanings (Orbuch, 1997). All the  
11 interviews were conducted in Italian by the first author, who tape-recorded, transcribed and  
12 translated them.

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  
Ethical approval was gained from the institution where the researchers were based at the time  
of the fieldwork. Participants have been granted confidentiality and anonymity through the  
use of pseudonyms, and they received a report of the findings at the end of the research.  
Interviews were manually coded, using a thematic coding frame that aimed at unpacking how  
respondents structure their morning routine and what meanings they attach to it, using codes  
both derived from literature and from data. We adopted a two-step coding process: first each  
group was coded separately and then it was compared for more re-coding. Following the  
principles of collaborative coding (Cornish et al., 2013), the second author coded a subset of  
data to check for reliability, while the third author was involved as auditor of the emerging  
codes. The interpretation aimed at unpacking family practices at breakfast.

### Talking about breakfast

43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
In asking participants about breakfast, their immediate answers were ‘it is not a big deal for  
us’, ‘it is a very simple matter’, or ‘well, we do not really have a breakfast as such,  
positioning it as a hot spot that does not raise moral concerns. For example, this is how  
Beatrice and Ascanio describe breakfast in their households:

*We have different schedules. Breakfast is not planned apart from holidays.* [Beatrice,  
heterosexual, housewife, two children]

*People do struggle to have time for breakfast. We do not have time for having breakfast  
together. Fabio leaves home at 7, I leave at 6, Francesca around 8, then Maria has breakfast  
later. Everyone gets up at different time, we do not manage to get up at the same time. But we*

1  
2  
3 *make sure to save time for lunch and dinner, depending on working commitments.* [Ascanio,  
4 heterosexual, sales agent, two children]  
5  
6  
7

8 These two quotes reveal how breakfast is inserted in the family economy of time (Maher et  
9 al., 2008) and in the cosmology of the meals (Douglas, 1972) and as such it can be  
10 understood only in relation to other meals. Breakfast is squeezed between inflexible paid  
11 work and schooling schedules (Le Pape and Plessz, 2017), and people ‘do not have time’ for  
12 breakfast, as Ascanio says, reflecting its status as a hot spot. Indeed, time seems to be  
13 perceived as a scarce commodity (Maher et al., 2008) and thus it is allocated cyclically to  
14 daily meals. In Ascanio’s household, for example, time is saved for lunch and dinner, while  
15 in Beatrice’s household time for breakfast is ‘found’ during holidays. In other households,  
16 time for breakfast is found at the weekends. Squeezing breakfast in or struggling to have  
17 breakfast together is not seen as a morally problematic. Participants often locate their  
18 organisation of breakfast as common and generic statements asserting that ‘people struggle to  
19 have time for breakfast’ are frequent. If in other studies conducted in the UK and US  
20 participants seem to be concerned with the erosion of time for having breakfast together, our  
21 participants also report a lack of time but do not seem to express concern about it  
22 (Kremer-Sadlik, et al., 2008). This lack of concern is particularly relevant in understanding  
23 participants’ memories of breakfast:  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 *‘My dad used to stuff our faces with Nastrine [convenience pastry] before we went to school*  
38 *[laugh] we were obviously always late. So my dad, to save time, did not give us the chance to*  
39 *chew it, and would put a whole Nastrina in our mouth.* [Paola, heterosexual, employee, two  
40 children]  
41  
42  
43

44 *My mum used to be out at 6.15, so even before I got up. My dad used to have breakfast at 7.00*  
45 *and I did at 7.15/7.30 to gain some time, so we all had it on our own.* [Fabiola, heterosexual,  
46 social educator, married]  
47  
48  
49

50 Both Paola and Fabiola have a vivid memory of breakfast within a tight schedule requiring  
51 the coordination of time and food. Paola’s memories of breakfast focus on her father’s  
52 attempt at network coordination, getting both her brother and her to school on time. The  
53 connection between parental care of feeding children and time scarcity is a common feature  
54 in participants’ accounts. Reflecting on their current and past routines of having breakfast,  
55 participants frame this family practice as ‘normal’, attaching to it a sense of regularity and  
56 indeed a sense of the everyday (see Morgan, 2011). As Pietro explains:  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *To be honest there is a pattern: I am the one who gets up first and prepares the coffee and*  
4 *breakfast for my children. The little one gets up after me and gets a merendina [convenience*  
5 *pastry], the eldest gets up ta last minute and he forces himself to have something before*  
6 *going. After all this, maybe there is time for a coffee with my wife, but always in a rush!*  
7  
8  
9 [Pietro, heterosexual, entrepreneur, two children]  
10

11  
12  
13 Interestingly Pietro admits that although breakfast is not ‘a big deal’, there is a pattern in its  
14 daily performance and there is indeed a ‘being together’. While breakfast is not consumed by  
15 the entire family around the table, there is precise pattern which is a sequence of events and  
16 his execution of specific tasks at a specific time. Pietro knows by heart when, what and how  
17 his children and his wife are eating, even if they are each having breakfast on their own.  
18 Knowing other family members’ preferences reflects the ‘distinctiveness’ of this family  
19 practice, which reproduces family ties while distinguishing family members from other  
20 relationships (Morgan, 2011). We found such intimate knowledge of breakfast a common  
21 feature among our sample, revealing how, despite the initial dismissive description of  
22 breakfast, this meal is more important to family life than first anticipated.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

### 32 **The rhythm of the morning: between synchronicity and commitment**

33  
34  
35 At first glance breakfast could be considered a quintessential example of a hot spot, as it has  
36 been theorised by Southerton (2003). The density of morning activities to be performed in a  
37 short amount of time and the coordination of such activities amongst different family  
38 members are certainty characteristics of a pressured time. This is particularly evident in  
39 households with young children, where parents need to juggle different tasks at once. Multi-  
40 tasking is not about doing more, but rather doing it all at once (Southerton, 2003). This is the  
41 case of Benedetta, who is responsible for coordinating her family’s morning timetable, such  
42 as waking everyone up:  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 *I immediately wake up when the alarm rings. Mara [her daughter] instead takes 40-45*  
52 *minutes. I wake up and I put my alarm in her room, because she does not wake up*  
53 *immediately, and she doesn’t like being touched. So I put the alarm on snooze, first 6.45, then*  
54 *6.50, then 7.05. After a while she gets up and she brings me the alarm. Sometimes she cuddles*  
55 *a bit with Btissam [Benedetta’s partner]. I prepare tea and she has zwiebacks with Nutella,*  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *we have a decaf and we have breakfast the three of us together.* [Benedetta, lesbian, therapist,  
4 one child]  
5  
6  
7

8 Benedetta's multitasking which combines waking up her daughter and getting breakfast ready  
9 reveals how 'getting things done' is her responsibility. The forty minutes everyone needs to  
10 get ready are populated by a density of actions that Benedetta co-ordinates; her daughter and  
11 her partner seem to be free from managing time and tasks, including preparing food that can  
12 be shared. In households where young children are present, participants see breakfast as a  
13 'good' and 'healthy' habit to be enforced regardless of their sacrifice to organise the meal,  
14 confirming what has been observed in other European contexts (Le Pape and Plessz, 2017).  
15 In fact, some share the same commitment that Benedetta has in making sure that breakfast is  
16 shared amongst the family members. For example, Linda (heterosexual, support teacher, two  
17 children) affirms that '*we all sit, eat, we have a chat, we are always in a rush, but the food is*  
18 *important for us*'. In other households sharing breakfast is important even if varying ways of  
19 doing breakfast occur:  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 *Some days of the week we are all together, others Sebastiano is in Rome, we do it differently.*  
31 *I must say that when my husband is not there we stay on the couch, we are a little messier.*  
32 *Sometimes we also have milk in bed, on the couch, we do the things you shouldn't*  
33 *do.* [Giacomo, gay, lawyer, civil partnership with children]  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 If alone with his son, ordinarily breakfast is a hot spot that prioritises the quality time of cold  
39 spots. Giacomo becomes a relaxed parent, performing 'things you shouldn't do', such as  
40 eating on the couch. Giacomo suggests that eating properly means eating at the table, but  
41 infringing this rule does not generate any moral anxiety. When Giacomo's husband is at  
42 home, breakfast becomes an opportunity to spend time together as a family, sitting together  
43 around the table and involving the child in a more elaborate version of breakfast. This more  
44 relaxed commitment to having breakfast together is also present in couples without children.  
45 For example, Michele says:  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 *If we wake up together it means that we both have time, so we eat with no rush and we talk*  
55 *about the day. This is the 50% of the times, while in the other 50% it means we have different*  
56 *schedules and we eat on our own.* [Michele, heterosexual, surveyor, without children]  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Breakfast is still considered as a pleasurable moment for family bonding, but not a  
4 compulsory one to attend. Conflicting schedules or tiredness are considered sufficient reasons  
5 for not having breakfast together. However, committing to having breakfast together implies  
6 focusing on quality time and interaction with the other person, borrowing elements from the  
7 cold spot even on weekdays. Later in the interview, Michele explains how breakfast with his  
8 wife often implies a tablecloth, signalling a special effort, and it would be consumed away  
9 from the television, which would disrupt the conversation. When on his own, Michele  
10 describes having other priorities and prefers to have a quick breakfast without setting the  
11 table (Marshall, 2005).  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 If the aforementioned examples show attempts of having breakfast together and the effort  
21 parents like Benedetta make to synchronise their own tasks with other family members'  
22 rhythms, there are also households in which such attempts are absent:  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 *In our house everybody wants to stay in bed. We all have breakfast on our own, because we*  
28 *have different schedules, everyone gets his own one ready [...]. Someone should wake up*  
29 *earlier to have breakfast together [...] we have other moments we look at during the*  
30 *day. [Francesca, heterosexual, stay at home mother, two children].*  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 Instead of having breakfast together, Francesca prioritises her own sleep. Her lack of  
36 commitment towards synchronising tasks is revealing of how breakfast is considered outside  
37 of her role of feeding the family (DeVault, 1991). In fact, later in the interview Francesca  
38 explains that her family always tries to eat together, but not at breakfast, and how other meals  
39 are her own responsibility. Her effort to share family meals goes as far as regularly  
40 postponing lunch until 2pm when her eldest son comes home from school. If time is a  
41 resource to be 'saved' and 'protected' for lunch, time for breakfast competes with other tasks.  
42 Unlike other meals, breakfast can be consumed individually without jeopardising the ideals  
43 attached to doing family around the dining table.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

### 52 A convenient breakfast

53

54  
55 A significant aspect of breakfast is that participants eat the same convenience food every day.  
56 This seems to echo international trends highlighting the predominance of daily consumption  
57 of convenience items (Yates and Warde, 2017). Interestingly, family members do not  
58  
59  
60

necessarily share the same preferences, and convenience food is consumed individually. Take for example the case of Sabrina and her household in which family members have individual preferences:

*We have it [breakfast] in two rounds. Those who go to primary school need to be out earlier, so they eat earlier. With the two younger ones, who are not independent and need to be spoon-fed, [comes a] second round. Because breakfast is conditioned by the time at which you must be out, lunch and dinner are not self-service, we eat together. Usually my husband wakes up earlier and he starts preparing the coffee. Everyone has their own taste, we are six and we eat six different things. He [the younger son] eats Pan di Stelle [a Mulino Bianco biscuit], the younger daughter cereals, the older bread and Nutella, the middle son bread and tomato, which is a slice of bread with my mother-in-law's tomato sauce and some salt. It is a sort of red pizza. The father has milk, coffee and biscuits. He prefers Macine [another kind of Mulino Bianco biscuit], or bread and jam [...]. I have cereals, but different from those that my daughter has. Each one of us eats on our own. There is the idea that since you don't eat much you can have what you prefer. With other meals you can make requests [before it is cooked] but once it is ready either you eat what's on the table or you fast. [Sabrina, heterosexual, consultant, two children]*

In this detailed description of how 'self-service' breakfast, as she defines it, is organised the intricate relationship between time and food emerges very clearly: six people eating six different food items in the same space and in a short amount of time. Referring to breakfast as a 'self-service' meal, which in the Italian language is a term often used as a synonym for canteen, Sabrina describes the sense of efficiency and time management. Convenience food and individualised consumption allow Sabrina and her husband to take turns feeding the children, or to let them prepare their own breakfast. This arrangement is not simply a matter of practicality but also of gratification, as personal preferences can be expressed without affecting other family members. Convenience food allows a moment of private indulgence where everybody's taste can be satisfied. As such convenience food is not experienced as a compromise or a short cut (Southerton, 2003:21) but rather as part of routine care enacted within the family (Meah and Jackson, 2017). As underlined by Sabrina, this does not happen during other meals in which care is enacted with a more rigid control on health (Wills et al., 2011) and with the moral obligation of eating what is available, summarised by Sabrina with the saying 'either you eat what's on the table or you fast'.

1  
2  
3 Southerton (2003) highlights how convenience products and short cuts adopted during hot  
4 spots generate anxiety amongst individuals, since they are seen as lacking care or not meeting  
5 social standards of appropriate food. Instead, we found that respondents considered  
6 convenience food nutritionally adequate, and that family consumption validated this choice:  
7  
8  
9

10 *I eat milk with biscuits and wholemeal rusks. [...] I have always had them with my family, as*  
11 *many as we wanted. They are nutritious products, and it is fine with me.* [Stella, heterosexual,

12 school teacher, three children]  
13  
14  
15  
16 The example of Stella shows how convenience food is part of life-long consumption patterns,  
17 present from childhood as well as in her current household. Convenience bakery products are  
18 not seen as an exceptional indulgence, but rather as a reasonably nutritious food that can be  
19 consumed quite liberally. In fact, in our sample participants do not show any anxiety around  
20 feeding their children with convenience food at breakfast and instead preferred brands of  
21 ready-made snacks are mentioned as part of caring for children:  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 *I do not usually have breakfast [...]. They [her daughters] have a yoghurt, a kinder Delice or*  
28 *a Kinder Brioss [two branded breakfast pastries]. I selected those because they have some*  
29 *milk in it and since they stopped having yoghurt and they are not having milk I thought let's*  
30 *give them milk in another way, even if that is not really milk.* [Paola, heterosexual, employee,  
31 two children]  
32  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 In Paola's account, branded pastries represent a 'good enough' (Molander, 2019) option for  
38 feeding her children in a short amount of time when other tasks need to be done.  
39 Convenience food interlaces with childcare, as it allows parents to feed 'something' to  
40 children who are perceived as fussy in terms of eating (Jackson, 2018). The careful selection  
41 among other branded products shows Paola's care in feeding her daughters, and her interest  
42 in giving them food they would eat and enjoy, while revealing the moral compromises that  
43 underpin her responsibility of feeding the family.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

## 50 Discussion

51  
52 Our findings addressed the temporality of family routines in Italy to understand the  
53 experience of eating in the context of being squeezed for time. Applying the notion of hot and  
54 cold spots (Southerton, 2003) to these accounts of breakfast, this paper makes three main  
55 contributions. First, it confirms the utility of focussing on the temporal nature of family  
56 practices, in agreement with Southerton (2003), Morgan (2019), and Maher et al. (2010).  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Second, it critiques Southerton's claim regarding the anxiety about taking shortcuts (2003) by  
4 showing that participants do not experience guilt around a meal based on time-saving  
5 strategies and by offering a moral account of such strategies, which goes against the norm of  
6 most family mealtimes. Third, it affirms that care takes place in the hot spot, contrary to the  
7 original theorisation that sees care as an element of cold spots (Southerton, 2003).  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 Our first contribution stresses the importance of time in the study of family practices. Hot  
14 spots are generated in the effort of coordinating different schedules and family needs  
15 (Southerton, 2003). By looking at breakfast, we show the implications of hot spots in doing  
16 family, as hot spots ease the 'sense of obligation' implied in creating quality time for others  
17 (Southerton and Tomlinson, 2005). In the hot spot individual needs, such as sleeping a bit  
18 longer or getting ready for the day ahead, can be prioritised without compromising family  
19 meanings, and expectations around synchronicity and presence around the table are  
20 negotiated without questioning togetherness. Moreover, we showed how boundary practices,  
21 which contribute to the feeling of belonging (Morgan, 2009), are present in the hot spot too,  
22 such as remembering by heart what other family members eat even if breakfast is not  
23 consumed together.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 The prioritisation of individual needs taking place in the hot spot has particular implications  
35 for the distribution of gendered work within families. The division of labour is very important  
36 in understanding gendered temporal practices. Research has shown how the organisation of  
37 children's lives is impacting most on the temporal rhythms of mothers, who tend to be the  
38 ones in charge of synchronising multiple dimensions of time (Morehead, 2001; Southerton,  
39 2006). Our data showed how the lack of moral judgement over convenience food and the  
40 frequent de-synchronisation makes breakfast the meal in which women have the least  
41 obligation to tend to their family members. This role of breakfast should be seen in relation to  
42 other meals (Douglas, 1972) where the expectations over eating together are higher and  
43 women do not enjoy the same flexibility.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 Our second contribution is that participants do not experience guilt or anxiety for using time-  
54 saving strategies in the hot spot. This contradicts the original argument about hot spots: 'the  
55 forms of convenience necessary to negotiate hot spots also generated anxiety about 'taking  
56 short cuts' and not 'doing a job well' (all narratives of personal integrity)' (Southerton,  
57 2003:21). Yet participants in this study did not feel particularly anxious about taking  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 shortcuts in relation to breakfast (such as simply opening a packet of pre-prepared biscuits)  
4 and did not express tensions between care and convenience (Meah and Jackson, 2017;  
5 Jackson, 2018; Warde, 1997). Hence, we contend that in the 'hot spot' participants did not  
6 express a sense of guilt or loss of their personal integrity for using short cuts motivated by  
7 time-management. Interestingly convenience food does not stop being consumed once there  
8 is more time for breakfast, for example during the weekend, showing how the exceptionality  
9 of this meal is not only related to time scarcity. This perhaps connects with Morgan's  
10 observation that family practices are not simply defined by the time in which they take place,  
11 but that 'it is also that a sense of time and space is created or recreated by these practices and  
12 the relationships involved' (2011:88).  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 Our third contribution is the observation that care can be enacted also in the hotspot. This  
23 contradicts the argument that hot and cold spots reproduce the tension between care and  
24 convenience (Southerton, 2003). In our sample, care was enacted through attentiveness rather  
25 than commensality. Examples of care in the hot spot include the accommodation of  
26 individual needs within collective schedules, memorising each other's morning rhythm, or  
27 the labour involved with feeding children even when parents were not having breakfast  
28 themselves. Convenience is not antithetical to care, as care is made possible through  
29 convenience food. Breakfast products are not simply seen as an acceptable convenience  
30 (Carrigan and Szimigin, 2006) but part of enacting care (Meah and Jackson, 2017). Thanks to  
31 such products, individual preferences can be accommodated, and parental care is maintained  
32 also during a hot spot. Valentine (1999) observed how individual preferences can be satisfied  
33 only at the expense of family food. Breakfast, instead, emerges as the only meal in which the  
34 expression of individual and indulgent preferences does not call into question whether the  
35 family is eating 'properly'.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 We want to conclude by making some suggestions for future research. The findings in this  
49 paper suggested that there could be merit in further investigating the dichotomy between hot  
50 and cold spots, raising the question of whether this is a straightforward binary, and whether  
51 family members might have a different experience of this temporal rhythm. Our data  
52 indicated that hot and cold spots might not be so rigidly divided, since breakfast showed a  
53 combination of both. There is also the question of whether all family members experience  
54 temporality in the same way. While this paper does not explore the discrepancy between  
55 individual perceptions of time pressure, it acknowledges that 'one person's interpretation of  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 rush may be another's experience of leisure' (Southerton, 2006: 443). As hot and cold spots  
4 and care and convenience are not always in opposition as previously theorised, further  
5 research could illuminate how these dichotomies apply to family life.  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 **Conclusion**

11  
12 This study contributes to understandings of how family practices are inserted in the family  
13 time economy (Maher et al., 2008). Inspired by Morgan's (2011) view that family practices  
14 are conducted with the use of time, this study has shown that time in the morning is a scarce  
15 resource in family life. As such, the allocation of time to certain tasks rather than others  
16 reveals priorities and commitments of individuals and their families. In looking at the specific  
17 case of breakfast in Italy, this study has shown how this meal is inserted in a flux of  
18 competing activities and thus it needs to be understood in relation to temporal priorities.  
19 Acknowledging such flux implies recognising that family practices might compete for time  
20 and that certain tasks might be squeezed amongst others that take priority. In studying the  
21 complexity of balancing and allocating time in family life, the investigation of what is eaten,  
22 how, how often and with whom becomes a matter of temporality and care.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 In investigating people's accounts of their experiences of breakfast, this study contributes to a  
34 deeper understanding of how individuals make sense of their daily schedules and enactments  
35 of care through food. The theoretical dichotomy between care and convenience and the  
36 related anxiety around eating and sharing convenience food were not confirmed in our  
37 research. A broader view of care was provided by participants, which departed from a simple  
38 nutritional understanding of food as good/caring versus bad/convenient. Providing  
39 convenience food for the self and others was not seen as morally problematic nor as  
40 neglecting 'normative social standards of expressive care' (Southerton 2003: 22). It was seen  
41 as a pragmatic compromise between paid work and family life and between parental duties  
42 and individual schedules. Such standards might also be framed in relation to other family  
43 meals, in which, it seems, different standards of care and different temporal arrangements  
44 were applied.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

- Arvidsson A (2003) *Marketing Modernity: Italian Advertising from Fascism to Postmodernity*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Baraitser L (2013) Mush time: Communitality and the temporal rhythms of family life. *Families, Relationships and Societies* 2(1): 147-153.
- Brannen J, O'Connell R, and Mooney A (2013) Families, meals and synchronicity: Eating together in British dual earner families. *Community, Work & Family* 16(4):417-434.
- Bugge AB and Almas R (2006) Domestic dinner: Representations and practices of a proper meal among young suburban mothers. *Journal of Consumer Culture* 6(2): 203–228.
- Carrigan M and Szmigin I (2006) “Mothers of invention”: Maternal empowerment and convenience consumption. *European Journal of Marketing* 40(9/10): 1122-1142.
- Carrington C (2013) Feeding lesbian families. In: Counihan C, Van Esterik P (eds) *Food and Culture: A Reader*. New York: Routledge, 187–210.
- Cornish F, Gillespie A and Zittoun T (2013) Collaborative data analysis. In Flick U (ed.), *Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: Sage, 79-93.
- DOXA-AIDEPI (2015) “Quando nasce la colazione italiana? Un salto negli anni ‘50”, available at: <http://iocominciobene.it/quando-nasce-la-colazione-italiana-un-salto-negli-anni-50/> (accessed on 02 January 2019).
- DeVault ML (1991) *Feeding the Family: The Social Organization of Caring as Gendered Work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Douglas M (1972) Deciphering a meal. *Daedalus* 101(1): 61–81
- Fischler C (2011) Commensality, society and culture. *Social Science Information* 50(3-4): 528-548.
- Gillies V (2011) From function to competence: Engaging with the new politics of family. *Sociological Research Online* 16(4): 11.
- Green T (2007) Tricksters and the marketing of breakfast cereals. *The Journal of Popular Culture* 40(1): 49-68.
- Jackson P (2018) Familial fictions: Families and food, convenience and care. *European Journal of Marketing* (25)12: 2512-2519.
- Jackson P, Olive S and Smith G (2009) Myths of the family meal: Re-reading Edwardian life histories. In: Jackson P (ed.), *Changing Families, Changing Food*. New York and London: Palgrave Macmillan, 131-145.

- 1  
2  
3 Kremer-Sadlik T, Fatigante M, and Fasulo A. (2008). Discourses on family time: The cultural  
4 interpretation of family togetherness in Los Angeles and Rome. *Ethos* 36(3): 283-309.
- 5  
6 Le Pape MC and Plessz M (2017) C'est l'heure du petit-déjeuner? Rythme des repas,  
7 incorporation et classe sociale. *L'Année Sociologique* 67(1): 73-105.
- 8  
9  
10 Lupton D (1996) *Food, the Body and the Self*. London: Sage.
- 11  
12 Maestri G and D'Angelo D (1995) Mulino Bianco. In: Ghini A (ed.). *Comunicare*  
13 *l'Eccellenza: Ferrari, Bulgari, Camel Trophy, Mulino Bianco*. Milano: Etas, 111–163.
- 14  
15 Marshall D (2005) Food as ritual, routine or convention. *Consumption, Markets and Culture*  
16 8 (1): 69–85.
- 17  
18  
19 Maher J, Lindsay J and Bardoel EA (2008) Time, caring labour and social policy:  
20 Understanding the family time economy in contemporary families. *Work, Employment and*  
21 *Society* 22(3): 547–558.
- 22  
23  
24 Maher J, Lindsay J, and Bardoel EA (2010) Freeing time? The 'family time economies' of  
25 nurses. *Sociology* 44(2): 269-287.
- 26  
27  
28 Meah A and Jackson P (2017) Convenience as care: culinary antinomies in practice,  
29 *Environment and Planning A* (49): 2065-2081.
- 30  
31 Mestdag I (2005) Disappearance of the traditional meal: temporal, social and spatial  
32 destructuration. *Appetite* 45(1): 62-74.
- 33  
34  
35 Milani P and Pegoraro E (2006) Tra pentole e legami familiari: il tempo dei pasti, *Rivista*  
36 *Italiana di Educazione Familiare* 2:50-70.
- 37  
38  
39 Moisis R, Arnould EJ and Price LL (2004) Between mothers and markets: Constructing  
40 family identity through homemade food *Journal of Consumer Culture* 4 (3): 361–384.
- 41  
42  
43 Molander, S (2019) A gendered agency of good enough: Swedish single fathers navigating  
44 conflicting state and marketplace ideologies *Consumption Markets & Culture* 24(2): 194-216.
- 45  
46  
47 Morehead A (2001) Synchronizing time for work and family: Preliminary insights  
48 from qualitative research with mothers. *Journal of Sociology* 37(4): 355–69.
- 49  
50  
51 Morgan DHJ (1996) *Family Connections: an Introduction to Family Studies*. Cambridge:  
52 Polity Press.
- 53  
54  
55 Morgan DHJ (2011) *Rethinking Family Practices*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- 56  
57  
58 Morgan DHJ (2019) Family troubles, troubling families, and family practices. *Journal of*  
59 *Family Issues* 40(16): 2225–2238.
- 60  
61  
62 Mortara A and Sinisi V (2016) Colazione delle famiglie italiane: Uno sguardo  
dall'interno. *Sociologia Della Comunicazione* 52: 84-102.

- 1  
2  
3 Oncini F (2020) Cuisine, health and table manners: Food boundaries and forms of distinction  
4 among primary school children. *Sociology* 54(3): 626-642.  
5  
6 Orbuch TL (1997) People's accounts count: The sociology of accounts. *Annual Review of*  
7 *Sociology* 23(1): 455-478.  
8  
9  
10 Pirani D, Cappellini B and Harman V ( 2018). The Italian breakfast: Mulino Bianco and the  
11 advent of a family practice (1971-1995). *European Journal of Marketing*, 52(12): 2478-2498.  
12  
13 Sassatelli R, Santoro M. and Semi G (2015) *Fronteggiare la Crisi: Come Cambia lo Stile di*  
14 *Vita del Ceto Medio*. Bologna: Il Mulino.  
15  
16  
17 Schneider T and Davis T (2010) Advertising food in Australia: between antinomies and  
18 gastroanomy, *Consumption Markets and Culture*, 13(1): 31-41.  
19  
20 Silverman D (2001) *Doing Qualitative Research: a Practical Handbook*. London: Sage.  
21  
22 Southerton D (2003) Squeezing time: Allocating practices, coordinating networks and  
23 scheduling society. *Time & Society* 12 (1): 5-25.  
24  
25 Southerton D (2006) Analysing the temporal organization of daily life: Social constraints,  
26 practices and their allocation. *Sociology*, 40(3): 435–454.  
27  
28 Southerton D and Tomlinson M (2005) 'Pressed for time'- the differential impacts of a 'time  
29 squeeze'. *The Sociological Review* 53 (3): 215-239.  
30  
31  
32 Valentine G (1999) Eating in: Home, consumption and identity. *Sociological Review* 47 (3):  
33 491–524.  
34  
35  
36 Veeck A, Hongyan Y and Yu F (2016) The intersection of family dinners and high school  
37 schedules in urban China. In: Cappellini B, Marshall D and Parsons E (eds) *The Practice of*  
38 *the Meal: Food, Families and the Marketplace*. London: Sage, 165-178.  
39  
40  
41 Warde A (1997) *Consumption, food and taste: Culinary antinomies and commodity culture*.  
42 London: Sage.  
43  
44  
45 Warde A (2016) *The Practice of Eating*. Cambridge: Polity Press.  
46  
47  
48 Wilk R (2010) Power at the table: Food fights and happy meals. *Cultural Studies- Critical*  
49 *Methodologies* 10 (6): 428–436.  
50  
51  
52 Wills W, Backett-Milburn K, Roberts M and Lawton J (2011) The framing of social class  
53 distinction through family food and eating practices. *The Sociological Review* 59 (4): 725-40.  
54  
55  
56 Yates L and Warde A (2017) Eating together and eating alone: Meal arrangements in British  
57 households. *The British journal of sociology* 68(1): 97-118.  
58  
59  
60

Daniela Pirani is Lecturer in Marketing at University of Liverpool. Her research interest include gender performances in the marketplace, cultural branding, food practices and visual

1  
2  
3 consumption. She has published on the commodification of veganism, on family in  
4 advertising and on the creation of brand practices.  
5  
6  
7

8 Vicki Harman is Senior Lecturer in Sociology. Her research interests include family life and  
9 social identities and inequalities such as gender, social class and ethnicity. She has recently  
10 conducted research on parents' perspectives on preparing lunchboxes for their children and  
11 mothers' perspectives on feeding the family in hard times. Currently, she is involved in  
12 empirical research projects investigating 1) the changing nature of grandparenting in Britain  
13 2) arts based and participative approaches to research in women's refuges 3) gender and  
14 ballroom dancing 4) food poverty in Liverpool and Stoke-on-Trent.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 Benedetta Cappellini is Professor in Marketing at Durham University. Her research falls  
23 broadly into the areas of Consumer Culture, Critical Marketing and Sociology of  
24 Consumption. Topics she has recently studied include food cultures, meal practices, austerity,  
25 intensive mothering and domestic violence.  
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