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# Introduction

After a rejection at a journal, I was asked by my PhD supervisor to make my article more conventional in its structure. I thought I was being conventional, but clearly didn’t have the knowledge of structural convention that was needed. So I took some articles recently published by my PhD supervisor, and one ethnography article (since the study I was trying to publish was an ethnography), and reverse outlined them.

I used Jessica Calarco’s outline of a journal article as a basis for reverse outlining these articles (which she makes available on her website, under Tips & Tricks > Teaching Resources [link at the bottom of the page] as of 21 Feb 2023). So in a way, this paper asks how widely and how exactly Calarco’s outline is applied (with an admittedly small and homogeneous sample).

What I found was that, for the 7 articles I coded, Calarco’s outline was never exactly applied. Some articles ranged very far from the outline in particular sections. Sometimes they followed some of the outline and neglected others. Sometimes they did most of the things but mixed up the order.

After doing this, however, I know what *usually* happens in each section (at least across these 7 articles).

In the following sections of this introduction, I will italicize the codes I used (I used Atlas.ti to code these).

I will put numbers in parentheses to mark how many times I coded a particular move in the articles. So this is not number of articles that had these passages, but instead how many times the move happened. So if a paper mentioned the data, then mentioned the findings, then mentioned the data again, in that sequence, there would be *Data* (2) and *Findings* (1).

## Abstracts

This is Calarco’s outline for abstracts:

250 words or less

* State your research question
* Explain how this research question speaks to a larger theoretical puzzle or gap in the literature (*Gap in existing literature*)
* Describe the data that you use to answer your research question (*Data*)
* State what you find (*Findings*)
* Describe what these findings suggest about the answer to your research question
* Explain why these findings are important (*Contribution to understanding world / Explain why these findings are important*)

The most common moves in abstracts were to talk about *Findings* (13) and to describe the *Data* (11). Then the next most common moves were to discuss the *Contribution to Literature* (9) and to discuss *Existing Literature* (8).

The moderately common moves in the articles were to *Identify an empirical case* *that has had relatively little attention in the literature* (5), *State the research question* (even if it wasn’t exactly in the form of a question, something like, “This paper analyzes how X and Y relate”) (4), and *State a fact about the world* (such as, “ethical consumption is a popular form of everyday politics”) (4).

Rare in abstracts were to explicitly articulate a *Gap in existing literature* (2), define a *Theory/Concept* (2), and mention a *Contribution to understanding world / Explain why these findings are important* (2).

Abstracts ranged from 172–251 words.

## Introductions

Calarco’s Sections (she says the introduction should be **3 paragraphs**) with my edits

**Describe the puzzle or gap in the literature that you will address with your data**

* What do we know?
* What do we not know (or not know well enough)?
* What does the existing research suggest might be the answer to that unanswered question?

**Identify your research question and explain how you answer it**

* What question will you answer? (Or what hypothesis will you test? )
* What data will you use to answer this question? (Or test this hypothesis? )
* What do you find?

**Explain the importance of your findings**

* What is the answer to your research question?
* CONTRIBUTION: How does this answer broaden, clarify, or challenge existing knowledge/theories? / TB edit: How does the paper’s answer to the research question(s) broaden, clarify, or challenge existing knowledge/theories? (TB made this edit because sometimes this comes before the authors state the research questions)
* CONTRIBUTION: How does the paper’s answer to the research question(s) broaden, clarify, or challenge existing knowledge/theories?

Introductions most commonly discussed *What we Know* (12) and *Findings* (12).

They often discussed *What do we not know?* (8), discussed the contribution (7), described the data (7), stated the research question(s) (7), and discussed what the existing research suggests might be the answer to the research question (6).

They sometimes discussed the general analytical strategy of the paper (4) and clarified a concept (3).

The papers rarely mentioned a fact in the world (2) (e.g., “a growing cultural narrative that children are “at risk””), a problem in the world (1), explained theoretical concepts (2), mentioned an exciting new trend in research (1), signposted what was to come in the article (2), provided a data excerpt (1), and gave wider context for findings (1).

Introductions ranged from 401–1,188 words.

## “Justification”/Literature Review

Calarco’s Outline (She says it should be “1,000 words or less”)

* Restate the puzzle or gap in the literature that you will address
* Explain why this puzzle or gap is important to address
* Describe (in more detail than in the intro) what we know about this topic/issue
* Describe (in more detail than in the intro) what we do not know about this topic/issue
* State your research question (i.e., “In light of these lingering questions, I seek to examine…”)
* Explain how your research question solves the puzzle or fills the gap in the literature (i.e., “Answering this question allows me to…”)
* Note: The point of a literature review is not actually to review all of the relevant literature. The point is to make the case for why your study is important.

Calarco calls this the “justification” section to highlight that “The point of a literature review is not actually to review all of the relevant literature …The point is to make the case for why your study is important.”

As you can guess, the most common move in the justification section is to talk about *What we Know* (39). The next common move is to *Restate the puzzle or gap in the literature that you will address* (12). Then the most common move after that is *Justifying choice of literature or concept(s)* (5).

Then there are several less-common moves, such as: *Clarifying/Defining a Concept* (4), *Contribution(s)/Clarifying the relationship of the paper to what we know* (3), mention the research question(s) (3), mention facts about the world (2) or problems in the world (1), mention a general question (“how queer people connect in the digital age”), coining a concept (1), and discussing a new trend in research (1).

Justification sections ranged from 776 – 3,390 words.

## Methods

Calarco says these should be “4-6 short paragraphs”, and this is her outline:

* Provide a brief overview of the study
* Describe your research site, why you chose it, and how you gained access
* Describe your research participants (the people you observed)
* Discuss your role in the field and how your identity shaped your observations
* Describe the fieldwork you conducted and the data you collected
* Describe how you analyzed the data you collected
* Describe the limitations of your study (i.e., explain how your study is limited by your methodological choices)

Most common in methods sections was *Characterizing the Sample / Describe the Data Collected* (24). The articles were mostly qualitative, and the next most common codes were *Interviewee/Focus Group Recruitment Methods* (8), *Qualitative Coding Method / Describe how you analyzed the data collected* (7), a general discussion of analytical strategy (8) (e.g., “By studying the political talk of organizational leaders advocating eat-local food practices in three cities, we aim to capture a sense of

the broader discourse animating eat-local activism in the Canadian context”.), describing interview questions asked (6), describing the research sites (6), describing the general strategy for data collection (5) (e.g., “This geographic range allowed us to access a diversity of perspectives that were not constrained to the specific environmental and regulatory conditions of a single region or province.”), and giving a brief study overview (4).

Less common moves were to make a statement that all names reported were pseudonyms (3 – the other articles did this in the analysis sections), make a statement about the representativeness of the findings (3), provide some findings (2), discuss empirical or theoretical literature (1), discuss methodological literature (1), describe political jurisdictions in which the data was collected (1), defining concepts (1), and explaining unfamiliar methods (1) (latent class analysis was the unfamiliar method described).

Methods sections ranged from 469–2,464 words. The article with the 2,464-word methods section was a mixed-methods study. Methods sections had 3–7 paragraphs.

The methods section were called “Data and Methods” (3), “Data and Method” (2), “Methods and Data” (1), and “Study Design and Data” (1).

## Analysis

Calarco’s outline (she gives no word limit suggestion)

* State your argument
* Identify 2-3 supporting points – how your data support your argument
* Identify 2-3 patterns in the data that provide evidence for each supporting point
* For each pattern:
	+ Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion
	+ Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern
	+ Provide a brief fieldnote, interview, or other data excerpt
	+ Explain how this subtheme links to the overall theme – may include developing/enhancing overall theme [TB addition]
* Offer EXPLANATION for observed patterns
* Caveats and clarifications identify any key exceptions to or variations to the overall patterns, and if possible, offer an explanation for these exceptions/variations

Most common in analysis sections was to *Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (e.g., through a quote)* (129), *Generalizing Across Sample* (64) (e.g., “For many mothers, the nutritional importance of meat for a growing child’s diet was a matter of common sense.”), and *Briefly explain how an example represents a larger pattern/sub-theme* (52).

Calarco, in her outline, talks about the difference between “supporting points” and “patterns in the data that provide evidence for each supporting point”. I did not find that distinction intuitive. Instead, I talked about analysis sections as having an “overall theme” (i.e., the main message of the findings). Then all of the papers broke that overall finding into subthemes. I called those subthemes just “subthemes” or “First Order Subthemes”. Then if one of those subthemes had a subtheme, I called that a “Second Order Subtheme” (I’m getting the idea of first, second, etc. “order” from Greek Philosophy — I’m using the idea loosely, but I wanted to use this language instead of saying things like “Sub-sub theme” or “Sub-sub-sub Theme”; so in the way I am using it, a “Sub-sub Theme” is a “Second Order Subtheme”). And so on. Some of the papers ended up having Fourth-order subthemes, and one paper even went so far as to have Sixth-order Subthemes. So it just refers to nesting of subthemes within each other.

So what I found in terms of that is that there were the overall theme was not mentioned that often, as might be expected (7 times), subthemes were mentioned a lot more (37 times), Second Order Subthemes were a main aspect of the articles (mentioned 45 times), as were Third Order Subthemes (used 58 times). Then the more nested categories beyond that were rare: Fourth Order Subthemes (19), Fifth Order Subthemes (3), and Sixth Order Subthemes (2). So as you can see, most of the papers had 3 levels of *subthemes*. Something like this:

Overall message of paper

* Subtheme 1
	+ Second Order Subtheme 1
		- Third Order Subtheme 1
		- Third Order Subtheme 2
	+ Second Order Subtheme 2
		- Third Order Subtheme 1
		- Third Order Subtheme 2
		- Third Order Subtheme 3
* Subtheme 2
	+ Second Order Subtheme 1
		- Third Order Subtheme 1
		- Third Order Subtheme 2
		- Third Order Subtheme 3
	+ Second Order Subtheme 2
		- Third Order Subtheme 1
		- Third Order Subtheme 2

That was the typical kind of structure in these articles.

Some of the other common moves that happened in the articles were discussing how the findings were consistent with previous literature (31), *introducing* a set of first/second/third/fourth/fifth/sixth order subthemes (14), and generalizing beyond the sample/contextualizing the findings (12).

Less common moves were discussing a conflict between the data and existing literature (7), offering an explanation for the observed patterns (5), stating the research question(s) (4), stating that the respondents’ names were pseudonyms (3), stating an analytical strategy (3) (e.g., “Our focus group data allow us to paint a richer picture of this orientation to food”.), and defining or clarifying a concept (2).

Analysis sections were 2,859 – 6,411 words (the highest one there is not the mixed methods study).

## Discussion

Calarco says that this should be 1,000 words or less. This is Calarco’s outline, with additions I made. In general, I found Discussion/Conclusion sections to be the most variable in terms of format. I numbered Calarco’s sections and added a “title” section. “TJB” are my initials, indicating where I added a section.

1 – TJB > Title of Section

**2 – Summarize your findings**

2.1 Remind readers of the puzzle/gap in the literature that you are trying to solve

2.2. Remind readers of the specific research question that you have answered

2.3. Review what you found

2.4. Explain what these findings imply about the answer to your research question

**3 – Discuss the implications of your findings**

3.1. TJB > State Implication(s) of Findings (without doing any of the sub-tasks Calarco outlines)

3.2. Explain how your findings solve the puzzle or fill the gap in the literature

3.3. Explain how the resolution of the gap/puzzle helps to clarify, challenge, or expand **existing knowledge or theory**

3.3. TJB > Explain how themes and/or subthemes, or the implication(s) of the findings, clarify, challenge, or expand exiting knowledge or theory

3.4. **Using existing literature**, explain why your findings are or are not surprising

3.5. TJB > Simply explain how previously published literature relates to your findings, without commenting on whether it is surprising relative to findings, and without saying that your data clarifies, challenges, or expands previous literature

3.6. TJB > Identify areas of social life where your argument likely applies

3.7. TJB > Draw out implications of your findings, without referring to literature

**4 – Identify possible explanations for your findings**

4.1. TJB > Identify a possible explanation for your findings without referring to existing research

4.2. Use existing research to discuss the most likely explanation for your findings

4.3. Consider alternative explanations for your findings and explain (using your data and/or other research) why these alternative explanations do or do not seem plausible

4.4. Conclude by reviewing why these findings (and the larger puzzle/gap they address) are important

5 – Apply Findings

5.1. TJB > Evaluate social change strategy held by respondents or scholarship activism more broadly by referring to literature and/or through argument referencing the study’s data

6 – TJB > Discuss Limitations

7 – TJB > Future Research

8 – TJB > Generalizing Beyond Sample without Referencing Literature

The titles were pretty boring and consistent — either “Discussion” or “Discussion and Conclusion”.

Most of the articles didn’t have a separate “Conclusion” section. So I just lumped them together. It seems, in general, that it is conventional enough to just forego the conclusion, unless you want a dedicated place to talk about future research. Future research isn’t in Calarco’s outline.

The most common move in the Discussion was to review the findings (13).

Then the general “implications” move was to *3.3. Explain how the resolution of the gap/puzzle helps to clarify, challenge, or expand existing knowledge or theory* (8). Sometimes, though, this main implications move was done a bit differently, and I reworded it to *3.3. TJB > Explain how implication of findings, themes and/or subthemes clarify, challenge, or expand exiting knowledge or theory* (5).

Then the most common moves were:

* *3.1. TJB > State Implication(s) of Findings (without doing any of the sub-tasks Calarco outlines)* (6)
* talk about future research (5), *2.1 – Remind readers of the puzzle/gap in the literature that you are trying to solve* (4)
* *3.6. TJB >* *Identify areas of social life where your argument likely applies* (4)
* *4.4. Conclude by reviewing why these findings (and the larger puzzle/gap they address) are important* (3)
* *Generalizing Beyond Sample without Referencing Literature* (3) (e.g., “As urban Canadian and American consumers are encouraged to understand how meals arrive on the plate, educating children about “where food comes from” has become central to an idealized performance of maternal foodwork.”)
* *2.2. – Remind readers of the specific research question that you have answered* (2)
* *Literature CONSISTENCY* (2)(discuss how your findings are consistent with literature)
* *5.1. Evaluate social change strategy held by respondents or scholarship activism more broadly by referring to literature and/or through argument referencing the study’s data* (2)
* *4.2. Use existing research to discuss the most likely explanation for your findings* (2)
* *3.4. Using existing literature, explain why your findings are or are not surprising* (2)
* *3.5. TJB > Simply explain how previously published literature relates to your findings, without commenting on whether it is surprising relative to findings, and without saying that your data clarifies, challenges, or expands previous literature* (2)
* *3.7. TJB > Draw out implications of your findings, without referring to literature* (2)

## Overall Assessment

Overall, I did find Calarco’s outline to be a good general guide for understanding the structure of journal articles. But as you can see, the structures varied *widely*.

This is not to say that they *should* have varied widely. Perhaps it would indeed be better if everyone kept to the exact structure that Calarco outlined. At least in some cases of course (mixed methods or purely quantitative data), you couldn’t exactly follow that template.

But something I found in these articles is that they weren’t trying to deeply change theory. If you just looked at Calarco’s outline, you might think that every article had to have a major theoretical contribution. There is this article …

Besbris, Max, and Shamus Khan. 2017. “Less Theory. More Description.” *Sociological Theory* 35(2):147–53.

… where they worry about people trying to revolutionize thinking with every contribution. That is certainly something I have learned in graduate school: that you don’t actually have to make ground-breaking theoretical contributions every time or even *ever*. And if you do that, sometimes you are typecast as a “theory” person, as in, a particular subfield of sociology. There are many debates about the status of theory and I’m not going to give a literature review of that here (e.g., in terms of whether it should be ever considered a sub-category of sociology or whether everyone should engage with theory construction, among other issues). But the point is that you don’t actually have to, in the words of Calarco’s outline, finding a “puzzle or gap in the literature”. Replicating research is, of course, frowned upon in sociology (but not in e.g., biology etc.). So it isn’t that you don’t have to find some kind of a gap. You do. But the gap doesn’t have to be a major modification or take-down of a theory. It can be an empirical gap, and you can just imply that the gap is there, while constructing an argument with important implications.

I created this document so that I would have *template outlines* for my drafts. I added all the quotes for the various coded parts so that I could know what I meant by a particular code. I’ve left that all here, you can take it or leave it (or modify it, or whatever).

Also, this is a first draft. As I work with this I may re-code something or refine some kind of this structure. This is all the details of the coding, the kind of behind-the-scenes process that you usually don’t get in qualitative coding! And people don’t give it out because they don’t want to be proven wrong etc. (which some people, like Biernacki, find a way to do anyway! Biernacki, Richard. 2012. *Reinventing Evidence in Social Inquiry*. New York, USA and Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan). So the following looks messy and I’m sure you can find a way to improve this coding structure. But if you want to see what I see as the outline of these articles (in a structural way) I wanted to provide what you could call the “findings” of this study of journal article structure.

I outlined more abstracts than the full papers—at the abstract phase, I was trying to figure out which I wanted a full outline for.

## Alternative Outline

Given all of this, I have made an alternative outline, that I tried to simplify. There are, of course, many other things you can add. But from my reading, these are what are most important.

*Many of these are copied from Calarco’s outline; in some cases, moves that are distinct in her outline are combined here*

**Abstract (150–250 words)**

* Existing literature / What we know
* Research Question / Gap or Puzzle / State that your empirical case has had relatively little attention in the literature / What we do not know
* Data
* Findings
* Contributions to literature
* OPTIONAL: Contribution to how activists [or some other category of social actor – businesses, governments, etc.] should be thinking about something

**Introduction – Basically it is an extended version of the abstract / a mini version of your full paper**

* Existing literature / What we know
* Research Question / Gap or Puzzle / State that your empirical case has had relatively little attention in the literature / What we do not know
* Data
* Findings
* Contributions to literature
* OPTIONAL: Contribution to how activists [or some other category of social actor – businesses, governments, etc.] should be thinking about something

**Justification**

* Existing literature / What we know
* Research Question / Gap or Puzzle / State that your empirical case has had relatively little attention in the literature / What we do not know

**Methods and Data**

* Characterize the sample / Describe the data collected (this is going to happen at several different points in the section – it’s less of a section in itself and more of a move that you do several times in the methods section – it is for anything that gives some shape or contours to the data collected) (e.g., “Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 40 women who saw food as important to their identities”) (e.g., “Interviewees had varied meat practices and preferences. Sixty-four percent were meat eaters (49), with 6% eating meat at every meal (5), 35% eating it every day (27), and 23% eating it occasionally (18). Purposive recruitment was done to interview a significant number of people who don’t eat meat (in order to better understand this relatively unusual choice); as a result, 23% of respondents identified as vegetarian (18) and 12% as vegan (9).”)
* Describe how you collected the data (interviewee recruitment methods, etc.)
* Describe some of the instruments (e.g., explain Latent Class Analysis or give a few particularly relevant interview questions)
* Describe the research site(s) (I mean “site” broadly defined—online, where interviews were done, fieldwork research site, etc.)
* Describe how you analyzed the data collected
* You may want to mention somewhere in the section that all names are pseudonyms – otherwise, plan to do that the first time a name is mentioned in the analysis section (e.g., with a footnote/endnote)

**Analysis**

*FOR QUALITATIVE ARTICLES ONLY: Have a structure something like this.*

*You do not have to have a certain number of subthemes, second order subthemes, third order subthemes, etc. – do what you actually have, whatever the nested structure is for your codes.*

*When you are coding, make sure you nest the codes so that you can write this section with ease when you get to the writing stage.*

*I realize the structure here is very repetitive, but I want to show the general structure.*

* Overall message of paper
* Introduce the sub-themes
	+ Subtheme 1
		- Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion by GENERALIZING across the sample OR providing 1–5 INDIVIDUAL example(s)
		- Briefly explain how an example represents a larger pattern/sub-theme OPTIONALLY mentioning 1-2 pieces of relevant literature
		- Introduce the Second Order Sub-themes
		- Second Order Subtheme 1
			* Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion by GENERALIZING across the sample OR providing 1–5 INDIVIDUAL example(s)
			* Briefly explain how an example represents a larger pattern/sub-theme OPTIONALLY mentioning 1-2 pieces of relevant literature
			* Third Order Subtheme 1
				+ Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion by GENERALIZING across the sample OR providing 1–5 INDIVIDUAL example(s)
				+ Briefly explain how an example represents a larger pattern/sub-theme OPTIONALLY mentioning 1-2 pieces of relevant literature
			* Third Order Subtheme 2
				+ Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion by GENERALIZING across the sample OR providing 1–5 INDIVIDUAL example(s)
				+ Briefly explain how an example represents a larger pattern/sub-theme OPTIONALLY mentioning 1-2 pieces of relevant literature
		- Second Order Subtheme 2
			* Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion by GENERALIZING across the sample OR providing 1–5 INDIVIDUAL example(s)
			* Briefly explain how an example represents a larger pattern/sub-theme OPTIONALLY mentioning 1-2 pieces of relevant literature
			* Third Order Subtheme 1
				+ Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion by GENERALIZING across the sample OR providing 1–5 INDIVIDUAL example(s)
				+ Briefly explain how an example represents a larger pattern/sub-theme OPTIONALLY mentioning 1-2 pieces of relevant literature
			* Third Order Subtheme 2
				+ Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion by GENERALIZING across the sample OR providing 1–5 INDIVIDUAL example(s)
				+ Briefly explain how an example represents a larger pattern/sub-theme OPTIONALLY mentioning 1-2 pieces of relevant literature
			* Third Order Subtheme 3
				+ Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion by GENERALIZING across the sample OR providing 1–5 INDIVIDUAL example(s)
				+ Briefly explain how an example represents a larger pattern/sub-theme OPTIONALLY mentioning 1-2 pieces of relevant literature
		- OPTIONAL: Generalize beyond the sample/contextualize the findings
		- OPTIONAL: Offer explanation(s) for the observed findings
	+ Subtheme 2
		- Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion
		- Briefly explain how an example represents a larger pattern/sub-theme OPTIONALLY mentioning 1-2 pieces of relevant literature
		- Introduce the Second Order Sub-themes
		- Second Order Subtheme 1
			* Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion by GENERALIZING across the sample OR providing 1–5 INDIVIDUAL example(s)
			* Briefly explain how an example represents a larger pattern/sub-theme OPTIONALLY mentioning 1-2 pieces of relevant literature
			* Third Order Subtheme 1
				+ Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion by GENERALIZING across the sample OR providing 1–5 INDIVIDUAL example(s)
				+ Briefly explain how an example represents a larger pattern/sub-theme OPTIONALLY mentioning 1-2 pieces of relevant literature
			* Third Order Subtheme 2
				+ Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion by GENERALIZING across the sample OR providing 1–5 INDIVIDUAL example(s)
				+ Briefly explain how an example represents a larger pattern/sub-theme OPTIONALLY mentioning 1-2 pieces of relevant literature
			* Third Order Subtheme 3
				+ Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion by GENERALIZING across the sample OR providing 1–5 INDIVIDUAL example(s)
				+ Briefly explain how an example represents a larger pattern/sub-theme OPTIONALLY mentioning 1-2 pieces of relevant literature
		- Second Order Subtheme 2
			* Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion by GENERALIZING across the sample OR providing 1–5 INDIVIDUAL example(s)
			* Briefly explain how an example represents a larger pattern/sub-theme OPTIONALLY mentioning 1-2 pieces of relevant literature
			* Third Order Subtheme 1
				+ Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion by GENERALIZING across the sample OR providing 1–5 INDIVIDUAL example(s)
				+ Briefly explain how an example represents a larger pattern/sub-theme OPTIONALLY mentioning 1-2 pieces of relevant literature
			* Third Order Subtheme 2
				+ Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion by GENERALIZING across the sample OR providing 1–5 INDIVIDUAL example(s)
				+ Briefly explain how an example represents a larger pattern/sub-theme OPTIONALLY mentioning 1-2 pieces of relevant literature
		- OPTIONAL: Generalize beyond the sample/contextualize the findings
		- OPTIONAL: Offer explanation(s) for observed findings
* OPTIONAL: Summarize the analysis sections / Generalize beyond sample / Offer explanation(s)

**Discussion/Discussion and Conclusion**

* Review what you found
* OPTIONAL: Generalize Beyond Sample, by referencing literature (or by reasoning)
* OPTIONAL: Explain your Findings, by referencing literature (or by reasoning)
* State implication(s) of findings
* Explain how themes and/or subthemes, or the implication(s) of the findings, clarify, challenge, or expand exiting knowledge or theory
* OPTIONAL: Identify areas of social life where your argument likely applies
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# Abstract (250 words or less)

Calarco’s Sections

* State your research question
* Explain how this research question speaks to a larger theoretical puzzle or gap in the literature
* Describe the data that you use to answer your research question
* State what you find
* Describe what these findings suggest about the answer to your research question
* Explain why these findings are important

*Poetics* – Johnston et al. 2021 – Abstract (251 words) – Genre: Promoting a concept – Do not outline full paper

* Theory/Concept (This article advances a sociological perspective on how people use prototypes to understand social categories. Prototypes are mental representations of best-fitting cases within categories that conserve cognitive effort by efficiently representing phenomena. While simple prototypes are well understood, what remains unclear is how more complex aspects of social life are understood in prototypical terms as well as how prototypes relate to boundary work and multiple axes of inequality.)
* Data (To stimulate a sociological perspective on prototypes, we investigate conceptualizations of prototypical meat-eaters and vegetarians)
* Existing literature (A longstanding cultural schema relating meateating to masculinity and plant-focused diets to femininity has been shown to powerfully guide everyday thinking about meat)
* Identify an empirical case that has had relatively little attention in the literature (multiple axes of identity are also implicated in meat consumption or abstention, raising the possibility that people will hold more complex ideas about these categories)
* Data – more specific (Based on 131 semi-structured interviews)
* Findings (our analysis reveals a range of understandings about the social locations of meat eaters and vegetarians. We find this evidenced in the presence of four intersectional prototypes: 1) the multicultural meat-eating muscle man; 2) the meaty fat man; 3) the skinny rich vegetarian; and 4) the religious vegetarian)
* Contribution to literature (In interrogating these four prototypical figures, we show how prototype analysis can help explain how people think in ways that both perpetuate and deviate from gender schemas, advance the study of perceptions of intersectional identities, and illuminate the link between culture and action.)
* Findings in light of theory/concept (In this case, prototypes reinforce but also complicate normative gendered performance and also suggest limits for adopting plant-based diets)

*Journal of Consumer Culture –* Baumann et al. 2019 – Abstract (172 words) – Do not outline full paper

* Existing literature (The phenomena of meat production and consumption are related but often studied separately, funnelled into silos of agro-food and consumer-focussed research.)
* Research question (This article aims to reconnect these spheres by asking: How do meat producers understand the role of consumers in the ethical meatscape?)
* Data (We draw from interviews and site visits with 74 actors engaged with the ethical meat system in Canada.)
* Findings (We find that consumers loom large in the cultural imaginary of meat producers and are often framed as key drivers of food system change. We make a two-pronged argument that explains the complex, embedded presence of consumers in meat producers’ cultural imaginary. Conceptually, we argue that producers draw from a cultural repertoire of consumer sovereignty that frames consumer choice as a foundational element of capitalist societies. Empirically, we argue that ethical meat producers’ direct relationships with consumers infuse producers’ work with meaning and emotional significance, and this works to reinforce a normative valuation of consumer sovereignty.)
* State your contribution to the literature in vague terms (This research contributes to scholarship interrogating the implications of consumer-driven models of food system change)

*Journal of Consumer Culture –* Kennedy et al. 2018 – Abstract (229 words) – Do not outline full paper

* State a debate in the literature (Scholars remain divided on the possibilities (and limitations) of conceptualizing social change through a consumer-focused, ‘‘shopping for change,’’ lens.)
* State main ideas that you evaluate (Drawing from framing theory and the concept of the democratic imagination)
* Very briefly introduce the data (we use a case study of ‘‘eatlocal’’ food activism to contribute to this debate)
* State your research question (We ask two questions: first, how do activists in the local food movement come to diagnose and critique the conventional industrial food system? and second, what roles do they envision for participants in the sustainable food movement?)
* Describe the data that you use to answer your research question (We address these questions by drawing from activist interview data (n = 57) and participant observation of the eat-local movement in three Canadian cities.)
* State your findings
* That’s it, no direct comment on how this relates to the literature

*Cultural Sociology –* Otto et al. 2022 – Abstract (211 words) – Do not outline full paper

* Existing literature (Recent research has extended the concept of moral entrepreneurialism to corporate actors.)
* Research question and preview of findings simultaneously (We build on this research to investigate how corporations succeed in this effort by uncovering the strategies and tools they employ as moral entrepreneurs.)
* Data (To do so, we examine the corporate discourse of three prominent fast-food firms to identify how they present hamburgers as good food, in a context where beef is increasingly criticized as morally suspect.)
* Analysis method (Based on a discourse analysis of corporate communications and marketing campaigns)
* Findings (we identify three distinct discursive strategies for managing meat criticisms: (1) global managerialism (McDonald’s); (2) aestheticized simplicity (A&W); and (3) nostalgic, personalized appeals (Wendy’s). These strategies are realized through the use of informational tools to shape what customers think and know about beef, and affective tools to influence how customers feel about beef. Together, these corporate strategies speak to the skilful ability of corporate actors to respond to socioenvironmental criticisms. Our case shows how fast-food market actors are able to incorporate critique and offer messages that seek to allow people to feel good about eating beef)
* Contribution to literature (vague) (This case is relevant to understanding the tools that corporations use to be effective moral entrepreneurs. It also provides a deeper understanding of marketing discourse at the nexus of social problems and consumption choices.)

*Social Forces* – Kennedy et al. 2019 – Abstract (245 words) – Quantitative and Qualitative Data – Do not outline full paper

* State your research question (Under what conditions is ethical consumption a high-status practice?)
* Data (Using unique food consumption survey data on aesthetic and ethical preferences, we investigate how these orientations to food are related.)
* Describe, in empirical terms, existing research that sets up the need for your study (Existing research on high-status food consumption points to the “foodie,” who defines good taste through aesthetic standards. And emergent evidence suggests the “ethical consumer,” whose consumption is driven by moral principles, may also be a high-status food identity.)
* Identify an empirical case that has had relatively little attention in the literature (However, ethical consumption can be practiced in inexpensive and subcultural ways that do not conform to dominant status hierarchies (e.g., freeganism).)
* Specific version of the research question (In order to understand the complex cultural terrain of high-status consumption, we investigate how socioeconomic status (SES) is related to foodie and ethical consumer preferences and practices.)
* Describe analysis methods and findings (Using a k-means cluster analysis of intercept survey data from food shoppers in Toronto, we identify four distinct clusters representing foodies, ethical consumers, ethical foodies, and those whose preferences involve neither aesthetic nor ethical ideals. Through multinomial logistic regression, we find that while high-status consumers can be foodies or ethical consumers, the highest status consumers prioritize ethical and foodie preferences. Respondents’ reported shopping locations corroborate the results of the regression analyses.)
* State the findings in general across all analysis methods (The taste preferences of the highest status consumers are associated with culinary sophistication and moral considerations, suggesting that high cultural capital tastes incorporate aesthetic and ethical dimensions)
* State how the findings contribute to literature in vague terms (These results contribute to literature examining how food consumption repertoires can produce and reinforce classed boundaries and to literature on tastes that has focused on aesthetics to the neglect of ethical ideals)

## *The British Journal of Sociology –* Kennedy et al. 2018b – Abstract (224 words) – Outline full paper

* State a fact about the world (Non-confrontational engagement practices like ethical consumption are a popular form of everyday politics.)
* Describe the existing research about that fact about the world (Existing research into these practices offers positive evaluations (highlighting the value of everyday engagement in public life) and critical perspectives (questioning whether myriad small acts can address structural barriers to equity and sustainability).)
* Describe a gap in existing literature (Meanwhile, less emphasis has been placed on understanding the underlying ideals and motivations for political action that seeks to avoid traditional politics.)
* Data (In order to advance such understanding, this case study uses participant observation and semi-structured interviews with 57 individuals whose daily paid or unpaid leadership roles shape eat-local initiatives.)
* State what you find (We find that in the local food realm, participants idealize pleasurable, convivial and pragmatic engagement and these ideals culminate in a particular form of everyday action we term ‘small-p politics’. The paper offers a theoretically and empirically informed investigation of non-traditional political engagement in eatlocal movements, concluding that it emerges from a site where: (a) cultural change is prioritized above contentious politics; (b) rejecting traditional political activity is linked with achieving tangible outcomes; and (c) consumers are deemed the ideal agents of change. Non-traditional politics play a prominent role in the landscape of contemporary civic engagement.)
* State how the findings contribute to literature in vague terms (This research advances our existing knowledge of such practices by providing a thick description of the political ideals that endorse consumption-based approaches to change in the realm of local food)

## *Poetics* – Baumann et al. 2022 – Abstract (219 words) – Outline full paper

* State a trend in existing research (Research on the tastes of higher status groups has long prioritized analysis of aesthetic preferences.)
* State how recent research is going against that trend (However, recent work has brought more attention to the moral dimensions of tastes.)
* State what you investigate in the paper (In this paper, we investigate the intersection of morality and aesthetics in tastes.)
* Very briefly introduce the data (Drawing on survey data and focus groups)
* State in more detail what you investigate (we investigate how aesthetic and moral concerns operate in the domain of food, and meat specifically)
* State what you find (A latent class analysis identifies four orientations to food that differ in their emphasis on aesthetic versus moral concerns. We identify classes that we label pragmatism, aestheticism, moralism, and moral aestheticism . These orientations toward moral and aesthetic concerns in food are associated with economic capital, cultural capital, age, political ideology, race, and gender. Respondents with higher social status are most likely to hold the moral aestheticism orientation, which simultaneously upholds moral and aesthetic concerns. Analysis of focus group data brings the nature of each of these four orientations into sharper focus. Further survey analyses show these four orientations predict high status aesthetic preferences and moral orientations beyond food, and they also predict the holding of symbolic and social boundaries related to moral judgments in food.)
* State how the findings contribute to literature (We argue that research on high status cultural consumption must conceptualize and measure moral consecration alongside aesthetic consecration in order to better understand the social stratification of tastes.)

## *Journal of Consumer Culture* – Baumann et al. 2019 – Abstract (175 words) – Outline full paper

* State a trend in the literature (Scholars have long studied consumer taste dynamics within class-stratified contexts)
* Identify an empirical case that has received “relatively little attention” in the literature (relatively little attention has been paid to the taste preferences of low-socioeconomicstatus groups)
* Describe the data you use to answer your research question (We analyze interview data from 254 individuals from 105 families across Canada to explore the cultural repertoires that guide low-socioeconomic-status consumer tastes in food)
* State your Findings (Analytically, we argue that lowsocioeconomic-status respondents demonstrate aesthetic preferences that operate according to four cultural repertoires that are distinctly different from that of highsocioeconomic-status omnivorous cultural consumption. Our respondents display tastes for foods from corporate brands, familiar ‘‘ethnic’’ foods, and foods perceived as healthy. While low-socioeconomic-status taste preferences in food are shaped by quotidian economic constraints – what Bourdieu called ‘‘tastes of necessity’’ – we show how cultural repertoires guiding low-socioeconomic-status tastes relate to both material circumstances and broader socio-temporal contexts.)
* State your Contribution to the Literature (Our findings advance debates about the nature of low-socioeconomic-status food ideals by illuminating their underlying meanings and justifications and contribute to scholarly understanding of lowsocioeconomic-status consumption.)

## *Sociological Forum* – Oleschuk et al. 2019 – Abstract (196 words) – Outline full paper

* State a fact about the world (Despite rising concerns about the meat industry and animal slaughter, meat consumption in Europe and North America remains relatively high, what has been called the “meat paradox.”)
* Data (In this article, we examine a diverse sample of Canadian meat eaters and vegetarians to build on earlier work on the psychological strategies people employ to justify eating meat.)
* Theory or concept used to interpret data (We analyze the explanations people give for meat eating within the context of what sociologists term cultural repertoires—the taken-for-granted, unarticulated scripts that inform actions.)
* Theory/Concept Innovation (We distinguish between two types of repertoires: identity repertoires that have a basis in personal, embodied group identities and regularly draw from vivid first-person experiences; and liberty repertoires that are more abstractly conceptualized and signal peoples’ sense of their rights in social space.)
* Findings (We find that these repertoires function in distinct ways, both in regard to how participants situated themselves within them, and in their capacity to facilitate active engagement with the ethical implications of conduct.)
* Contribution to the literature and to understanding the problem in the world (Through these repertoires, we show how the meanings attributed to meat consumption are crucial for understanding its persistence in the face of strong reasons to change, while also advancing literature on cultural repertoires by highlighting their variability.)

## *Journal of Rural Studies* – Johnston et al. 2022 – Abstract (207 words) – Outline the whole paper

* State fact about the world (Because of concerns about human health, the environment, and animal welfare, meat is a highly contentious food. Accordingly, a broad range of alternative, small-scale practices for raising livestock and producing nonindustrial meat are in the spotlight.)
* Existing Literature (scholars have examined consumer perspectives on “ethical” meat)
* Identify an empirical case that has had relatively little attention in the literature (less is known about producers’ perceptions of how small-scale meat production fits into the broader food system, and how their perceptions relate to broader sustainability debates surrounding meat)
* Research question (We explore producer perspectives on small-scale “ethical” meat production and its role in a sustainable food system)
* Data (We do so through interviews and site visits with 74 people working within alternative meat production in four Canadian provinces, a sample that includes farmers, ranchers, butchers, and meat-focussed chefs.)
* Findings (We find that, in the face of practical challenges linked to small-scale production, producers are passionately committed to the project of small-scale animal rearing that they regard as humane and sustainable. Despite these similarities, producers have radically different ideas about the purpose and potential of ethical meat. We observed major differences among producers’ cultural imagination of meat, exemplifying varied ideas for fitting meat into a sustainable food system.)
* Contribution to Literature (Our findings underscore the importance of charting not only producers’ practices, but also their cultural orientations.)

## *Agriculture and Human Values* – Cairns and Johnston 2018 – Abstract (238 words) – Outline the whole paper

* State fact about the world (Knowledge is a presumed motivator for changed consumption practices in ethical eating discourse: the consumer learns more about where their food comes from and makes different consumption choices)
* Existing literature (Despite intuitive appeal, scholars are beginning to illuminate the limits of knowledge-focused praxis for ethical eating)
* Data (In this paper, we draw from qualitative interviews and focus groups with Toronto mothers to explore the role of knowledge in conceptions of ethical foodwork.)
* Findings (While the goal of educating children about their food has become central to Canadian and American discourses of “good” mothering, we identify a paradoxical maternal expectation surrounding meat consumption: (1) to raise informed child consumers who know where their food comes from, and (2) to protect children from the harsh realities of animal slaughter. Rather than revealing the story behind the meat on a child’s plate, mothers seek to shield children from knowledge of meat production)
* Contribution to Literature (Our analysis of the child consumer contributes to ethical eating scholarship and illuminates a larger paradox surrounding knowledge of meat in an industrialized food system)
* Findings again and in more detail (In the practice of feeding children, mothers confront the visceral discomforts of meat consumption; their reactions speak to discordant feelings involved with eating meat in a setting far-removed from the lives and deaths of animals. Ultimately, the paper illustrates the limits of consumer-focused strategies for food-system change that call on individual mothers to educate young consumers and protect childhood innocence, all while getting ethically-sourced meals on the table.)

## *Qualitative Sociology* – Baldor 2022 – Abstract (187 words)

* Existing Literature (Sociology has a long history of analyzing relationships between strangers in everyday life.)
* Identify an empirical case that has had relatively little attention in the literature – GAP in existing literature (The ubiquity of social media and mobile technologies, however, necessitates refined theories of how people relate to and interact with strangers in a social world where online and offline contexts are intertwined)
* Data (This study examines public encounters between acquainted strangers, a type of connection fostered through social media wherein people are both digital acquaintances and offline strangers. Drawing on ethnographic data of queer men who use mobile dating and hookup apps)
* Findings (I find that queer men experience these encounters as routine yet problematic, which past theories of stranger relationships cannot fully explain. I argue that offline interactions with acquainted strangers amplify interactional uncertainties around identification (e.g. “I know them, but do they know me?”) and recognition (e.g. “What are the moral demands of our relationship?”). Managing these uncertainties is socially significant as the decision to regard or ignore an acquainted stranger marks not only interpersonal acceptance/rejection but also broader forms of belonging and exclusion.)
* Contribution to understanding world / Contribution to Literature / Explain why these findings are important (These findings underscore how mobile technologies are fundamentally transforming what it means to be a “stranger.”)

# Introduction (3 paragraphs)

Calarco’s Sections

**Describe the puzzle or gap in the literature that you will address with your data**

* What do we know?
* What do we not know (or not know well enough)?
* What does the existing research suggest might be the answer to that unanswered question?

**Identify your research question and explain how you answer it**

* What question will you answer? (Or what hypothesis will you test? )
* What data will you use to answer this question? (Or test this hypothesis? )
* What do you find?

**Explain the importance of your findings**

* What is the answer to your research question?
* CONTRIBUTION: How does this answer broaden, clarify, or challenge existing knowledge/theories? / TB edit: How does the paper’s answer to the research question(s) broaden, clarify, or challenge existing knowledge/theories? (TB made this edit because sometimes this comes before the authors state the research questions)
* CONTRIBUTION: How does the paper’s answer to the research question(s) broaden, clarify, or challenge existing knowledge/theories?

Alternative version of Calarco’s outline, with TB edits

**1. Describe the puzzle or gap in the literature that you will address with your data**

1.1. What we know / What do we know?

1.2. What do we not know (or not know well enough)?

1.3. **What does the existing research suggest might be the answer to that unanswered question?**

1.4. TJB > Clarifying a Concept

**2. Identify your research question and explain how you answer it**

2.1. Question SPECIFIC / Research Question / RQ – What question will you answer? (Or what hypothesis will you test? )

2.2. Data DESCRIPTION – What data will you use to answer this question? (Or test this hypothesis? )

2.3. Findings – What do you find?

2.4. TJB > Data EXCERPT

2.5. TJB > Question GENERAL (e.g., “I chose … to examine the … analytical question of how and why individuals act the way they do.” [Leschziner 2014, *At the Chef’s Table*, p.xi]; “What do higher status people prefer in their cultural consumption options?” [Bauman et al. 2022, coded in this document])

**3. Explain the importance of your findings**

3.1. What is the answer to your research question?

3.2. CONTRIBUTION: How does this answer broaden, clarify, or challenge existing knowledge/theories?

3.2. TB edit > How does the paper’s answer to the research question(s) broaden, clarify, or challenge existing knowledge/theories? (TB made this edit because sometimes this comes before the authors state the research questions)

3.3. CONTRIBUTION: How does the paper’s answer to the research question(s) broaden, clarify, or challenge existing knowledge/theories?

## *The British Journal of Sociology* – Kennedy et al. 2018b – Introduction (800 words) – 4 paragraphs

* What do we know? (Those who see evidence of a disillusioned and apathetic public sphere may not have interacted recently with foodies, local farmers, and their kin. Inspired by documentaries like Food Inc. and texts such as The Omnivore’s Dilemma (Pollan 2008), collective efforts to redesign food consumption and production draw private eating practices into the public domain. Thus, calls for localized eating that is more just and sustainable can be considered an expression of what has been termed political, or ethical, consumption. Those active in ethical consumption broadly, or the eat-local movement specifically, represent a ‘class’ of citizenship that is having a significant impact on cities in North America, Europe, and beyond: establishing farmers’ markets, building community gardens, and promoting organic food. Such gains give cause to celebrate local food movements (e.g., Blay-Palmer, Landman, Knezevic and Hayhurst 2013; Marsden and Sonnino 2012). However, critics suggest consumption-focused movements unwittingly cater to neoliberal ideologies and privilege elite tastes (e.g., Alkon and Agyeman 2011; Guthman 2008; Szasz 2007).)
* What do we not know? (how to theorize contemporary civic engagement) (a shift in practice that is typically situated in the private sphere yet increasingly imbued with citizenship qualities offers fertile territory to theorize contemporary civic engagement.)
* What does the existing research suggest might be the answer to that unanswered question? (Sociological literature on civic life and democracy has wrestled with defining, conceptualizing and situating political activity that take place in relatively private spaces (Goldfarb 2006) or in the marketplace (Barnett, Cloke, Clarke and Malpass 2011; Haenfler, Johnson and Jones 2012; Micheletti 2003) and therefore offers a useful starting place to makes sense of current trends in civic engagement. Some observers of these non-traditional forms of politics claim that participants are not engaged in collective action (McQuarrie 2015; Szasz 2007). Others point out that since day-to-day acts can provide a foundation for more substantial political reforms to take place when adopted collectively, non-traditional politics can coalesce into a sort of ‘individualized collective action’ that is an important part of a repertoire of broader social change (Barnett et al. 2011; Micheletti 2003: 12; Willis and Schor 2012; Yates 2015).)
* Data – General (The contested political efficacy of eat-local movements offers an ideal setting to understand contemporary political engagement.)
* What does the existing research suggest might be the answer to that unanswered question? (The contested political efficacy of eat-local movements offers an ideal setting to understand contemporary political engagement. The popularity of local food initiatives across North America and Europe indicates that this relatively new site of civic engagement has succeeded in developing a collective identity amongst consumers (Johnston, Szabo and Rodney 2011), and may provide new ways to build capacity in marginalized communities (Broad 2016). While the enthusiasm surrounding local food projects is difficult to deny, debates persist over the power of these forms of local engagement to deliver systemic reform to the food system: the challenge is considerable. The contemporary agricultural system is a product of deliberate state interventions to subsidize cheap food for the purposes of corporate gain; this system operates on a massive scale, and is deeply reliant on production and manufacturing processes that threaten the health of workers, eaters and the natural environment (Bonnano and Busch 2015). From this perspective, alternative food movements can appear to extend the neoliberal model: downloading responsibility to individuals and local communities and delivering high-quality products to privileged consumers, while leaving the broader industrial edifice of corporate food largely intact (Goodman, Dupuis and Goodman 2012). Of course, food scholars frequently acknowledge that this debate is far from black-and-white, and not all alternative food projects are cut from the same cloth. While some local food projects seem more vulnerable to the critique of neoliberal downloading and individualization, others use food to focus collective mobilization on issues of class and racial justice (Broad 2016).)
* RQ (This paper contributes to scholarship on non-traditional political engagement by seeking to understand the productive tensions that exist within the institutional and organizational context of eat-local movements.)
* Findings (On the one hand, our participants represent strong leadership in change-making organizations that extend beyond markets; on the other hand, they employ conventional tropes of a neoliberal subject, with markets at the forefront of thinking and strategy)
* Data – More specific (Interviewing and observing actors located in civil, state and market spheres in three Canadian cities, we describe commonly articulated political ideals that inform and shape these individuals’ civic activity in food politics.)
* Findings/What is the answer to your research question (These ideals give rise to an engagement approach that we call ‘small-p politics’. Working closely with context-specific information we offer three explanations as to why small-p politics is so prominent within the eat-local initiatives studied: (a) change through cultural shifts and consumer tastes is prioritized over change through contentious political engagement; (b) in their arena, creating discursive distance from traditional political activity is felt to be effective for achieving desired goals; and (c) consumers are believed to be the ideal target for social change. We also argue that while participants value broader goals like overcoming inequality in the food system, their imagined pathways to achieve such goals are narrowed as they reject approaches that seem contradictory to the ideals of small-p politics.)
* Missing: How does this answer broaden, clarify, or challenge existing knowledge/theories?

## *Poetics* – Baumann et al. 2022 – Introduction (1,188 words) – 7 paragraphs

* General question (What do higher status people prefer in their cultural consumption options?)
* What we know (One robust finding in past research is that higher status consumers are attracted to consecrated aesthetic choices (Bourdieu 1984). For example, a stereotypical high-status person listens to music that is appraised by music critics, reads books that won literary awards, and eats in restaurants that are well-reviewed and recommended by their high-status friends. Bourdieu (1984:466) demonstrated that members of dominant classes tend to have internalized schemes of perception and appreciation that lead them to prefer consecrated cultural practices and goods that befit their class position. Bourdieu’s insights about classed consumption remain broadly influential, especially as scholars affirm the ability of social elites to consume a wide variety of consecrated cultural forms (e.g., Cattani, Ferriani, and Allison 2014; Johnston and Baumann 2015; Peterson 2005; Warde et al. 2007).)
* What we know – explaining theoretical ideas (In Bourdieu’s (1984) analyses, “the aesthetic disposition” is a central concept, referring to the cognitive and perceptual schemes that people with high cultural capital deploy when evaluating cultural consumption options. Bourdieu’s analysis goes beyond describing the relationship between class and cultural consumption to explain why certain cultural options are consecrated. Cultural goods that become consecrated tend to hold aesthetic characteristics, such as those features that symbolize luxury or a distance from necessity. Other scholars have highlighted additional aesthetic features. For example, Griswold (1987) argues that cultural objects that possess “cultural power” will demonstrate multivocality, a valued aesthetic characteristic.)
* What we know – a new trend in research (In this paper, we turn our attention to moral dimensions of consecrated cultural forms. Although Bourdieu (1984) did theorize the moral aspects of cultural consumption, it is only recently that empirical research on high-status tastes has shifted the focus away from strictly aesthetic dimensions of cultural consumption and toward moral dimensions (Carfagna et al. 2014; Friedman and Reeves 2020; Hahl, Zuckerman and Kim 2017; Hanquinet 2018; Kennedy, Baumann and Johnston 2019; Kennedy and Horne 2020). These authors identify the moral signaling or moral valence inherent in particular cultural options as important to understanding high-status tastes. Just as higher status people are oriented to particular aesthetic features, they are likewise oriented toward socially-valued, moral features within cultural consumption. We build ambitiously on this turn toward understanding the moral dimensions of high-status tastes by using mixed methods and an abductive analytic strategy to propose and empirically support the concept of moral consecration. Hitlin and Vaisey (2013, p.55) explain that one of the ways social scientists advance our understanding of morality is by capturing how social groups define what is deemed to be moral. In this tradition, which reflects our own engagement with the concept of morality, the emphasis is on identifying, “universal standards of right and wrong linked to concerns about justice, fairness, and harm”. In this way, researchers can conceptualize “social arrangements along a dimension of how moral they are”, a dimension that, in principle, ranges from immoral to moral.)
* How does the paper’s answer to the research question(s) broaden, clarify, or challenge existing knowledge/theories? – Odd location for this, in terms of Calarco’s outline – (We argue that in order to understand which cultural options have the most symbolic value, and are therefore most appealing to higher status consumers, scholars should consider, conceptualize, and measure levels of both aesthetic and moral consecration. By way of example, foie gras has been a high-status food option for a very long time, existing within the French tradition and typically being perceived as expensive and refined (DeSoucey 2016). Foie gras is also, however, produced through a means of force-feeding fowl that is now commonly viewed as a violation of animal welfare standards (Gu ́emen ́e and Guy 2004). In response to this change of view, some high-end restaurants have removed foie gras from their menus (DeSoucey 2016). In foie gras, we see a case of an aesthetically-consecrated cultural option that is lacking moral consecration. We can also think of veal as having a similar consecration profile. Meanwhile, ethical, but refined, protein choices, like pastured heritage pork, free-range chicken and line-caught fish, have moved onto high-end menus1. These patterns suggest that we should consider both the aesthetic and moral consecration levels of food in order to fully understand high-status consumption. Foods can reflect a range of aesthetic qualities and moral commitments but food is by no means the only consumption realm where aesthetic and moral dimensions of cultural objects come together. In fact, we see both these dimensions in many cultural consumption realms. For example, a novel such as Margaret Atwood’s The Handmaid’s Tale brings together highly-valued literary aesthetic qualities with feminist ethics. Similarly, the television series Atlanta incorporates avant-garde narrative and visual qualities at the same time that it employs story lines that discuss white supremacy and anti-Black racism. Such cultural objects are both aesthetically and morally consecrated (e.g., Mead 2017; Morris 2018).)
* Specific Questions/Research Questions – with introduction and explanation (The turn toward understanding the moral dimensions of tastes raises important questions about the nature of high-status consumption. In this article, we are interested in knowing whether classed cultural consumption preferences are oriented toward both the aesthetic and moral characteristics of consumption options simultaneously, using the case of food. We also aim to understand whether these concerns and preferences extend beyond the specific case of food, toward other cultural realms. And finally, we seek to estimate whether these patterns influence how people interact, since, for tastes and preferences to matter for inequality, they must manifest in social interaction (Erickson 1996). Accordingly, we ask, first, can we identify distinct orientations to food based on aesthetic preferences and moral priorities? Second, are aesthetic and moral orientations in food consumption choices associated with social status and other demographic measures? Third, are aesthetic and moral orientations in food transposable to cultural consumption more broadly? And fourth, do aesthetic and moral orientations in food lead to drawing symbolic and social boundaries? In answering these questions, we are attuned to different possibilities for how aesthetic and moral preferences may interact, including the possibility that higher status people might lean toward aesthetic versus moral qualities, or vice versa, or they might prefer options that are consecrated on both dimensions.)
* Data (To answer our questions, we draw on original survey and focus group data we collected in order to investigate issues of taste and morality in food, and particularly meat, as a category of food with salient aesthetic and moral qualities. We work abductively between these sources, using the survey data to establish key patterns and associations involving social status and consumption preferences. We use the focus group data to help illuminate and clarify those patterns and associations, and to highlight the social significance of classed cultural consumption preferences.)
* Findings (Through a latent class analysis, we identify four classes of people with specific orientations to the aesthetics and morality of food)
* Analytical Strategy (We examine the demographic correlates of these classes to establish connections between these orientations and social status net of other demographic characteristics, and we also turn to our focus group data to enrich our understanding of these orientations. We then assess how well these orientations can predict high-status aesthetic and moral preferences outside the realm of food to establish the broader applicability of our analysis of moral consecration. Finally, we present evidence from our survey and focus groups to show how aesthetic and moral preferences are foundations for both symbolic boundaries and social boundaries.)
* The reader gets the sense here that they ran out of space when explaining the findings, so instead of actually stating the findings, they just gave the analytical strategy at the end of the introduction

## *Journal of Consumer Culture* – Baumann et al. 2019 – Introduction (401 words) – 4 paragraphs

* What do we know? (much is known about ‘‘foodies’’ (Johnston and Baumann, 2015) and how upscale food culture serves as a source of status and distinction)
* What do we not know? (less is known about the food tastes of individuals with low socioeconomic status (SES))
* What does the existing research suggest might be the answer to that unanswered question? (Prior research documents what foods low-SES people buy (Darmon and Drenowski, 2008, 2015) and how concerns about food consumption are class-stratified, especially around health (Bennett et al., 2009: 164–168; Inglis et al., 2005).)
* What do we not know? – Clarified given the statement of existing research that might answer the unanswered question (Yet we have a poor understanding of what those with low-SES like in food, and a similarly poor understanding of why.)
* Data (We draw from a large-scale Canadian interview project to investigate the food preferences of people of low-SES.)
* Analytical Strategy (We move beyond an analysis of necessary consumption choices to an analysis of respondents’ food ideals in the hypothetical absence of economic constraints and through perceptions of foods that impress others. Our analysis focuses on what foods low-SES participants describe as desirable and how they justify their preferences.)
* Findings (In doing so, we show that low-SES participants work with different adjudication criteria from their high-SES counterparts.)
* Analytical Strategy (This article presents a novel analysis of low-SES tastes that relates to both household economic circumstances and broader socio-temporal contexts. While low-SES food choices have a connection to ‘‘tastes of necessity’’ (Bourdieu, 1984: 374–376), we reveal the cultural repertoires (Lamont, 1992) respondents draw on when expressing food tastes and relate these repertoires to broader forces such as transnational migration, cultural globalization, dominant health discourses, and the corporatization of the food sector.)
* CONTRIBUTION: How does the paper’s answer to the research question(s) broaden, clarify, or challenge existing knowledge/theories? (There is currently debate about the extent to which class differences in food consumption reflect differences in food knowledge, affordability, cooking skills, and tastes (namely, Alkon et al., 2013). Darmon and Drenowski’s (2008) review concludes that while the relationship between SES and quality of nutritional intake is positive, there is conflicting evidence about how that relationship is shaped by food costs, food access, or the educational and cultural traits of low-SES people. This article contributes by showing that aesthetic food preferences vary between lowand high-SES respondents and reveals how general aesthetic preferences shape food ideals. More broadly, this study is important for demonstrating the distinctiveness and meanings of low-SES consumption, as well as shedding light on the relationship between culture and poverty (Small et al., 2010).)
* Signposting (Before presenting data supporting our argument, we briefly outline literature concerning the classed dimension of consumption habits, as well as the connection between food and SES.)

## *Sociological Forum* – Oleschuk et al. 2019 – Introduction (854 words) – 5 paragraphs

* Overall: This introduction takes many twists and turns. The articles by the more experienced professors tend to change less between the different elements (placing all the findings in one section of the introduction, for example).
* Problem in the world – Not in Calarco’s outline – (Most Europeans and North Americans eat meat that is raised industrially in confined pens, commonly referred to as “factory farms,” or CAFOs (confined animal feeding operations). These production systems are associated with multiple environmental and social externalities such as greenhouse gas emissions, antibiotic resistance, corporate concentration, animal cruelty, water contamination, dietrelated disease, and workers exploitation (e.g., Garner and Rossi 2014; Herrero et al. 2016).)
* What do we know and what do we not know at the same time – Puzzle in the world that we know about – Zuckerman’s “Known Puzzle – (Prior research has demonstrated the existence of a “meat paradox”: most people care about animals and believe it is problematic to treat animals poorly, yet they eat meat (e.g., Bastian, Loughnan, and Haslam 2012). Indeed, most consumers in North America and Europe continue to eat meat, despite the public prominence of environmental, animal-welfare, and health issues related to it. Rates of vegetarianism are difficult to measure, but estimates are typically quite low—somewhere between 3% and 8% in countries such as the United States and Canada (Ruby 2012).)
* What does the existing research suggest might be the answer to that unanswered question? (Scholars have presented some explanations for the paradox. Consumption scholars have identified a more generalized phenomenon of the “attitude behavior gap” (e.g., Vermeir and Verbeke 2006), wherein people commonly express a set of values but behave in ways that are inconsistent with those values. Researchers have examined this gap in relation to consumer concerns around environmental sustainability and shown a similar pattern: while most people consider climate change to be a pressing issue, few mitigate their high greenhouse gas–emitting behaviors in substantive ways (Gifford 2011; Leiserowitz 2006; Lorenzen 2012; O’Neill and Nicholson-Cole 2009). More specific to the case of meat, psychologists have uncovered cognitive strategies that people employ to reconcile their discomfort or even disgust with their continued meat consumption, including denial (Bastian et al. 2012; Loughnan, Haslam, and Bastian 2010), dissociation (Kunst and Hohle 2016), repression (Herzog 2010:188; Holm and Mohl 2000:180), and rationalization (Joy 2010; Piazza et al. 2015).)
* What do we not know? / What question will you answer? (While these psychologically oriented explanations are important for understanding contradictory ideas and behaviors concerning meat, we contend that we can improve our understanding of meat maintenance by expanding analysis beyond the individual consumer psyche and considering more centrally the social and cultural environment in which meat eating takes place.)
* Analytical Strategy (In particular, we take stock of meat attitudes in a highly diverse urban landscape, mapping the relationship of these attitudes to dominant cultural scripts, or repertoires (Lamont 1992; Swidler 1986, 2001).)
* What do we not know? (We deem this an especially significant task since many important studies of vegetarianism and meat eating (e.g., Rothgerber 2013) have focused on white eaters, with far less understanding of how meat eating is understood cross-culturally (Piazza et al. 2015:126; Ruby 2012:145). Sociologists have only begun to address the puzzle of sustained meat consumption,)
* What do we know? (yet recent scholarship (on meat and other forms of ethically laden consumption) emphasizes the practical, embedded, contextual nature of consumption choices (e.g., Chiles 2017; Schoolman 2016; Thorslun and Lassen 2017; Warde 2016))
* Data (We build on these insights, drawing from a highly diverse set of consumer interviews that includes consumers from varied ethnoracial backgrounds and socioeconomic positions)
* CONTRIBUTION: How does the paper’s answer to the research question(s) broaden, clarify, or challenge existing knowledge/theories? (Our contribution is to connect literature on practical consumption to “cultural repertoires” or cultural scripts, and we argue that repertoires are essential tools that allow consumers to juggle contradictions and maintain meat consumption habits from diverse subject positions.)
* Findings (We also find that these scripts take varied forms. To foreshadow our findings, through identity repertoires, participants frame themselves as gendered members of communities, religions, and families with very concrete social obligations and repercussions that often conflicted with ideas about meat abstention; such conflicts were experienced in personal, embodied ways. In contrast, through liberty repertoires, participants drew from an abstract sense of rights to make sense of continued meat consumption. However, we suggest that all cultural scripts are a kind of social lubricant that allow people to manage the meat paradox in their daily social interactions and consumption practices.)
* CONTRIBUTION: How does the paper’s answer to the research question(s) broaden, clarify, or challenge existing knowledge/theories? (Ultimately, we demonstrate how a consideration of cultural repertoires provides an important complement to psychological theories, helping us understand why and how consumers deny, repress, reframe, and/or rationalize the realities of meat’s origins.)
* Analytical Strategy (By identifying the cultural repertoires people draw on to make sense of meateating, we illuminate more generally how consumers manage contradictions and resolve paradoxes in their daily lives.)
* Specific / Research Question (While we aim to contribute to conceptualizations of cultural repertoires by identifying the different forms they can take, this article is rooted in a concrete empirical question: how do consumers make sense of eating meat in a diverse ethnoracial and socioeconomic context where meat is a contested food?)
* Findings (We find evidence that confirms that many consumers are uncomfortable with some dimension of meat eating or the meat industry, sometimes drastically so. Through asking people to articulate how they view their meat eating, we also find evidence for cultural scripts that inform ideas about appropriate meat eating.)
* Signposting (Below, we briefly sketch out key trends in meat production and consumption and explore how scholars have theorized continued meat consumption alongside consumer critiques. We then present evidence on consumer discomfort (and even disgust) with meat, and then explore the identity and liberty repertoires that work to maintain meat consumption.)

## *Journal of Rural Studies* – Johnston et al. 2022 – Introduction (973 words) – 6 paragraphs

* What do we know? Zuckerman’s Known Puzzles (Our society’s relationship to meet reflects deep paradoxes. Many people care about non-human animals and feel uncomfortable with slaughter, but also enjoy the taste of meat and imbue it with cultural meaning (Oleschuk et al., 2019). Even though critiques of meat are commonplace in the public sphere, most consumers in wealthy industrialized states continue to eat meat (Blanchette 2019; Chiles 2017; OECD 2019; Reinhart 2018; Ruby 2012; Weis 2013; Willett et al., 2019). While meat-eating continues apace, negative perceptions of industrialized meat have fuelled demand for more “ethical” meat products that feel “morally palatable” (Herzog 2010: 191; Rothgerber 2015).)
* Clarifying a concept – Ethical meat (What do these “ethical” meat products look like? Take a moment to imagine a package of grass-fed beef, or a heritage-breed antibiotic-free chicken. You might also think of a carton of cage-free eggs, a liter of grass-fed milk, or other animal products marketed to appear higher quality, artisanal, sustainable, and humane. This space of “ethical”1 meat has clear examples, but fluid borders. It includes, on the production and processing side, ranchers and farmers but also chefs, butchers, hunters, and slaughterhouse operators. On the consumption side are conscientious omnivores (Rothgerber 2015), also known as flexitarians (Rosenfeld 2018) who limit their meat intake to specific sources or types. These actors occupy different positions across the commodity chain but share a general sense that the meat paradox can be resolved; that meat can be humane and healthy, delicious and sustainable. The space of ethical meat comprises both material and cultural dimensions. Ethical meat is produced within a material realm of money and niche markets, pastures and barns filled with animals, workers, and natural resources like water, manure, and soil. At the same time, ethical meat occupies a cultural realm of contested ideas, evocative visuals, and powerful emotions and narratives. The space of ethical meat conjures images of family farms and “happy”2 animals foraging outdoors – an image that encourages consumers to imagine eating an animal that doesn’t suffer its last days crowded into a factory farm, dissected on a fast-moving slaughterhouse assembly line. We think of these ideas and visuals as the cultural imaginaries surrounding meat.)
* What do we know? (Numerous studies have examined consumers’ complicated ideas about meat, aiming to better understand which meat products feel more appealing, how flexitarian consumers become selective about meat consumption, and what leads some eaters to give up meat altogether (e. g., Rothgerber 2015; Rosenfeld 2018). While scholars have studied the perspectives of conventional animal producers (e.g., Ellis, 2014) and certain sectors of alternative agriculture (e.g., Bruckner et al., 2018; Riely, 2011),)
* What do we not know? (less is known about how ethical meat producers think, feel, and imagine their products fit into the broader food system (Driessen 2012). This is an especially important question given the lively debates concerning meat’s role in a sustainable global food system (Willett et al., 2019; Steinfeld et al., 2006).)
* Specific / Research question (Here, we focus on a two interrelated research questions. First, how do ethical meat producers perceive the opportunities and challenges of their small-scale operations? Second, how do producers see the role of meat in the broader context of a sustainable food system, and how do they grapple with scalar tensions around conventional versus “alternative” production methods?)
* Data (To understand producer perspectives, we draw from farm visits and interviews with 74 actors involved at various points in ethical meat commodity chains (e.g., farmers, ranchers, butchers, chefs) across four Canadian provinces.)
* Findings (We find that while all producers struggled with the difficulties inherent in small-scale meat operations, they were passionately committed to the idea of raising animals in a way that felt intimate, humane, and sustainable. At the same time, we observed significant differences when we investigated producers’ meat imaginaries. Drawing from work charting the democratic, cultural imagination as it relates to food systems and eco-social change (Kennedy et al., 2016; Perrin 2006), we chart a wide range of imagination – and considerable dissensus – when it comes to understanding the role meat should play in a sustainable food system. Specifically, we identify three major producer positions on the role of ethical meat in the food system: 1) support for the status quo (a minority perspective); 2) a vision for “less meat, better meat” (a majority perspective), and 3) a challenge to the cultural centrality of meat (a minority perspective). Such a typology has not been analyzed in past research and might be difficult to predict simply from observing farm practices.)
* CONTRIBUTION: How does the paper’s answer to the research question(s) broaden, clarify, or challenge existing knowledge/theories? (Our research also aims to contribute to understandings of rural subjectivities and the rural imaginary. Rural people and producers can feel misunderstood and undervalued by urbanites as well as the broader political system and food system (e.g., Cairns 2013; Carolan 2019, 2020). Farmers may seek to conserve natural resources and raise healthy food, at the same time they are depicted as profiteers that disregard the environmental impact of farming practices (McGuire et al., 2013). Yet in addition to feeling vilified, farmers are often romanticized (Weiler et al., 2016). In Canada, the rural imaginary is embodied in the idea of a family farm that has “strong cultural associations with colonization, heteronormativity, and whiteness” (Cairns et al., 2015: 6; also 2013). Alongside producers of other crops that have become contentious in contemporary sustainability debates, such as almonds, avocadoes, and palm, it is important to understand producer perceptions of ethical meat, especially as it relates to understandings of sustainability and their ‘alternative’ credentials. This makes it even more important to study producer perceptions of ethical meat, especially as it relates to understandings of sustainability and their “alternative” credentials (Mount 2012: 108; Kessler et al., 2016). As Brislen (2018: 106) argues, it is “perilous” for “social scientists or policymakers to overlook the subjective experiences of [producers] whose acceptance of new [production] practices and social roles is essential for realizing the transformation of our food systems” (see also Gwin 2009: p. 192).)

## *Agriculture and Human Values* – Cairns and Johnston 2018 – Introduction (821 words) – 6 paragraphs

* Overall: An interesting thing in this introduction is that, since the unexpected finding was arrived at inductively, there wasn’t really a clear gap in the literature until the research was completed. So the findings and the what do we NOT know part of the introduction were merged. There are no research questions stated, again because this finding was arrived at inductively.
* So it seems that Calarco’s outline is a bit deductive. There are sometimes inductive papers that don’t require research questions. A finding appears inductively that can speak back to the literature.
* Fact in the world (Ethical eating discourse posits a clear connection between knowledge and behavioral change. Champions of ethical eating suggest that when consumers know more about food production practices, they will make more humane, sustainable consumer choices)
* What we know (While broadening consumer knowledge about the industrial food system is undeniably important for an informed food citizenry, scholars have begun to illuminate the limits of a knowledge-driven understanding of consumer practice1 (Carolan 2015; Guthman 2008; Warde 2014, 2016). Knowledge clearly matters in the supermarket, but food choices occur within a complex matrix of social, cultural and economic factors. Ethical eating discourse frequently underestimates the power of habit, emotion, routine, and economic constraint. To put the matter bluntly, sometimes consumers know about ethical options, but continue to purchase—and enjoy—factory farmed burgers and industrially produced sausages. Debates around knowledge and ethical eating become particularly salient in the domain of feeding children. Because the child is seen to represent the future, children’s food knowledge becomes a key site of interventions to produce educated, ethical consumers (Allen and Guthman 2006; Pike and Kelly 2014). Children are widely seen as needing special protections within a billion-dollar food and beverage industry that actively targets young consumers. Public health scholars liken these marketing efforts to earlier campaigns by Big Tobacco, and view children as a “vulnerable group” who “should be protected from commercial influences that may adversely impact their health” (Story and French 2004, p. 14).)
* Fact in the world (Such concerns fuel a growing cultural narrative that children are “at risk”—for a shortened life span, obesity, diabetes—and need to know more about where their food comes from in order to make better choices.)
* What we know (These child-focused food interventions have gendered implications, as mothers are frequently tasked with protecting children and the planet by making responsible consumption choices (Cairns and Johnston 2015). In these efforts, mothers must not only serve healthy, ethical foods, but also educate children about the food system, fostering healthy, ethical habits they will sustain in the future (Cairns et al. 2013). The task of raising responsible consumers is not only gendered, but also classed, given the substantial economic and cultural capital required to pursue the costly practices Brenton (2017) terms “intensive feeding.” In short, teaching children the story behind their food has become a central component of “good” middle-class mothering, especially in industrialized urban contexts where kids lack direct experience with food production.)
* Data (In our research with Toronto women, many mothers described efforts to raise ethical child consumers.)
* What do we not know? (a previously unacknowledged paradox)
* Findings (Yet, our research revealed a previously unacknowledged paradox: namely, while mothers seek to educate children about ethical choices, some do not want children to know the origins of the meat they consume. Instead, we observed deliberate attempts to shield children from an understanding of how meat gets on the plate.)
* What do we know / Fact about the world / Contextualizing the findings (This paradox can be seen in the co-existence of two maternal foodwork narratives. The first emphasizes the virtues of transparent food knowledge, and insists children should know where their food comes from—that a carrot came from the earth, not simply the supermarket. While this ideal of raising an informed child consumer was prominent in our data, it was in tension with a second narrative surrounding meat consumption. When it came to meat-eating, mothers frequently depicted children as innocent beings who should be protected from the harsh realities of animal slaughter. Here, too much knowledge was seen as a problem, and was often assumed to increase problematic consumption practices, like “picky” eating. In this second narrative, mothers are responsible for protecting children from the violence of eating animals, and the harshness of an industrial livestock industry many adults find troubling (Bergstra et al. 2016; Holm and Mohl 2000). Notably, both narratives emerge within a globalized industrialized food system that distances consumers from food production.)
* CONTRIBUTION: How does the paper’s answer to the research question(s) broaden, clarify, or challenge existing knowledge/theories? (An analysis of the child consumer can generate new insights within studies of ethical eating, speaking to a larger consumer paradox surrounding knowledge of meat in an industrial food system. Although ethical eating discourse applauds the idea of knowing how food reaches the plate, when it comes to meat, consumers may repress certain knowledge to make consumption more palatable (Piazza et al. 2015; Bulliet 2005). In the practice of feeding children, mothers confront the visceral discomforts of meat consumption; their reactions speak to the discordant meanings and feelings involved with eating meat in a setting far-removed from the lives and deaths of animals (e.g., Bulliet 2005; Bray et al. 2016). The “good” mother finds herself in a difficult situation, expected to educate her child on the origins of a pork chop while protecting the child from harsh knowledge of the meat industry. Besides shedding light on the challenge of ethical (meat) eating, our findings contribute to scholarly understanding of broader tensions surrounding maternal food femininities—ideals many women struggle to achieve in daily life (Bowen et al. 2014; Cairns and Johnston 2015).)

## Qualitative Sociology – Baldor 2022 – Introduction (1,097 words) – 6 Paragraphs + 2 paragraphs of long quotes from interviews

* Data EXCERPT – Findings (I don’t very often find myself in queer spaces, but I do very often see people in my neighborhood who I’ve interacted with to some degree on Grindr or Tinder or Hinge on the streets and in coffee shops... I think it’s generally accepted that it’s an awkward moment. (Ryan, 25, gay) I’ve used a bunch of apps to find sex. I’ve also used Instagram and Twitter for that same purpose... Sometimes I’m relieved [when a guy from a mobile app ignores me in public], and I’m like, ‘Oh good, they did it first.’ This happens so much that it feels like one of us is going to do it. Which one’s going to do it first? And that’s kind of ridiculous... There’s not a single night that I’ve gone out in the last, I don’t know, five years where this hasn’t happened. Maybe we should have a word for it or recognize it as a fairly normal behavior at this point. (Andrew, 31, gay))
* What we know (In common usage, a stranger is a person we do not know. In sociology, the stranger has a vibrant history as a concept that both extends and complicates this definition. In modern cities, characterized by a shift from Gemeinschaft (close, homogenous ties) to Gesellschaft (distant, heterogenous ties) (Tönnies 2011 [1887]), relations between strangers are a patterned characteristic of urban living (e.g., Durkheim 2014 [1893]; Goffman 1963; Lofland 1973; Simmel 1950; Wirth 1938). This broad sociological tradition of “interaction spaces and urban relationships” (Lofland 2003) examines how people manage the anonymity of urban life. A key theme is that stranger relationships often blur the lines between stranger and acquaintance. People may be acquaintances or even personally known to one another but also cultural strangers (Simmel 1950). Strangers can also be categorically known to one another through making inferences about their age, race, gender, or class (Lofland 1973). Cultural and categorical forms of knowing strangers “made [city life] possible” by making stranger encounters interactionally predictable (Lofland 1973, 22). Furthermore, strangers who are not total strangers play an important role in rendering urban spaces less anonymous (e.g., Lofland 1973, 1998; Milgram 1977). In the digital age, however, mobile technologies produce hybridized social spaces, which encompass how “online interactions are deeply intertwined with offline places and relationships” and vice versa (Blackwell et al. 2015, 1117). New media and cultural geographic research show how hybridization complicates sociological assumptions of urban anonymity and the relationships people generate with strangers (Humphreys and Liao 2013; Koch and Miles 2020; Licoppe 2016; Licoppe and Inada 2012; Miles 2021; Schwartz 2013; Sutko and de Souza e Silva 2011). Social media creates stranger relationships that fundamentally differ from analog strangers, one of which Baldor (2022) defines as acquainted strangers, or “digitally mediated social tie[s] that individuals foster through social media use” (5). Acquainted strangers are acquaintances—to varying degrees—in digital space, yet strangers in physical space.)
* Findings (As the above quotes from queer men1 suggest, users of mobile dating and hookup apps routinely experience chance encounters with geographically proximate users with whom they have interacted online, even if they did not intend to meet. These encounters occur in nightlife and beyond: in their apartment buildings and neighborhoods, on public transit, at work, and in school.)
* Research Question – Explanatory (In this article, I examine why queer men’s acquainted stranger encounters are frequent yet marked by uncertainty.)
* Findings (Ryan and Andrew describe navigating these encounters as “awkward” and “ridiculous” despite regularly running into digital acquaintances in-person.)
* What do we not know? (Analog theories of stranger relationships cannot fully explain this tension between routine and unpredictability. As Lofland (1973) notes: “It is only when strangers appear routinely among a people unarmed with routine handling procedures that we can begin to meaningfully talk about ‘difficulties’” (182).)
* Research Question – Explanatory (Why do queer men seem to lack “routine handling procedures” when encountering acquainted strangers in public, despite it being so frequent?)
* What does the existing research suggest might be the answer to that unanswered question? (To address this question, I draw on both new media scholarship and sociological theories of face-to-face interaction. I theorize in-person encounters between digital strangers as moments of context collapse (boyd 2010), which encompass “how people, information, and norms from one context seep into the bounds of another” (Davis and Jurgenson 2014, 477). While the concept is widely used in social media research, context collapse is also a fruitful framework to analyze digitally mediated in-person interactions. I argue that acquainted strangers running into one another in everyday life is a form of what Davis and Jurgenson (2014) refer to as context collisions where “different social environments unintentionally and unexpectedly come crashing into each other” (480).)
* Findings (Digital interactions produce an array of uncertainties in moments of face-to-face context collisions as queer men contend with multiple audiences and contexts simultaneously. Drawing on Goffman’s (1963) theories of public interaction, I examine interactional uncertainties in two interrelated processes as individuals initiate interaction: (1) cognitive recognition, or “the process through which we socially or personally identify the other” and, in turn, (2) social recognition, or “the process of openly welcoming or at least accepting the initiation of [social interaction]” (112–113). Cognitive recognition between acquainted strangers is marked by relational uncertainty (e.g. “I know them, but do they know me?”), which affects social recognition (e.g. “I do not know how to interact with this person because I do not know what our relationship is”). Furthermore, I find that queer men variably frame digital interaction as necessitating offline social recognition (e.g. do mobile apps place in-person moral demands upon us?). The queer men app users I observed and interviewed either did not know or could not agree on how to interact with acquainted strangers offline. These uncertainties produced uncomfortable—and at times frustrating—encounters that shaped how queer men perceived and experienced queer community.)
* How does the paper’s answer to the research question(s) broaden, clarify, or challenge existing knowledge/theories? (By paying close attention to how digital technologies shape people’s relationships and in-person interactions using the case of queer men and mobile hookup apps, I show how people must grapple with “the philosophical quagmire of questions about what it means to ‘truly know’ another” (Lofland 1973, 184) that interactionists have long sidestepped when analyzing analog stranger interactions through everyday collisions between digital and in-person situations. These thorny questions are at the forefront of people’s minds as they navigate encounters at the nexus of the digital and the analog. The concept of acquainted strangers, then, not only builds on classic sociological statements of how people manage anonymity and diversity in everyday life but also illuminates how our digitally mediated social contexts are reshaping what a “stranger” fundamentally is.)

# Justification (1,000 words or less)

Calarco’s Outline

* Restate the puzzle or gap in the literature that you will address
* Explain why this puzzle or gap is important to address
* Describe (in more detail than in the intro) what we know about this topic/issue
* Describe (in more detail than in the intro) what we do not know about this topic/issue
* State your research question (i.e., “In light of these lingering questions, I seek to examine…”)
* Explain how your research question solves the puzzle or fills the gap in the literature (i.e., “Answering this question allows me to…”)
* Note: The point of a literature review is not actually to review all of the relevant literature. The point is to make the case for why your study is important.

## *The British Journal of Sociology –* Kennedy et al. 2018b – Justification (1232 words)

* Introduce the discussion about what we know (We look to several sociological sub-disciplines to understand non-traditional civic engagement. Our aims are to summarize divergent views on the value and appeal of civic action that eschews the formal political realm.)
* Restate the puzzle or gap in the literature that you will address (the value and appeal of civic action that eschews the formal political realm)
* Describe (in more detail than in the intro) what we know about this topic/issue (Non-traditional engagement: co-opted and compromised? Critics of non-traditional politics take aim at the process of such engagement, the discursive frames used, and embedded practices. Looking first to process-based critiques, scholars have noted that apparently ‘democratic’ participation may be a co-opted site that maintains elite domination. McQuarrie’s (2015) case study of community-based organizations in Cleveland, Ohio, for example, examines an instance where engaged citizens endorsed recommendations that led to more income inequality. Amidst escalating rates of foreclosures and a declining economy, a panel of community members appointed by the local government recommended raising taxes on lower-income residents and lowering corporate taxes. Elites leveraged evidence of public participation to underscore their legitimate authority to rule, suggesting that active civic engagement prompted by the state or privileged actors does not necessarily lead to pro-democratic outcomes. Similar patterns are reported in other empirical analyses (e.g., Grossman and Creamer 2017; Kenis and Mathijs 2014). Extending this analysis to discursive framing in civic life we draw on the work of scholars who question the efficacy of relatively apolitical issue frames. For instance, Skocpol (2003) critiques what she terms, ‘non-political civic localism’, which, she argues, results when voluntary groups are led by professionals rather than members. The danger of talking about political matters in increasingly polite tones, Skocpol contends, is that ‘regular people engage in public life only when they think important things are at stake. Hard as it is for educated elites to stomach, emotions matter as much as cognition in group life and politics alike’ (Skocpol 2004: 235). These arguments echo Gamson’s (1992) observations from focus groups studying political talk: framing issues through a lens of injustice was most effective for engaging a broad public and instigating their desire to act on concerns. The practice of non-traditional politics can also be critiqued as ineffective for advancing the common good. For example, Szasz (2007) is sceptical that consuming bottled water in response to contamination of drinking water will result in an equitable distribution of risks. Szasz’s conclusions are supported in a study of consumer-oriented movements in France (Dubuisson-Quellier 2010): even when the ultimate aim is to alter consumer behaviour, social constraint and political empowerment are likely more effective than ‘voting with one’s dollars’. Beyond political consumerism, scholars have questioned whether nonconfrontational volunteerism can resolve threats to inequality. For example, Poppendieck (1999) observed that increased demand for food banks in California in the 1980s led to a growth in the number of volunteers and that volunteers experienced their efforts as rewarding. However, the rise of voluntarism did not ultimately lead to better outcomes for the hungry; instead, a charity-based model of addressing poverty has become broadly institutionalized without effecting meaningful change for the poor. Non-traditional politics: effective collective action Defenders of non-traditional politics conceptualize a continuum of engagement rather than a dichotomy (traditional/non-traditional; confrontational/ non-confrontational) and argue that everyday politics can ‘prefigure’ movement goals and serve as an important part of a broader repertoire of social change strategies. Goldfarb’s (2006) concept of a ‘politics of small things’ illuminates the value of everyday discourse and practice for maintaining space to challenge hegemonic power. These spaces are foundational for larger, more collective politics to emerge over a longer timeframe. This prefigurative function is useful both for sustaining movements in periods of abeyance, and as part of a repertoire of social change. Maintaining spaces to demonstrate a social movement’s goals can sustain a movement through protest cycles (Polletta 1999); even outside of periods of abeyance, prefigurative politics may enhance the possibility of achieving movement goals by providing opportunities to experience the desired ends of a social movement (Yates 2015). In other words, as an engine of social transformation (Taylor 1996), prefigurative politics can perform the oftenoverlooked work of pursuing social change through an emphasis on cultivating cultural values for an alternative future. Another defence of non-traditional political activity is the claim that political consumerism does not displace traditional forms of engagement, but forms part of a repertoire of engagement (Adams and Raisborough 2010; Barnett et al. 2011). For example, Willis and Schor (2012) use two surveys from the United States to conclude that consumer-based practices are associated with higher levels of traditional political engagement. Likewise, in a qualitative study of ethical consumers in France, Dubuisson-Quellier (2013) demonstrated that rather than weakening efforts to reform the state, the acts of political consumers worked to remake the market as a space for action. These studies caution against summarily dismissing non-traditional political projects as ineffectual, suggesting that more conceptual work is required to understand the political nuance of acts that may appear apolitical.)
* Adding a question that seems like a research question but is just a way to introduce another set of “what we know” literature – this is a bit confusing (Why do some social actors want change, but not the association [be associated?] with traditional politics?)
* What we know (Why do some social actors want change, but not the association with traditional politics? To answer this question, we look to ethnographic research showing that associational groups deliberately use strategies like ethical consumption to create distance from traditional political practices in order to increase civic engagement. This section reviews empirical research that will help us understand when and why engaged citizens adopt non-traditional discourse and tactics. It is possible that the anodyne political discourse Skocpol (2004) decries may in fact be used to create a space for political engagement. Through ethnographic study of seven voluntary organizations in Rhode Island, Bennett et al. (2013) demonstrate that citizens both mistrust politics and intuit that their audiences will as well. As a result, they explicitly reject politics as a strategy for engaging in public life. Their term ‘political disavowal’ describes a discursive mechanism designed to distance the speaker from a political sphere associated with special interests, endless debate and limited solutions (Bennett et al. 2013). In the words of the authors, ‘disavowal can be productive of civic engagement’ (2013: 520, emphasis in original).While not an explanation of the practice of non-traditional engagement, Perrin’s (2006) concept of a ‘democratic imagination’ is also instructive here. Perrin (2006) calls on scholars to consider talk as indicative of citizens’ cultural tools (akin to Swidler’s 1986 cultural toolkit). The democratic imagination is thus a cultural construct that ‘tells us when and why to get involved in politics, how to do so, and when and how to stay away’ (Perrin 2006: 2). Perrin’s concept sensitizes us to consider that how people discuss politics is a crucial part of citizenship. That is, sensitivity to how engagement ideals influence the democratic imagination can facilitate an evaluation of how political practices link discourse to action.)
* Summarizing the different strands of research reviewed in a novel way and drawing out the implications of this novel view (This review makes clear that non-traditional politics is a multi-faceted form of engagement dependent on context rather than comprised of a universal repertoire of practices that transcend specific realms and produce uniform outcomes. Thus, evaluating the efficacy of non-traditional political practices is not as straightforward as a simple binary between top-down ‘define and convince’ autocrats and naive, bottom-up ‘vote-with-your-dollar’ enthusiasts. Understanding and evaluating everyday politics requires in-depth analyses of the discourse and practices of those engaged in shaping opportunities for political engagement.)
* Research question, but not stated as a question (In our eat-local context, we seek an explanation for the tension between our participants’ active involvement in eco-social change and deep values for justice and sustainability, and their reliance on non-confrontational engagement styles and focus on ‘winnable’ problems.)
* Missing: Explain how your research question solves the puzzle or fills the gap in the literature (i.e., “Answering this question allows me to…”)
	+ The way the section was worked out, since they state the puzzle or gap clearly, this is implied, but not done as a separate discussion after stating the questions.

## *Poetics* – Baumann et al. 2022 – Justification (1608 words)

* Describe (in more detail than in the intro) **what we know** about this topic/issue (While the class-patterning of tastes has long been recognized, over time the conceptualization of the nature of the link between class and tastes has evolved. Historically, high status was conveyed by consuming rarefied, highbrow things, conspicuously (Veblen 1899) and with an eye to signalling social differentiation (Simmel 1957). Bourdieu’s classic work (1984) documented a pattern of stratified class consumption in 1960s France where the dominant class possessed a high degree of cultural capital that afforded these consumers an aesthetic disposition that oriented them toward consecrated forms of culture.)
* Clarifying a concept (Aesthetic consecration refers to the esteem and prestige that accrue to cultural works and cultural producers through the collective recognition afforded by influential actors in a field. Crucially, consecration is not a binary, but instead can be present along a spectrum from no consecration to a high level of consecration.)
* Describe (in more detail than in the intro) **what we know** about this topic/issue (The theory of cultural capital, specifically that family socialization and formal education, through the habitus, shape aesthetic preferences in adulthood, has received strong empirical support across many (predominantly Western) contexts (e.g., Holt 1998; Nagel and Lemel 2019; Notten et al. 2012; Scherger and Savage 2010; Warde et al. 1999; Yaish and Katz-Gerro 2012). As an overall organizing principle, what privileged people learn, perceptually at a practical level of consciousness, is to appreciate goods and practices that signal a distance from necessity or a taste of luxury (Bourdieu 1984). From a Kantian perspective, the non-instrumentality of cultural options is central to their aesthetic valuation; high-status tastes are oriented toward an appreciation of aesthetics that uphold beauty for beauty’s sake (in whatever form beauty takes in a particular instance). At the same time, past research has demonstrated that high-status tastes change over time in terms of which cultural options are preferred. In the US context, DiMaggio (1982, 1992) and Levine (1990) show that consecrated aesthetic genres and objects have shifted in response to societal changes. More recently, research on omnivorousness has shown that high-status tastes have broadened to include aesthetic genres and objects that have been recently consecrated (Peterson 2005), while other work has illustrated how the expression of cultural capital evolves over time to find new expressions (Friedman et al. 2015; Prieur and Savage 2013). Despite the broadening of expressions of high-status tastes to include points of overlap with low-status tastes, cultural consumption remains stratified by status (e.g., Bennett et al. 2009; Chan and Goldthorpe 2007; Flemmen et al. 2019a). These studies have some differences regarding their arguments about the ways that social status and tastes are related, but they are united in a strong focus on the aesthetic dimensions of cultural goods and practices for understanding high-status tastes. Bourdieu (1984) discussed the importance of conceptions of moral worth in legitimizing class boundaries, and Lamont (1992) expands on this observation through extensive interview research conducted with upper-class men in France and the United States. On the basis of contrasts in the specific types of moral boundaries her participants drew, Lamont demonstrates the importance of moral judgments for self-worth and the practice of drawing boundaries between in-groups and out-groups. More recent work has turned to classed perceptions of the moral worth of opinions. This is the focus of De Keere’s (2020) analysis of survey data collected from Flemish households. De Keere describes a moral space for issues, one that is structured by cultural and economic capital. Those with higher economic and cultural capital shared a moral space characterized by egalitarian views on issues like climate change and immigration. This matters for the construction of social hierarchies. As De Keere (2020: 2) argues, people, “gain access to class-specific privileges and resources not only because they value the same cultural style or have a similar economic profile, but because they are governed by the same moral dispositions.” In other words, moral beliefs play a role in the creation and maintenance of social hierarchies (see also, Flemmen et al. 2019b). Recent work (Puetz 2021) finds that tastes, “operate as platforms from which people draw moral and esthetic boundaries”. These boundaries demonstrate that moral and aesthetic criteria operate simultaneously.)
* Restate the **puzzle or gap** in the literature that you will address (We build on prior research that demonstrates how class stratification maps onto moral evaluations of people (e.g., Lamont 1992; Puetz 2021) and moral evaluations of opinions (e.g., De Keere 2020) by turning our attention to perceptions of the moral worth of cultural consumption choices.)
* What we know (Prior work on class patterns in cultural consumption choices has focused primarily on the aesthetic qualities of those choices, with some choices being aesthetically-consecrated, giving them high symbolic value.)
* A new trend (more recent work suggests higher status consumers are also concerned with the moral qualities of the goods they prefer. For example, Atkinson and Deeming (2015) find that British consumers with the most cultural and economic capital prioritize ethical consumption in food. In work that seeks to develop an understanding of motivations behind moral preferences in consumption, Hahl et al. (2017) find that high-status tastes are oriented toward lowbrow aesthetic consumption choices because their perceived authenticity can signal moral worth for the consumers, which is especially valuable to reinforce high status when the legitimacy of that status can be called into question. Building on this finding, Friedman and Reeves (2020) demonstrate that British elite tastes have changed over decades. In the post-WWII period elites began to include everyday activities common across classes in their cultural repertoires. The authors argue that these genres of leisure activities held moral qualities that allowed elites to signal “ordinariness” and “authenticity” to help legitimize their elite status at a time when snobbery was morally suspect. In a similar vein, in her interviews with very wealthy New Yorkers, (Sherman, 2019) finds that her economically-elite participants frame their consumption in moral terms. Specifically, these elite consumers highlight the moral acceptability of their choices by tying them to perceptions of restraint, middle-class typicality, and ordinariness.)
* What we know (Other work has begun to clarify how aesthetic and moral preferences relate to one another. In work that focuses on the moral worth of cultural consumption choices, Hanquinet, Roose, and Davage (2014) suggest that “social reflexivity” is another dimension on which art is evaluated and matters to higher status people, and that this dimension of art escaped Bourdieu’s notice. Hanquinet (2018) expands on this idea to theorize that the moral dimensions of cultural consumption choices are inextricable from their aesthetic dimensions. And Kuipers et al. (2019:394) argue that these valuations are increasingly blurring after a general trend in the 20th century of the “separation of aesthetic and moral ‘rationalities.’” Arfini’s (2019) case study of the production of “authentic” tortellini by artisanal craftworkers illustrates concretely how the perception of aesthetic value is intertwined with the perception of moral value. Moral dimensions of tastes have been investigated in the realm of ethical consumption. Carfagna et al. (2014) study the tastes of high cultural capital consumers in order to build on and update earlier work by Holt (1998). Whereas Holt identified a range of aesthetic traits valued by high cultural capital consumers – including cosmopolitanism, naturalness, idealism, among others – Carfagna et al. (2014:175) identify an inversion of some of these earlier traits that reflect “how the severity and scale of global environmental crisis has pervaded the American consciousness since the mid-1990s.” For example, a preference for cosmopolitanism and idealism seems to have shifted toward a preference for localism and materiality, as high cultural capital consumers valued local provenance, and small-scale, manual labor. Together these traits represent a moral orientation toward sustainability, which the authors label the “eco-habitus.” They argue that high cultural capital consumers prefer cultural goods and practices that signal commitments to achieving sustainability.)
* Working out the **gap** (While environmental sustainability is one kind of moral stance that can appeal to higher status people, there are other moral concerns that cultural goods and practices can reflect and that higher status people can prefer.)
* Justifying the data – not in Calarco’s outline (Food is an ideal cultural realm for exploring a range of moral dimensions in cultural consumption. In a review of the “ethical foodscape”, geographers Goodman, Maye, and Holloway (2010: 1782) write of the ubiquity of ethical food: “the good food ‘revolution’ – from foods defined variously as healthy, low-carbon, fairly traded, local, organic, free-range, cruelty-free, natural and/or slow – has no doubt come to a supermarket shelf, farm shop, TV set, book store, magazine rack, or even a kitchen table near you.” Studies of foodie discourse suggest that desirable foods are not only delicious, authentic, and exotic, but are also sustainable, eco-friendly, and ethically-certified (Goodman, Johnston, and Cairns 2017; Phillipov and Gale 2020). As Johnston and Baumann write, “many foodies not only understand what an authentic ceviche is, but they also worry about whether the seafood that made up their ceviche is from a sustainable source” (2015: 115). Food scholarship suggests that for high-status consumers, delicious (aesthetically-valued) foods are frequently connected to good foods (morally-consecrated) (Emontspool and Georgi, 2017).)
* Restate the **puzzle or gap** in the literature that you will address (However, past research is unclear about how individuals’ taste profiles accommodate both aesthetic and moral preferences.)
* What we know (Earlier work by Kennedy et al. (2019) uses intercept survey data from Toronto, Canada to suggest that the highest status people value foods that conform both to the ethical and aesthetic preferences of foodie culture)
* Analytical Strategy / Data – Not in Calarco’s outline (We build on this work by employing data from a national quota sample, by combining qualitative and quantitative data analysis, and by using measures specifically designed to understand how aesthetic and moral orientations interact in cultural consumption.)
* Research Questions (We also address crucial questions for understanding the significance of high-status aesthetic and moral orientations in cultural consumption: Are these orientations transposable – does an orientation toward aesthetic or moral consecration in food transpose to other cultural realms? And do these tastes play a role in the maintenance of symbolic and social boundaries?)
* Missing: Explain how your research question solves the puzzle or fills the gap in the literature (i.e., “Answering this question allows me to…”)
	+ The way the section was worked out, since they state the puzzle or gap clearly, this is implied, but not done as a separate discussion after stating the questions.

## *Journal of Consumer Culture* – Baumann et al. 2019 – Justification (1,063 words)

Justification section 1

* What we know (There is a long history of sociological attention to the patterns and logics of classed cultural consumption, from Veblen’s (2007 [1899]) ‘‘conspicuous consumption,’’ to Simmel’s (1957) ‘‘trickle down’’ theory of class emulation. Bourdieu’s (1984) theory of classed consumption has been particularly influential for consumption research and food scholars alike and serves as an analytic launch pad for our analysis. In Distinction, Bourdieu (1984) argues that tastes are part of a social system differentiating people by SES. Two Bourdieusian concepts illuminate class taste differences: privileged ‘‘tastes of freedom (luxury)’’ and working-class ‘‘tastes of necessity’’ (Bourdieu, 1984:177–178). Analyzing empirical data from 1960s France, Bourdieu found that tastes of necessity included working-class food preferences for ‘‘the heavy, the fat, and the coarse,’’ while bourgeois foods of ‘‘freedom’’ included ‘‘the light, the refined, and the delicate’’ (Bourdieu, 1984: 185). The upper classes, whose tastes used ‘‘stylized forms to deny function’’ (Bourdieu, 1984: 6), prioritized presentation and style over substance, quality over quantity. While tastes of freedom are rooted in the myriad options available to affluent consumers, tastes of necessity involve a preference for quantity over quality – for ‘‘foods that are simultaneously most ‘filling’ and most economical’’ (Bourdieu, 1984: 177). When food scarcity is an immediate possibility, people not only choose heavier dishes but also greater amounts, particularly on special occasions, which ‘‘by [their] very rarity . . . [are] associated with the idea of abundance and the suspension of ordinary restrictions’’ (Bourdieu, 1984: 179). Holt’s (1998) research on cultural capital in the United States found a similar lower class preference for abundance, which in the North American context can take the form of the buffet restaurant (p. 11))
* Justifying choice of literature (Bourdieu’s empirical findings cannot be simply transposed to contemporary contexts, but an essential insight from his writing remains: consumption is not straightforwardly driven by necessity. A strength of Bourdieusian analysis – and of practice approaches more generally – is a commitment to studying the rich culture underlying consumption choices, and not assuming that income or values dictate consumption choices (see, for example, Warde, 2014). The habitus of marginalized groups is formed in response to economic conditions, and the habitus’ internalized evaluative schemas themselves come to structure tastes, rather than economic conditions alone. This perspective encourages an examination of embodied food experiences such as food cravings and desires, as well as the mundane, routinized ways food ideals are imagined in daily life. These are key insights we build on in our analysis.)
* What we know (While Bourdieu’s analytic focus was on the effects of class position on tastes, recent research has examined the contemporary complexity of classed tastes (see, for example, Lizardo and Skiles, 2012). Much of this research follows Peterson’s (2005) investigations of omnivorous cultural consumption among high-SES groups and his finding that high-status people consume broadly (omnivorously) across lowbrow and highbrow boundaries. Crucially, scholars working in this vein argue that the connections between tastes, identity, and values are influenced by contemporary cultural discourses such as multiculturalism (Bryson, 1996), meritocracy (Johnston and Baumann, 2015), and populism (Ollivier, 2008). In addition to the microsociological effects of individuals’ class position, consumption preferences are also shaped by broad, macrosociological cultural discourses that have currency in particular times and places. These discourses inform individuals’ cultural repertoires.)
* Defining/Clarifying a concept (Cultural repertoires can be conceptualized as ‘‘toolkits’’ of ideas and ‘‘strategies of action’’ (Lamont, 1992, 2000; Swidler, 1986). Just as a musical ‘‘set’’ contains multiple songs, a cultural repertoire contains a collection of habits, routines, and ideas.)
* Justifying choice of literature (Studying cultural repertoires allows scholars to understand how consumers from the same group can act differently. For example, not all upper middleclass consumers engage with an ethical eating repertoire; some may prioritize getting the cheapest food possible (Johnston et al., 2011). Analytically, the cultural repertoire concept discourages economic-deterministic approaches and encourages investigations into the broad cultural scripts used to make sense of (and justify) intersectional inequalities (Lamont, 2000). Access to cultural repertoires is shaped by class, but cultural repertoires do not dictate behavior, and repertoires often exist beyond a specific class niche (see, for example, Cairns et al., 2013; Lamont, 2000). To understand low-SES tastes, we suggest that the study of cultural repertoires is a critical, complimentary analytical resource to Bourdieu’s ‘‘tastes of necessity.’’)

Justification section 2

* What we know – Empirical (Scholars have used survey data to document what foods people have access to and consume. These studies suggest that higher SES groups are less likely to buy energy-dense (high-calorie) foods and more likely to eat whole grains, lean meats, low-fat dairy products, and fruits and vegetables (Darmon and Drenowski, 2008: 1108; Ricciuto and Tarasuk, 2007: 187). In Canada, research has documented a clear, positive, and ongoing relationship between SES, nutrient levels, and higher quality foods (Ricciuto and Tarasuk, 2007: 192–194). A US study on low-SES food consumption found that respondents tended to buy less healthy food (avoiding higher cost healthier foods) and prioritized meat consumption (Alkon et al., 2013). While these trends might appear straightforward, the relationship between SES and food consumption is complex and defies popular stereotypes. For instance, fast food is consumed regularly by people from across the class spectrum in the United States, and in some studies it is positively related to income (Dugan, 2013; Kim and Leigh, 2011; Vikraman et al., 2015). While the stereotype of uneducated poor people making unhealthy choices holds considerable sway in the public domain, scholarship shows that the relationship between education and healthy choices is complex; many low-SES people understand the imperatives of healthy food choices even as income constraints restrict these choices (Beagan et al., 2015; Gross and Rosenberger, 2010).)
* Restate the puzzle or gap in the literature that you will address – this is basically a research question, also, being “Why do people from different SES groups have consistently different food choices?” (Although prior work documents strong SES differences in food choices, the reasons underlying those differences are poorly understood. We address this gap in the literature by investigating how food tastes differ by SES. While prior work (Johnston and Baumann, 2015) has studied privileged food tastes, less attention has been paid to understanding food tastes among groups with low economic and cultural capital (cf. Beagan et al., 2015; Bowen et al., 2014; Daniel, 2016).)
* Analytical Strategy (We identify low-SES food tastes in our respondents’ answers by capitalizing on two important insights in prior work. First, following Bourdieu, we look for relationships between conditions of economic constraints and aesthetic (food) preferences. Second, following Peterson and others, we examine the interplay between broad cultural discourses and classed consumption preferences.)

## *Sociological Forum* – Oleschuk et al. 2019 – Justification (1,757 words)

* Notably, this “justification” section has a 3 stage gap statement. What they say is that, in the world, there is a puzzle (awareness of the problems of eating meat is increasing dramatically but people aren’t eating less meat). Then, after reviewing some psychological literature, they say that their gap is going to be how cultural factors are at play, something the psychological literature doesn’t talk about. Then they talk about what sociologists have said about cultural factors. Then their third gap statement is that these sociologists haven’t talked about the concept of *repertoires* when understanding the meat paradox (the “puzzle”), in this sociological cultural way. So that brings you to their three stage gap: 1) there is the “meat paradox” in the world; 2) there are cultural factors; 3) there are repertoires. So they use repertoires as a cultural factor to understand the meat paradox, which nobody has done before. That is the three stage gap. The “puzzle” is the meat paradox itself, the fact in the world. Then the “culture” and “repertoire” phases are what we could call “gap in scholarly knowledge” statements. (14Feb2023,11:40).

Justificatoin/Literature Review Section 1: Meat consumption and how to explain it

* Problem in the world (Concerns about the social, health, and environmental consequences of industrial meat production and consumption are not isolated to academics, activists, and public officials (e.g., Lusk 2011; Miele and Evans 2010); the public has also taken notice. Growing numbers of news media headlines generate rising awareness about meat consumption concerns (McKendree et al. 2014; Ogle 2013).)
* Restate the puzzle or gap in the literature that you will address (Concerns about the social, health, and environmental consequences of industrial meat production and consumption are not isolated to academics, activists, and public officials (e.g., Lusk 2011; Miele and Evans 2010); the public has also taken notice. Growing numbers of news media headlines generate rising awareness about meat consumption concerns (McKendree et al. 2014; Ogle 2013). Rising levels of awareness might suggest that things are dramatically changing, when in reality, meat consumption is fairly constant (i.e., remains widespread) in Europe and North America (Henchion et al. 2014; Tonsor and Olnyk 2011). This does not mean that meat-eating practices are static. Indeed, research indicates shifting patterns within meat consumption. For example, Holm and Mohl (2000) suggest that negative attitudes toward meat consumption may not lead to diminished meat consumption overall but to a changed structure of consumption consisting of less joints of meat and more ground meat or poultry. Recent data indicate that reductions in beef eating have been accompanied by increased chicken consumption (Herzog 2010:192– 193; OECD 2018). People may also become more discerning about where their meat comes from, a trend that Rothgerber (2015) terms conscientious omnivorism. Still, levels of vegetarianism remain quite low in Europe and North America (Ruby 2012), leaving us with a meat paradox.)
* What we know (Research investigating the meat paradox initiated in psychology (Herzog 2010; Loughnan et al. 2010). Here, scholars have drawn on cognitive dissonance theory, which emphasizes people’s need to perceive their behavior as aligned with their morals. To achieve this in the case of meat, people may situate food animals within a category of animals that denies the worthiness of moral concern for their suffering (Bratanova, Loughnan, and Bastian 2011). Consumers also engage in a process of repression that helps them separate “animals” from “meat.” For example, research by Kunst and Hohle (2016) finds that processed meat (such as ground meat) makes people less empathetic to animal slaughter than unprocessed meat; meanwhile, placing the head of a roasted pig on restaurant tables (rather than removing it) and exchanging “cow/pig” with “beef/pork” on menus increases consumer disgust and, with it, empathy. Scholars have also identified rationalization as an important cognitive mechanism that consumers use to justify their behavior to themselves and others (Joy 2010; Piazza et al. 2015). Rationalization involves focusing on stories that confirm one’s own perspective and neglecting those that oppose it, resulting in overestimations of evidence supporting (or rationalizing) consumers’ actions. Research by Joy (2010) and Piazza and colleagues (2015) have identified four important rationalizations—the 4Ns—that dominate meat eaters’ justifications: (1) meat eating is natural, an essential aspect of human evolutionary history and therefore something we biologically crave; (2) meat eating is necessary for human health and integral for human growth, strength, and development; (3) meat eating is normal, or encompassed in normative social and cultural practice for the majority; and (4) eating meat is nice, producing specific pleasures from the taste of animal protein. Psychological studies and the 4N concept are extremely useful for understanding the tension between attitudes and behaviors around meat consumption)
* Restate the puzzle or gap in the literature that you will address (we find benefit in an expanded conception of the “attitude-behavior” gap that moves beyond individual consumer psyches, one that considers the cultural factors that facilitate sustained meat-eating habits alongside rising concern.)
* What we know – Sociology (Sociologists have recently taken up the challenge of explaining continuity in ethically contested consumption practices by drawing from practice theory (e.g., Schoolman 2016; Warde 2016). Critically, practice theory suggests that people don’t always consume deliberately but rely on unconscious routines/habits. Research suggests that habits play a strong role maintaining consumption practices such as meat eating (e.g., Zur and Klo€ckner 2014). Changing habits is not simple or straightforward. Although class and education can make ethical shopping more likely, Schoolman (2016) finds that ethical grocery shopping requires time to break old routines and create new shopping habits—a process he calls a “routine-reflection” circuit. Practice theory also suggests that consumers’ decision-making logics are not universal but contextspecific. Thorslund and Lassen (2017) carried out focus groups and find that people draw on context-specific moral logics to make sense of meat eating. When thinking about the context of consumption, consumers have moral codes or logics that emphasize price, flavor, and value; when thinking about the context of production (away from the dinner table), consumers employ different moral codes that acknowledge the implications of industrial meat production on animal welfare and environmental degradation. These different contexts produce distinct moral considerations that do not seem to significantly overlap, allowing consumers to eat meat in a way that brackets ethical concerns relating to meat production. Chiles (2017) takes an integrated approach to the topic of meat that combines interviews and content analysis of media sources. He coins the term suppressive synergy to describe how industrialized meat concerns are suppressed by way of both spatial-temporal dimensions (production is sequestered in rural areas) and “cognitive-affective” dimensions (consumers stick to habits and dissociate themselves from meat controversy). In turn, media contributes to the suppressive feedback loop by “normalizing” meat culture and infrequently covering debates. Here, Chiles offers insight into how the spatial/temporal separation of meat production combined with the news media’s benign framing works to normalize meat consumption.)
* Restate the puzzle or gap in the literature that you will address (We draw on this prior research and applaud its emphasis on cultural factors, while introducing a different analytical tool—cultural repertoires.)
* Justifying choice of literature or concept(s) (This tool has the virtue of allowing us to connect our sociocultural findings back to specific psychological strategies (e.g., the 4Ns) and better understand how people manage contradictory ideas about meat.)

Justification/Literature Review Section 2: Cultural repertoires, inequality, and the values/action gap

* Restate the puzzle or gap in the literature that you will address (Scholarship in sociology and psychology has come a long way in explaining continuity in meat eating. Gaps nonetheless remain in understanding how cultural contexts play a role sustaining meat consumption, and how the attitude-behavior gap varies in diverse social settings (i.e., beyond the white, middle-class consumer).)
* Clarifying/Defining a Concept (The sociological term cultural repertoires (Lamont 1992; Swidler 1986, 2001) considers culture as tools that people use resourcefully to make choices about how to act. Put differently, cultural repertoires can be thought of as scripts that contain understandings, values, habits, routines, and ideas and that enable specific ways of thinking and acting in the world. Actors understand and articulate their actions by employing different elements of cultural repertoires at different times depending on the situation)
* Justifying a concept (The cultural repertoire concept has been contested (e.g., Vaisey 2008) but remains persistently influential. It has been described as “one of the most exciting developments in cultural sociology” (Garrett 2016:19), perhaps because the concept “brings attention to how social agents selectively draw from elements of a larger culture to make sense of their decisions, or justify action and inaction” (Johnston, Szabo, and Rodney 2011:298). Seminal work on cultural repertoires works to address the values-action contradiction. Swidler’s (2001) early writing on cultural repertoires in Talk of Love was precisely oriented to understand the contradictions people hold in the domain of love. In her interviews, Swidler found that people talk about love as a choice to actively make but also discuss love as a commitment to be endured. Her interviewees idealized love in a romantic, Hollywood sense, but they also framed love in prosaic, realistic terms. To conceptualize these contradictions, Swidler (1986, 2001) advances a view of culture that exists not as a singular thing but as a cultural toolkit that can be employed selectively for various tasks. This conceptualization is profoundly useful for helping us identify and understand how consumers use various cultural repertoires to make sense of eating meat, often in the face of deep contradictions. Looking at the breadth of scholarship employing cultural repertoires or toolkits, it is clear that the concept is both long-lived and productive (e.g., Fosse 2010; Garrett 2016; Harding 2007; Johnston et al. 2011; Lamont 2000; Small, Harding, and Lamont 2010; Streib 2015).)
* What we know (Looking at the breadth of scholarship employing cultural repertoires or toolkits, it is clear that the concept is both long-lived and productive (e.g., Fosse 2010; Garrett 2016; Harding 2007; Johnston et al. 2011; Lamont 2000; Small, Harding, and Lamont 2010; Streib 2015).)
* Contributions/Clarifying relationship of the paper to what we know (Here, we do not focus on investigating stratified access to cultural repertoires on meat eating, but we do aim to contribute to research on social location by interrogating how a highly diverse group of eaters make sense of meat eating, and whether they draw from similar or different cultural scripts. In short, we draw from the cultural repertoires literature to shed light on the cultural tools used by diverse consumers to manage the contradictions surrounding meat eating. We also make a broad, interdisciplinary claim: the cultural repertoire concept is a useful complement to prior psychology research and can help illuminate how and why consumers maintain meat consumption as well as other ethically contested forms of consumption. By showing how consumers draw on varied cultural repertoires to make sense of their choices, we show how social tendencies to deny, repress, reframe, and/or rationalize can be more broadly connected to the meanings embedded in these repertoires. Last, we offer a contribution to the literature on cultural repertoires by demonstrating their variability. The cultural scripts our participants deployed did not all function in the same way, both in regard to how participants situated themselves as actors within them and in their capacity to facilitate active engagement with the ethical implications of participants’ conduct. We identify two types of repertoires: (1) identity repertoires that have a basis in personal, embodied group identities and regularly encompass concrete and vivid first-person experiences; and (2) liberty repertoires that are more abstractly conceptualized, and signal discourses based in people’s generalized ideas about their rights and responsibilities. Both repertoires exist within a context of neoliberal capitalist democracies that foreground connections between consumption choices, identity projects, and freedom (e.g., Bauman 2007; Slater 1999). The liberty repertoire resonates with consumer culture scholarship suggesting that a primary way people frame liberty is through consumption—having the freedom to choose in the marketplace (Bauman 2007; Slater 1999)—which can obfuscate citizenship responsibilities to the environment, animals, and distant others (Johnston 2008). Parsing out the type of script deployed holds implications for better understanding how diverse consumers engage with the ethical implications of consumer practices—namely by facilitating a different quality of engagement with the contradictions embedded in their choices.)

## *Journal of Rural Studies* – Johnston et al. 2022 – Justification (3,390 words)

* Like Oleschuk et al. (2019), this article’s justification section has a multi-stage gap statement in the first literature review section. First they review literature on different “imaginations” and coin the concept of the “cultural imagination”, as the first gap they fill (an overarching concept for all the different “imaginations”). Then they say that less is known about how producers use their cultural imaginations to think about ethical meat. But they say, there is some information about how producers relate to ethical meat. Yet, they clarify the gap again, saying that we still don’t know some critical things about how producers relate to cultural ideas about meat. So this has 3 stages, just like Oleschuk et al. (2019), although it is different than Oleschuk et al. (2019) in that this paper has a theoretical gap first, then hedges twice just like Oleschuk et al. (2019).
* Introduce the discussion of what we know (To appreciate a complex, ecologically significant food category like meat, it is important to examine production practices as well as the ideas, conceptual frameworks, and values surrounding meat. As such, our first goal is to outline the emergence of the space of ethical meat and the cultural imaginary surrounding ethical alternatives to conventional industrial meat. This space is a realm of contested ideas and varied cultural imaginings about alterity. This contestation draws attention to the fuzzy dividing line between conventional commodity meat and ethical meat. Our second goal is to outline key debates around scale and social transformation in alternative agricultural projects, including debates on the appropriate scale for raising ethical meat. We explain how these debates are related to ethical meat’s contested alterity and set the stage for investigating producers’ perceptions on these matters.)

Literature Review Section 1: The Rise of Ethical Meat

* Fact in the world (Conventional meat-based agriculture is largely associated with largescale confined feeding operations (CAFOs) where animals are raised together indoors and in large numbers.)
* What we know (Eaters are often dismayed and even disgusted by the idea of large-scale, factory-farmed meat (Holms and Mohl 2000; McKendree, 2014; Oleschuk et al., 2019; Rothgerber 2015). As a result, there is growing market space for meat that appears more ethical, channeling public concern against the environmental, moral, and health concerns of industrialized meat. These ethical markets seek to capture the dollars of “conscientious omnivores” and other critical consumers, especially since most consumers continue to eat meat despite the growth of concern about industrial production methods and animal welfare (Miele et al., 2013; Rothgerber 2015). The space of ethical meat exists sometimes alongside and sometimes within alternative food networks (Goodman, Dupuis and Goodman 2005), and exemplifies Belasco (1989) notion of a “countercuisine” that emerges as a cultural challenge to the food mainstream.)
* Clarifying/Defining a Concept (Ethical meat encompasses the material and ecological practices of alternative meat (e.g., rotational grazing techniques, pastured poultry, heritage pigs raised outdoors) as well as cultural discourses, logics, and rhetorical tendencies.)
* What we know (The match between the material reality and the cultural understandings of ethical meat can sometimes align and at other times diverge. The cultural understanding of ethical meat includes a sometimes-romantic imaginary of small, mixed farms with animals grazing happily while not degrading the land. Compared to animals raised conventionally, ethical meat offers a vision of humanely produced, happy animals who become “happy meat” nourishing consumers. Overall, the logic of ethical meat suggests that consumers do not have to eschew meat, but can eat high-quality meat produced under healthy, humane, sustainable conditions. “Happy” meat is presented as a way to address eco-social challenges arising from high levels of meat consumption and resolve the meat paradox – caring about non-human animals, but also enjoying the way they taste (Oleschuk et al., 2019).)
* Coining a Concept (We can think of the ideas and values connected to ethical meat as representing a cultural imagination. Here, we draw from scholars who use the term to represent the realm of ideas that shape our sense of identity and belonging.)
* What we know – theory (For example, Anderson’s classic work on “imagined communities” (1983) helps us understand how culture works to draw boundary lines determining who fits in the imagined idea of a nation. Perrin develops the concept of a “democratic imagination” (2006) that shapes our collective sense of the politics of the possible: “What you can imagine doing; what is possible, important, right, and feasible” (2006: 2). At a time when factory farms render meat an ecologically suspect food item, Cairns et al. (2015) analyze a hog industry marketing campaign to redeem pork as a worthy product; they employ the idea of a “white family farm imaginary” to understand how the campaign operates as a cultural intervention. Kennedy et al. (2016) draw from Perrin’s idea of a democratic imagination to study the eat-local movement. Drawing from interviews with activists, they document a relatively “thick” democratic imagination when it comes to diagnosing the multifaceted problems of the industrial food system, but a relatively “thin” democratic imagination when it comes to imagining ways to change the system – a tendency which leads activists to rely heavily on an individualized “shopping for change” strategy)
* Coining a Concept (Overall, these studies lead us to argue that the ideas, values, and images around ethical meat can be conceptualized as a cultural imagination which allows us to chart the ways ethical meat is imagined as a source of goodness and well-being – but also a source of change and eco-social transformation. The cultural imagination surrounding ethical meat is especially salient at a time when meat’s legitimacy is being challenged in the public realm.)
* Restate the puzzle or gap in the literature that you will address (While scholars are starting to look carefully at how consumers imagine ethical meat options (e.g., Rothgerber 2015; Oleschuk et al., 2019), less is known about how producers imagine this realm, and how they see their work fitting into the bigger picture of food system sustainability)
* What we know (That said, there is some research shedding light on the motivations that lead producers to participate in the space of ethical meat. Key factors include a desire for autonomy from the pressures of conventional commodity markets and a hope that these value-added niche markets will enable enhanced soil fertility as well as financial viability (Heiberg and Syse 2020; Hilimire 2011; Lozier et al., 2008; Mount and Smithers 2014:102). Political-economic factors loom large, and we can only briefly refer to them here. Many farmers seek a price premium from alternative meat products, especially since they must contend with low and unstable commodity prices, rising input costs, and a reliance on off-farm income to make ends meet.3 Geographic factors mediate their participation in alternative meat markets, including access to nearby slaughtering and processing facilities along with proximity to direct-marketing opportunities and urban niche markets (Riely, 2011; Romig, 2013). Although alternative food producers are motivated by a diversity of goals (e.g., Davidson et al., 2016; Pereira et al., 2016), they often cite the significance of non-commercial motivations like quality of life, contributing healthy food for the local community, animal welfare, ecological conservation, and perceived higher quality in the healthfulness or ‘naturalness’ of their products (Conner et al., 2008; Mann et al., 2019; McEachern and Willock, 2004). Research also points to emotionally rewarding human-animal interactions that seem especially salient in small-scale settings (Bock et al., 2007; Bruckner et al., 2018). A sense of meaning can also be cultivated from dealing with whole animal carcasses, as Ocejo (2017) documents how artisanal butchers take pride in re-claiming the skilled, intimate act of breaking-down whole animals.)
* Restate the puzzle or gap in the literature that you will address (Restate the puzzle or gap in the literature that you will address)

Second Literature Review Section: Small-Scale Agriculture and Eco-Social Transformation

* Positioning the focus of the article in a wider action and theoretical context (The rise of ethical meat fits within the emergence of alternative food networks (AFNs), an umbrella term including initiatives ranging from school gardens to organic produce to fair trade coffee to farmers’ markets. What unites AFNs is an intention to provide an alternative to the eco-social harms arising from dominant modes of agriculture (Goodman, Dupuis and Goodman 2005). The transformative potential of civic-oriented AFNs and their relationship to conventional commodity agriculture remains a critical issue for food studies, yet the distinction between “alternative” and conventional agriculture is notoriously muddy. Scholars have pointed to distinguishing characteristics of AFN’s such as the prioritization of pro-social, environmental and animal welfare goals over profits, and the reliance on small-scale production (Jarosz 2008; Lyson 2004:74; Lyson, 2004). Such characteristics are tendencies, however, rather than clear dividing lines. Notably, what counts as “alternative” can exclude parallel food networks of racialized communities who face profound struggles to access land and capital in order to produce and consume culturally significant foods (e.g. Gibb and Wittman, 2013; Quisumbing King et al., 2018). Considerations of ethical meat fit squarely within these debates – both in relation to their transformative potential and the slippery boundaries determining what constitutes a meaningful alternative to commodity agriculture.)
* What we know (Food scholars have questioned the extent to which small-scale niche markets can generate large-scale changes in commodity agriculture. For example, Obach (2015) study of the organic sector suggests that despite the environmental benefits it has delivered, organics (which represents 4% of the U.S. food and beverage market) will likely remain a niche market indefinitely and will not automatically expand to generate systemic sustainability (2015:227). Similarly, Wilson’s analysis of local food networks in Washington State concludes that this network “does not go against the grain as much as rest alongside it” (2018: 94). These studies raise questions about the capacity of ethical meat to significantly challenge commodity agriculture and its perpetual role as a niche market serving relatively affluent consumers. In a similar vein, scholars have identified a problematic tendency for alternative food to serve as “yuppie chow” enjoyed by a small, privileged groups of consumers and powerful market actors, leaving aside larger, critical structural issues of redistribution and regulation (e.g., Calo 2020; Guthman 2003; Johnston 2008; Kennedy et al., 2019). The “yuppie chow” problem is a thorny issue for ethical meat producers who must typically charge higher prices than found in conventional grocery stores and operate in a political-economic context of deeply stratified consumer markets. Questions about ethical meat also hinge on the concept of “quality”. Numerous labels, certification schemes, and attributes (e.g., grass fed, humanely raised, natural, antibiotic free) abound, promising highquality, sustainable, humane meat that deserves a premium price-tag. These “happy meat” attributes constitute part of a broader “quality turn” towards specialization, private labeling schemes, and niche markets in AFNs (Goodman 2003:1). Quality-turn indicators function as a part of capitalist commodification processes that add value (plus a degree of trust and transparency) to meat commodity chains (e.g., Buller and Roe 2014; Miele et al., 2013), but these indicators interact with and can be subsumed within a neoliberal logic that downloads eco-social responsibilities to private, non-state market actors and individual consumers (e.g., Campbell et al., 2011; Telligman et al., 2017; Hinrichs and Clare, 2003). Put simply, the emergence of “quality”, “happy” meat does not mean that industrialized meat vanishes from supermarket shelves or that “low-quality” production practices like factory farming disappear. In sum, critical food scholars raise difficult questions for ethical meat: Do small-scale niche markets remain comfortably “niche”, generating premiums and capturing value precisely because of their distinction relative to mass-market products? If ethical meat became accessible to mass-market consumers, could these products remain meaningful, civic-minded alternatives to conventional commodity agriculture (Lyson, 2004)? Food scholarship encourages us to ask tough questions, but also to avoid fatalistic conclusions. Numerous voices call for investigation into how food projects may serve as “one of many means to an end, one of many tools working in concert towards a unified vision of food justice, and of just sustainability” (McClintock 2014: 166; also Sarmiento 2017). Small-scale food projects should not be romanticized as panaceas to problems like food insecurity or climate change, but they have pedagogical potential (Sarmiento 2017), serving as concrete, place-specific starting points for building critical food literacy and collective power to address broader issues in the food system (e.g., Johnston and Baker, 2005; Sbicca 2018). This introduces the issue of scale, which we turn to next.)

Subsection 1: Debates on Scale, AFNs and food system transformation

* What we know (The concept of scale4 is useful for asking questions about the potential for small food projects to reach more eaters – and broaden beyond individualized consumption to address structural issues like government safety nets and wealth inequality (Johnston and Baker, 2005: 313, 318). We see scale not as a geographically fixed, ontological “fact” but as a socially constructed relation that is replete with power dynamics (e.g., Brislen 2018; DuPuis and Goodman 2005; Gwin 2009; Mount 2012; Neumann, 2008; Pitt and Jones 2016; Wilson 2018). A key point we wish to emphasize here is that the term scale, when applied to food literature,5 broadly signals a desire for a greater impact: expanding policies and markets to reach more consumers and stakeholders, making a more significant ecological impact, and surpassing local boundaries and crossing jurisdictional lines. Research on alternative food has focused extensively on the limits and potential for smallscale actors to make a greater impact, shape wider ecosystem expanses, and involve larger numbers of human and non-human animals. Practically speaking, scaling up could occur in varying ways: by increasing the number of animals in an operation, expanding the landmass involved, selling to more consumers, or working with different levels of institutions (e.g., buying cooperatives, supermarkets) beyond face-to-face sales. To the extent that scale mediates the transformative potential of alternative food initiatives, we are interested in small scale meat producers’ perceptions of strengths and drawbacks of rearing relatively small numbers of animals for localized markets. The issue of how alternative food initiatives relate to large-scale food system transformation remains a subject of debate (Sarmiento 2017; McClintock 2014). Brislen notes that “scaling-up literature” that relates to alternative food often displays an “un-reflexive zeal for the expansion of AFNs and the ‘good’ that process is presumed to provide” (2018: 106). Yet Connelly puts it this way: “[t]he key challenge facing local food initiatives is how to scale up to the point of transforming (rather than merely “informing”) the much larger conventional food system” (2010: 1, emphasis ours; also Mount 2012: 108). Food scholars and activists alike examine how local food projects can be used to challenge an unsustainable industrial, unjust economic system (e.g., Alkon and Grace McCullen, 2011; McClintock 2014). The benefits of small-scale projects can transcend geographic locales; a growing number of equity-seeking communities have leveraged alternative food projects to reclaim working-class power, Indigenous sovereignty over land and water, and self-determination (e.g. Cot ́e 2016; Figueroa and Alison Hope, 2017). While scaling up to sustainably feed large groups of non-elite consumers is critical, scholars have problematized pat assumptions about the desirability or feasibility of scaling up. There are longstanding reasons to be cautious about large-scale agriculture and its negative impacts on land and people (e.g., Goldschmidt 1978), even though the pressures to scale up are not experienced or managed uniformly (e.g., Connelly and Beckie 2016; Nost 2014). Local and/or small-scale food projects are not necessarily sustainable or socially just compared to national or globally scaled food systems – an assumption that Born & Purcell refer to as the “local trap” (2006; see also Baritaux et al., 2016; Hinrichs and Clare, 2003). Even if small scale projects have impeccable eco-social credentials, the complexity that comes with scaling up favors governance models involving high-level decision makers who can be insensitive to impacts on the ground (Wilson 2018: 87). Non-economic attributes of food such as trust and sustainability may be easier to embed in markets organized through close, face-to-face relationships between people – and animals (Bock et al., 2007; Mount and Smithers 2014: 104). The economic benefits of small-scale relationships, like the elimination of profit-taking intermediaries, may disappear when supply chains are lengthened and processing plus certification fees are added into the mix; in the process, producers may lose both financial benefits and legitimacy (Mount 2012: 108) These issues connect to the challenges facing mid-scale agriculture (Kirschenmann et al., 2008), which may be too large to subsist on direct marketing but too small to integrate into global agricultural circuits and corporate retail (Kirschenmann et al., 2008, p. 3; Brislen 2018; Mount 2012; Wilson 2018). The vulnerabilities facing the “agriculture of the middle” (Kirschenmann et al., 2008) speak to the logistical, financial and cultural challenges of scaling up agricultural projects beyond local projects mediated by direct, face-to-face relationships. In short, debates on scale and AFNs involve a thorny tension between small-scale romanticism and large-scale complexity. On the one hand, it is important to avoid the tendency to idealize small-scale projects that rest on face-to-face relationships. On the other hand, larger scale efforts are likely necessary to shift dominant ways of producing and consuming food towards great equality and sustainability (see McClintock 2014: 160). Addressing this unavoidable tension involves being mindful of the romanticism of the “local trap”, analyzing the potential for conventional agriculture to scale-down and adopt practices of alternative food initiatives, and empirically investigating how scaling up might address system-level eco-social objectives and mass markets (Lyson 2004; Nost 2014). This raises the following question: what role can small-scale ethical meat projects play in meeting consumer demand?)

Sub-section 2: Scaling up ethical meat

* What we know (Can ethical meat be a meaningful option for the average consumer? Stanescu (2010: 15) contends that “happy” meat will “never constitute more than either a rare and occasional novelty item, or food choice for only a few privileged customers”, arguing that “there simply is not enough arable land left in the entire world to raise large quantities of pasture fed animals necessary to meet the world’s meat consumption” (2012:15). Indeed, it is unlikely that the planet could sustain current North American levels of meat consumption, even if all meat was raised in an “alternative” fashion. Some models suggest that a shift towards grass-finished systems would increase the U.S. cattle herd by 30 percent, leading researchers to conclude that an overall reduction in American meat consumption is a necessary dimension of sustainability (Hayek and Garrett 2018:2). Even if all consumers could access small-scale sustainable meat, it remains unclear whether this would reduce the consumption of cheap industrial meat or reduce overall consumption levels (de Boer, Scho ̈sler & Aiking, 2014; Neff et al., 2018, p. 1842). The reality is that after decades of industry consolidation, a relatively small number of operations raise large numbers of animals, and a handful of corporate actors buy and process the vast majority of livestock in the U.S. and Canada (Heiberg and Syse 2020; Janssen 2018; Gunderson 2013). Put simply, most meat is conventional industrial meat. How could ethical meat scale out to feed more consumers? Part of the challenge for producers involves accessing sales opportunities at a profitable price point. Mount and Smithers (2014) analyzed how natural beef producers in Ontario grappled with the challenges of scaling up through a direct-marketing collective and selling to an intermediary marketing-group, and their findings speak to the financial challenges facing the small-scale meat sector. Producers reported problems of inadequate financial returns, as well as a clear need for increased scale, with one farmer noting, “[i]t has to get bigger, or we are done” (2014: 110). Getting bigger was no small feat, however, since scaling up the marketing collective required investment in infrastructure and marketing, sales experience, and knowledge of consumers – all factors that were in limited supply. When producers attempt to increase profits through increased speed and volume (e.g., finishing cattle with grain, raising pigs in barns), they risk losing consumer legitimacy (Gwin 2009: 204). Regulations geared toward industrial-scale production also impact the economic viability of small producers, with slaughter facilities optimized for large numbers of standardized animals (McCutcheon et al., 2015; McMahon 2011; Romig, 2013; Gwin 2009: McMahon 2011). Additionally, food safety regulations typically favor large-scale operations, squeezing out local processing infrastructure along with smaller-scale alternatives like farm-gate sales and on-farm slaughter (Brynne 2020; Miewald et al., 2015; Miewald et al., 2013). In sum, there are significant obstacles to scaling up ethical meat production. Political economic and logistical factors make it difficult to provide affordable ethical options for mass-market meat eaters without watering down principles like sustainability, animal welfare, and fair wages. Industrialized, large-scale meat is the cheapest game in town. At the same time, the issue of small-humane meat versus big-industrial meat is not black or white. There are likely unrealized possibilities for mid-sized operations that could feed a greater number of consumers, and the presence of small-scale operations can help raise the profile of meat-related issues and increase pressure to raise standards in industrialized settings, as seen in the phasing out of battery cage hens in the E. U. (Buller and Roe, 2014: 59).)
* Research Question (While scholars have identified fundamental tensions relating to scale in ethical food markets, we know little about how the people who produce ethical meat – raising animals, breaking down carcasses, slaughtering on site – understand and work with these tensions. How do producers experience and respond to the tensions that scholars identify, and how do they see ethical meat’s place within the broader food system?)

## *Agriculture and Human Values* – Cairns and Johnston 2018 – Justification (2,465 words)

* Notably, the first section of the literature review here did NOT introduce a 3-stage gap statement, unlike Oleschuk et al. (2019) and Johnston et al. (2022). It was almost purely “what we know”. The second section of the justification section DOES have a 2-stage gap statement: 1) the meat paradox, 2) little is known about how the ambivalence of meat matters for women and families.
* Introduce the discussion of what we know (To understand why mothers may want to simultaneously reveal and obscure the origins of their children’s dinner, we draw on three overlapping literatures: (1) the emphasis on knowledge in ethical eating discourse; (2) contradictory dimensions of meat consumption; and (3) lessons on the mother/child relationship in food scholarship.)

Literature Review Section 1: Ethical eating discourse: the imperative to know where food comes from

* Fact about the world (In contemporary ethical eating discourse, consumers are encouraged to make ‘good’, responsible choices (e.g., organic, free-range, fair-trade), based on in-depth knowledge about the foods they ingest.)
* What we know – DEBATES in the field (Scholarship on ethical eating has documented popular understanding of food choices as socially and environmentally significant, and has explored associated tensions and contradictions (e.g., Biltekoff 2013; Goodman et al. 2011; Sassatelli and Davolio 2010; Thompson and Coskuner-Balli 2007). The desire to build a more sustainable foodscape is typically framed as an individual imperative (e.g., “vote with your fork!”), an emphasis that can draw attention away from the need for structural reform in a deeply inequitable, corporate controlled food system (Delind 2011; Johnston 2008). The class dimensions of ethical consumption have been critiqued (e.g., voting with your fork gives affluent consumers more votes) (Cairns and Johnston 2015; Guthman 2003), and scholars have drawn attention to the problematic association between ethical eating, whiteness, and racism (Alkon and McCullen 2010; Guthman 2008; Harper 2010; Slocum 2010; Slocum and Saldanha 2013). From a gendered lens, ethical eating discourse can increase pressures on women, who are often tasked with promoting “food literacy,” whether in nonprofit organizations, school campaigns, or privatized food education (Kimura 2011). Within the home, these pressures typically fall to mothers, who tend to be responsible for foodwork, socializing children, and managing family health (Cairns et al. 2013; Afflerback et al. 2013; Brenton 2017; MacKendrick 2014; Parsons 2015). Because most consumers have little knowledge of the inner-operations of an industrialized, globalized food system, ethical eating discourse champions greater consumer understanding of how food gets to our plate—the fossil fuels involved, the exploited workers, and the grisly practices of industrial animal husbandry. As Guthman notes, the phrase “if people only knew where their food came from...” is one that “resounds in alternative food movements” (2008, p. 387). The idea of “defetishization” draws from Marxist theorizing in its call to challenge the “fetish” of the capitalist commodity that obscures its conditions of production. Products like organic food and fair-trade coffee may have defetishizing effects, allowing consumers to make more ethical choices (e.g., Allen and Kovach 2000), and some scholars argue that a more direct connection with food producers can foster shifts in consumer consciousness (Kerton and Sinclair 2010). Nevertheless, defetishization projects have faced critiques. Gunderson (2013) argues that commodity defetishization can reproduce capitalist processes by suggesting new commodities (e.g., organic lettuce) are the solution to capitalism’s problems. Kimura (2011) critiques a conception of “food literacy” that suggests systemic problems will be solved by addressing a knowledge deficit in individuals. Guthman charges that the “if they only knew” logic obscures the privilege of white, affluent eaters, perpetuating “colorblind mentalities and universalizing impulses often associated with whiteness,” which become inscribed in culturally dominant ideas of “good food” (2008, p. 388). Other scholars question how consumer knowledge and ideals—including ethical eating ideals—influence food decisions. Practice theorists like Warde (2014, 2016) note that food habits and routines are dominated by intuitive cognition, not slower, deliberate processes of cognition and reflection. Food decisions are not straightforwardly dictated by attitudes but involve a complex constellation of cultural and historical context, power relationships and social structures (see Shove 2010; Kennedy et al. 2015). Drawing from different theoretical lineage but congruent with a practice theory approach are interventions that emphasize affective, embodied processes. Carolan (2015) argues that consumers’ embodied preferences have been “tuned” to tastes provided at a low cost by the industrial food system; a taste for food alternatives cannot simply be “thought” but must also be “felt” (2016, p. 150). Jessica and Allison HayesConroy argue for a “visceral politics” that takes seriously the “realm of internally-felt sensations, moods and states of being” that shape the way people relate to food (2008, p. 462). By shedding light on emotional, sensorial, habitual elements of food choice, scholars challenge the notion that knowledge of the food industry—or knowledge of ethically “correct” choices—will straightforwardly determine eating practices. As scholars become increasingly aware of the complexity of food decision-making, there has been growing public interest in education initiatives to promote healthier child food choices—as famously embodied in Michelle Obama’s Whitehouse Garden, which “broke ground” with the help of local schoolchildren. These programs tend to approach health promotion as a straightforward objective linked to responsible students who practice universally desirable health behaviors (Kimura 2011; Seedhouse 2004; Lupton 1999). While often well-intentioned, food education interventions can be significantly divorced from the social, cultural and economic factors that shape real-life food decisions. In the province of Ontario, the Ministry of Education has legislative authority to set nutrition standards and guidelines in the curriculum. Premier Kathleen Wynne has justified regulatory interventions to “protect the well-being of our young people” in the face of rising rates of obesity (Gray 2017, p. 117). In 2010, the government introduced a School Food and Beverage Policy restricting access to unhealthy foods in school vending machines and cafeterias. One study that investigated the impact of various Ontario health-promoting policies showed high school students found higher-priced healthy cafeteria foods costly and unappealing, and simply left school to buy cheaper ‘junk’ food at nearby fast-food outlets (Gray 2017, p. 135).2 These findings suggest regulatory restrictions or nutrition education may not significantly shape food practices, and that state funds may be required to provide healthy and sustainable school meals that are free or heavily subsidized (cf., Mintz 2017). More generally, critical health and education scholars suggest policy interventions promoting nutrition education tend to assume a neoliberal framework that re-inscribes the idea of self-governing, responsible citizens who must rely on their own knowledge and resources to protect their health through responsible food choices (Wright 2009). Taken together, critical food scholars illuminate the complexity of the imperative to acquire food knowledge and understand where food comes from. This impulse is rooted in the belief that informed consumers will make “ethical,” responsible choices when they understand how food gets to the plate. However, food and health researchers show how a knowledge-focused narrative can affirm a neoliberal view of food system change that downloads responsibilities to individual eaters and upholds the class and race privilege of elite consumers)

Literature Review Section 2: The Moral Ambiguities of Eating Animals

* Restate the puzzle or gap in the literature that you will address (Within ethical food discourse, few issues are as emotionally fraught or ethically complex as eating animals (e.g., Saja 2013). International experts suggest Western meat-heavy diets are both unhealthy and unsustainable, yet expanding globally at a tremendous pace (Weis 2013). While global “meatification” (Weis 2013) shows little sign of abatement, many consumers are critical of industrial meat production methods (e.g., Rothgerber 2015). Bulliet (2005, p. 17) argues the transition to a “post-domestic” society where consumers have little relationship with animal production creates a paradoxical outcome: scientific and industrial techniques of meat production vastly expand the slaughter, supply and consumption of meat, but increase feelings of disgust at prevailing modes of animal production. These feelings are heightened by media exposés documenting health concerns, environmental issues, and animal welfare abuses within industrialized meat production (Bulliet 2005, p. 30). Food scholars identify a “meat paradox” that involves caring deeply about (some) animals, while enjoying animal flesh as a dietary staple (Herzog 2010; Joy 2010; Rothgerber 2014, 2015; Piazza et al. 2015; Tian et al. 2016). Contemporary consumer concerns about industrial-raised meat have coincided with something of a renaissance of meat as a cultural product. Ethical eating discourse broadcasts the benefits of meat “alternatives” that range from vague (e.g., “natural”) to institutionally certified options (e.g., “certified organic”) (Abrams et al. 2010). An appreciation for “good” meat has become a source of cultural capital, with upscale butchers functioning as a space of elite food consumption (Ocejo 2014). It seems that one way of addressing the “meat paradox” is to prioritize “ethical” animal products—sometimes referred to colloquially as “happy” meat (Cole 2011). Notably, increased knowledge about meat production has not significantly impacted quantities of meat consumption. One Dutch study found consumers were critical of industrial meat production and worried about health impacts, but still ate meat every day (Holm and Mohl 2000). This literature paints a picture of conflicted consumers who continue eating meat in a larger context of concern about factory farming.)
* What we know (Scholarship on children’s meat consumption is more limited. A small literature explores the relationship between childhood pet ownership, empathy towards animals, and future dietary habits, although this relationship is far from straightforward (Paul 2000; Rothgerber and Mican 2014). In Australia, Bray et al.’s (2016) online survey of family attitudes toward meat found urban parents were more likely to articulate inner-conflict about meat-eating and support vegetarian children. A Canadian study found parents’ responses to teens’ vegetarianism reflected classed conceptions of good parenting; while middle-class parents tended to accommodate teens’ vegetarianism as an expression of parental support, working-class parents were more likely to advocate continued meat consumption as part of a “proper diet” (Beagan et al. 2015, p. 115). Researching Canadian and American “School Garden and Cooking Programs,” HayesConroy and Hayes-Conroy found some children were critical of the vegetarian diet that was served—a diet that aligned with facilitators’ conception of ethical eating, but conflicted with the centrality of meat in children’s family meals (2013, p. 84). Brenton’s research with a diverse group of American mothers suggests a “healthy,” “normal” family meal is assumed to include meat (2017, p. 7), an assumption rooted in the historical naturalization and cultural legitimation of meat-consumption (see Chiles and Fitzgerald 2017). In sum, the literature reveals a continued dependence on animal protein alongside ambivalence about modern meat production.)
* Restate the puzzle or gap in the literature that you will address (What is less known is how this ambivalence plays out in the lives of consumers—often women—seeking to manage family consumption, get dinner on the table, and socialize children to be responsible consumers.)

Literature Review Section 3: Consumption, children and the “good” mother

* What we know (The job of feeding the family and socializing children tends to fall largely on the shoulders of mothers (DeVault 1991; Cairns and Johnston 2015). To understand the social significance of family foodwork, we turn to feminist scholars of mothering and childhood. These scholars have demonstrated how idealized conceptions of the “good” mother are best understood in relation to historically and culturally specific constructions of childhood (Burman and Stacey 2010; Cook 2009; Murphy 2000). A widespread and powerful ideology of intensive mothering suggests children must be carefully nurtured through extensive investments of time, emotion, and resources, including careful and costly consumption practices (Hays 1996). Because such practices require significant resources, intensive mothering ideology tends to idealize a highly privileged, labor-intensive performance of motherhood associated with white, middle-class women (Arendell 2000; Brenton 2017). While there is a diversity of maternal food practices, ideals of intensive mothering ratchet up the pressures and moral judgments felt by all mothers striving to provide their children “good” food (Cairns and Johnston 2015). While maternal foodwork has longstanding significance in the project of raising children, the demands of this responsibility shift historically. In contemporary Canadian and American contexts, this maternal ideal involves educating children to make healthy and ethical choices, in order to cultivate future consumer-citizens who promote the collective good through their purchases (Cairns et al. 2013). However, this celebration of the informed child consumer comes into tension within another culturally significant figure: the innocent child, who must be shielded from the harsh world that surrounds them. Indeed, Hays writes that “the prolonged protection of childhood innocence” is central to “the logic of intensive mothering” (1996, p. 163). As a vulnerable subject, the child requires not only physical protection, but the “preservation of a state of ignorance, of unknowingness, about certain areas of life” (Mills 2000, p. 12). Constructions of childhood innocence are commonly defined by “a series of have nots” (Kincaid 1998, p. 15), including a lack of knowledge about particular subjects that are restricted to the world of adults (Jenks 1996; Kehily and Montgomery 2005). While innocence is naturalized as a defining feature of Western childhood, scholars have shown how conceptions of innocence preserve the boundaries of an idealized white childhood. In North America, the historical emergence of childhood innocence worked to exclude Black children from the category of childhood (Bernstein 2011), and today, this ideal continues to legitimize the criminalization of children of color (Meiners 2016). Thus, like intensive mothering, the ideology of childhood innocence upholds systemic inequalities even as it appeals to essentialist notions of a universal childhood. Conceptions of childhood innocence hold particular implications in the context of the industrial food system and the discourse of ethical eating. Bulliet (2005, p. 9–10) contends that in a “post-domestic” society, children are positioned as innocent subjects to be shielded from the “carnal realities” of past domestic societies, especially the animal slaughter they would have previously witnessed as everyday facts of life. Thus, while educating children about the food system is central to the maternal project of raising an ethical consumer, providing children with knowledge of animal slaughter runs counter to the intensive mothering ideal of protecting childhood innocence, especially in the urbanized settings where most Canadian and American consumers live.3 Attending to these complex constructions of childhood can contribute to scholarly understanding of food consumption and maternal food practices. Cook contends the mother–child relationship is not merely derivative of consumer culture, but inhabits a central, constitutive role (2008, p. 221). Studying mothers and children disrupts the individualistic focus of consumer culture—and some consumption/food scholarship—and draws attention to the relationships that shape consumer behavior like food shopping (Cook 2008, p. 222). Central to these relational dynamics are impulses of love and care that motivate maternal shopping (Miller 1998), as well as the everyday negotiation of consumption practices within family life (Martens et al. 2004). In the case of meat consumption, mothers’ efforts to shield children from knowledge of industry practices may illuminate tensions within ethical eating and meat-eating more broadly (e.g., Loughnan et al. 2014). As Mills writes, “perhaps in protecting children from adult secrets, we are in effect trying to protect ourselves also; to keep at bay unpalatable truths” (2000, p. 13).)
* Contribution (Similarly, we argue mothers’ efforts to shield children from knowledge of animal slaughter reflect a wider consumer discomfort with the “unpalatable truth” of meat eating in an industrialized food system.)

## Qualitative Sociology – Baldor 2022 – Justification (776 words)

* Restate the puzzle or gap in the literature that you will address – Describe (in more detail than in the intro) what we know about this topic/issue – Describe (in more detail than in the intro) what we do not know about this topic/issue (This article contributes to urban sociological research on everyday interaction in the digital age as well as interdisciplinary research on queer digital cultures, which I discuss in turn. Analog stranger relationships are marked by clear norms and obligations for interaction, which allow people to live in “a world of strangers” (Lofland 1973). For example, Milgram’s (1977) field research of train commuters who become “familiar strangers” shows how clear norms and obligations allow for a “real relationship, in which both parties have agreed to mutually ignore each other” (53) to foster between urban denizens. In addition, quotidian stranger encounters are predicated on the certainty that neither actor personally knows the other. In familiar stranger relationships, for example, both parties recognize the other through repeated exposure, but they do not possess additional kinds of personal information about each other (Milgram 1977). This is not necessarily the case between digitally mediated acquainted strangers as digital interaction can produce several types of uncertainty that people must negotiate. Communication scholars delineate three forms of interpersonal uncertainty that are salient in acquainted stranger encounters: (1) self uncertainty (e.g. do I know this person?), (2) partner uncertainty (e.g. does this person know me?), and (3) relationship uncertainty (e.g. are we strangers, acquaintances, or friends?) (e.g. Knobloch and Solomon 1999). Similarly, new media scholar Licoppe (2016) identifies issues around real-life identification of digital acquaintances in public (e.g. is that the person I think it is?) as a factor that complicates encounters with other location-aware app users, whether they be from hookup, gaming, or other kinds of social media apps. Just as there are different types of analog stranger relationships, mobile technologies produce different kinds of digitally mediated strangers. New media research in this vein tends to focus on location-aware mobile applications, which encompasses but is not exclusive to hookup and dating apps. For example, Schwartz (2013) analyzes how users on social media applications such as Foursquare foster “networked familiar strangers” who are familiar strangers both on and off an app in that they see each other but do not directly interact. In contrast, Licoppe (2016) defines “pseudonymous strangers” as “[app] users with whom one may never have interacted or talked about before” but about whom some information is known through the app (108). This article specifically elaborates upon Baldor’s (2020) concept of acquainted strangers, which emphasizes how people can become digital acquaintances through directly messaging and sharing personal information on mobile apps and yet remain strangers in-person. When we run into acquainted strangers in-person, which can be a regular occurrence for users of GPS-enabled mobile apps where users connect with nearby others, the digital relationship does not neatly translate into offline acquaintanceship. Rather, people may choose to treat acquainted strangers as either strangers or acquaintances in-person. Baldor draws on this concept to illuminate how gay clubgoers tend to avoid acquainted strangers in person due to issues of “context collapse” (boyd 2010), which cause feelings of stress, embarrassment, and rejection. This paper further elaborates why mobile app users experience acquainted stranger encounters as interactionally problematic.)
* Contribution(s)/Clarifying the relationship of the paper to what we know (While mobile hookup apps’ location-aware design features allow for theoretical generalizability to other location-aware social media and its users, this study’s empirical focus on queer men’s experiences also draws on and contributes to research on how queer people connect in the digital age. A key theme is that queer users of mobile hookup apps are ambivalent about their experiences on these platforms that are normatively used for immediate, impersonal sexual encounters. Generating sexual or social ties on the apps is an uncertain process (Corriero and Tong 2016; Fitzpatrick and Birnholtz 2018). Despite “dominant cultural beliefs that virtual intimacies are failed intimacies” (McGlotten 2013, 7), queer cultures and communities are inextricably hybridized and queer people rely on mobile apps for a variety of purposes (Mowlabocus 2016; Renninger 2019). Studies focus on how users’ management of sexual stigmas can limit the apps’ potential benefits, such as new social connections or the emergence of public queer sex cultures (Ahlm 2017; McGlotten 2013). When research on queer mobile apps focus on in-person situations, they tend to focus on planned sexual encounters and how “digital cruising” (Mowlabocus 2016) practices privatize queer sex by “turning [the home] into a place to meet strangers” (Licoppe et al. 2016, 2542). This context sets the stage for this study’s emphasis on unintentional, non-sexual encounters with other app users in public. Focusing on these everyday situations is important for better understanding mobile hookup app users’ digital behaviors as well as queer people’s ambivalences toward apps that are ubiquitous in queer communities.)

# Methods (4-6 short paragraphs)

Provide a brief overview of the study.

Describe your research site, why you chose it, and how you gained access

Describe your research participants (the people you observed)

Discuss your role in the field and how your identity shaped your observations

Describe the fieldwork you conducted and the data you collected

Describe how you analyzed the data you collected

Describe the limitations of your study (i.e., explain how your study is limited by your methodological choices)

## *The British Journal of Sociology –* Kennedy et al. 2018b – Methods (1,142 words) – 7 paragraphs

* Title of the section: Study Design and Data
* Subtitles in the methods section:
	+ Study design and data
	+ Study setting
	+ Sample

Subsection: “Study Setting”

* Analytical Strategy/Provide a brief overview of the study (By analysing the discourse and practices common among leaders of community-based eat-local projects in interviews and observational settings, we identify and describe the political ideals associated with a local-food focused approach to eco-social change. Food movements range from anti-genetically modified organisms (GMOs) lobby groups that rely on contentious politics, to foodies who eschew collective behaviour. Our study investigates the everyday political work involved in the community-based branch of local food initiatives – groups and individuals focused on expanding opportunities for local food production and consumption. Delving into an examination of civic engagement in these eat-local initiatives, we identify, describe and evaluate small-p politics by locating patterns in discourse and practice across state, market and civic spheres in three Canadian cities. By studying the political talk of organizational leaders advocating eat-local food practices in three cities, we aim to capture a sense of the broader discourse animating eat-local activism in the Canadian context.)
* Characterizing the broader social field within which the study took place – National and Continental (The Canadian local food movement varies in flavour across the country and across urban and rural landscapes. The infrastructure of local food production and consumption across the country includes farmers’ markets, community gardens, community-supported agriculture (CSA), backyard farming, and food policy councils (citizen groups that advise municipal officials on local foodrelated matters). These local organizations are becoming more common, with food policy councils emerging in various North American cities since the beginning of the twenty-first century (Elton 2011).)
* Describing Political Jurisdictions (We conducted our fieldwork in Edmonton, Toronto and Victoria between May 2013 and May 2014. Edmonton and Victoria are mid-sized cities in Western Canada, with populations of 1,328,290 and 344,625 respectively. Toronto is Canada’s most populated city with 6,055,700 inhabitants, and is located in central Canada (all estimates are based on census metropolitan areas).)
* Characterizing the broader social field within which the study took place – Municipal (The cities were selected in order to develop a sample with varying geographies, histories of eat-local initiatives, and levels of institutional support for local food actions from municipal governments. The three cities also vary in political orientation and local food history. Edmonton, Alberta is a politically conservative place infamous for its close ties to the oil and gas industry but agriculture is also central to the provincial economy. The rising popularity of local food in Edmonton is evidenced by investment from the municipal government in 2013 to appoint a food council to advise government on food-related issues and policies. Victoria, British Columbia (BC) is home to a much more leftwing, environmentalist political culture (Canada’s only Member of Parliament from the Green Party was elected by constituents in the Victoria area). The city is located on Vancouver Island, roughly 40 kilometers from the mainland of BC. Unlike Edmonton, at the time of the interviews, Victoria had little in the way of formal food-related policy. Toronto has a reputation for being a highly multicultural metropolis; more than 50 per cent of the population is born outside Canada. Toronto has also developed a reputation for food activism and a vibrant ‘eat local’ scene. Myriad farmers’ markets, food co-ops, and regional CSAs bring high-quality produce to consumers, while other food activists build community gardens and deliver healthy snacks to low-income schools. The Toronto Food Policy Council was established in 1991, making it one of the oldest councils in North America.)

Subsection: “Sample”

* Interviewee recruitment methods (In each site we recruited participants through key informants, targeted invitations, and general invitations sent through local listservs.)
* Characterizing the sample (Based on our intent to describe how politics is inscribed in everyday life, our sample includes people involved, on a daily basis, in projects designed to build a more sustainable food system rooted in eating locally. Participants represented different organizational sectors (state, market, civil society), but were united through this objective. We operationalized daily involvement in food politics by asking participants the following screening question: ‘Through your paid or unpaid work, are you involved in promoting food systems that are healthy for people and the planet?’ Interviewing those who answered ‘yes’ and screening for participants who were involved with more than personal local food consumption or production, our final sample includes 57 participants – 22 participants in Edmonton, 19 in Toronto, and 16 in Victoria. We spoke with 24 participants whose primary involvement is with civil society, 24 who are primarily involved in the market, and 9 representatives of the state. To be clear, these participants were not ordinary consumers committed to eating locally, but were engaged with local-eating on a full-time, professional (paid and unpaid) basis that connected them to some form of state government, market initiative, or non-profit organization. Our participants are disproportionately female (75 per cent) and white (89 per cent). The median age of our sample (42 years) is slightly higher than the national median (40.6 years). Most interviewees were university-educated and reported earning a middle-class income (CAN$50,000–$70,000). Interviewees from civil society included community gardeners, members of food policy councils, volunteers and employees of non-governmental organizations. Market actors included small-scale organic farmers, social entrepreneurs, and farmers’ market managers; representatives of the state included employees of municipal, provincial and federal governments. Government employees were commonly employed at the intersection of food and health, and one participant was employed specifically to promote a local food system.)
* Strategy for Participant Observation (We attended 14 food-related events where we collected data as participantobservers. Participant observation sites include food-related networking events, strategy meetings, a political fundraiser, protests against municipal and provincial government plans to develop agricultural land, farmers’ markets, a foraging workshop, and a food council meeting. Drawing on Blee’s (2012) approach to collecting micro-interactional data, our observations focused on what topics were discussed, and how; what topics were avoided, and how; what evidence of power relations existed; as well as notes on body language, glances and facial expressions to account for the dynamics of the group. These methods allowed us to identify small-p political practices early in the data collection process and use follow-up interviews to enhance understanding.)

Subsection: “Analyses”

* Qualitative Coding Method (By asking participants, ‘Do you understand your work to be political?’ and looking for discussions of political strategies in participant observation events, we assessed how leaders of food-related civic action define their work, noting also how they describe what their approach to politics does not entail. The analyses relied on iterative thematic coding as articulated by Strauss and Corbin (1990). The theme ‘small-p politics’ became evident during the data collection and coding process, and was not a theme we initially expected to find. We analysed data through a process of decontextualization (taking excerpts from transcripts to nodes) and recontextualization (examining data within nodes to identify similarities and differences) (Coffey and Atkinson 1996). Building on decontextualized coding that confirmed the high frequency of small-p politics in our sample, we then recontextualized interview transcripts to interrogate why people believe small-p politics is effective, what they believe to be an ineffective approach to politics, and what the consequences of small-p politics are in terms of topics or issues that are deemed out of reach.)

## *Poetics* – Baumann et al. 2022 – Methods (2,464 words) – 7 paragraphs

* Section Title: Data and Methods
* Analytical Strategy / Provide a brief overview of the study (The mixed methods data for this paper are drawn from a larger study on Canadians’ orientations toward ethical meat. In this paper, we use quantitative (survey) data and qualitative (focus group) data to examine the associations between social class and aesthetic and ethical orientations to food. We take an abductive approach influenced by calls for a “forensic social science” (Goldberg 2015), in that rather than seeking to test a range of hypotheses, we cast a wide net on a specific topic of interest to generate phenomenologically valid arguments about what motivates higher status consumers’ food consumption patterns (see also: Martin 2011). Our analysis is driven by an overarching question – what do higher status people prefer in their cultural consumption options? We address this question through an iterative process, in our case, moving abductively between analyses of the survey and focus group data (Swedberg 2014). For ease of presentation, we present details about our survey data and analysis separately from details about our focus group data and analysis.)

Survey: Sample, Measures and Analytic Approach

* How the survey was administered (The survey was administered online using a Qualtrics panel in the autumn of 2019 (n= 2328))
* When the survey was administered (The survey was administered online using a Qualtrics panel in the autumn of 2019 (n= 2328))
* The size of the sample (The survey was administered online using a Qualtrics panel in the autumn of 2019 (n= 2328))
* Characterizing the Sample (Respondents were screened in order to produce a sample that reflects quotas among the Canadian population in terms of gender, age (18+), race, education, income, and province of residence.2)
* Statement of Representativeness (Footnote 2: Samples generated from panelists for firms such as Qualtrics are quota samples. These samples are subject to the limitation that they might not be representative of the national population insofar as participation requires internet access and is based on voluntary inclusion by respondents. Internet access in Canada is very common, with more than 94% of Canadians having home internet access (Statistics Canada 2019). Some studies of quota sampling have supported the use of quota samples to generalize findings (e.g., Zhang et al. 2020), or at least found that quota samples provide substantively similar results to probability samples (Moser and Stuart 1953), while reducing problems with high levels of non-response often found with probability samples. We acknowledge that the likelihood of participation in a quota sample can be influenced by the topic of the research (Yang and Banamah 2014), and so we caution that our results may be limited in their representativeness.)
* Describing Questions Asked (In addition to questions about meat, our survey included questions about food more generally to provide context for understanding attitudes and behaviors towards meat.)
* Describing how RQ relates to question categories (To address our first research question (can we identify distinct orientations to food based on aesthetic preferences and moral priorities?), we analyze survey questions relating to aesthetic and ethical orientations to food.)
* Statement about Supplementary Material/Appendix ((See the appendix for sample means on all measures employed in this article.))
* Analysis Method Used (In this step, we conduct a latent class analysis without covariates)
* Software (using Latent GOLD 5.1 (Vermunt and Magidson 2016).)
* Describing Unfamiliar Analysis Method (Latent class analysis uses a set of indicators to identify clusters that are based on an unobserved categorical grouping and assigns a likelihood of class membership for each case.)
* Analytical Strategy [NOTE: I could have kept going at a more specific scale as in the last few bullets, but I changed to a broader scale here to save time] (To identify classes, we rely on three indicators that previous research (Johnston and Baumann 2007) points to as reflecting an aesthetic orientation in food and four indicators modified from Schoolman (2019) that relate to a moral orientation in food. The aesthetic questions are: 1) “I consider myself a foodie.” (strongly disagree to strongly agree); 2) “I seek out foods from different ethnicities and cultures.” (strongly disagree to strongly agree); and 3) “When I travel, I prefer to eat at restaurant chains that I know.” (strongly disagree to strongly agree, reverse coded) The indicators operationalizing moral orientations are: 1) “When you grocery shop, how often do you AVOID buying certain products for political, ethical or environmental reasons (also known as ’boycotting’)? (never to always) 2) “It’s unethical that many animals live in crowded conditions.” (strongly disagree to strongly agree) 3) “Indicate how important each of the following factors is when choosing which foods to buy: environmental impact.” (not important to extremely important) 4) “The way that meat is produced in this country is a big problem.” (strongly disagree to strongly agree). We also include an indicator that implicates both aesthetic and moral judgments (DeSoucey 2016), How comfortable are you with eating foie gras” (not comfortable to comfortable), foie gras being a food that is often aesthetically valued but morally condemned34. Following the initial specification of our classes, we then re-estimate the classes while including covariates, in order to address our second research question (are aesthetic and moral orientations in food consumption choices associated with SES and other demographic measures?). This process allows us to assess the relationships between the classes and a set of demographic control variables along with focal variables related to social stratification5. In addition to questions on gender, race, and age, we include a scale for political orientation6. The scale is based on two questions: “How would you describe your political opinions on SOCIAL issues (e.g., environment, women’s rights, religion, multiculturalism)?” and “How would you describe your political opinions on ECONOMIC issues (taxes and government programs)?” Response options range from “Very liberal” (=1) to “Very conservative” (=7) on a seven-point scale. We add scores from these two questions, with higher numbers indicating conservatism, and the scale ranging from 2 to 14. We also include a question about household income which asked the respondent to select one of nine bands for household income (see Table A3). We include a question about childhood arts exposure, “During your childhood how frequently did your parents or guardians engage you with the arts (e.g., music, theatre)?” Response options range from “not at all” (=1) to “all the time” (=7). Finally, we include a question about respondent’s highest educational qualification obtained. We combine responses of “No certificate, diploma or degree” and “Secondary school diploma or equivalency certificate” as the reference group. We combine responses of “Apprenticeship or trades certificate or diploma” and “College, CEGEP or other non-university certificate or diploma” and “University below bachelor’s degree” to create a category of Moderate Education. We combine responses of “Bachelor’s degree” and “Master’s degree” and “Doctorate or professional designation (e.g., M.D., D.D.M.) to create a category of High Education. The next part of our analysis addresses our third and fourth research questions (are aesthetic and moral orientations in food transposable to cultural consumption more broadly? And, do aesthetic and moral orientations in food lead to drawing symbolic and social boundaries?). We follow a “three-step approach” (Vermunt 2010) for estimating relationships between the latent classes and two sets of “distal outcomes” (Bakk et al. 2013). Our first set of distal outcomes are aesthetic and moral orientations beyond the case of food (see below for detail), which addresses our third research question. Our second set of distal outcomes is holding symbolic and social boundaries corresponding to moral evaluations in food, our fourth research question. For the three-step approach, we use the procedure available with Latent GOLD, which incorporates correction methods to account for the introduction of bias that occurs when cases are assigned to latent classes based on their posterior class membership probabilities assigning class membership to cases7. In this process, after class membership is assigned, that assignment is used as an explanatory variable for estimating distal outcomes via a regression model8. We constructed scales for the orientations beyond food from a number of survey items. In order to measure high cultural capital aestheticism, we asked respondents to indicate their engagement in 14 pastimes over the previous year. We included a range of traditionally high and low cultural capital activities. To create a scale, we first conducted a principal components analysis with varimax rotation to determine the number of factors and identify a high cultural capital (HCC) aestheticism factor. The items are in line with findings of prior research on HCC aestheticism (e.g., Bennett et al. 2009). The survey asked, “In the past twelve months, which of the following activities have you done.” The activities in the HCC aestheticism factor include: visited an art museum; watched a foreign film; went to a symphony, ballet or opera; listened to jazz music; purchased art for my home; and read a restaurant review. The HCC aestheticism factor explains the greatest amount of variation (18%) and each of these items load highly onto the first factor (loadings are .400 or higher). As evidenced by an estimate of Cronbach’s alpha, the items have high inter-item reliability (alpha=.614) and the alpha score is not improved by removing any of the items. The index ranges from zero to six, with a mean score of 1.66 (s.d.=1.519)9. We model this variable as a count variable.)
* What we know (Compared with the extensive body of research examining HCC aestheticism, there is far less research into HCC moralism. However, De Keere (2020) suggests that those with higher cultural capital are more likely to express strong views that issues like climate change are serious social problems and to feel a sense of responsibility to take personal action to address it. With respect to evaluating the principle role of governments, those with high cultural capital stressed the need to address social and economic inequality, rather than individual rights and freedoms (De Keere 2020). Similarly, Flemmen et al. (2019b, p. 169) identify associations between social class and political values, in particular, the space of high cultural and economic capital (the upper left quadrant in Bourdieusian maps of social space) corresponds to a “liberal, ‘new left’ fraction”.)
* Analytical Strategy (In our survey, we asked respondents to indicate how strongly they agree that climate change, sexism, discrimination against racial minorities, and homophobia are pressing social problems requiring urgent attention and action10. A reliability analysis indicates that the items can be used as a scale (Cronbach’s alpha=.816). The scale ranges from one to five, with a mean score of 3.83 (s.d.=.94). We created the scale from averaging the scores on each individual question, and the scale has 17 levels (see Table A4). We model this variable as a continuous variable11. Our final research question asks whether aesthetic preferences and moral concerns in food relate to symbolic and social boundaries. To measure a symbolic boundary that people draw around meat choices, we asked respondents to indicate how strongly they agreed with the statement, “Good people make it a priority to buy ‘ethical’ meat (humanely raised and sustainable)” (strongly disagree to strongly agree). To measure a social boundary around meat, we asked respondents how strongly they agreed with the statement, “Many people I know have reservations about eating meat” (strongly agree to strongly disagree). These questions are primarily measuring moral boundaries. We dichotomize these variables (strongly agree or agree = 1) and regress class membership on these indicators of symbolic and social boundaries using logistic regression12.)

Focus Groups: Sample, Themes, and Analytic Approach

* Describing how the qualitative data relates to the quantitative data (We conducted focus groups with meat consumers in Toronto and Vancouver in order to clarify and deepen our understanding of the relationships we observe in the survey data. Specifically, we employ our focus group data to illuminate the nature of the food orientations we find through the LCA (the first research question), and to look at how judgments of food are bound up with social class and perceptions of moral worth (the last research question))
* Characterizing the Sample (In both sites, we recruited people who expressed an appreciation for meat as well as an awareness that meat is implicated in social and ecological issues. In Toronto, we conducted five focus groups with a total of 18 meat consumers. In Vancouver, we conducted four focus groups with a total of 16 meat consumers. (See Table A5 for an overview of our focus group participants’ sociodemographic characteristics.) Pseudonyms are used for all participants to ensure confidentiality.)
* Pseudonym statement (Pseudonyms are used for all participants to ensure confidentiality.)
* Characterizing the Sample (There are two unique features of our approach to recruitment for the focus groups. First, we targeted people who seek out and consume “ethical meat”, which we defined as meat which is produced in a way that is healthy, humane and sustainable. Within this specific criterion, we also worked to have representation from people with different motivations for choosing ethical meat, including health, animal welfare, and environmental protection, and we aimed to achieve diversity in age, gender, race/ethnicity, and income. Ultimately, the people we spoke with varied in the way they defined ethical meat and in the positions they took towards meat. We sampled people who take, at times, the position of moral aestheticism. But no one took that position all the time.)
* Recruitment (The second unique feature of our recruitment strategy is that we only actively recruited one participant per focus group and asked that person to invite three to four friends who were also interested in, but not necessarily strongly committed to, ethical meat. This approach had two advantages: it introduced heterogeneity into our sample, as the primary participants sometimes included people who were not necessarily regimented ethical meat-eaters. And it meant that the participants in the focus group had a strong rapport and felt comfortable challenging and disagreeing with one another. In this way, our data collection took full advantage of the strengths of focus groups as a data-making tool: the groups’ conversations reflected the particular language and interests of the participants; the group was able to generate fully-articulated accounts by drawing one another out into debates and discussions; and, by observing the focus groups, we had the opportunity, “to observe the process of collective sense-making in action” (Wilkinson 1998, p.181).)
* Describing questions asked (The focus group guide elicits participants’ aesthetic appreciation for meat as well as their moral concerns with meat and animal agriculture. In order to get a sense of the extent to which these two dimensions motivated participants’ meat choices, we asked participants to tell us what meats they love to eat and what meats they would never eat, and asked them more specifically how they identify meat that is “ethical”)
* Qualitative Coding Strategy (Our analytic approach to understanding how participants defined aesthetic and moral properties of meat and the relative importance of each dimension relied on a two-stage coding strategy. In the first stage, we wrote structured analytic memos immediately after each focus group to synthesize observations about the relative importance of moral and aesthetic motivations for the participants, and to think through various ways that each dimension was signaled and discussed. Reflecting on the consumer orientations that emerged in our statistical analysis, our second stage of analysis involved line-by-line coding to see if the data corroborate the existence of these four orientations to food and meat. We also worked to link excerpts of text to aesthetic and moral themes (e.g., moral–connection to a producer) to support and sharpen our claims about how these concerns relate to social interactions. This iterative coding strategy is based on Saldan ̃a’s (2015) analytic and focused coding techniques, respectively.)
* Describing questions asked (The next theme that we explore in the focus groups relates to symbolic boundary work. In order to understand the role that meat consumption patterns play in the distinctions that participants make about their own and others’ eating practices, we asked several questions. First, we asked participants to describe the stereotypical “ethical” meat eater and the stereotypical “unethical” meat eater.)
* Qualitative Coding Strategy (To analyze the symbolic boundary work in our focus groups we used the same analytic process as described above. The first stage of analysis (the analytic memo) centered on the following questions: Do participants see ethical meat-eaters as a higher status group? How do they see people who don’t eat ethical meat? What boundaries do people draw in relation to good meat / bad meat? This process generated the thematic codes used for the second stage of analysis. In the second stage, we used line-by-line coding to link excerpts of boundary-work text to thematic categories from stage one (e.g., unethical meat eaters are unaware) as well as the four orientations.)

Provide a brief overview of the study.

Describe your research site, why you chose it, and how you gained access

Describe your research participants (the people you observed)

Discuss your role in the field and how your identity shaped your observations

Describe the fieldwork you conducted and the data you collected

Describe how you analyzed the data you collected

Describe the limitations of your study (i.e., explain how your study is limited by your methodological choices)

## *Journal of Consumer Culture* – Baumann et al. 2019 – Methods (684 words) – 4 paragraphs

* By the start of the methods section, they have not clearly stated their research questions. You can extract this question from the puzzle statement of the “justification”/literature review section. Basically, “why do people from different SES groups have consistently different food choices?” Or as stated in the methods section (for the first time as a question): “why do low-SES interviewees categorize certain foods as desirable?” (p.322).
* Title of section: Data and method
* Provide a brief overview of the study (Our analysis is based on data collected from 2008 to 2010 for a cross-Canada study investigating the influence of SES and family context on food practices.)
* Characterizing the Sample (Interviews were completed with 254 participants (123 adults and 131 teens) in 105 families1 in 10 rural and urban locations across Canada.)
* Recruitment (Recruitment occurred through public venues (e.g. newspaper advertisements, online ads), and for a small minority of cases, snowball sampling produced study participants.)
* Representativeness (A stratified quota sampling method was used to attain class and ethnic diversity at each site and in the broad sample. A stratified quota sampling method was used to attain class and ethnic diversity at each site and in the broad sample. Each family was assigned to one of the following categories: high-SES (35 families), mid-SES (27 families), and low-SES (43 families). The sample reflected the ethno-racial diversity of urban Canada (i.e. urban samples were more diverse than rural) and is roughly aligned with Canadian population demographics (19% of Canadians are a visible minority; Statistics Canada, 2011).)
* Characterizing the Sample (Seventy-seven percent of participants identified as White/Euro-Canadian, 6% as First Nations/Aboriginal, 6% as South Asian, 2% as Chinese, and 2% as African-Canadian. The remaining 7% identified with another heritage (e.g. Eritrean, Japanese) or had a mixed background. As for gender, 105 participants were women, 77 were girls, 54 were boys, and 18 were men.2 (See Appendix 1 for further details.))
* Describing how RQ relates to question categories (We used interview data to identify patterns in everyday food ideals and also to illuminate the meaning of food consumption: why do low-SES interviewees categorize certain foods as desirable? We focused on three interview questions devised to access food ideals: (1) ‘‘If you were inviting someone you really wanted to impress for a meal, what would you serve?’’ (2) ‘‘If someone were visiting your area and wanted to know how locals eat, where would you recommend they shop or eat out?’’ and (3) ‘‘How might you eat differently if you had more money?’’ Why these questions? The first two questions ask respondents to think about relatively rare occasions when the importance of food choices is salient. In contrast to quotidian food choices, making dinners to impress and guide visitors to ‘‘good’’ food are instances when tastes are predominant in making food choices. Additionally, these first two questions focus on social interactions and perceptions, and therefore evoke social issues of identity and self-presentation that are of particular interest to us. Question 3 asks interviewees to think about ideal tastes without the economic constraints that routinely circumscribe their options, allowing for another channel to express preferences and ideals. Each question is relatively open-ended, but invited reference to specific foods; these foods were compared to determine thematic patterns and class differences.)
* What people say they do vs. what they actually do (In the larger interview, subjects were encouraged to discuss food ideals and also to consider how ideals connected to lived experience and restrictions. While we acknowledge that consumers are not always fully conscious of their food choices (see, for example, Wansink and Sobal, 2007), the interview process encouraged dialog on the distance between food ideals and practices, and this context was taken into account in our analysis of the target questions. While an interviewee’s response can be seen as a way to present the self in an admirable light, these responses can provide useful clues about the schematic ideals at stake, as well as the subject’s ‘‘emotional landscape of desire, morality and expectations’’ (Pugh, 2013: 50).)
* Qualitative Coding Method (Interviews were transcribed and coded using ATLAS.ti. Given the paucity of prior research on the aesthetic food preferences of low-SES people, our analysis was inductive. The authors independently read the answers to the three interview questions and systematically recorded the characteristics and types of food mentioned as well as the reasons provided. We compared observations and through discussion identified emergent themes relating to food preferences and justifications. As motivations for particular food choices were sometimes left unexplained in the excerpts we examined, we studied other sections of the transcript and reviewed the family memos to determine general family food habits.3 The authors then discussed potential themes and narrowed them down according to commonality and analytical robustness. This was an iterative process that involved going back to the transcripts individually and meeting multiple times and ultimately produced the themes we discuss below.)

## *Sociological Forum* – Oleschuk et al. 2019 – Methods (664 words) – 3 paragraphs

* Title of methods section: Data and Methods
* Characterizing the sample (Data for this article come from qualitative research conducted in 2017 in the Peel region, a diverse area in the west end of the Greater Toronto Area (GTA). )
* Brief study overview (Semistructured interviews with 77 adults explored consumer knowledge and attitudes surrounding the meat industry and meat consumption and avoidance. Data were collected as part of a senior undergraduate seminar in the Sociology of Culture taught by two of the authors; admission to the course was competitive (based on grades). The students came from a wide range of religious and ethnocultural backgrounds (e.g., Eastern European Jewish, Pakistani Muslim, Buddhist Vietnamese, Hindu Indian, Somali Muslim, Filipino Christian). A small minority of the students were white (3/19), and most were female (17/19). Besides reading articles about meat production and consumption, students were instructed on effective interviewing techniques (i.e., recruitment, open-ended questioning, probing, note taking, memoing, and transcription) and were mentored as they conducted four to five interviews each with individuals in their networks. Check-in discussions and support were offered weekly, and students were given extensive feedback after each interview and memo in turn, providing them with consistent guidance and opportunity for improvement. The quality of the interviews therefore remained high throughout. Interviews took place primarily in respondents’ homes or sometimes at the university. Respondents were asked a variety of questions about their meat consumption practices, their mental and emotional associations with meat, its connections to social relationships and cultural rituals or traditions, as well as their awareness and thoughts around common concerns with meat production.)
* Qualitative Coding Method (All interviews were read by two of the authors in order to develop the initial codes. While some of the codes were derived from prior research (e.g., the 4Ns), other codes were developed inductively based on the initial reading of the interviews. These codes were applied to a subset of interviews and then refined and reapplied in order to better represent the patterns observed in the transcripts. Codes were then reviewed by all authors in order to identify a set of codes that spoke directly to the question of how people make sense of their own meat eating, or in the case of vegetarians, how they justify not eating meat.)
* Characterizing the Sample / Descriptive Statistics (Interviewees had varied meat practices and preferences. Sixty-four percent were meat eaters (49), with 6% eating meat at every meal (5), 35% eating it every day (27), and 23% eating it occasionally (18). Purposive recruitment was done to interview a significant number of people who don’t eat meat (in order to better understand this relatively unusual choice); as a result, 23% of respondents identified as vegetarian (18) and 12% as vegan (9).)
* What we know – Typical Sample Bias in the Literature (As noted, studies of vegetarianism and meat consumption tend to rely on homogenous, often white, consumer populations (e.g., Rothgerber 2013), leaving less opportunity to explore diverse cultural meanings around meat (Piazza et al. 2015:126; Ruby 2012:145).)
* Characterizing the Sample (The sample reflects the diversity of the GTA, with a large proportion of people of color (64 respondents, or 84%, alongside 12 white respondents, or 16%). The sample also included a variety of religious backgrounds (21 Christian, 21 Muslim, 12 Hindu, 5 Sikh, 2 Buddhist, 1 Jewish, and 15 not identifying a religious orientation). Forty-seven percent of individuals (36) were born in Canada, while 53% (41) identified as first-generation immigrants. Due to the nature of the recruitment method, the sample is younger and overrepresentative of university students (51% of the sample are students, and 66% are between 18 and 30). The sample is closely split by gender (40 women and 37 men) and includes respondents from diverse class backgrounds (29 middle income, 19 upper or uppermiddle income, 25 low income or poor, and 4 people not reporting income))
* Pseudonym statement (As we report our findings, we identify interviewees by pseudonym and by multiple demographic characteristics, focusing on attributes most relevant to the substance of the quote.)
* Characterizing the Sample (Most respondents are Canadian citizens or permanent residents, and reference their self-described ethnicity (and religion, when relevant) without emphasizing citizenship status (i.e., we use “Jamaican” rather than “Jamaican Canadian”).)

Provide a brief overview of the study.

Describe your research site, why you chose it, and how you gained access

Describe your research participants (the people you observed)

Discuss your role in the field and how your identity shaped your observations

Describe the fieldwork you conducted and the data you collected

Describe how you analyzed the data you collected

Describe the limitations of your study (i.e., explain how your study is limited by your methodological choices)

## *Journal of Rural Studies* – Johnston et al. 2022 – Methods (752 words) – 6 paragraphs

* Title of methods section: Data and method
* Describe the research site (To gain information on producers’ perceptions, we interviewed producers and visited their places of work.)
* Recruitment (We generated a list of potential interviewees through web searches and contacted farmers, butchers, and chefs who self-identified as working within the space of ethical meat (See Appendix).)
* Defining Concepts / Findings (Participants used a range of terms and certification systems in their work such as, naturally raised, organic, heritage, holistic management, whole-animal butchery; we see these terms as generally falling with an ethical meat space that is imagined as a counterpoint to industrialized, large-scale meat operations.)
* Characterizing the Sample / Describe the data you collected (Calarco) (Participants used a range of terms and certification systems in their work such as, naturally raised, organic, heritage, holistic management, whole-animal butchery; we see these terms as generally falling with an ethical meat space that is imagined as a counterpoint to industrialized, large-scale meat operations. Their work ranged from raising chickens and eggs, running a restaurant focussed on locally-sourced whole-animal products, raising cattle using holistic ranching techniques, raising pastured pork, and running a small slaughterhouse. Most participants shared a vision for raising animals outdoors in relatively small numbers that involved careful attention to ecological improvements using pasture management. For people who worked directly with live animals, they displayed a close connection to the animals they raised, and often worked with different kinds of animals in their operations (e.g., having a horse team to plough the fields, or raising a flock of chickens that grazed pastures also used by sheep, or raising a small number of heritage pigs along with cattle).)
* Describing questions asked (Our interviews covered a broad range of topics, such as motivations and priorities for producing ethical meat, views on consumers, opinions of certification regimes, meat philosophy, and understandings of conventional versus alternative meat. In this article we focus on their perspectives on the question of scaling up alternative meat production, as well as how meat fits into their larger vision of food system sustainability.)
* Characterizing the Sample (Between 2016 and 2018 we interviewed a total of 74 producers across four Canadian provinces – British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Ontario.)
* Data Collection Strategy / Representativeness (This geographic range allowed us to access a diversity of perspectives that were not constrained to the specific environmental and regulatory conditions of a single region or province.)
* Characterizing the Sample (The average age of interviewees was 46, and our sample included 30 female-identified and 45 male-identified participants.)
* Describe the research site (We frequently interviewed married couples who managed their business together.)
* Characterizing the Sample (Most participants were heterosexual, but some did not answer the question and two participants described themselves as “fluid”. Almost all interviewees self-identified as white or Caucasian; exceptions included three participants who described themselves as Cree, Chinese-Canadian, and Jewish respectively)
* Representativeness (Although the Canadian government does not collect data on the race of farmers, this trend reflects broad patterns of dominant whiteness in land ownership that are also observed in the United States, and can be attributed to white settler colonialism, institutional racism, and intergenerational land transfer within farming families (e.g. Quisumbing King et al., 2018; Rotz 2017).)
* Characterizing the Sample (We targeted producers of beef, pork, and/or chicken, although many also worked with other animals (e.g., lamb, ducks) and with plants.)
* Describe the research site (In most cases we conducted interviews at workplaces – mainly farmhouses but also butcher shops, pastures, farm-to-table restaurants, and two slaughterhouses.)
* Data Collection Strategy (Site visits greatly increased the amount of information we gained, and we were often able to observe everyday aspects of farm life and pose additional questions related to what we were observing.)
* Recruitment (A small proportion of our interviewees were referred to us by earlier interviewees. Some referrals were to producers who were not personally known to earlier interviewees but were known by reputation.)
* Interview length (Interviews lasted between 30 min and 4.5 h, but most were around 2 h long.)
* Qualitative Coding Method / Describe how you analyzed the data collected (Calarco) (Immediately after interviews, we wrote memos that included a description of the interview site and subject(s), post-interview thoughts and reflections, and a working set of emerging themes. Subsequent memos were informed, but not constrained by, earlier memos in terms of the list of emerging themes. The issues of scale, ethics and mass-markets emerged as core themes early on through this memoing process, although these issues were also suggested by prior research. Interviews were transcribed and entered into a qualitative software program. Codes were developed in two steps. First, an initial code list was created based on prior literature that informed our interview guide. This code list was applied to early interviews and then the coding scheme was refined. Refinement continued as codes were applied to the rest of the interviews; some codes became more specific, others more general, while other codes were added or dropped based on their relevance to the data. After coding was complete, we generated transcript excerpts connected to specific codes relevant to our interest in understanding how ethical meat producers understood ethical meat, their own operations, and the goal of building a more sustainable food system.)

## *Agriculture and Human Values* – Cairns and Johnston 2018 – Methods (469 words) – 3 paragraphs

* Title of section: Methods and data
* Brief study overview (This research emerges from a qualitative study exploring gender and contemporary food ideals.)
* Characterizing the Sample / Describe the data you collected (Conducted in Toronto, the larger study included interviews and focus groups carried out in 2012–2013 with 129 adult food consumers. Focus groups were comprised of groups of friends and acquaintances.)
* Recruitment (Each group was recruited through an initial research contact who invited others in their social network for a discussion about food.)
* Describe the research site (These groups included four to six women and men, and were held in participants’ homes.)
* Characterizing the Sample (Semistructured interviews were conducted with 40 women who saw food as important to their identities,)
* Recruitment (recruited through notices at grocery stores and food-related listservs.)
* Describe the research site (Interviews were held in the participant’s preferred setting (e.g., home, university, public library).)
* Describing questions asked (In both focus groups and interviews, we asked participants about priorities guiding everyday food practices, as well as any tensions they experienced in relation to food and eating (e.g., health imperatives versus food pleasures and body pressures). We asked if and how often participants ate meat, and if their shopping and eating practices were shaped by ethical issues; our questions allowed participants to define ethical food issues on their own terms, and explored if these priorities came into conflict with everyday food practices and constraints (e.g., household finances, children’s preferences). We asked about the experience of feeding children, including foodwork routines and challenges, the division of labor with partners, and any concerns that arose in the practice of shopping and cooking for young family members.)
* Data collection strategy (Focus groups fostered discussion (often spirited!) of food issues, provided opportunities for participants to connect and express solidarity over shared foodwork experiences, and employed dialogue to generate insights on areas of disagreement, stress, and tension related to food. Interviews allowed us to probe more deeply into mothers’ foodwork narratives, and gain detail about specific food practices, ideas and emotions.)
* Qualitative Coding Method / Describe how you analyzed the data you collected (Data were analyzed thematically through a two-stage coding process. Both authors read through all transcripts to develop a list of initial themes, which were then used to guide a second round of focused coding. This process revealed an underlying tension between mothers’ narratives of educating and protecting children in relation to knowledge of food’s origins.)
* Characterizing the Sample (In this paper, we draw from narratives of the 47 mothers within the study (17 interviewees and 30 focus group participants), with a focus on discussions of ethical eating and meat-eating in the context of feeding children. Mothers in our study came from a range of race and class backgrounds (32 white and 15 women of color; 27 middle-class and 20 working-class or poor). )
* Methods – Findings (We did not explicitly ask participants if they taught children about meat’s origins, yet the topic arose independently in many conversations. More specifically, the data revealed a meat-knowledge paradox: mothers should teach children where food comes from, but also protect children from knowledge of animal slaughter.)

## Qualitative Sociology – Baldor 2022 – Methods (4 paragraphs)

* Provide a brief overview of the study / Analytical Strategy (This paper’s findings developed inductively from a larger in-person urban ethnography on the interactional bases of sexual community (Baldor 2019, 2022). My data and methods both align with traditional ethnography as well as extend these methods for the digital age by capturing the hybridized nature of in-person social life through in-person observations and interviewing)
* Characterizing the Sample / Describe the Data you Collected (I draw on approximately 400 hours of participant observation in gay nightlife spaces in and beyond Philadelphia’s Gayborhood neighborhood, and 34 in-depth interviews with queer men and countless informal interviews during fieldwork.)
* Explaining Controversial Methodological Decisions (I rely on in-person observations and narrative accounts of queer men’s digital experiences, rather than follow participants and observe them on hookup apps, for several methodological reasons. First, these apps’ interfaces make conducting virtual observations difficult. An ethnographer can set up a profile on Grindr, for instance, and see a dynamic grid of profiles in their immediate area (and thus be seen by others). However, they cannot observe interactions happening between other users; the “action” (Goffman 1967) occurs privately through direct messaging. This limits an ethnographer’s insights to how users interact with them. Second, given the project’s focus on face-to-face interaction in urban gay spaces, my research protocol was not oriented towards obtaining intimate digital data and recruitment did not hinge on whether participants would be willing to discuss their digital lives. Rather, these topics came up organically in interviews.)
* Describe your research site – Strategy for Participant Observation (I conducted fieldwork in 2015 and intermittently from 2018 to 2021. I joined queer men in their nighttime rituals, frequenting every gay bar in the Gayborhood (around ten bars at any given time) as well as queer events throughout the city. I joined clubgoers as they made their nightly rounds, oftentimes starting at pre-games in private apartments and ending at late-night dining spots popular among revelers after the clubs closed)
* Interviewee/Focus Group Recruitment Methods (I primarily interviewed club-goers with whom I socialized while out. During the COVID-19 pandemic, I also used snowball methods to interview six additional club-goers through fieldwork contacts)
* Characterizing the Sample / Describe the Data you Collected (In total, all interviewees sexually identify as either gay or queer; 75% of interviewees identify as gay men, while 25% identify as nonbinary, transgender, or genderqueer. In terms of race/ethnicity, 62% of interviewees identify as non-Hispanic white.)
* Pseudonym statement (All names of club-goers in the text are pseudonyms.)
* Analytical Strategy – Data Collection Strategy – Describing Questions Asked (I did not initially consider how I could leverage the popularity of mobile dating and hookup apps among queer men in my fieldwork, especially as I observed few bar patrons using hookup apps while out. However, I found through informal conversations in the bars and in-person interviews that club-goers’ digital performances, interactions, and relationships collided with their in-person experiences in the bars. From these insights, I adapted the interview protocol to include more questions around app use and participants’ experiences running into other app users in gay and nongay public spaces. In particular, the prompt “Describe a recent time you encountered someone from the apps in-person” proved to be generative, as queer men had often seen a digital acquaintance very recently and could recount—and wanted to recount—the situation as it unfolded both in-person and on the apps. Furthermore, interview data illuminated the pervasiveness of acquainted stranger encounters in men’s everyday lives beyond nightlife or the Gayborhood. As a gay person in my early to mid-twenties, I had personal experience navigating mobile dating apps and the acquainted strangers these platforms generate. While I do not directly draw on or analyze my experience, my biography helped to inform data collection and analysis (cf. Blackwell et al. 2015, 1124).)
* Not included (Calarco’s sections)
	+ Describe why you chose your research site and how you gained access
	+ Discuss your role in the field and how your identity shaped your observations
	+ Describe how you analyzed the data you collected
	+ Describe the limitations of your study

# Analysis (Calarco gives no suggested word limit)

Calarco’s Outline

* State your argument
* Identify 2-3 supporting points – how your data support your argument
* Identify 2-3 patterns in the data that provide evidence for each supporting point
* For each pattern:
	+ Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion
	+ Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern
	+ Provide a brief fieldnote, interview, or other data excerpt
	+ TJB > Explain how this subtheme links to the overall theme – may include developing/enhancing overall theme
* Offer EXPLANATION for observed patterns
* Caveats and clarifications identify any key exceptions to or variations to the overall patterns, and if possible, offer an explanation for these exceptions/variations

## *The British Journal of Sociology –* Kennedy et al. 2018b – Analysis (2,859 words)

* Title of 1st section: “Small-p politics”
* Fieldnote excerpt (At the inaugural public meeting of Edmonton’s newly formed Food Council, participants report on the results of their World Caf􏰀e discussion where they were tasked with deciding how they would like to position their voice in the municipal region. A female representative of a non-profit food assistance organization speaks on behalf of her table: ‘It’s okay [for the council] to be controversial, but we don’t want to be polarizing.’ She pauses for a moment and says, ‘Actually, it might not be okay to be controversial. Engagement is the big one. We want to make sure we can engage people, so maybe we don’t want to be controversial.’ The crowd murmurs in agreement. (Fieldnotes from an Edmonton Food Council meeting))
* State your argument (In the vignette above, a group of volunteers uses their knowledge of the local political context to shape a strategy for collective action. Listening to the speaker deliberate on mobilization tactics, we overhear her hesitation with controversial and polarizing approaches to action. In short, we hear her advance tactics for mobilizing the public that appear non-traditional, if not apolitical. We labelled this approach to socio-ecological change, ‘small-p politics’.)
* Identify 2-3 supporting points – how your data support your argument (In seeking to understand why small-p politics made sense for our participants, we identified three interrelated ideals in our data: pleasure, conviviality and pragmatism. A few participants specifically used the term ‘small-p’ to describe these engagement practices; others inferred the term by raising the three dimensions when describing their approach to food system change..)
* Stating that an excerpt you are going to introduce is particularly relevant (Of the 48 participants who described an approach to engagement that we labelled small-p politics, the following excerpt is particularly succinct.)
* Introducing the demographic information of the person giving a quote (Sarah (we use pseudonyms throughout, to protect confidentiality) is a 55-year old community organizer in Edmonton)
* Introducing the significance of a quote (Sarah (we use pseudonyms throughout, to protect confidentiality) is a 55-year old community organizer in Edmonton whose conceptualization of small-p politics highlights her views on what constitutes an effective approach to social change. In her words:)
* Quote (Am I political? Well, you have to distinguish between the small-p and big-P. I’m really not comfortable with that sort of big-P political . . . or the damning of anybody or going up against anybody . . . I’m not an activist, I’m not trying to tell someone their way of doing something is wrong.)
* Interpreting a quote (Sarah is more comfortable demonstrating alternatives to food practices she believes are unjust and unsustainable than she is practising contentious forms of resistance.)
* Generalizing across sample (Participants commonly associated traditional political engagement with confrontational tactics, denouncing these tactics as unproductive for both achieving objectives and sustaining engagement.)
* Signposting Main Themes to be Discussed (In the next three subsections we describe how pleasure, conviviality and pragmatism inform the small-p politics that emerged from our analyses. In the final section of results, we explore how small-p politics both mobilizes collective action (particularly ethical consumption) and may work to obscure pressing issues of sustainability and social inequality.)

Sub-theme 1: Small-p politics: a pleasurable way of making change

* Quote (After years in the environmental movement, I came home one day from an environmental protest and thought, ‘I don’t want any part of that.’ I didn’t want to be a part of a violent, revolutionary thing any more. I saw the environmental movement more and more as not being productive. But gardening is fun and it’s right there and you can do something. I enjoy it.)
* Participant Demographic Information – Pseudonym, Age, Role, Location (Barry, mid 60s, volunteer president of community garden). Barry is the president of an established community garden in Victoria.)
* Interpreting a Quote – Describe an example from your data that typifies this pattern (By contrasting and comparing gardening to environmental protest, he is prefacing and justifying his story of adopting a different approach to politics – one that is fun and devoid of conflict.)
* Generalizing across sample – Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Personal enjoyment is a strong sub-theme (expressed by 41/48 supporters of small-p politics) of the congenial nature of small-p politics that stands out in Barry’s comments, especially when contrasted with traditional politics, which is understood and experienced as both exhausting and ineffective. Participants argue that pursuing social change through pleasurable pathways is both feasible and preferable to traditional political action. In describing the pleasurable aspects of small-p politics, we mean the visceral enjoyment of locally produced food and the pleasant experience of engaging in politics that does not demand confronting others. )
* Participant Demographic Information – Pseudonym, Age, Role (Karen, a 60-year-old in Edmonton who runs a social enterprise that employs low-income female immigrants to make preserves from discarded fruit)
* Introducing the significance of a quote – Describe an example from your data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Karen … conveys the belief that her work has a political component but she no longer wants to challenge power. When asked why that is, she answers:)
* Quote (You know what? If you want an honest answer, I’m too old and I’m too tired and I have danced the dance. I’m a social worker and I have advocated all of my life and I don’t want to do that anymore. I just want to play. I’ve been a groundbreaker a number of times and it is hard; it’s emotionally hard. It takes real commitment and I don’t want to do it anymore.)
* Interpreting a quote – Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Like Barry, Karen’s political imaginary encompasses a continuum of civic action; she emphasizes that the two ends of this continuum can be informed by the same principles, but they feel differently, they do not produce the same tactics, and they may not pursue the same ends. Karen expands on this:)
* Quote (Our goals are still the same, we work towards ... equality; feeding people; being concerned about the environment; healthy and local foods – for all, not just those with money; continuing and teaching old traditions of food preservation as well as the attitude that we can be more self sufficient in terms of food; and creating local jobs through the creation of a small local business . . . If these actions and plans create political change or contribute to some bigger plan, then it is ‘all good’. If not, we will continue to make jam . . .)
* Creating link with previous research – Generalizing beyond sample – Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Karen’s reflections illuminate a key element of a small-p politics: like Poppendieck’s (1999) middle-class volunteers who enjoyed their work at food banks, practitioners of small-p politics seek out activist practices that are personally meaningful and pleasurable.)
* Briefly explain how this subtheme links to the overall theme (Although they may still hold onto broad socio-ecological goals, they have relatively modest expectations for how to achieve those goals through their activism. Put differently, small-p politics puts greater weight on the means of engagement than the end of engagement.)
* Creating link with previous research (Eat-local activists see political activity as relatively multi-faceted. Our participants’ imaginaries convey their view that civic engagement involves both direct action and lifestyle movements (Adams and Raisborough 2010; Haenfler et al. 2012).)
* Generalizing Across Sample – Explain how this subtheme links to the overall theme – may include developing/enhancing overall theme (They link direct action to political change and describe this work as arduous and ineffective. In contrast, they associate non-traditional politics with cultural change, achieved by demonstrating alternatives. An important justification for this latter approach is that it feels good. As evidenced by the fact that each of our participants prefaced a description of their engagement practices by conjuring up the contentious politics model, this end of the engagement continuum apparently looms large in the collective imagination. Nonetheless, it is small-p politics that dominates the landscape of community-based eat-local initiatives we observed; the positive emotions associated with this form of engagement provide a kind of fuel and nourishment for local food activists.)

Sub-theme 2: Small-p politics: Convivial social action

* Connection between two subthemes (One of the reasons that small-p politics feels good is because it is productive of a diverse array of (often unlikely) alliances)
* Generalizing across Sample – Subtheme Statement (The dimension of conviviality captures our participants’ sense that groups can achieve more through alliance-building than contention because of the productive partnerships that may emerge across state, market and civic spheres)
* Generalizing across Sample – Quote – Subtheme Statement – Describe an example from your data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Participants understand local food politics to be ‘the movement everyone loves’ (male farmer, early 40s, Toronto) and view this popularity as a marker of success.)
* Generalizing across Sample – Subtheme Statement (Most participants who endorsed small-p politics emphasized the virtue of conviviality (44/48).)
* Describe an example from your data that typifies the pattern under discussion – Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (As Damion, a 34-year-old social entrepreneur in Toronto, explains, ‘there is a new sort of politics where people are engaged’. Damion later elaborates on his reference to ‘people’ as inferring a range of actors, from social entrepreneurs, to community gardeners, to elected representatives from across the political spectrum. When asked what engages ‘people’, his comments resonate with Sarah’s and Barry’s statements from above, describing ineffective politics as a site where people only discuss what is wrong with the world, where they offer no good news, and where people focus on large-scale system change by collective challenging corporate power and corrupt governments – in short, critiquing repertoires of contention. Damion describes an approach that represents the sort of message he uses: “ There are a lot of politics involved with environmentalism. I can get food politics on the agenda where those environmental issues are so entrenched in politics and activism. I can bring people to any food event and people get inspired in that space. Somebody tweeted after one of the last events, ‘If you’re feeling doubt about the state of the world, go spend an evening in a room with food activists or social entrepreneurs and see what they’re doing.’” Damion describes food-related civic action as a site that is structured from the inside and the outside as one of conviviality. The assets of aligning movement goals with a wide array of interests are evaluated against confrontational and divisive approaches that are seen as antithetical to engaging allies and thus ineffective for changing the food system.)
* Caveats and clarifications identify any key exceptions to or variations to the overall patterns, and if possible, offer an explanation for these exceptions/variations (Some participants drew from personal experiences to demonstrate that repertoires of contention are ineffective in the realm of local food politics while others supported contention and conviviality but preferred convivial politics.)
* Variable Pattern 1 – Describe an example from your data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Exemplifying the former, Bob (42 years old, government employee) recounts using economic benefits as a common ground to create a convivial approach to food system change. Offhand, we asked him whether he thought a local food system would be better than a globalized industrial food system and he grew very agitated: No, no, no. That’s the wrong mindset to take. That’s what creates ‘we’ and ‘they’. We have to get beyond the ‘versus’ conversation because it creates ... [shakes fists]. Two and a half years ago, when I started this path to recruit people onto my team, that door was getting shut because as soon as I would mention local food I was presenting it as an alternative, either/ or. I realized my language and the wording wasn’t approaching it correctly . . . You have to describe it as a complementary system. It’s about both of them existing together and one will not replace the other. Both of them are market opportunities.)
* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern
* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Bob’s comments suggest that some convivial approaches build alliances at the expense of pursuing more radical changes (e.g., altering perverse subsidies to corporate agriculture, tackling unjust working conditions for farm labourers).)
* Variable Pattern 2 – Describe an example from your data that typifies the pattern under discussion (In contrast, consider the case of Alana, a mixed-race woman in her 30s who works for a local farm in Toronto. She maintained an appreciation for activist work done to change policy and institutions, but personally prioritized convivial politics, relationships, and tangible outcomes: I don’t look at [change] happening though the activist side of politics. I’m interested, I think, in more of the tangible qualities of food and people’s relationships with food and connecting to people, land and farmers. Those kinds of interpersonal relationships [mean more to me] than maybe the institutional side or the government.)
* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (She touches on an important dimension of convivial politics: it involves change you can see and feel. Lobbying for a policy that may never be adopted, and whose effects may never be seen, is less immediate than seeing people who form a meaningful relationship along short supply chains.)
* Generalizing Across Sample (Participants expressed disquiet about the environmental and social problems generated by the conventional food system, and acted on their concern by engaging in a way that would avoid the ‘door getting shut’, based on their experience that repertoires of contention would close that door or their sense that convivial politics results in tangible change.)
* Generalizing Beyond Sample (As others (Broad 2016; Obach 2015) have described, alternative food initiatives focus less on opposing industrial food production and more on offering tastier, healthier, ‘greener’, or otherwise ethically superior food alternatives.)
* Generalizing Across Sample (Our participants make clear that this approach is effective for creating a welcoming environment where actors from diverse backgrounds and organizational affiliations are comfortable working together toward common goals. We see this pattern replicated in the structure of food councils across the country.)

Sub-theme 3: Small-p politics: prioritizing pragmatic tactics

* Quote / Provide a brief fieldnote, interview, or other data excerpt (There is no easy solution or perfect solution to fix the food system. I think all that we can do is try to be as aware as possible and try to make very conscious choices in how we spend our money. I am always resistant to anything that gets too hard and fast in terms of ideology. I believe that we have to be pragmatic in our approaches to change. (Paul, 40 years old, former elected representative of municipal government))
* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern – Generalizing Across Sample (Paul conveys a pragmatist view commonly held amongst food activists (40/48 proponents of small-p politics stressed the virtues of pragmatic goals): there are complex problems in our current food system, but the most effective path to addressing those problems is to first accept that there is no easy solution.)
* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (He then shifts his argument to what is possible – making a personal decision to spend money consciously and modelling an alternative in the hopes that others will follow suit. This pragmatic approach is conducive to achieving many laudable ‘wins’ (e.g., getting a new farmers’ market established, forming a food policy council, saving community gardens from development))
* Author Critique of Interviewees (but those wins do not necessarily translate into advances for food justice nor into challenges to the industrial food system.)
* Generalizing Across Sample – Sub theme (2nd level – I.e., what forms does “pragmatic” social activism take? Answer: individualistic approaches) (The myriad problems associated with the conventional food system are not unknown to the leaders with whom we interacted. Yet while cognizant and troubled by challenges like perverse government subsidies, unjust labor laws for migrant farm workers, pesticide-use on industrial farms, and the oftenprohibitive cost of healthy food and locally grown food, few participants raised these issues when asked how they believed the food system ought to be reformed. Instead, they were more likely to argue that the essential practice to sustain engagement with food system issues was to encourage consumers to shop more conscientiously. Talk of food system solutions often involved the implicit assumption that the complex problems associated with conventional food production could be overcome if consumers spent their money ethically. The pragmatic and everyday nature of the approaches used to achieve food system change coalesces in relatively individualistic and incremental models of social change)
* Participant demographic information/description (Nikki, speaking below, is a retired Japanese-Canadian woman in her 60s who lives in Victoria. She is an active community gardener, growing much of her own food for the year and donating excess to charity; she also gives free workshops on seed-saving and organic gardening because she believes access to nutritious food is unjustly distributed.)
* Provide a brief fieldnote, interview, or other data excerpt (Below, Nikki articulates her model of political change: “I’m a doer more than a talker. I like to live what I believe. I don’t really believe in just talking about ideology. I believe in food and the relationship between food and my own body and everything else in this environment and I want to live that belief, I want to practice it. . .. For change to happen, we don’t have to make a big impact on lots of people, but if we can change two people, that is pretty good. You don’t have to become a big nuisance to other people.”)
* Generalizing Across Sample (The pragmatic orientation of small-p politics is exemplified by an individualized approach to change and a focus on problems that can be solved. Broader concerns (such as class-based access to nutritious food) still exist, and the practitioner’s involvement in seeking change provides evidence of those concerns. The exhortations to ‘just get involved somehow’ represents a normative standard affirming that efforts to solve a problem by altering one’s own practices are ethically superior to demanding change from more powerful actors. This pragmatic scope influences the tone and direction of small-p politics: a concern for broader issues and active engagement in civic life exist alongside a sentiment that doing something is better than doing nothing but talking about the ills of the current food system.)
* Generalizing Across Sample – Sub theme (2nd level – I.e., what forms does “pragmatic” social activism take? Answer: individualistic approaches) (Our participants’ comments reflect a sense that cultural change – demonstrating alternative food production and consumption practices – is not only more pleasurable, as discussed earlier, but also more feasible than political change.)
* Participant Information (David, a 41-year-old farmer who lives outside of Toronto)
* Provide a brief fieldnote, interview, or other data excerpt (David, a 41-year-old farmer who lives outside of Toronto articulates a statement in keeping with this pragmatic, individualized, and incremental approach: It became clear to me that if I wanted to make a difference in the world that it starts with me being the healthiest person in the world. It meant that the most important responsibility in trying to be of service in the world is to be the healthiest me I can be. I kind of have a poem that kind of guides me, which is that from one seed, an entire orchard can grow so I shall be the healthiest seed I can be.)
* Generalizing Across Sample (Thus, Nikki aims to change two people, and Paul and David aim to be more conscious consumers in their own lives and to model that for others. Again, we see that challenging people’s consumption patterns is deemed in line with small-p politics – challenging elite power, however, is out of sync with the ideal of small-p politics. This is a politics of pragmatism – setting realistic goals, seeking change at the most manageable level (individual consumers), and using non-confrontational tactics to achieve goals through altering cultural practices at a small scale)

## *Poetics* – Baumann et al. 2022 – Analysis (4,060 words)

Overall Title of Analysis Sections: Findings

Subsection: Identification of Food Orientations and their demographic Correlates (“4.1”)

* Research Question (In this section we address our first two research questions regarding the existence of aesthetic and moral orientations toward food, and the demographic correlates of those orientations.)
* Subtheme introduction (Our first model is a latent class analysis with no covariates, which allows us to identify dominant food orientations. As mentioned above, based on the eight survey items relating to food aesthetics and food ethics, we find that our respondents’ orientations toward food reflect distinct positions characterized across four latent classes (the model selection procedure is described in the appendix): pragmatism, aestheticism, moralism, and moral aestheticism. Fig. 1 presents the deviation from the mean for each of the eight questions we use to identify the food orientations, by latent class..)
* Analytical Strategy (Like with other inductive pattern-finding procedures, latent class analysis requires an interpretive move to characterize the nature of the groupings it produces. We based our interpretation of the LCA groupings on a reading of the commonalities and differences in mean responses to the questions, but also based on our knowledge of people’s food orientations, especially regarding meat, gained through our focus group data. Below we flesh out the nature of the four classes through drawing on the LCA results and focus group data together. We use our analyses not to definitively identify participants as belonging to a specific category of consumer, but rather to characterize the positiontaking that is represented by each latent class. Underscoring this argument, we often found that focus group participants could hold opinions and ideas that were in tension or even contradictory, reflecting shifts across orientations. Nonetheless, these opinions and ideas could be matched with the orientations represented by the latent classes.)
* Subtitle (4.1.1. Pragmatism)
	+ What is the subtheme? (Our first class captures an orientation toward food and meat that has little interest in either aesthetic or moral properties (see Fig. 1).)
	+ Describe an example from your data that typifies the pattern under discussion (This orientation is represented by scores below the sample mean on all items.)
	+ What is the subtheme? (Given its lack of connection with aesthetic and moral concerns, we label the position-taking here as pragmatism. This is distinct from the tradition of pragmatist sociology and is instead intended to reflect a practical, “no-nonsense” approach to consumption.)
	+ Describe an example from your data that typifies the pattern under discussion (The pragmatism orientation reflects 29.4% of the survey sample, which is the largest of the four classes. Table 1 presents the results of our second model, a latent-class analysis including demographic covariates, which contributes to our description of the four classes. Compared to the overall sample, pragmatism is an orientation that is more likely to be held when people have lower income, lower inherited cultural capital, lower educational attainment, and more conservative politics. Each successively older age group is more likely to be associated with pragmatism, and holding this position is negatively associated with being Asian and female. To help interpret the log odds, the coefficient for the gender. Although our focus groups were not designed to study the pragmatist orientation to meat, we did identify some attitudes and beliefs articulated by participants that reflected this impulse.)
	+ What is the subtheme? (The pragmatist perspective is not concerned with either aesthetic or moral properties of meat, focusing instead on the values of being filling, tasty, and for having been a traditional family staple. Overall, we could describe the pragmatist perspective on meat-eating as relatively uninterested in the particularities of meat’s provenance, ethics, or gourmet elaborations.)
	+ Describe an example from your data that typifies the pattern under discussion – with excerpt (The pragmatist perspective emerged in certain moments of focus groups. For example, in a Vancouver focus group, Max Easton, a 39-year-old white man with a trade school diploma described his favorite meat, bacon, in a way that focused on its general taste with little attention to aesthetic or moral concerns: “I know this is such a low cut of meat, but I love bacon. Bacon, bacon, bacon. Give me all the bacon. Like, ‘Can I put bacon with that?’” Interestingly, Max holds this position while openly acknowledging that bacon isn’t a particularly high-status food.)
	+ Describe an example from your data that typifies the pattern under discussion (While a pragmatist perspective came through episodically in our focus group discussions (e.g., a brief but happy mention of veal, or bacon, or grocery-store meat), occasionally it was strongly pronounced within a single participant’s general perspective on meateating. This perspective made the participant stand out in a focus group studying conscientious omnivores, where most group members had significant reservations and concerns about eating meat. For example, in one Vancouver focus group, Mindy Cabello, 38year-old Southeast Asian woman with a Bachelor’s degree, seemed a bit out of place in a focus group of conscientious omnivores. At the outset of the group interview, we asked everyone to share their favorite meat-based meals and to offer a label to describe their approach to meat-eating. Mindy’s answers contrasted with the general tone in the group (hesitant about meat-eating). In response to the question about her favorite meat-based meal, she said, “I love pork. And anything that has pork in it, I’m there.” While others described quite detailed accounts about particular cuts of meat, Mindy was not as discerning in her consumption habits as portrayed in her focus group contributions. While the other women in the focus group commented on the emotional complexities of eating meat, Mindy stated succinctly, “I don’t feel guilty about eating meat.” Perhaps even more telling, when asked for a label to describe her diet, Mindy says, “If I’m hungry, I eat whatever I want to eat.”)
	+ What is the sub-theme? (Overall, the pragmatist impulse is centered around a relatively uncomplicated and undiscerning enjoyment of meat.)
* Subtitle (4.1.2. Aestheticism)
	+ What is the subtheme? (We label our second class “aestheticism” because this position is characterized by a very strong interest in the aesthetic properties of food. At the same time, taking the aestheticist position corresponds with less engagement with ethical concerns.)
	+ Describe an example from your data that typifies the pattern under discussion (In Fig. 1 we see that those taking the aestheticist position score far above the sample mean for identifying as a “foodie,” seeking out ethnic foods, avoiding chain restaurants, and feeling comfortable eating foie gras. In contrast, this position belies weak attachment to the ethical properties of meat.)
	+ What is the subtheme? (In contrast, this position belies weak attachment to the ethical properties of meat.)
	+ Describe an example from your data that typifies the pattern under discussion (From Table 1, aestheticism is more likely to be held by those who identify as Asian, with a higher household income, with being politically conservative, and with engagement with the arts as a child. It is also negatively associated with identifying as a woman.)
	+ What is the subtheme? – Generalizing Beyond Sample (The combination of position-taking toward food and sociodemographic characteristics suggests that this class reflects traditionally high cultural capital tastes, in a Bourdieusian sense.)
	+ Describe an example from your data that typifies the pattern under discussion (This class represents the position taking of 24.4% of the sample.)
	+ Describe an example from your data that typifies the pattern under discussion [there are some other things going on here, like generalizing across sample, but overall, this is a set of examples that typify the pattern under discussion] (We saw many responses in our focus groups that we would categorize as expressing aestheticism. When asked to describe her orientation to meat in a Toronto focus group, Selena, a 30-year-old white woman with a postgraduate degree, called herself a “tasteatarian”, meaning somebody who prioritized meat when it added “something really good, flavor-wise”. In Vancouver, Cameron Sawyer, a 35-year-old, mixed race chef with a college certificate, exemplified aestheticism in his comment: “I like to play with meat”. He elaborated: “You can smoke it, you can cure it, you can braise it, you can do many, many different types of things to it.” These aesthetic properties are what is “alluring” for Cameron about meat. Unlike those who reflect moralism and moral aestheticism, those who take the aestheticist position value the “hunt” for meat. As Cameron said, “I will drive across the city to get good meat if it comes down to it. I will sacrifice convenience for quality every time.”)
	+ What is the sub-theme? – Briefly explain how an example represents a larger pattern/sub-theme (For the aestheticist position, moral concerns are not central for motivating meat consumption preferences, and do not play a dominant role in differentiating between meat that tastes “good” or “bad”. While those who espouse aestheticism are aware of the market for ethical meat, they often dismiss these products as being too expensive, and/or a secondary concern in the pursuit of great taste.)
	+ Describe an example from your data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, Dahlia, a 55-year-old Iranian-Canadian woman with a Bachelor’s degree, described how she had purchased an ethically-certified version of grocery store meat, but wouldn’t buy it again because she didn’t think it tasted as good as regular meat. In another instance, Sandra Appleton, a 34-year-old white woman with a Master’s degree told us that although she tries to pay attention to the provenance of meat, she finds that, “a lot of the ethically-raised meat is just super expensive.” Even those who are happy to pay top dollar for a quality piece of meat, tell us that morals are not a central consideration when pursuing something really delicious. Dan Miller, a 50-year-old white man with a bachelor’s degree told the group he would be unlikely to care about the ethics behind a burger. In his words, “It doesn’t make a difference for me [whether a burger is ethical or not]. If I’m choosing fast food, I really don’t care, because I know it’s probably not great anyway.”)
	+ What is the sub-theme? – Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (While a moral orientation involves strict guidelines about where to source meats, aestheticism is oriented toward the truest expression of a genre (e.g., the best junky hamburger) over the moral properties of meat.)
* Subtitle (4.1.3. Moralism)
	+ Literature Conflict (Whereas a traditional understanding of high cultural capital tastes prioritizes aesthetic preferences,)
	+ What is the sub-theme? (our analyses point to the existence of a parallel orientation focused on the moral properties of food. Moralism describes a position toward food and meat wherein aesthetic preferences are secondary to moral concerns)
	+ Describe an example from your data that typifies the pattern under discussion (23.3% of the survey sample reflects this orientation. In Fig. 1, we see that moralism is characterized by responses that are below the sample mean on all of the aesthetic items, but above the sample means on all items that indicate concern for ethical issues in food, and meat in particular. We see in Table 1 that moralism is much more likely to be expressed by females (32% more likely based on the odds ratio (not shown)), Moralism is more likely to reflect the preferences of younger respondents and less likely to be held by those with a high income.)
	+ Literature Consistency (an observation that is consistent with existing literature (Kalof et al. 1999).)
	+ What is the subtheme? – Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Amongst our focus group participants, the moralist motivation is most often motivated by concerns about animal welfare and the environmental impacts of meat.)
	+ Describe an example from your data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Yasir, a 31-year-old male with a postgraduate degree (who had been a vegetarian in the past), saw a clear tension between eating meat and being pro-environmental: “I love eating meat and anything in it, but I also aspire to be an environmentalist and I know that meat production is one of the largest producers of greenhouse gases”. Others saw an ethics/pleasure contradiction in terms that focused on their care and concern for animals. For instance, Hailey Merksburg is a 42-year-old white woman with a Master’s degree who eats very little meat and feels guilty about eating animals: “I have very mixed feelings about eating pigs because they’re so intelligent and sweet.” Grant Davies, a 50-year-old, straight white man with a law degree spoke to the environmental impacts of meat. Describing what influences his meat choices, Grant said, “environmental reasons are my main one after health”.)
	+ What is the subtheme? – Generalizing Across Sample– Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Although those taking a moralist position toward meat describe relatively strict ethical standards, this does not mean that they always eat meat in line with these preferences. What was common, however, were the expressions of guilt among those with a moralist orientation when recounting moments that they felt were transgressions from their ideals. Eating meat is complex emotional terrain in the moralist impulse.)
* Subtheme (4.1.4. Moral Aestheticism)
	+ Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Our final latent class is moral aestheticism … expressed by 22.95% of the sample)
	+ What is the subtheme? (a position strongly prioritizing foods’ aesthetic and moral properties)
	+ Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (We can see in Fig. 1 that this class is above the sample mean on all aesthetic items. At the same time, this class is also above the mean on all of the items measuring ethical imperatives regarding food. The question about being comfortable eating foie gras works well to distinguish our classes. While aestheticism is most at ease with foie gras, and moralism is least comfortable with foie gras, moral aestheticism is an intermediate orientation, reflecting an aesthetic appreciation but also a degree of moral rejection. From Table 1, we see that this orientation is strongly associated with women (those holding the moral aestheticist position are more likely to be female (32% more likely), high household income, childhood arts exposure, and moderate and high educational attainment, with this orientation being 39% more likely to have the highest level of educational attainment. Moral aestheticism is negatively associated with political conservatism and with age, with the oldest age group 43% less likely to have this orientation)
	+ Generalizing Beyond Sample (We note in these data a reflection of a dominant trope of the “cultural elite,” where moral aestheticism is reflected among younger, politically liberal, highly-educated, wealthier people.)
	+ Analytical Strategy (Our focus group data allow us to paint a richer picture of this orientation to food.)
	+ What is the subtheme? (Moral aestheticism involves an embodied
	+ orientation to meats that satisfy culturally-consecrated criteria for aesthetic sophistication and morality)
	+ Analytical Strategy (These criteria are dynamic and constantly evolving, but here, we draw from our focus groups to identify the aesthetic and ethical properties of meat that appeal to our conscientious omnivore participants.)
	+ Second Order Subthemes (We note three interconnected themes: first, we observe that an important distinction among the moral aestheticist orientation is the inseparability of these two elements. To be aesthetically satisfactory, meat has to be perceived to meet certain moral standards. And our participants use some symbolic signposts to evaluate the extent to which they could trust that a meat product was truly “moral”, for instance, preferring a high-end butcher shop over a more generic shopping experience. Second, we note that in contrast to moralism, moral aestheticism is characterized by quite fluid boundaries between “moral” and “immoral” meats. In other words, the list of meats that this class might consider to be ethical is far more substantial than within moral aestheticism. And third, we comment on some of the characteristics of meat that can imbue a product with moral consecration.)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 1 – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (To illustrate our first point, we draw on Vancouver focus group participant Katie Szymanski, a 38-year-old white woman with a Master’s degree. Throughout the focus group, she spoke about her connections in the food industry, from friends who run a CSA (Community-Supported Agriculture), to friends who run a farm-to-table restaurant. Katie follows food influencers on social media, takes pride in having omnivorous food tastes, and conveys the importance of eating delicious food. But Katie also alluded to the role that morals play in distinguishing the delicious from the unpalatable. For example, in describing her love of bacon, Katie told the group, “I love bacon!”, but then qualifies this by describing her discomfort with knowing about issues in how pigs are raised and processed. She explains that this is, “a conscious thought for me”. Katie resolves these tensions by seeking out bacon that satisfies certain ethical criteria: “if it’s ethical, and it was sustainable, and they were taken care of, and they weren’t put into a situation that’s a mass market, then I’m more likely to be okay with eating it. And it tastes better to me.” This excerpt illuminates a key trait of moral aestheticism—the inseparability of aesthetic and moral priorities. It also points to some elements that participants used to characterize “ethical” meats: a smaller scale of production, a shorter supply chain, and evidence that the producer took “care” raising the animal.)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 2 – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Our second theme stresses the flexibility in defining meat as moral that is characteristic of the moral aestheticism orientation. Ethical meat is meat that the consumer believes offers higher standards in terms of sustainability and animal welfare, especially when compared with conventional grocery-store meat. These flexible, process-related criteria mean that there is a wide range of meat products that can potentially be ethically-satisfactory. Participants who align more strongly with moralism have more clear-cut boundaries between ethical and unethical meats (e.g., veal can never be ethical), but those who endorse moral aestheticism conveyed an openness to classifying diverse meat products as ethical, depending on the level of awareness and attention to detail in the meat production process. Katie spoke about foie gras specifically, referring to the strict boundaries among ethical eaters and contrasting this with her own flexible approach. Referring to foie gras, she said, “That’s always been such a huge thing with vegetarians and vegans.” Now that some in the industry are responding to those concerns though, Katie argued, “they’re saying, ‘no, this is actually ethical foie gras. We haven’t stuffed the ducks with the food and we’re treating them well, and they’re out on the farm.’” For Katie, an ethically-problematic food like foie gras can be rendered morally acceptable through a reassertion of the producers’ attention to the care of animals as well as the small scale of production.)
	+ Second Order Theme 3 – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (The third theme is closely connected to the previous theme because it deals with degrees of moral consecration. Rather than the flexible nature of that consecration, this third point focuses on the signals that people attend to in understanding moral consecration. One common signal of moral consecration among those who reflect moral aestheticism concerns the qualities of the person selling the meat. For Ella, a 30-year-old white Toronto focus group participant with a postgraduate degree, the defining qualities she attributes to her local Italian butcher shop – “Mom & Pop”, “humble” – allow her to classify the meat she buys there as moral and “sustainable”, even though this old-fashioned local butcher shop has no explicit claims to selling sustainable meat beyond a vague assurance of sourcing “the highest quality” meat from local farmers. Although Ella later acknowledges in the interview that she doesn’t think all meat from a butcher is “pure”, she sees shopping at a butcher shop as a way to get meat that is directly connected to a presumed ethical producer: “I think I just feel better going to a butcher and being quite confident that it’s a one-link to a farmer”. Her fellow-focus group participant, Serena agrees with this butcher-focused perspective, saying, “At least they’re [the butcher] hitting that mark of the, that your final person in your supply chain is the small business within your community.” Retailers’ characteristics were a common signal for assessing moral consecration, and other signals included labels and certification standards (e.g., organic, grass-fed), as well as perceptions of a small-scale, family operation.)

Sub-section (4.2. Beyond the Domain of Food)

* Research Question (Our third research question asks about the transposability of orientations to food beyond this specific domain. To what extent are aestheticism and moralism in food reflective of broader orientations toward cultural consumption?)
* Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Results in Table 2, below, present the results of a three-step process ending in regression analyses where class membership predicts high cultural capital dispositions. To reiterate, cases in the sample are assigned class membership to one of the four latent classes and using a correction procedure for measurement error class membership predicts high cultural capital aestheticism and moralism in realms outside food. We see that the orientations toward aesthetics and morals that each class holds toward food are, for the most part, mirrored in their orientations toward high-status aesthetics and high-status moral positions beyond food. People who hold the pragmatism orientation to food reported lower-than-average scores on the variables measuring both HCC aestheticism and HCC moralism. People taking the moralism orientation report lower-than-average scores on HCC aestheticism, and higher-than-average scores on HCC moralism. The aestheticism orientation is the inverse of the moralism position: members of this class report higher scores on HCC aestheticism and lower scores on HCC moralism. Finally, those taking the moral aestheticism position on food have higher-than-average scores on both HCC aestheticism and HCC moralism.)
* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (As the highest-status orientation, this extension of the valuing of high-status aesthetics and moral stances to cultural realms beyond food reveals an important fact—namely, the broad cultural relevance of the simultaneous valuing of HCC aesthetics and HCC moralism among higher status people)

Subsection (4.3. Symbolic and Social Boundaries)

* State your argument (We argue that higher status individuals prefer culture that is both aesthetically and morally consecrated.)
* Literature PROVIDING CONCEPT (Past work on cultural consumption argues that classed aesthetic preferences are socially significant because they are the basis for symbolic boundaries, which can manifest as social boundaries (Lamont and Molna ́r 2002).)
* Research Question (If moral consecration is an important criterion shaping high-status cultural consumption, then we should also see evidence that moral consecration can serve as the basis for symbolic boundaries and social boundaries.)
* What is the subtheme? (To address our final research question, in this section we present evidence from our survey and focus group data to demonstrate that these positions are strongly linked to the symbolic boundaries that people draw and the social boundaries they live with.)
* Analytical Strategy (We used indicators of specifically moral boundaries regarding meat eating. In this analysis we use latent class membership as the predictor in logistic regression models.)
* Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (In Table 3 we see that pragmatism is significantly negatively associated with holding either type of boundary. In contrast, moralism is significantly positively associated with holding both a symbolic and social boundary. Aestheticism is, like pragmatism, significantly less likely to be associated with holding a symbolic or social boundary. Moral aestheticism stands out as the orientation that is most likely to hold these boundaries; nearly 80% more likely than the rest of the sample to hold the symbolic boundary and 70% less likely to hold the social boundary. In this analysis, moral aestheticism and pragmatism represent opposite ends of a spectrum regarding drawing moral boundaries.)
* Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Our focus group participants mentioned at various points perceptions about food and status that confirm what we found in our survey. There were many evocative examples, and we share two here. The first illustrates how our participants evaluated people who buy low-cost, conventionally-produced meat and the second example showcases judgments of people who purchase ethical meat. Cameron, quoted earlier, told the focus group that he would never buy meat from Walmart, but that because he lives near the store, he will, on occasion, “go in there and get toilet paper and whatnot and then I’ll kind of cruise through the food aisles just to check it out.” What stood out to him is that when the store has, “whole chicken specials, for maybe like $6 a chicken”, he sees, “this energy in people’s eyes. They just, like, go after it.” Cameron told us, “for me, I’m personally horrified. It’s literally a no-label chicken just wrapped up. I wouldn’t touch it with a 10-foot pole.” But he clearly distinguished himself from, “a large majority of the population that thinks they’re getting a deal because it’s like, ‘Oh, I’m getting a $6 chicken.’” Another participant, Max Easton, argued, “Well, they are getting a deal.” Cameron disagreed. He said, “For me, that person is—I don’t want to say unintelligent...” Participant Palmer Lacey, a 34-year-old Southeast Asian man offered: “Unconscious?” “Exactly!”, Cameron exclaimed. He continued, “They’re unconscious consumers that maybe have come from a family that doesn’t care about food or what-have-you. So, to their minds, they’re thinking this deal is getting them better meat.” But Max pressed him: “Maybe they’re just poor.” Cameron countered, “Yeah, maybe. But the thing is, even if I’m poor, I’m still going to find an ethical way to... I’m not going to feed my kid shitty food.” The boundaries Cameron draws based on whether or not someone buys a $6 chicken are only partly socioeconomic. He also imputes these shoppers’ competence and moral worth from their purchases, distinguishing himself in the process. Many of our participants’ evaluations of people who buy ethical meat were strikingly different—commenting on those consumers’ higher-order concerns and values. For example, a Vancouver-based focus group included several people who work at an ethical butcher and expressed an orientation towards moral aestheticism. One participant, Bonnie Schraeder, is a 37-year-old who manages the shop. When we asked Bonnie if she could characterize the patrons of her store, she told us there are three categories: “One is for taste, they just want quality.” It sounds as though Bonnie is referencing those who take the aestheticist position toward meat. The second, she said, is concerned with health, which reflects research showing that being health conscious is commonly perceived as a morally-valued lifestyle (Crawford 2006). And the final category includes, “people who care”, which she explained is expressed by their concerns for, “the environment, [and] the animal.” The phrase, “people who care” is a stamp of moral approval. Bonnie’s comments indicate a symbolic boundary that casts ethical meat eaters as having moral qualities that Cameron’s $6 Walmart chicken buyers lack.)

State your argument

Identify 2-3 supporting points – how your data support your argument

Identify 2-3 patterns in the data that provide evidence for each supporting point

For each pattern:

Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion

Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern

Provide a brief fieldnote, interview, or other data excerpt

Explain how this subtheme links to the overall theme – may include developing/enhancing overall theme [TB addition]

Caveats and clarifications identify any key exceptions to or variations to the overall patterns, and if possible, offer an explanation for these exceptions/variations

Enriching, deepening, fleshing out, growing, cultivating,

Note: Everything that you include in your analysis should be relevant to your argument, and that argument should be the answer to your research question. A clear structure (with topic sentences and transitions) is very important for writing an analysis that meets this goal.
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* Literature CONFLICT (Prior research on high-SES food tastes has identified authenticity and exoticism as highly valued food ideals (Johnston and Baumann, 2015), yet the first stage of our data analysis revealed that these ideals were relatively minor concerns for low-SES respondents (see Appendix 2))
* Subtheme Introduction (Instead, low-SES respondents reported an alternate set of concerns and tastes when describing their aesthetic food preferences. These tastes are grouped into four categories: (1) tastes of abundance, (2) a taste for corporate brands, (3) a taste for familiar ‘‘ethnic’’ foods, and (4) a taste for ‘‘healthy’’ foods.)
* Literature CONSISTENCY and Literature CONFLICT (While the first taste category is strongly aligned with Bourdieu’s concept of a taste of necessity, the latter three have a more complex relationship with this concept.)
* Comprehensiveness and/or Contradiction (We put forward these categories of tastes as part of a conceptual taste typology and not as a descriptive list of each (or every) low-SES consumer’s taste preferences. As such, we recognize that a particular respondent may value one taste category more than another, and taste preferences may stand in contradiction (e.g. a taste for corporate foods may not always align with health preferences). This is in keeping with observations about high-status consumption which also exhibits contradictions (e.g. a taste for local foods contradicts a preference for exotic foods). We also recognize that our data cannot provide a comprehensive typology of all low-SES food preferences. Our findings instead represent the most salient categories that emerged in our data.)

Sub-theme 1 (A taste for abundance)

* Second Order Subtheme 1 (Low-SES Taste for Abundance)
	+ Literature CONSISTENCY (In keeping with Bourdieu’s (1984) work on tastes of necessity and Holt’s (1998) research (p. 11), we found a valuation of abundance among low-SES participants in relation to entertaining at home and eating out.)
	+ Generalizing Across Sample – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Respondents frequently used words such as ‘‘huge’’ and ‘‘big’’ to describe desirable dishes (e.g. a ‘‘big ham’’).)
	+ Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Norah Walters,4 a White5 low-SES mother, mentioned abundance in terms of quantity and variety. Describing a meal at home to impress a guest, she said, “You’d have bean salads, you’d have garden salads, you’d have pasta salads. You’d have several different types of meat . . . cooked several different ways. It’s just a little bit of everything . . . kind of like buffet style.” Brenda Voisey, a low-SES mother of Irish heritage, spoke of her entertaining preferences this way: ‘‘I like to serve it like a buffet style so people can help themselves...I always like to make lots because I like people to eat lots.’’ Allyou-can-eat buffet restaurants were also mentioned as favorites because of variety and quantity. Bai Voung, a low-SES Chinese mother who described normally having a small and sensitive stomach, seemed proud about her ability to ‘‘eat lots’’ on rare buffet visits. She set the scene: ‘‘The waitress is looking at us, ‘More?’ [and] I say, ‘Yeah come on bring more . . . just keep on bringing it’.’’)
* Second Order Subtheme 2 (Midand high-SES focus on aesthetics over abundance)
	+ Second Order Subtheme (Midand high-SES participants also wanted to make sure people were well-fed, especially when entertaining, but there was a greater focus on aesthetics than quantity.)
	+ Not Generalizing – Individual Example – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, Tina Payne, a White high-SES participant, said that her family typically serves the same kind of food to guests as they normally eat, but offer a more stylized presentation: “I think what we do differently [for guests] is the presentation. Trent has made these long boards with brass handles...[We’d serve] a special kind of arugula...or I’d probably get those tiny little peppers instead of the regular big bell peppers, and place it differently, asymmetrically.” Here, the small size, and therefore, unique appearance, of Tina’s ‘‘tiny little’’ peppers made them worthy of guests.)
	+ Generalizing Across Sample – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Mid-/high-SES participants also spoke about choosing small quantities of high-quality food over larger quantities of less desirable food. This was particularly evident in the talk of participants with a high degree of food knowledge, but limited economic capital.)
	+ Not Generalizing – Individual Example – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Tandy Price, a mid-SES college student and single mother, said she paid more for local tomatoes, even on a tight budget. In this case, the prioritization of quality over quantity is more deliberate because of financial constraints: ‘‘I just didn’t buy as many . . . [I] try to savour a few slices instead of a whole one.’’)
* What is the subtheme? – Generalizing Across Sample (In sum, there was a clear contrast between mid-/high-SES participants and lowSES participants in terms of attention to abundance. While low-SES participants emphasized quantity, size, and variety, particularly for special occasions, mid-/ high-SES participants emphasized quality and presentation, even at the expense of quantity. This suggests that low-SES food tastes are to some degree structured by tastes of necessity; in conditions of economic constraint, low-SES consumers exhibit a taste preference for meals that are hearty, ample, and abundant)
* Subtheme Introduction or Signposting (However, there is more to low-SES food preferences than a valuation of abundance. Below, we present three low-SES food tastes that suggest that the concept of ‘‘tastes of necessity’’ must be geographically and temporally contextualized and that ‘‘tastes of luxury’’ also have a structuring role.)

A taste for corporate brands

* What is the subtheme? (The second taste we observed among low-SES participants revolves around demand for what we call ‘‘corporate brands.’’ In brief, corporate brands are widely marketed foods mass-produced in a factory or chain restaurant according to rationalization criteria such as efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and predictability (Ritzer, 2004). They are well-known foods made by multinational food chains with large advertising budgets and broad distribution networks. Corporate foods have minimal geographic specificity and are generally ubiquitous; they can be found on highway billboards, television advertisements, big box stores, and fast-food courts. Examples of corporate brands include chain restaurants and food brands such as Subway, Coca-Cola, and Kellogg’s.)
* Generalizing Across Sample – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (There was a noticeable difference in the valuation of corporate brands in our sample. In answer to our query about what they would serve a guest they wanted to impress, virtually no mid-/high-SES participants mentioned corporate brands. In contrast, more than a quarter of low-SES participants did so.)
* Second Order Subtheme 1 (low-SES admiration of corporate food)
	+ Not Generalizing – Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, Naomi Williamson, a White low-SES mother, said that for an impressive meal, ‘‘I’d definitely buy dessert . . . that’s a good way to impress people . . . I would probably go to Dairy Queen or something and get one of the really nice cakes.’’ Similarly, when asked what side-dish her mother might serve to impress a guest, Nevada Wheeler, a 14-year-old living on social assistance with her mother, said ‘‘Some noodly type of thing, some [Knorr/Unilever brand] Sidekick type of thing.’’ Corporate food was also mentioned by Travis Patterson, a 17-year-old living on social assistance with his grandmother. When describing a meal to impress a guest, he said, ‘‘I’d probably go out somewhere...Like not to McDonald’s...If you want to impress, more classier right?...Like Swiss Chalet [a chain rotisserie chicken restaurant] or something.’’)
* Second Order Subtheme 2 (midand highSES denigration of corporate food)
	+ Literature CONSISTENCY – Second Order Subtheme Statement (The admiration of corporate food brands among low-SES participants stands in stark contrast to the common denigration of corporate foods we encountered among mid-/high-SES participants as part of their valuation of culinary authenticity (Johnston and Baumann, 2015: 68–69).)
	+ Third Order Subtheme: Cooking
		- Not Generalizing – Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, Therese Parsons, a White high-SES mother, described an experience where she cooked for friends who hosted her out-of-town visit. Below, she explains her disappointment when rummaging through their drawers, referencing the same brand (‘‘Sidekicks’’) that Nevada Wheeler considered impressive: “I pull out this drawer and it’s filled with . . . Sidekicks equivalent or you know Knorr be ́ chamel sauce. What is all that?! . . . If I need a be ́ chamel sauce, I will make it [from scratch].”)
	+ Third Order Subtheme: Restaurants
		- Not Generalizing – Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (A disdain for corporate foods also came out in mid-/high-SES participant talk about restaurants. Tammy Raikatuji, a mid-SES Japanese-Canadian participant, mentioned a general opposition to chain restaurants in her middle-class neighborhood and explained a specific campaign to shut down a local Swiss Chalet because ‘‘it was a corporation as opposed to locally owned.’)
		- Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Here, we again see a contrast between SES groups around a particular brand, one that was mentioned by a lowSES respondent as a ‘‘classy’’ place to take someone you want to impress.)
	+ Third Order Subtheme (Intergenerational Skills Transfer/Concerted Cultivation)
		- Third Order Subtheme Statement – Generalizing Across Sample (Many mid-/high-SES parents mentioned efforts to pass on culinary knowledge to children; the development of cooking skills was framed as a superior alternative to relying on corporate foods (e.g. homemade be ́chamel sauce vs ‘‘Sidekicks’’). Corporate foods were often framed as the antithesis of ‘‘good taste.’’)
		- Fourth Order Subtheme 1 – Literature CONSISTENCY (teach culinary skills to their children) (For highSES parents, especially, we noted a desire not only to teach culinary skills and connoisseurship (as in Holt, 1998: 16) but also to transmit an orientation toward corporate food as unpalatable.)
		- Fourth Order Subtheme 2 – Literature CONSISTENCY (teach connoisseurship to their children) (For highSES parents, especially, we noted a desire not only to teach culinary skills and connoisseurship (as in Holt, 1998: 16) but also to transmit an orientation toward corporate food as unpalatable.)
		- Fourth Order Subtheme 3 (teach their children that corporate food is unpalatable) (For highSES parents, especially, we noted a desire not only to teach culinary skills and connoisseurship (as in Holt, 1998: 16) but also to transmit an orientation toward corporate food as unpalatable.)
			* Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Therese Parsons, a White, high-SES mother, put it this way: “I don’t think I would get very much satisfaction from throwing fish sticks and McCain [frozen] fries on the table for my kids. I think I would feel like a terrible parent . . . and it would taste crappy also...[T]he kids wouldn’t like it [either]. *My* kids. We’ve worked very hard to expose the kids to good food and show them that it’s not that hard to make.)”
			* Literature CONSISTENCY – Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Therese establishes a symbolic boundary by distinguishing herself from mothers who, according to middle-class parameters about ‘‘proper’’ parenting (Parsons, 2014), do not set a good example and serve frozen fries.)
		- Literature CONSISTENCY – Generalizing Across Sample – Third Order Subtheme (intergenerational skills transfer) – Second Order Subtheme (midand highSES denigration of corporate food) (We are not suggesting that high-SES participants are more conscientious parents. Rather, it appears that high-SES consumers are more likely to have the time and knowledge to develop food skills,7 and they may also have more motivation to do so given the prestige of culinary knowledge in middle-class circles (Johnston and Baumann, 2015; Johnston et al., 2011; Parsons, 2014).)
* Generalizing Beyond Sample / Contextualizing (We see these findings as connected to the most significant developments of the past half century in the food system: corporatization, industrialization, industryconcentration, and globalization (e.g. Nestle, 2015; Winson, 2013). This system produces a wide range of relatively low-priced, mass-produced foods, especially compared to artisanal fare. While food costs constitute a relatively low proportion of Canadian consumers’ budgets (about 14%), many low-income consumers face food insecurity – a condition impacting more than 12% of Canadian households (Tarasuk et al., 2013).)
* Second Order Sub-theme 1 (Low-SES Admiration of Corporate food)
	+ Third Order Subtheme (Limited) – Generalizing Across Sample (It is not surprising then that our lowest income participants often spoke of being limited to cheap, corporate foods.)
		- Not Generalizing – Individual Example – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, Katherine Keating, a White, low-SES participant, mentioned that the only restaurant she could afford was Kentucky Fried Chicken on Tuesdays when a meal costs two dollars.)
	+ Third Order Subtheme (Familiarity) – Generalizing Across Sample (Food corporations’ large advertising budgets contribute to a familiarity that low-SES participants found important and can also be linked to budget concerns.)
		- Not Generalizing – Individual Example – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Naomi Williamson put it simply: ‘‘When I go to a restaurant, I wouldn’t want to waste my money on something I may not like.’’ She frequented the chain restaurant Swiss Chalet because ‘‘you always know what to expect.’’)
		- Third Order Subtheme restated – Literature CONSISTENCY (For low-SES groups, the search for exoticism common in mid-/high-SES groups is risky, even foolhardy. If money is spent on a meal that turns out to be unsatisfying or unpalatable, budgets may not allow a replacement (DeVault, 1991; Stead et al., 2004).)
* Second Order Sub-theme 2 (Midand HighSES Denigration of Corporate Food)
	+ Caveats and clarifications identify any key exceptions to or variations to the overall patterns, and if possible, offer an explanation for these exceptions/variations – Third Order Subtheme (Midand HighSES respondents still ate fast food) – Literature CONSISTENCY (Although higher SES interviewees minimized corporate food consumption in our interviews, we do not want to suggest that they never eat fast food (e.g. Dugan, 2013, Vikraman et al., 2015).)
* Second Order Sub-theme 1 (Low-SES Admiration of Corporate Food)
	+ Third Order Subtheme (classy/fancy corporate food) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (for lower SES respondents, certain fastfood chains were seen as fancy or ‘‘classy’’ – as in Travis’ suggestion above that Swiss Chalet is ‘‘classier’’ than McDonalds. This suggests that certain fast-food chains (e.g. fast-casual chains such as Chipotle) can possess status associations for low-SES groups and are valued because they provide familiar, low-risk options distinguishable from McDonald’s value-meals. Indeed, for some low-SES consumers, certain fast-food brands may symbolize inclusion within the cultural mainstream, especially in the face of other indicators of their marginalization)
* Generalizing Across Sample – Generalizing Beyond Sample – Literature CONSISTENCY (The low-SES taste for corporate foods suggests a significant intersection with a Bourdieusian ‘‘taste of necessity.’’ In addition to being inexpensive and familiar, corporate foods can operate as desirable food options for low-SES consumers. Branded corporate foods are not just what poor people can afford; they can be experienced as tasty, enjoyable, predictable, and appropriate for special occasions. In this way, taste and necessity overlap.)

Subtheme: A taste for familiar “ethnic” foods

* Subtheme (The third taste we observed among low-SES participants revolves around ‘‘ethnic foods.’’ The term ‘‘ethnic foods’’ problematically assumes a Euro-Canadian reference point, but is used here because of its widespread place in popular language.)
* Generalizing Across Sample (Many low-SES participants mentioned an ethnic dish or restaurant8 in answer to either or both of our first two target questions and focused primarily on what we call ‘‘familiar ethnic’’ foods (in contrast to mid-/high-SES valuation of culinary exoticism).)
* Defining or Clarifying a Concept (By ‘‘familiar ethnic’’ foods, we mean foods from an ethno-cultural context different from a participant’s own, but still familiar because (1) they contain ingredients common in the participant’s own culinary traditions and/or (2) because the cuisine in question has a well-established presence in Canada and is understood as relatively ‘‘normal.’’9 An example of a familiar ethnic food for most of our participants is Chinese chicken balls.10 Chinese immigration began in Canada more than 150 years ago, and although the majority of early immigrants were railroad workers, Chinese restaurants began emerging in the early decades of the century and became a mainstay in small and large Canadian centers many generations ago (Cho, 2010: 8). Although Chinese chicken balls are understood as ‘‘ethnic,’’ the ingredients themselves – chicken breast meat breaded with flour – are commonplace in EuroCanadian cuisine. While Chinese foods such as chicken balls and egg rolls have become familiar and are adapted to mainstream Canadian tastes (Moore, 2007), cuisines associated with ethnic groups that have immigrated relatively recently (e.g. African, South Asian; Statistics Canada, 2001) are generally less familiar.)
* Second Order Subtheme 1 (Familiar/long-standing ethnic foods favoured by Low-SES)
	+ Generalizing Across Sample (There was a notable interest among low-SES participants in familiar ethnic foods. The most commonly mentioned ethnic cuisines were Chinese11 and Greek. Both are well-established ethno-cultural groups in the country with relatively large waves of immigration occurring prior to the 1960s (Cho, 2010; Library and Archives Canada, 2014). The cuisines of more recent immigrant groups were much less commonly mentioned. For example, Indian food, which was the third most commonly mentioned cuisine by low-SES participants, received roughly half as many mentions as Chinese and Greek. Thai and Vietnamese cuisine,12 which received a fair number of mentions among mid-/high-SES groups, were never mentioned by low-SES participants. The desire for familiarity in ethnic foods was apparent in the talk of low-SES participants, especially those from small cities or rural areas.)
	+ Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Cree teenager Arnold Ahenakew from rural Alberta talked about liking a local Chinese restaurant and described the food as ‘‘a mix of Chinese, Western-Chinese, and just Western food.’’ When Nakisha and Nia Hendsbee, two African-Canadian teen sisters from the small city of Halifax, talked about favorite restaurants they described a Chinese restaurant where they ordered dishes such as chicken balls and egg rolls. Kendall Church, a White low-SES mother, recommended visitors to her small Ontario town visit ‘‘the Greek restaurant’’ and try souvlaki, a skewered beef or chicken dish usually served with potatoes, rice, and salad.)
* Second Order Subtheme 2 (Midand HighSES favour authenticity and exoticism)
	+ Generalizing Across Sample (Low-SES interest in familiar ethnic foods comes into sharp relief when contrasted with the highand mid-SES interest in authenticity and exoticism. As mentioned above, highand mid-SES participants were much more likely to prioritize culinary authenticity and reject ethnic foods perceived as inauthentic.)
	+ Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (It is not surprising, then, that Brant Fitzgerald, a White high-SES teen, described his family as avoiding ‘‘dulled down’’ ethnic restaurants, with ‘‘bland’’ food that is ‘‘made for Canadians.’’ Similarly, Bette Falcon, a mid-SES mother of Cree and French origins, spoke critically about the ‘‘camouflaged’’ and ‘‘Americanized’’ ethnic food in her rural area. Higher SES participants not only rejected familiar ethnic foods but also emphasized their enjoyment of unfamiliar dishes or typically taboo ingredients. Nigel Wood, a Caucasian, high-SES father with FrenchCanadian roots, described this taste preference explicitly: The kids, they’re complete omnivores like I am. I mean they’ve done sushi, they’ve done dim sum. We were eating barbequed chicken feet at the [Chinese] restaurant and there’s no squeamishness. Nallely [daughter] was probably the only kid in the history of [her] school to bring oxtails and sauerkraut in her lunch...I [also once] made homemade haggis [a Scottish organ meat dish].)
	+ Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Like many high-SES participants, Nigel highlighted his family’s appreciation for myriad ethnic foods, especially those positioned as unusual by virtue of taboo ingredients (e.g. oxtails) or the imagined reaction of others (e.g. squeamishness). This stands in contrast to the low-SES preference for familiar ethnic foods.)
	+ Offer EXPLANATION for observed patterns – A set of Third Order Subthemes are here as well (What accounts for the low-SES valuation of familiar ethnic foods such as Chinese chicken balls and Greek souvlaki? First, the interest in ethnic foods among low-SES groups is related to globalization and migration patterns, which have influenced culinary repertoires in many countries (e.g. Italian food in the United States and Indian food in the United Kingdom). We see these national cultural repertoires (Lamont, 1992) reflected in our respondents’ tastes and expect familiarity with a greater number of ethnic cuisines to expand over time among low-SES consumers. (This expectation relies on the fact that 20% of the Canadian population is foreign born, which is the highest rate among G8 nations; Statistics Canada, 2011.) The low-SES interest in familiar ethnic foods also appears related to the interplay between material circumstances and taste, as in the case of corporate foods. Like corporate foods, familiar ethnic foods were seen as cost-effective among lowSES participants. This aligns with Canadian research demonstrating that ethnic restaurants (especially those owned by racialized groups) are widely perceived to have low prices (Turgeon and Pastinelli, 2002). In the previous section on corporate foods, we argued that familiarity is prized in low-SES households because budgets do not allow replacement meals if new (unfamiliar) foods are tried but disliked (see Daniel, 2016). This argument can be extended to familiar ethnic foods, which offer familiar favorites (e.g. wonton soup) for minimal cost. For example, to explain why she likes a well-known Chinese-Canadian chain, low-SES participant Trudy Patterson states, ‘‘they’re a big chain, you know, they’re a very popular restaurant, wonderful website, so I just put my trust [in them], you know.’’ When another lowSES participant, Naomi Williamson, was asked whether she would go to a sushi restaurant, she responded, I’d be afraid of the fish being raw or something weird . . . When I go to a restaurant...I tend to stick to tried and true, like quesadillas and things that I know I like . . . because I don’t want to ruin my meal. Yet familiar ethnic foods offer more than a low-risk, low-cost meal. As with corporate foods, when low-SES consumers choose familiar ethnic foods it is not simply an instrumental economic decision. Instead, low-SES consumers have an aesthetic sensibility where these accessible ethnic foods are perceived as pleasurable, fun, tasty, and enjoyable. When Betje Fortuyn, a low-SES mother of Dutch background, was asked for a restaurant recommendation, she offered, ‘‘Probably Sylvano’s [a Greek restaurant]...[or] the Chinese [place]...I like the particular taste of the Chinese.’’ Kaycee Chambers, a White, low-SES teen, mentioned ‘‘loving’’ Chinese food because, as she put it: ‘‘I get to drown it all in soya sauce!’’ Ethnic foods also add variety to low-SES diets. Keira Karsten, a White low-SES mother, describes Chinese egg rolls a ‘‘fun’’ alternative to the ‘‘very plain Jane [Western]’’ meals she otherwise made. Choosing ethnic food can demarcate an evening as an ‘‘event’’ and offer a break from routine. In sum, familiar ethnic meals offer pleasure, leisure, and variety with minimum risk. As with corporate foods, it is not that low-SES participants necessarily sacrifice taste to meet budgets,13 but they have a taste for foods they know and can afford. In turn, what low-income consumers know and can afford is influenced by the availability of ethnic restaurants offering dishes familiar to mainstream palates.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 1 (Migration has added to the repertoire)
			* Literature CONSISTENCY (We see these national cultural repertoires (Lamont, 1992) reflected in our respondents’ tastes and expect familiarity with a greater number of ethnic cuisines to expand over time among low-SES consumers.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 2 (The low-SES interest in familiar ethnic foods also appears related to the interplay between material circumstances and taste, as in the case of corporate foods. Like corporate foods, familiar ethnic foods were seen as cost-effective among lowSES participants)
			* Literature CONSISTENCY (This aligns with Canadian research demonstrating that ethnic restaurants (especially those owned by racialized groups) are widely perceived to have low prices (Turgeon and Pastinelli, 2002). In the previous section on corporate foods, we argued that familiarity is prized in low-SES households because budgets do not allow replacement meals if new (unfamiliar) foods are tried but disliked (see Daniel, 2016)..)
			* Not Generalizing – Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, to explain why she likes a well-known Chinese-Canadian chain, low-SES participant Trudy Patterson states, ‘‘they’re a big chain, you know, they’re a very popular restaurant, wonderful website, so I just put my trust [in them], you know.’’ When another lowSES participant, Naomi Williamson, was asked whether she would go to a sushi restaurant, she responded, “I’d be afraid of the fish being raw or something weird . . . When I go to a restaurant...I tend to stick to tried and true, like quesadillas and things that I know I like . . . because I don’t want to ruin my meal.”)
		- Third Order Subtheme 3 – Literature CONSISTENCY (As with corporate foods, when low-SES consumers choose familiar ethnic foods it is not simply an instrumental economic decision. Instead, low-SES consumers have an aesthetic sensibility where these accessible ethnic foods are perceived as pleasurable, fun, tasty, and enjoyable.)
			* Not Generalizing – Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (When Betje Fortuyn, a low-SES mother of Dutch background, was asked for a restaurant recommendation, she offered, ‘‘Probably Sylvano’s [a Greek restaurant]...[or] the Chinese [place]...I like the particular taste of the Chinese.’’ Kaycee Chambers, a White, low-SES teen, mentioned ‘‘loving’’ Chinese food because, as she put it: ‘‘I get to drown it all in soya sauce!’’)
		- Third Order Subtheme 4 (Ethnic foods also add variety to low-SES diets … Choosing ethnic food can demarcate an evening as an ‘‘event’’ and offer a break from routine..)
			* Not Generalizing – Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Keira Karsten, a White low-SES mother, describes Chinese egg rolls a ‘‘fun’’ alternative to the ‘‘very plain Jane [Western]’’ meals she otherwise made.)

Subtheme (A taste for “healthy” foods)

* Subtheme – Literature CONFLICT (In the above sections on corporate and familiar ethnic foods, we argue that lowSES tastes are shaped by cost, availability, and a desire for familiar, predictable foods. In many ways, then, low-SES food tastes are shaped by necessity. However, we also saw evidence that low-SES tastes were not always tastes of necessity closely tied to material constraints. Put differently, low-SES participants did not exclusively ‘‘have a taste for what they are anyway condemned to’’ (Bourdieu, 1984: 178) and expressed a desire for relatively unattainable ‘‘tastes of luxury.’’ This was most apparent when low-SES participants expressed a taste for ‘‘healthy’’ foods14 – a category often connoted by organics15 and fresh produce.)
* Literature CONSISTENCY (Health concerns have become paramount food ideals for many people (Beagan et al., 2015; Rozin et al., 1999), although food practices vary considerably.)
* Generalizing Across Sample – Subtheme (For low-SES participants, healthy eating was a desirable, but often-unattainable way of eating. This came across especially in answers to our third target question: ‘‘How might you eat differently if you had more money?’’.)
* Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Ardith Elliott, a White, low-SES mother, imagined using a larger food budget this way: ‘‘The biggest thing is I’d eat more organic . . . stuff that was a little more pricey.’’ For Trina Parker, a White low-SES participant living with her granddaughter, she said that if she had more money, ‘‘there would certainly be more fruit [and] there would probably be more veggies.’’)
* Second Order Subtheme (Maintaining healthy eating but struggling) (Less often, low-SES participants described their diet as healthy but difficult to sustain.)
	+ Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Belinda Veitch, a mother of Scottish and First Nations descent who described her family as ‘‘struggling . . . because I’m on social assistance,’’ spoke at length about the effort her family put into eating ‘‘well.’’ Her family hunts, picks, and preserves wild berries, and Belinda spends significant time cooking and baking. Although Belinda saw organic products as healthier and better tasting, she limited organic purchases because ‘‘it’s just so expensive.’’)
	+ Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Belinda’s situation demonstrates that healthy diets were not absolutely out of reach for all low-SES participants, but were seen to involve significant labor and compromise)
* Second Order Subtheme (midand highSES groups have differences) (Again, a comparison with midand high-SES groups is instructive. While mid-/ high-SES groups also valued organics and fresh produce, two key differences are notable.)
	+ Third Order Subtheme 1 (First, higher SES participants generally had access to what they valued. When asked about stores they would recommend to visitors, many mentioned organic or ‘‘natural’’ food stores that they were familiar with. Salads and vegetables were commonly highlighted as an important component of regular family meals, as well as special meals for guests.)
	+ Third Order Subtheme 2 (Second, high-SES interviewees expressed a unique appreciation for the aesthetic qualities of healthy foods. Higher SES participants were much more likely to take artfully composed photographs of healthy foods and describe healthy eating in stylized terms – with what Bourdieu (1984) would call an ‘‘aesthetic disposition’’ (p. 32).)
		- Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, Therese Parsons, a White high-SES mother, showed photographs of her local farmers’ market and remarked, ‘‘It’s so pretty how they lay it out . . . It looks lovely to me . . . I think the color is great. It kind of looks like a French flag, don’t you think’’?)
	+ Second Order Subtheme Summarized Again (In short, while virtually all participants saw healthy eating as an important ideal, high-SES consumers saw these foods as accessible and worthy of aesthetic distinction.)
* Offer EXPLANATION for observed patterns – Generalizing Beyond Sample / Contextualizing – Literature CONFLICT (While the valuation of organics and fresh produce among higher SES groups has been documented elsewhere (Inglis et al., 2005; Johnston and Baumann, 2015; Martikainen et al., 2003), the valuation of these foods among our low-SES participants merits some explanation. For one thing, it departs from Bourdieu’s (1984) finding that the working class prefer ‘‘the heavy, the fat and the coarse’’ (p. 185). In addition, this appreciation for healthy foods is not captured in market and health research that suggests that low-SES groups make fewer organic and fresh fruit and vegetable purchases (Martikainen et al., 2003; Ricciuto and Tarasuk, 2007: 192). Several characteristics of the contemporary foodscape help explain the low-SES taste for health.)
	+ Offer EXPLANATION for observed patterns – Generalizing Beyond Sample / Contextualizing (health in the media) (The first is the explosion of media attention in past decades to the connections between diet, body fat, and disease (Campos et al., 2006; Schlosser, 2001). This has involved significant evangelizing around food habits, from governments increasing healthy eating messages to celebrity chefs such as Jamie Oliver pledging to ‘‘fight obesity with better food’’ (Jamie Oliver Food Foundation U.S.A., n.d.). This evangelizing frequently targets low-SES groups, who are assumed to need nutrition education (Julier, 2012; Saguy and Gruys, 2010). Past decades have seen an expansion of organic foods at mainstream supermarkets and discount retailers such as Wal-Mart (Harris and Strom, 2014). It is not surprising, then, that most low-SES participants expressed a desire to consume more fresh produce (preferably organic) and assumed healthy eating as a normative practice … .)
	+ Offer EXPLANATION for observed patterns (health condition / ordered by doctor) (There are a few additional reasons why low-SES households identified healthy eating as a food ideal.16 Some low-SES participants with health conditions became hyper-aware of the challenge of healthy eating on a limited budget. Tabia Punnu, a low-SES Eritrean immigrant, had a painful liver condition that had led to multiple hospitalizations. Her daughter, Tafari, had serious knee problems her doctor attributed to her weight. Both were advised by healthcare providers to eat more vegetables and fish. After describing her situation, Tabia wiped away tears and offered, ‘‘I have to eat a special diet. I can’t afford everything I buy . . . Yeah, it’s hard . . . it’s very expensive.’’)
	+ Offer EXPLANATION for observed patterns (cultural “caché” of healthy food) (Other low-SES participants expressed a general sense of the cultural value and status of healthy eating. When Keran Chambers, a White, low-SES teen, was asked what he might eat if money was no object, he said, ‘‘Fancy stuff from a farm or something . . . It seems like unhealthy food is generally cheaper than the healthier stuff. So I would probably start eating healthier.’’ For Keran, healthy foods seem desirable at least, in part, because they are ‘‘fancy’’ – status-laden and more expensive. Trudy Patterson, a White, low-SES participant, also noted the ‘‘cache ́ ’’ of farmers’ markets selling ‘‘freshly grown’’ local produce. The media undoubtedly play a key role propagating a cultural repertoire linking status and healthy/organic/ ‘‘from-a-farm’’ type foods (Johnston et al., 2011). Health discourses and discussions of food in popular media are pervasive, and low-SES respondents demonstrate that they are aware that these are foods they ‘‘should’’ be eating.17 There is, then, a confluence between what low-SES people think they should be eating for health reasons and what they should be eating to demonstrate belonging and cultural worth.)
* Conclusion – Subtheme (Together, these factors underpin a low-SES taste for healthy foods.)

## *Sociological Forum* – Oleschuk et al. 2019 – Analysis (6,411 words) – “Findings”

Subtheme 1 (Meat and Meat Eaters: Concerns and Associations)

* Research Question (Given the range and prominence of meat-related issues raised in the public sphere, we begin by asking, to what extent does this diverse group of consumers express concerns about eating meat?)
* Second Order Subtheme Introduction (Our findings indicate that vegetarians and meat eaters alike understand and/or endorse a range of reasons for not eating meat. We categorize these reasons as (1) negative perceptions of meat production, (2) worries about the health impacts of eating meat, and (3) negative perceptions of meat eaters.)
* Second Order Subtheme 1 (Negative perceptions of meat production)
	+ Second Order Subtheme (First, most respondents believe that industrial meat production treats animals inhumanely and produces undesirable environmental outcomes, and expressed concern about these practices..)
	+ Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (As Lilly, a 21-year-old Chinese meat eater, put it, “A lot of the time, we kill more than we can grow, we kill more than we can breed, and we harm nature more than we protect it.” Similarly, Sarah, a 52-year-old white meat eater, understood and cared deeply about the conditions in which animals are raised. She lamented knowing “about these farms where [animals] are put in these cages and they are just injected with things and they aren’t running free—hundreds of them and hundreds of them come out of one facility and they are raised just for mass slaughtering.” Similarly, in her interview, Mila, a 21-year-old white student, said that she considered vegetarianism because “I don’t agree with the way our meat system is run. I feel it could be more humane and could be more efficient. . .. The meat industry is like one of the biggest carbon producers in the world.”)
	+ Generalizing Across Sample (While some respondents had fairly specific concerns like Sarah and Mila, others had vaguer misgivings about meat production, especially about the inhumane living conditions of animals. They were nonetheless clearly troubled.)
* Second Order Subtheme 2 (health)
	+ Third Order Subtheme 1 (Second, while many respondents in our study saw meat as a food containing health benefits, it was also common for them to focus on meat’s health risks.)
	+ Third Order Subtheme 2 – Literature CONSISTENCY (When respondents emphasized meat’s health benefits, they primarily focused on the role of meat as a necessary source of protein (Piazza et al. 2015).)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Maria, a 23-year-old white meat eater, summarized a commonly heard sentiment: “I think protein and nutrients are really important. You don’t want to have low iron and protein. Like, I know you can get it from other vegetables and beans and stuff, but I think meat is an easier and more convenient way to get it. For your health basically.”)
	+ Third Order Subtheme 3 (It is not surprising that people saw meat as a healthy source of protein; what is significant is that meat was simultaneously associated with healthy benefits and significant health and body risks—a confluence that frequently occurred in the same interview)
		- Generalizing Across Sample – Seems to apply to Third Order Subthemes 1 and 2 but the section on these 3 third order subthemes could be better organized (These health and body risks were mentioned by both vegetarians and people who regularly ate meat.)
	+ Back to Third Order Subtheme 1 (health risks of meat)
		- Fourth Order Subtheme 1 – Literature CONSISTENCY – (connecting human body fat with non-human animal fat) (One of the primary ways that people showed a health-based concern with eating meat was in discussions connecting obesity (body fat) and animal fat. The commonly articulated association between fat and negative attributes (e.g., sloth) often affirmed the negative stigmas noted by fat-studies scholars, as well as the commonplace (but contested) notion that fat causes disease (e.g., Rothblum and Solovay 2009).)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Rick, a Vietnamese-Cantonese meat eater in his 20s, described vegan bodies as being “leaner and cut [muscled]” as compared to meat-eating bodies that “obviously have a bit more fat,” and concluded, “Even though I am a meat eater, I do believe it’s not really healthy at all. It brings high cholesterol and everything.”)
			* Generalizing Across Sample (The health connections between meat, body fat, and poor health were often vaguely felt rather than scientifically specified in exact terms, and did not necessarily accompany efforts to restrict meat consumption.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Saad, a meat-eating Indian man in his late 20s, described how he loved eating meat: “I fucking like meat. I’m a meatatarian,” and followed up by connecting meat with fat and poor health: “I think it’s not healthy to be a meatatarian.... People say it’s unhealthy.... I don’t know why. Meat has almost that negative connotation of, you know, cholesterol. You know, fatty food generally tend to be meaty foods.”)
* Second Order Subtheme 3 (many in our sample, including meat eaters, articulated negative perceptions of people who eat meat)
	+ Literature CONFLICT ((a finding that has not been widely noted in existing literature))
	+ Third Order Subthemes (Common associations of meat eaters included the following attributes: excessive masculinity, lack of intelligence, a “primitive” unrefined nature, and slothfulness, which for some, overlapped with obesity.)
	+ Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Katherine, a 28-year-old Filipina vegetarian, put it this way: “When I think of a meat eater, I know everybody around me eats meat, but I can’t help but see a guy with a belly eating steak and potatoes and he’s kind of bald and he’s sweaty.”)
	+ Generalizing Across Sample (While we might expect vegetarians to look negatively at meat eaters, these negative associations were not restricted to vegetarians or women.)
	+ Individual example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Consider the case of Liam, a 20-year-old white male who loved eating shepherd’s pie; he said that he assumed that vegetarians had a “higher level of more awareness and intelligence” compared to meat eaters, and he imagines a meat eater as a man who is “having a hamburger and it dripping onto their shirt.” Similarly, Steven, an Anglo-Italian meat eater in his 30s, said that meat eating has a “negative undertone,” and he associated it with “the typical dudey-dude with the steak, with his typical baseball cap or sports show.”)
* Generalizing Across Sample (The vast majority of respondents were able to articulate reasons that one might expect would reduce or stop eating meat. Yet most of them did not.)
* Subtheme Introduction or Signposting Mid-section (Next, we present evidence documenting the cultural repertoires respondents drew on to make sense of meat eating.)

Subtheme (Cultural Repertoires for Maintaining Meat)

* Representativeness – Comprehensiveness (Before presenting the repertoires, a caveat is in order. We do not claim that these findings are representative of all possible cultural repertoires, especially given our nongeneralizable sample. Instead, we see them as illustrative of what are likely to be the dominant cultural repertoires available to consumers as they make sense of their continued meat eating.)
* Subtheme Introduction or Signposting Mid-Section – Third Order Subthemes (Based on our data, we identify four repertoires that consumers used to make sense of meat eating: embodied masculinity, cultural preservation, consumer apathy, and consumer sovereignty).
* Defining or Clarifying Concept(s) – Second Order Subthemes (Moreover, we propose that the first two are productively understood as identity repertoires and the last two as liberty repertoires. As the name suggests, identity repertoires are based in personal, embodied group identities and are often invoked in concrete and vivid first-person detail. Embodied masculinity and cultural preservation both exemplify identity repertoires as they map onto identity projects based in gender ideals and ethnocultural traditions. These repertoires are differentiated from liberty repertoires, which invoke people’s sense of their rights and freedoms in social space. In our data, liberty repertoires are articulated in relation to consumers’ rights in the market—the right to prioritize self-interest above larger collective issues, and the right to make independent consumer choices. Below, we explicate the main content of these cultural repertoires, drawing connections to psychological research (e.g., the 4Ns) on the continuity of meat consumption.)
* Second Order Subtheme 1 (Identity Repertoires)
	+ Third Order Subtheme 1 (Meat and Muscles: Reproducing Embodied Masculinity)
		- Connection to prior First Order Subtheme discussion – Connection between Two Subthemes (Even though meat eating was negatively connected to masculinity through images of obesity, sloth, and animalistic behavior (as discussed above), this was not the only way that meat was gendered.)
		- Literature CONSISTENCY (As noted in prior research (e.g., Sobal 2005))
		- Third Order Subtheme Description – Generalizing Across Sample (we document a prominent and pervasive cultural repertoire that positively connects meat to an embodied form of masculinity emphasizing power, athleticism, and muscled bodies. This first cultural repertoire was used by participants to make sense of meat eating in relation to their embodied gender identities, and we refer to it as the meat and muscles repertoire.)
		- Literature CONSISTENCY (This identity-focused cultural repertoire builds off ample prior research showing that cultural conceptualizations of gender identities and boundaries are powerful determinants of how people think and behave regarding their gender (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005; West and Zimmerman 1987).)
		- Third Order Subtheme Description – Generalizing Across Sample (This gender-meat repertoire positions a muscular, masculine meat-eating body in contrast with a thin, feminine body that restricts meat and favors plant-based foods. Besides linking meat consumption with idealized muscular bodies, our data showcase embodied ideas about meat eating as necessary for men in daily life..)
		- Literature CONSISTENCY (This relates to the 4N rationalizations identified in prior literature, which posit that eating meat is “necessary,” insofar as animal protein is seen as the only realistic way to meet men’s need for protein.)
		- Generalizing Across Sample – Literature CONSISTENCY (Relatedly, we observe ideas related to the rationalization that eating meat is “normal”; specifically, it is normal for men to eat meat, just as it is “normal” for men to want a muscled physique and for women to strive toward a thin, feminine body. These embodied gender scripts also relate to the rationalization that eating meat is “natural,” specifically seen when participants reference the biological link between musculature and animal-based protein. The “meat and muscles” cultural repertoire was particularly employed by the meat-eating men and, significantly, included men of various ages and ethnocultural/religious backgrounds. Women also referenced this repertoire, primarily when explaining men’s greater meat consumption. The meat and muscles repertoire was most frequently articulated in discussions about bodies, where participants affirmed the value of a muscled masculine physique. The gendered meat repertoire commonly invoked the assumption that meat protein is necessary to build muscles and/or that men naturally need more meat than women.)
		- Fourth Order Subtheme (Meat necessary for Muscles) (The meat and muscles repertoire was most frequently articulated in discussions about bodies, where participants affirmed the value of a muscled masculine physique. The gendered meat repertoire commonly invoked the assumption that meat protein is necessary to build muscles and/or that men naturally need more meat than women.)
			* Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Aman, an Indian man in his 20s, sums up this association, which is notable given his Hindu, vegetarian background and the fact that he came to Canada as a teenager: “meat eaters are mostly ... mostly, uh ... they’re seen as more built, more muscular. And I would say they’re mostly considered to be men.” Lee, a Chinese man in his 30s, similarly articulated a masculinity/muscle connection: “my general idea is that guys cannot live without meat.” When asked why, he responded, “Because when you look at a guy, he usually looks meatier. More flesh. So when you see someone with more flesh, you will think, ‘Where did that person get his flesh from?’ Obviously from meat.” Ping, a Chinese man in his 20s, also closely connected meat to muscles, saying of vegetarians, “I don’t think they can be muscular” because “they don’t have the protein.” He continues by saying, “When you’re eating meat, there’s certain things attached to it, like strength, protein, dominance.... There’s just something about meat that is supposed to showcase more male characteristics.”)
		- Fourth Order Subtheme – Generalizing Across Sample (The specifically athletic dimension of masculinity was referenced multiple times by interviewees.)
			* Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Ken, a Chinese man in his 20s, articulated the meat-masculinitymuscles connection, relating it to successful male athleticism: “Many of the extreme sports like hockey, basketball, soccer, they all eat meat because it helps strengthen their muscles. It helps them with their lean muscle mass, helps them gain some weight and bulk so they can be better at what they do.” Saad, an Indian male, similarly connected athleticism to meat. He described the “manly associations” of eating meat—those conveying muscles and athleticism—using the example of Campbell’s chunky soup and its use of NFL players in its advertising: “So yeah, the Campbell’s chunky with the manliness. NFL players you know, they eat that, you know. Protein and bodybuilders, all these guys eat a lot of protein, a lot of fish, a lot of meat. For the protein.”)
		- Fourth Order Subthemes (mastery, power, dominance) (The gendered meat and muscles repertoire draws on both factual and symbolic associations with protein and muscles. Further symbolic associations connected meat with mastery, power, and dominance, in opposition to feminine caring.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (A good illustration of these connections was seen in our conversation with Bilal, an 18-year-old Pakistani interviewee and one of the few male vegetarians in our sample. Although Bilal began the interview by insisting that both men and women could stop or minimize meat eating, because “we are all the same,” he later observed that “there might be more women who are [vegetarian],” since women “tend to care more for other things . . . they are able to think further and think about others.”)
		- Fourth Order Subtheme (Tension between ideas and practice) (The symbolic connections linking masculinity and meat eating were not simply idealized expressions but were reflected in personal accounts of eating and body practices. As with Bilal, we observed tensions between food ideals (how meat eating should occur) and embodied practices (how meat eating actually does occur). Respondents expressed reticence about reinscribing stereotypical gender dualisms, even as they affirmed those dualisms in their practices.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, Austin, a 34year-old white man, said, “Stereotypically, you can describe a vegetarian as a skinny white female who’s following a trend from media or a celebrity,” but insisted that gender “should not define how much meat you should be eating.” However later, he explained why he loved eating ribs by referencing his own feelings of manliness: “I guess, you could say it makes me feel more like a man [laughs], because when you think of a man, you stereotypically think of either steak or ribs.” When asked who she imagines a meat eater to be, Hanna, a 21-year-old Eritrean meat eater, put it this way: “I picture a woman eating something very delicate in a very feminine manner. . .. When I think of a male, I picture large food, meat and heavy, like, dominant sort of food.”)
		- Fourth Order Subtheme (Male Bonding) (These connections held deeply personal implications for male participants’ social relationships. Meat eating was linked to male bonding and collective solidarity-building.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Liam, a 20-year-old white meat eater, explains: “[Men] see meat as sort of celebratory. Like when we’re celebrating someone’s birthday. . .. Or even just get-togethers, let’s say, having friends over, then we have a barbecue.” Liam determined that meat eating is “sort of a cultural thing in the sense that it strengthens I guess our relations with one another.” In turn, vegetarian men expressed experiences of exclusion in these social settings, as Vishal, a 20-year-old West Indian man, described at his friends’ wing nights: “That was like a guy’s night out type of thing that I wouldn’t wanna go to. I wouldn’t want to join with [them] ‘cause I wouldn’t really be part of it.”)
		- Third Order Subtheme – Generalizing Across Sample (In sum, participants commonly expressed this repertoire in connection to their personal identities, embodiment ideals, and consumption experiences. These connections were sometimes accompanied alongside reflexivity and criticism of the associations between meat and masculinity. To make sense of continued meat eating, respondents drew from their embodied experiences as well as observations of idealized masculine and feminine bodies. These idealized bodies held a powerful sway in their accounts and were incorporated into their personal gender identities and food practices—even when they expressed reticence about gender stereotypes. Crucially, the meat and muscles repertoire helps us identify conditions under which meat-eating rationalizations are more likely to be invoked—specifically, when men and women think about the relationship between diet and their embodied gender identity.)
	+ Third Order Subtheme 2 (Cultural Preservation: Meat as a Vessel Containing Culture)
		- Literature CONSISTENCY (Past work has demonstrated that the cultural repertoires concept is a powerful way to understand how people develop and maintain ethnic identities and boundaries (Lamont 2000).)
		- Third Order Subtheme Description – Generalizing Across Sample (Interviews with the diverse participants in our sample reveal the existence of strong cultural connections between meat eating and ethnocultural identity. With the exception of those with vegetarian backgrounds, meat was a staple in dishes that connected people to their cultural traditions. This was true for diverse respondents, including those from Anglo-European backgrounds. Meat acts as a cultural vessel containing social connections, rituals and traditions, and bonds between individuals, families, and communities. As with the meat and muscles repertoire, participants’ affiliations to their cultural identities were regularly experienced on a personal, everyday level. Over shared meals of meat, food-focused interactions with friends and family members affirmed a group’s shared identity and an individual’s sense of belonging.)
			* Fourth Order Subtheme 1 (Regional Meat Culture)
				+ Fifth Order Subtheme (Regional Normality of Meat in Cuisine)

Fifth Order Subtheme Description – Generalizing Across Sample (While almost all meat-eating respondents, regardless of background, identified the role of meat in cultural and familial continuity, these sentiments were particularly observable for participants with roots in certain South and East Asian, African, and Caribbean countries such as Pakistan, Somalia, Eritrea, Jamaica, and the Philippines. These respondents felt strongly that eating dishes with meat was integral to expressing their cultural heritage, especially in a larger context of whitestream cultural hegemony)

Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Hanna describes the significance of meat for Eritrean families such as hers: “[Meat is] incorporated into every aspect of our culture, whether it be weddings, baby showers, even when someone passes away they cook meat for the family. . .. If you were to take [meat] away from the Eritrean culture, you wouldn’t have what makes the Eritrean culture the Eritrean culture. It’s a part of what it means to be Eritrean. So, part of me feels like if I don’t [eat meat], I’m pushing myself away from my culture. When I go to these family functions, what am I going to eat?”)

Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (For participants like Hanna, eating meat is a “normal” part of their culture, encompassed in rituals and events as well as everyday enactment. Meat consumption powerfully connects individuals to their families and cultures in embodied ways. Even though Hannah has reservations about eating red meat, she describes enthusiastically eating and enjoying meat-based Eritrean dishes, especially those with red meat prepared by her father.)

* + - * + Fifth Order Subtheme 2 (In Certain Regions, Meat is Normal Because it is Necessary)

Subtheme Description – Generalizing Across Sample – Individual Example(s) (Diverse respondents contextualized meat-eating identities in a global context, decentering an idealized identity of a white vegetarian concerned about animal welfare. For example, Sahar, a 32-year-old first-generation Pakistani immigrant, expressed skepticism about the ability and desirability of changing subsistencebased meat practices in the Global South)

Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, Sahar, a 32-year-old first-generation Pakistani immigrant, expressed skepticism about the ability and desirability of changing subsistencebased meat practices in the Global South: “You’re not going to get a whole world of people to stop eating meat. . .. People in Asia, people in Africa, people in Oceania, where meat eating is such a significant part of their culture, it’s part of their sustenance—they need to eat meat to survive, hunting is part of their culture, and all that kind of stuff, right? Like, you’re not going to get them to stop eating meat because “Oh no, the animals are sad.” It’s not gonna happen.”)

* + - * + Fifth Order Subtheme 3 (Normality of Meat in Islam)

Fifth Order Subtheme – Generalizing Across Sample – Literature Consistency (The particular “normalness” of meat eating in Muslim communities was also a prominent theme in our interviews. Many tied this to the tradition of Eid that includes the ritual slaughter of a goat or sheep (see Kassam and Robinson 2014).)

Sixth order Subtheme (Ethical meat in Muslim Communities)

Sixth Order Subtheme – Generalizing Across Sample – Literature Consistency (In turn, Muslim respondents also regularly considered animal welfare and ethical slaughter to be intrinsic to their religion.)

Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (When asked whether he was bothered by the inhumane conditions in which animals are raised, Tariq, a 30-year-old meat eater born in India, responded, “It matters a lot. Being raised up as a Muslim person, it really matters because you would never want to see an animal get mistreated.” Muslim respondents differentiated factory farmed industrial meat from halal meat, which they considered humane based on Muslim principles of dignity and respect built into the process. Idil, a 45-year-old first-generation Somali immigrant, echoes the connection between Islam and animal ethics in describing the philosophy behind halal slaughter: In Islam, we are taught to respect animals, to care and not abuse or commit any crime against them.... There’s a system that has to be followed when you’re killing the animal. There’s a way you have to cut it so it’s really fast, and they die really fast, so they wouldn’t suffer, you understand? The knife you’re using has to be very, very sharp, and also in Islam, you’re not supposed to show the animal the knife, you have to keep it away from them. . ..)

Sixth Order Subtheme (Particular struggles of rejecting meat as a Muslim)

Sixth Order Subtheme (Significantly, some Muslim vegans or vegetarians reported that not eating meat was a difficult choice because they risked being perceived as disrespecting or rejecting their culture or religion. This risk can be considered especially difficult in the broader cultural contexts of (1) social norms surrounding hospitality and commensality in Muslim communities where giving and receiving food functions as important signals of respect and sincerity, and (2) Islamophobia, where pride in religious identity serves as an important form of resistance (Ali 2015; Kassam and Robinson 2014).)

Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (In one example, Zenia, a 34-year-old first-generation Muslim Pakistani vegetarian and activist, described her difficulties navigating these social relationships: Every time somebody comes over, there would be loads and loads of meat dishes on the table. Sometimes there’s absolutely no vegetarian options, because it’s considered respectful to prepare meat. It’s a more expensive item. And so, meat being such a big part of our diet, for my parents it was just unfathomable. . .. As a child, when you’d go to other people’s homes—our family friends—if it was Eid, our religious celebration, or whatever, people would always make such a big deal about me not eating meat. Similarly, Shazia, a Muslim woman in her early 50s who was born in Pakistan but dislikes eating meat, described difficulty communicating this preference to friends and family. She indicated that her aversion to meat sometimes caused others to challenge her religious identity. In one part of the interview, she described the pressure to eat meat, which she considered to come from her culture, not her Muslim faith: R: When I don’t eat meat, my brother and sister say, “You are Hindu.” … because Hindu people not eating meat. I: Oh, and Muslims do? R: Yeah, they are supposed to eat meat. Every day. Every time. I: Is that in your religion? To eat meat all the time? R: Nooo. It is, I think it’s about culture. . .. People confuse [culture] with religion. They say maybe Muslim people are [obligated] to eat meat, lots of meat. But it is not about religion, it’s about culture.)

* + - Third Order Subtheme Summary (In sum, meat eating regularly reinforced participants’ diverse cultural and religious identities. Vegetarianism, in turn, was often considered distinctly “Other,” associated most regularly with Hinduism and white, North American culture.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (As Ricardo, a 19-year-old second-generation Jamaican meat eater, states, “My parents were born in Jamaica which means that naturally there are going to be a lot of spicy foods and a lot of meat. . .. It is definitely a big part of my culture. . .. It is very rare that you see a Jamaican vegetarian, a full-blood Jamaican that is brought up by Jamaican family of a traditional culture.” Later in the interview, when asked to elaborate on his associations with vegetarianism, Ricardo states, “[Vegetarianism is] definitely white. Black cultures are rooted around the eating of meat.” For Ricardo, vegetarians are “usually hippies, like white people I guess who are wanting to ‘save the world.’”)
		- Third Order Subtheme Summary (When consumers justify meat eating as part of an ethnocultural tradition, they consider meat eating as “normal” for people who belong to that tradition, ingrained in the social relationships and normative practices of community belonging. Some respondents felt reservations about eating meat, but they described how resisting the cultural pull of meat-focused meals directly challenged their identity and sense of belonging. The meat-culture connection is particularly salient in a political context where racial and religious groups are threatened by racism, Islamophobia, and cultural assimilation. Finally, it’s important to note that many respondents suggested that their culture of meat eating is “nice” (i.e., delicious), and they enjoy eating and celebrating traditional meat-based dishes at family gatherings or religious ceremonies. In short, meat eating involves an element of identity that includes feelings of belonging as well as embodied sensory pleasures.)
* Second Order Subtheme 2 (Liberty Repertoires)
	+ Second Order Subtheme Description (The final two cultural repertoires we identified in the interviews are liberty repertoires, distinctive in their signaling of people’s understanding of a citizenconsumer’s rights and responsibilities in the body politic.)
	+ Third Order Subtheme 1 (Consumer Apathy: The Right to Ignore Inconvenient Truths)
		- Third Order Subtheme Description (The first is a repertoire of consumer apathy. By consumer apathy we mean that respondents’ decisions about meat are informed by a cultural script for consumer behavior that frames consumption as legitimately apolitical and sometimes even unthinking. Markets, market forces, and meat eating are framed as inevitabilities, which creates a sense of resignation and rationalization for enjoying consumer pleasures, such as eating meat.)
		- Generalizing Beyond Sample / CONTEXTUALIZING – Literature REVIEW (Consumption scholars have previously identified a generalized discourse of pleasure-prioritizing consumption that can decenter or obscure collective citizenship responsibilities (e.g., Johnston 2008). Consumer apathy has been characterized as “a political and ethical complacency driven by a refusal to accept and/or act on the need for personal and social change in what and how much is consumed” (Humphery 2011:235). Consumers can be apathetic about many problematic forms of everyday consumption. For example, many kinds of consumption are environmentally destructive (e.g., plane travel) or unhealthy (e.g., fast food) but remain commonplace. Meat is a consumer product that implicates these and other social problems but remains for the vast majority of people a daily consumption choice. Scholars have examined ways that consumers are distanced from the troubling information about meat (Chiles 2017))
		- Literature GAP (what is less clear is how consumers reconcile knowledge about risks and problems with daily consumption habits)
		- Third Order Subtheme Description (Here, we identify a consumer apathy repertoire that minimizes the disruption to meat eating posed by ethical conflicts or discomforts. It is functional (myopically) for consumers insofar as it allows them to focus uncritically on their individual needs and desires, rather than confronting difficult ideas and collective challenges.)
		- Fourth Order Subtheme 1 (Deliberate not thinking or blocking)
			* Fourth Order Subtheme Description (The repertoire of consumer apathy relies heavily on a script emphasizing deliberately not thinking or blocking out unpleasant thoughts. Respondents cognitively disengage from problematic issues surrounding meat, often using a phrase such as, “I try not to think about it.”)
			* Generalizing Across Sample – Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, consider how Tariq, a 30-year-old Indian male, responds to a question about whether he thinks about meat’s animal origins: “Um, I mean I am aware of it, but I wouldn’t say I think of it actively.” This type of response was widespread in our data and extended across age, gender, and ethnic groups. Rayan, a meat-eating Somali man in his 50s, responded to a question about industrial livestock production in a similar way: “I view it as I view death. It’s inevitable and it’s going to come. So therefore why think about it?” The word block was used by several respondents to describe how they managed what they knew about meat when it came time to eat. For example, Sahil, an Indian meat eater in his 20s, explains, “I know for a fact that meat comes from an animal, but it’s just like a thought that I block or put in the back of my head.” For many of our respondents, the information about meat is not “active,” and so they are distanced from it. This allows them to focus on the pleasures at hand, enabling meat eating without the experience of being polluted by uncomfortable thoughts or associations. Saad, an Indian man in his 20s, expressed understanding the issues but preferring to turn away from them. When asked whether he thinks about the conditions in which animals are raised, he replied, “Like I understand that, but I don’t want to think about it, like ignorance is bliss.” The “bliss” of being able to enjoy the pleasures of consumption occurs alongside the blocking of unpleasant information. In response to the question of whether she had seen any documentaries or videos about the meat industry, Tara, a Ghanaian Jamaican woman in her 20s, answered, “How am I going to enjoy my meal if I watch that sad stuff?” Indeed, this quote highlights how the script of “blocking” out of unpleasant information served to prioritize and recenter the consumer pleasures associated with eating meat.)
			* Fourth Order Subtheme 1 Summarized Again (At an individual psychological level, disengagement and blocking out information involves the avoidance of thinking about difficult or unpleasant information, like the death of animals, or the conditions in factory farms.)
		- Fourth Order Subtheme 2 (Cultural Script about inevitability)
			* Fourth Order Subtheme Description (Thinking sociologically, we ask, how is this avoidance or distance from animal death and factory farms culturally maintained? Our data suggest that avoidance is enabled by a cultural script emphasizing the inevitability of meat eating and the relative insignificance of individual consumer choices to challenge these inevitabilities.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (As discussed above, Rayan, a Somali man in his 50s, saw eating meat as an “inevitability,” a phenomenon as unnegotiable as his own death. Vivian, a Vietnamese meat eater in her 20s, was asked whether she thinks about the conditions in which animals are raised, and she responded, “I don’t [think about it], just because I think that at the end of the day, if it’s just getting slaughtered, then that’s just the final product. So it’s like, even if they live a good life, they’re still being slaughtered at the end of the day.”)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Vivian clearly identified the inevitability of animal slaughter where meat is the “final product”; this script of inevitability facilitated her disengagement from thinking about conditions of industrial meat operations.)
		- Fourth Order Subtheme 3 (Cultural Script about futility of individual action)
			* Fourth Order Subtheme Description – Literature CONSISTENCY (The consumer apathy repertoire pairs the inevitability of meat eating with the relative insignificance of one individual’s consumer choice to make change. Related to the inevitability of animal death and meat eating, respondents emphasized the relative insignificance of their consumption choices to make change. This repertoire allowed consumers to frame the problems associated with meat eating as outside the practical and ethical scope of an individual’s consumer agency (Macdiarmid, Douglas, and Campbell 2016).)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, Austin, a white man in his 30s, articulates the impracticality of approaching the problem through his own food choices: I: Do you ever think about the conditions under which animals are raised and slaughtered for food? R: Yes and I don’t agree with it, but one person’s not going to change anything and me eating meat is not going to change [vegetarians’] views on the way they treat animals. I: Interesting. And so have you seen any popular food documentaries that you’re basing your opinion on? R: No, I’ve seen YouTube videos and it’s not nice, but there’s nothing I can do. I: So you don’t think that change can come about from people refraining from eating meat or giving up some meat intake? R: Well, if a large quan tity, then yeah, but I personally would not stop eating meat just for that.)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Despite vegetarianism being a key topic of the interview and a dietary choice he described very positively, Austin paradoxically also upholds the idea that “there’s nothing I can do.” He sees his own choices through an individualistic lens and, thus, unrelated to broader change.)
			* Generalizing Across Sample (The ineffectiveness of one person’s choices creating change led to a defeatist attitude in many of our interviewees,)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Ken, a 21-year-old Chinese man (“There’s really nothing I can do about it”), and Asma, a Pakistani woman in her 30s (“I can’t really do anything about it”).)
			* Generalizing Beyond Sample / CONTEXTUALIZING – Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (While it might be tempting to blame individual consumers for not caring about animals, it is important to socially contextualize these decisions; we emphasize how respondents draw from a broader cultural repertoire of consumer apathy. By employing this repertoire, individual desires to eat meat can be sensibly and seamlessly prioritized, especially given the repertoire’s emphasis on the inevitability of meat eating and the powerful view that individual actions are inconsequential to make change.)
		- Caveats and clarifications identify any key exceptions to or variations to the overall patterns, and if possible, offer an explanation for these exceptions/variations (At the same time, it is also important to note that apathy is not the only cultural response available.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Consider the contrasting quotes: first, from Pratibha, an Indian vegetarian woman in her 50s, who finds disassociation impossible: “When somebody says, ‘OK, this is lamb,’ I can see a lamb there and so I cannot [eat it]”; and second, from Amber, a white vegetarian woman in her 20s, who illustrates a cultural repertoire of consumer activism when explaining why she abstains from meat: “I don’t eat meat because I don’t agree with the meat industry that we have, mainly in North America but globally as well. I feel like a lot of first world countries have such a high demand for meat. We raise animals in factory farms and kill them in mass numbers, and I think it’s very inhumane to have animals raised for killing. It doesn’t sit right with me.”)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Both Pratibha’s and Amber’s quotes show a clear relationship between having information that presents an ethical problem and then acting in accordance with an ethical imperative by not eating meat.)
			* Generalizing Across Sample (While these consumers thought their actions could address larger issues of animal suffering, this approach of consumer activism was rare among our interviewees. Much more common was the consumer apathy repertoire that frames consumers as legitimately apathetic, disempowered in the face of meat’s inevitability (“I can’t change it”) and able to prioritize the pleasures of eating meat. This repertoire operated without a sense of shame or stigma, suggesting its relative normalcy in the broader culture.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 1 Summary (Analytically, the consumer apathy script helps us see beyond individual disinterest and illuminates a broader cultural discourse that legitimates the prioritization of consumer self-interest, minimizes animals’ worthiness for moral concern, and culturally facilitates a psychological disassociation of meaty meals from their animal origins. This script provides consumers with the liberty to ignore inconvenient truths, which helps us makes sense of how consumers are able to focus on the pleasurable aspects of meat—meat is “nice”—to rationalize their choice.)
	+ Third Order Subtheme 2 – Literature CONSISTENCY (Consumer Sovereignty: The Right to Choose Meat Freely. While the first consumer apathy repertoire emphasizes the right to not care about broader consumption issues, a second repertoire of consumer sovereignty emphasizes consumers’ right to make autonomous choices in the marketplace. This repertoire is built on the idea that protecting choice is vital, because choice represents a fundamental realm of individual autonomy (Korthals 2001). In upholding their own autonomy to pursue their consumer self-interest, people are supporting a broader conceptualization of themselves as autonomous, self-determining individuals. Whereas consumer apathy deemphasizes the social significance of individual consumption decisions and food choices, consumer sovereignty highlights the moral imperative of consumer choice—a powerful idea in contemporary consumer society (Johnston 2008). What is imperative in the consumer sovereignty repertoire is the right to choose, irrespective of what is being chosen. Thus, the consumer sovereignty repertoire can help maintain meat consumption in the face of evidence documenting meat’s health harms and social-ecological issues.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion – Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Consumer sovereignty is clearly evident in the response of Khan, a Pakistani man in his 20s, to the question of how he would justify his meat consumption to a vegetarian: “I’d say we’re humans. And it’s their choice if they’re eating vegetables, but it’s my choice, I’m eating meat, and it’s up to me.” There’s a slight defensiveness in Khan’s answer, as though he suspects that the existence of vegetarianism poses a potential infringement on his right to choose. Other respondents were more confident that the importance of individual choice was broadly acknowledged. Liam, a white man in his 20s, answered the question of how he thought that vegetarians viewed him as a meat eater in this way: I guess just some would probably perceive me as just be like “OK, that’s your choice,” like they’re probably similar to “Respect mine, and I’ll respect yours,” and I’m fine with that. There might be some [vegetarians] that sort of see me as being a hypocrite . . . and I get that, but again, it’s a choice to eat meat and for them it’s a choice to eat, I was going to say roots, but I feel like that’s offensive [laughs], but yeah, so they have their right and I have mine, so I’m sure the majority of them respect my lifestyle. Many of our vegetarian interviewees did, in fact, respect meat eaters’ right to choose meat and even defended the idea of individual choice over more collectivist aspirations. Pratibha, an Indian vegetarian woman in her 50s, expressed this view of meat eaters: “I feel it’s a personal choice. I’m not here to pass judgment on anybody. How they were raised, what they like, what they believe, as long as I’m not forced to eat [meat].” Here, she simultaneously affirms the right of others to choose to eat meat and her right to choose not to eat meat. Consumer sovereignty was often emphasized as important to vegetarians who felt like they sometimes had to justify their vegetarianism to meat eaters. Similarly, some respondents had been vegetarian for some periods of their lives, and they were also insistent on the importance of being able to choose when to eat meat and when to stop. Ayesha, a Pakistani woman in her 20s who was currently a meat eater, explained that she had been given a hard time by her family when she stopped eating meat. In response to how she thought vegetarians viewed her now, she said, “I think everybody has a life and everybody has a choice. It’s everyone’s choice.”)
		- Fourth Order Subtheme (With the focus on individual choice, the significance of the collective consequences of dietary choices seems to fade away.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (We see that in the opinion of Sama, a Palestinian Jordanian woman in her 20s, in response to the question of what impact she thinks vegetarianism has on the world. She says, “I mean, it also opens, I would say, businesses up and restaurants up, because there’s restaurants only for vegetarians, so I would say it impacts it in a positive sense. It gives people more choice.”)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern – Generalizing Beyond Sample / CONTEXTUALIZING (For Sama, a meat eater, vegetarianism is primarily significant for offering consumers more choices in how to eat. This idea draws from and reinforces a dominant cultural ideal in consumer society—consumer choice as both normal and deeply pleasurable, or in the language of the 4Ns, “nice.” When this repertoire is employed, the collective social and environmental outcomes associated with individual choices are deemphasized. This fits with a market-based ideology that assumes that positive collective benefits will result from private individuals pursuing their self-interest. In focusing forcefully on the importance of individual choice and autonomy, the consumer sovereignty repertoire provides a powerful rationale for continued meat consumption.)
* Comparing First Order Subthemes (Finally, we want to make one concluding point comparing the two identity repertoires (meat and muscles, and cultural preservation) against the liberty repertoires (consumer apathy and consumer sovereignty).)
	+ Point 1 – Generalizing Across Sample (We observed that our participants drew on liberty repertoires in relatively impersonal, rote ways. Interview transcripts from highly diverse participants were filled with similarly used, stock phrases—phrases such as, “I try not to think about it,” “I can’t change it,” and “It’s my choice.” The idea of being a choosing consumer, who has the right to make their own moral priorities and to choose products that prioritize their own consumer pleasures, was employed in the abstract manner of inalienable rights..)
	+ Point 2 – Generalizing Across Sample (This stood in contrast to identity repertoires, which were referenced in more personal, vivid, and embodied ways; they were used to connect meat eating to ongoing gender and ethnocultural identity projects and reflect its role in maintaining a sense of self that is worthy, physically attractive, and belongs to a group. While the identity repertoires were employed in more personal ways, all of the four repertoires worked to allow participants to make sense of their meat eating and to bracket concerns about animal death, suffering, and the conditions of industrial agriculture.)
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Offer EXPLANATION for observed patterns
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## *Journal of Rural Studies* – Johnston et al. 2022 – Analysis (4,654 words) – “Findings”

* Theme of the paper – Main Message of the Paper – State Your Argument (The data we collected showcases a wide range of perspectives on the possibilities and limitations of small-scale meat operations.)
* Subtheme Introduction (First, we present producers’ perceptions of the tensions inherent to scaling up production while also trying to avoid the worst practices and harms of the conventional meat industry. We find that producers share a commitment to producing meat that built relationships and improved the wider ecosystem, even as they are cognizant of the limited scale of their impact. Second, we discuss the broad range of perspectives on the role of meat in a sustainable food system, a discussion which illuminates tensions – and dissent – about how to balance small-scale agriculture with a vision of realizing systematic changes in the food system. The concept of cultural imagination allows us to make sense of the significant variations in producers’ ideas about ethical meat and the role it should play in building a more sustainable food system.)
* Subtheme 1 (4.1. Producer experiences, rural subjectivity, and the challenge of scale)
	+ Subtheme Description (In this section we provide details about the experiences and perceptions of producers regarding the challenge of scale. Many producers felt that a small scale enabled them to produce an ethical product at a practical level, allowing them to adhere to high standards of sustainability and animal welfare. Aside from the practical affordances, the personal affordances were also central to what producers appreciated about small-scale production.)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 1 (Close relationships)
		- Second Order Subtheme Description (The producers spoke passionately about the close relationships they cultivated with people, animals, and the land. In a small-scale context, producers can know most or even all of their customers personally and have meaningful, trusting relationships with them. Producers’ relationships to animals are likewise highly personal, as they often get to know the animals as individuals, with particular preferences, needs, and sometimes names. For producers who raised animals, small-scale production also allows them to interact intimately with the natural environment. Even producers who worked with animal carcasses as chefs and butchers felt that they were playing a part improving ecosystems. These benefits were cited repeatedly across our interviews.)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 2 (Small scale isn’t very profitable which makes life difficult)
		- Second Order Subtheme 2 Description (At the same time, the economics of small-scale production often made these producers’ work difficult – emotionally, physically and financially. Scaling up can be more profitable, but in many ways the practicalities of scaling up were in tension with the goals and ideals of ethical meat production.)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 3 (Production and logistical issues of scaling up)
		- Second Order Subtheme 3 Description (Some of the scaling-up challenges relate to production and logistical issues.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (In one example, restaurant owner Brie Falkes describes the difficulties faced by a producer (Linda) who supplies them with rabbits. Brie explains how Linda used small-scale, labour intensive methods (e. g., feeding homemade dried apples to finish the rabbits) to raise a product that is appealing to restaurants, but notes: “She’s not making any money”. However, Brie reports that when Linda tried to scale up, problems followed: “Predators came. Then, she was dealing with a rat problem. So, she scaled right back down and she’s like, “It’s just not worth it’.” In this example, scaling up by increasing the number of uncaged rabbits invited predation. Brie uses this rabbit example to reflect on how she and her partner, Owen, thought about the logic of their own small restaurant. Brie: The scale of what we’re trying to do here, is in tune with our community. I mean, we have an eight-table restaurant on purpose because we are going to serve local food year-round. Owen: Yeah, that’s all we can handle. I mean, to get more local food – it’s a struggle as it is. It’s not like I email the farm and say, okay, I want 20 pounds of this, 15 pounds of that. I just take whatever they can give me. That’s really it. Brie and Owen have deliberately designed their restaurant to allow them to flexibly adapt to the meat (and produce) available to them from small-scale sustainable growers they knew personally, whose production ethics they endorsed, and who grow a limited amount of food. This is sometimes stressful in the kitchen, especially when products run out or popular items, like pasture-raised chicken, that are expensive and have a limited supply. These small-scale commitments also limited the scope of their influence on the food system. As Brie put it, “Bigger restaurants, city restaurants, they can embrace that [direct relationships with farmers] even more and make even more of an impact.”)
		- Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Brie’s words speak to a common theme in our interviews: producers recognized that they could make a bigger impact with a bigger operation, but the idea of scaling up produced significant challenges that often led them to stick with a more modest, ‘small is beautiful’ vision.)
	+ Back to Second Order Subtheme 2 (Small scale isn’t very profitable which makes life difficult)
		- Second Order Subtheme Description – Generalizing Across Sample (Pursuing this type of small-scale vision was not without its challenges, especially financial. Numerous small producers we spoke with relied on off-farm income earned by a spouse or had a retirement income that supplemented their farm income. We observed in numerous instances how this can create tension with other producers.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (One farmer, Dylan Scott, spoke in negative terms of the limited profitability – and impact – of the small-scale meat operations he saw popping up around him: You’re not going to stick around for that long, or you’re not going to stick around at a scale where it is 20 or 30 pigs a year. That’s not going to ever make you a living. It’s not going to do anything for the environment. Maybe it will ... like you do a tiny, tiny fraction, small little thing. That’s super [said sarcastically]. You’ve got a few customers that think you’re the best.)
		- Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Dylan’s critical comments speak to a key tension between staying small, earning limited revenue, and developing close relationships, but not getting sufficiently large to earn a viable income or provide substantial ecological benefits.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Dylan criticized these types of small farmers for relying on off-farm income to sustain themselves (and undercutting his prices). He declared, “You’re screwing over somebody like me. I don’t want to produce 50 pigs a year. I want to produce 200 pigs a year, and I want to make it my full-time living.”)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 4 (Profits not prioritized) (Although farmers like Dylan were clear that they wanted to make a living and cover their costs, most interviewees explained that they remained small-scale because profit-making was a relatively low priority. In fact, when we asked them to rank their priorities, they consistently put issues like sustainability, health, and animal welfare well above profits.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (The relative decentering of profit-making is clearly articulated by Karen Miller, who helps manage a farmer collective: “I’d say that [profitability] is definitely [at] the bottom [of the priority list]. [these] farmers are not in this for the money.”)
		- Second Order Subtheme Description – Generalizing Across Sample (The idea of raising animals more slowly, with more natural feed sources (e.g., grass for cattle, outside foraging for poultry), meant that profits weren’t maximized, but producers describe feeling good about their work. For example, multiple chicken producers described how they would adopt practices like raising chickens on expensive grains, often certified organic – avoiding cheaper grain like corn – and allowing them to grow more slowly. This meant that their profit margins were squeezed because feed costs were higher, but they felt good about providing a humane, sustainable, healthy product.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Karen Miller said: If you rush chickens, they can be so heavy that they can’t walk, and they have heart attacks, and it’s just not nice for the bird itself, never mind what the meat tastes like in the end, you know? So, [here] it’s done much more humanely for the actual species, too.)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 5 (Practical barriers to scaling up – Or the tension between scale and sustainability or ethics [kind of an unclear point overall]) (Beyond maintaining a small scale because it resonated emotionally with their ethical views, some producers identified practical barriers to scaling up.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, Kristine Brown, who raises eggs and poultry, articulates a similar view on the issue of scaling up. She only raises meat birds outside in the summer and allows them to grow at a slower rate than conventional poultry operations, meaning that she can only raise a limited number of animals and consistently disappoints customers with her limited supply. From her perspective, getting bigger would mean more revenue and market share, but also greater pressure to engage in practices like raising chickens indoors that would dilute her sense of producing a sustainable, humane product. The tension between scale and sustainability also emerged clearly in our conversation with Brandon Hunter, who talked about the difference in scale required to be an economically viable cattle rancher today versus in the time of his grandfather, who he said could make a good living raising only fifty cows. While Brandon feels that a larger-scale model of agriculture (moving from 50 cows to 300 cows) would be more profitable for him, but it wouldn’t offer the same possibilities for fully protecting the land. As a result of this unacceptable tension, he has developed his own niche for raising a small number of grass-finished cattle, selling shares in his cattle herd directly to consumers and killing animals on site: I farm the same amount of land my grandfather did, with the same amount of cows, and I’m able to look after all the ephemeral wetlands, and all the other wetlands, and you know – work hard during the grazing season to sequester as much carbon as possible ... I’m paid enough to care.)
		- Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Brandon’s story makes clear that the decision to stay small scale stems from a principle of producing meat in ways that feel sustainable, humane, while generating just enough income to be financially viable.)
	+ Second Order Subthemes – 6-x, many described – Generalizing Across Sample (Alongside a widespread appreciation for the benefits of remaining small scale, our interviewees speak of numerous practical, logistical, and financial barriers to expansion: insufficient capital, limited consumer markets (especially for remote rural producers), size limitations on small egg and poultry producers because of quota systems, expensive and limited slaughterhouse options, and ample bureaucratic red-tape and expense required to bring in the certification systems (e.g., organic) required once operations outgrew a direct, face-to-face trust model.7 All of these factors limited profitability, which reduced the capital available to expand the operation and scale up. These logistical and financial burdens are significant and exist alongside the moral and emotional burdens associated with scaling up for these producers.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (These concerns are illustrated well in the case of a whole-animal butcher operation owned and operated by Cam Philips. Cam describes how a supermarket chain had been trying for years to purchase his brand and bring it into their stores. His response demonstrates pride in maintaining a smallscale operation, a belief that an ethical scaling up wouldn’t be practically possible, and fear that scaling up would lead to a loss of integrity and legitimacy. Cam says, “It’s not in my make-up as a person, to be able to put a [supermarket] business like that together. ... being able to stand behind a product and be proud, I couldn’t have done that. It wasn’t for the right reasons.” He continues by noting that scaling up to serve supermarkets would water down his product beyond recognition: “There is a supply element ... there isn’t enough sustainably raised meat out there to supply our business. Like if [the supermarket] wanted to change their whole business model to ethical, sustainable, in the real sense of that word, not in the b.s. sense that’s going around right now. It would be impossible. There is just not enough [sustainable] meat.” Cam concludes by stating, with certainty in his voice, that scaling up would effectively “kill” his brand and his reputation: “Selling out this little business I have, and all the clients I have done well by and that I’ve worked hard for. They’d see me [as a sellout].” Scaling up is a difficult prospect, logistically but also ethically and emotionally. And yet, producers like Cam understand “ethical” meat represents only a small fraction of the total market for meat.)
	+ Subtheme 1 – Overall Theme (Many producers also recognized that despite its difficulties, some scaling up could be possible under the right conditions,8 but most were limited by logistic constraints, finances, and/or simply lacked interest in expansion.)
	+ Subtheme Introduction (Given the constraints on scaling up, how do producers understand the space of ethical meat and its role promoting a more sustainable food system?)
* Subtheme 2 (Producers’ understandings of ethical meat) (4.2. What is the role of meat in a sustainable food system?)
	+ What is the Subtheme? (How do alternative meat producers see the role of alternative meat production in a broader context of industrial meat-intensive diets and the need to achieve greater food system sustainability? To address this question, we employ the concept of cultural imagination, as it allows us to make sense of significant variations in producers’ ideas about ethical meat.)
	+ Subtheme Introduction (We argue that within the broader cultural imagination of ethical meat, there are three ideal-type positions. These positions on the topic of ethical meat emerged inductively in our data and include the following: 1) support for the status quo (a minority perspective); 2) a vision for “less meat, better meat” (a majority perspective), and 3) a challenge to the cultural centrality of meat (a minority perspective). (See Table 1).)
	+ Comprehensiveness and/or Contradiction and/or Ideal Types (To be clear, this typology of perspectives is not intended as a typology of producers themselves – especially since some people articulated more than one position.)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 1 (4.2.1. Position 1: meat is sustainable. The current system of meat production is sustainable. Small-scale niche markets can co-exist with large scale industrial agriculture. This first perspective presents the current pathway of meat production and consumption as relatively sustainable. It does not involve a sustained critique of large-scale industrialized meat, and it does not suggest that excessive meat eating is problematic.)
	+ Generalizing Across Sample – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (This perspective is a minority viewpoint, heard infrequently across our interview sample and most commonly articulated by mid-sized producers in rural Alberta, especially ranchers who believe that holistic management practices will improve soil health, sequester carbon and conserve biodiversity. Operators articulating this perspective prefer their alternative methods of meat production (e.g., raising chickens outside in the summer, grazing using holistic grassland management), but avoid openly critiquing largescale conventional methods.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 1 (falling meat consumption)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (When we ask if current rates of meat consumption are sustainable, rancher Joy Wolfson responds with a contrary statement, “I think there’s a lot of Canadians and Americans that don’t eat a lot of meat.”)
			* Generalizing Across Sample – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Indeed, in our conversations with Alberta beef producers, many worried about falling consumer demand for their beef and worriedly discussed plant-based meat alternatives.)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (This first perspective is rooted in a general sense that the meat industry is threatened and even under attack, and consequently, resists the idea that meat consumption and production should be restricted or downsized, especially in relation to climate change concerns.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 2 (close-knit ties)
			* Third Order Subtheme Description – Generalizing Across Sample (This first perspective also appeared rooted in the close-knit ties of rural life. Conventional farmers are their friends and neighbors, which feeds a reluctance to cast judgement.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, Kerri Sharpe is hesitant to position her own holistic management practices as superior to conventional agriculture: “I mean, even with a conventional rancher, their animals are on grass the whole time too, right? [before they go to a feedlot] They’re managing their land differently, but again, they are land based. That’s so important to them. That [the land] needs to be healthy and viable.” When we follow up to see if she has any critiques of conventional livestock farming, she demurs, saying, “They’re different approaches, but they are similar, if you know what I mean, right?” When we admit that we don’t understand what she means, she responds by talking about her neighbors, the Taylors, who are large conventional ranchers: “The Taylors would be a perfect example, because they’ve never been to a holistic management course. They would not ever say that they are practicing it. And yet, they’re taking good care of their land and their animals.”)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Kerry’s approach to grassland management fits with her own understanding of land regeneration, but she does not openly identify other methods of raising or finishing cattle as problematic or unsustainable. From this first perspective, meat production does not need to be scaled back or fundamentally altered to be sustainable.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 3 (Shoddy science)
			* Third Order Subtheme Description – Generalizing Across Sample (The idea that meat is unsustainable is linked to shoddy or inconclusive science.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, when this topic came up with Alberta-based rancher Dean Carol, he responds, “What I would suggest [is that] in research [and] in science, you specialize, and you learn more and more about less and less. Until you know absolutely everything about nothing.” His wife, Betty, agrees that the scientists do not understand the environmental impact of beef production, adding, “humans probably give off more methane gas than cows.”)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (The “meat is sustainable” perspective emphasizes the importance of careful land management strategies (e.g., intensive grazing, pasture rotation) and responsible decision-making at an individual scale.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (As Dean puts it, holistic management is a way “[t]o make, simultaneously, decisions that are socially, environmentally, financially sound”.)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern – Literature CONSISTENCY (These methods offer a way of farming that feels meaningful, sustainable, and close to “nature” (see Kessler et al., 2016), but there wasn’t a perceived need to scale up these methods to replace conventional approaches.)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 2 – Generalizing Across Sample (4.2.2. Position 2: scale up ethical meat. Consumers should eat “less meat but better meat”. Ethical meat should constitute a greater share of consumers’ diets. “Big Meat” needs to be challenged and dismantled. The second and most widely held position in our interview sample is the “less meat, better meat” perspective whereby consumers eat more meat from ethical meat projects and less meat from the industrial food system. This prominence of this position reflects that most interviewees were troubled by the status quo. According to the “less meat but better meat” perspective, consumers should eat more meat raised through small or mid-scale operations that are sustainable, humane, and economically de-centralized. They recognize that such meat would likely be more expensive than conventional fare, but hope that consumers would prioritize this expenditure and vote with their forks.)
	+ Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Jared Bellows notes that he wants consumers to say, “I believe in this system, I have this relationship with this farmer, I want to support them, and so I’m going to eat a little bit less but spend a little bit more”.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 1 (The “less meat, better meat” position involves a critique of “cheap meat” or factory-farmed meat raised through large-scale, intensive industrial operations owned by a small number of actors.) (Second order theme this is under: Scale up)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For Jared Bellows and many others we interviewed, “cheap meat”’ is created, “at the expense of environmental health and animal welfare” and is deeply problematic: “It is no longer agriculture. It’s just a business. It’s a way to make money. And cows, pigs, chickens whatever you have, are just units to make money off of ... that involves a lot of animal environmental degradation, a lack of animal welfare, a lack of social responsibility. And I think that it’s just very devastating to see how that’s happened, and the scale that it’s happened on.”)
		- Third Order Subtheme 2 – Generalizing Across Sample (Consumers need to change the system) (To achieve sustainability, interviewees feel that large industrialized systems of raising animals and processing meat need to be challenged and scaled back. This would require consumers to turn away from a “cheap meat” system,) (Second order theme this is under: Scale up)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (which poultry farmer Karen Miller describes as a system where, “People eat a lot of meat and maybe don’t value what goes into raising it. It’s just like a candy bar or something”.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 3 – Generalizing Across Sample (Big corporations were seen as producing junk food, and incapable of producing sustainable, high-quality meat. This idea came out when we asked about the hypothetical possibility of an ethical fast-food hamburger.) (Second order theme this is under: Scale up)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (In response to this question, rancher Sheila Roberts responds vehemently, “No, that’s not healthy. That’s not normal. That’s not normal at all. ... that’s not how we’re supposed to eat ... the [industrial] system has so screwed up food that it’s now considered a biohazard and it’s ridiculous”.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 3 – Generalizing Across Sample (Scaling up) (Alongside critiques of industrial, corporate, factory-farmed meat, producers articulating this second position implicitly and explicitly call for a scaling up of smaller operations) (Second order theme this is under: Scale up)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (especially, “meat that is raised on grass, that is raised in a manner that is responsible for the environment”, as Jared Bellows puts it.)
			* Fourth Order Subtheme 1 (To achieve this, the meat industry will need to be broken up, and decentralized so that more meat would come from smaller, more sustainable sources.)
				+ Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Russell Hill suggests that a sustainable meat system could be possible in conditions where, “people that [are] looking after animals, humanely, but not on such a concentrated scale. And multiple families doing that”.)
			* Fourth Order Subtheme 2 (The “less meat, better meat” position also involves advocating for direct-marketing)
				+ Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (which producers like Jared Bellows see as important for “cutting out the middle-person” who is “taking all the profits”, and making sure that, “If you [the consumer] eat meat, it’s environmentally and socially responsible. Fair price to the farm, fair care for the environment, fair care for the animals”.)
			* Back to Fourth Order Subtheme 1 – Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (This involves breaking up the concentrated power at multiple nodes of the meat supply chain, including a “decentralization of some of the processing, decentralization of some of the feedlots and the feed.”)
			* Fourth Order Subtheme 3 (Producers were not usually explicit about how this transformation could take place (i.e., how would monopolies or oligopolies be dismantled to create a greater number of smaller market actors?), or if it required state intervention.)
			* Third Order Subtheme Overall – Generalizing Across Sample (this second perspective was based on a clear sense that the status quo dominated by large-scale monopolistic actors is neither humane nor sustainable, and that production systems and consumption practices both need to change.)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 3 – Generalizing Across Sample – Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (4.2.3. Position 3: meat is not central Meat is not necessary for human health; sustainable food systems should not focus on meat. A small minority of producers articulated a radical critique of the role of meat in the food system. We think of this third position as encapsulated by the idea that “meat is not central” to an imagined healthy, sustainable food system. Beyond the viewpoint that consumers should eat “less meat, better meat”, this perspective involves a radical re-thinking of the role of meat in human diets, questioning the absolute necessity of even the most ethical, small-scale meat operations. This view was relatively rare in our sample, and often co-existed in interviews with statements supporting position #2. For some actors articulating this perspective, farm animals can still exist in a sustainable food system, but meat should be consumed rarely, and people should focus on plant-based nutrition. A sustainable food system does not hinge on a goal of scaling up sustainable meat operations and should instead work to decenter the place of meat in North American diets. To be clear, virtually all interviewees9 thought that animals could and should be part of the nutrient system of agriculture, adding fertilizer to the soil and providing animal labour – and joy – to farm life. This perspective was not a call for the end of animal agriculture. However, producers articulating this third perspective see meat as a “by-product of an environmental effort” rather than an end goal itself, as articulated by rancher Joe Reid. Animals should be part of farm ecosystems because of the non-meat benefits they provide (e.g., fertilizer for soil, assistance in grassland management), but eating meat is not seen as a main objective.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 1 (For producers like Joe, this perspective emerges out of a deep commitment to environmentalism that is prioritized above humans’ desire to eat meat.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 2 (For others, it emerges out of an experiential discomfort with the meat industry and animal death.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Rancher and slaughterhouse owner, Jeremy Stewart became radicalized by his hands-on experience killing animals; he believes that many of the fatty carcasses of feedlot animals he sees on the kill floor are diseased and unhealthy to eat.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 3 (People don’t need meat and it isn’t ethical? Many themes mixed up together) (He admits he enjoys the taste of meat and would, “have a real hard time giving it up”. However, he muses at various points in the interview that he does not think people need to eat meat and most people probably should not eat meat)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (People should not eat meat at all, unless they have all of the connections to it. I think ideally they should have every connection to the meat that they eat, because it’s a living thing with nerve endings ... it’s a living, semi-sentient ... A conscious living thing. If you understand the process of it, then I think you have to earn your entitlement to eat meat by understanding where animals come from, how they’re made, how they live and then how they die, and what goes into the processing and how and why. Otherwise, I think people just should stay clear, should steer clear. ... I think the default mode, the default switch should just be, ‘be a vegan’. (Emphasis ours) For Jeremy, meat is delicious to eat, but not fundamental to his imagined vision of humane, healthy sustainable food system. As he puts it, we humans “have big brains, we can think of a better way. Like eating beans. We can meet our nutrition requirements without eating meat.”)
		- Third Order Subtheme 4 (Beyond philosophical) (The “meat isn’t central” position moved beyond abstract philosophizing and lead some interviewees to change their diets and business practices.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, Jeremy’s work on the kill floor decreased his personal meat consumption: “I eat less of it because I’m conscious of the work and the tragedy of animals being killed”. In another case, beef farmer Mark Lewis made the decision to not kill any more of his cows and converted his farm into an animal sanctuary where farm animals could live out their days, and urbanites could come learn about sustainable farming. Mitchell Rubert, a chicken farmer, decided to stop raising chickens for meat and converted his operation to focus on eggs. Defying the dominant practice of egg producers, Mitchell refused to cull chickens that were becoming less productive, instead creating a space for all hens to live out their days. Restaurant owners Owen and Brie also expressed radical critiques of meat, which Brie sees as, “a part of a convoluted food system that is about oppression and overconsumption”. Owen stopped including meat in his own diet and was very judicious about using meat in the restaurant. Meat is on the menu but is served in small quantities and is not the center piece of dishes)
		- Third Order Subtheme 5 (What keeps people in the market when they think meat is unethical?) (What keeps Brie and Owen invested in small-scale animal agriculture, and serving meat, is the value of the personal ties to farmers, and the belief that the producers they deal with are stewards of sustainability)
		- Second Order Subtheme 3 Summary (The presence of this third perspective reveals the breadth of producer perspectives about animal agriculture as well as the capaciousness of the cultural imagination surrounding meat amongst ethical meat producers.)
	+ Second Order Subthemes Summary (Some producers are content with the status quo and many others call for less meat but higher quality, more sustainable meat. Still others go well beyond a vision of “scaling up” small-scale animal agriculture and question whether meat should be on the table. These producers imagine a world where meat is not a central dietary component. They imagine farms where animals are valued not simply as commodities but as part of larger processes of sustainability. In this vision, animals are raised for their value as companions, farm laborers and ecological stewards, and are not narrowly seen as meat machines that humans are entitled to harvest.)

## *Agriculture and Human Values* – Cairns and Johnston 2018 – Analysis (3,099 words) – “Findings: informed child consumers and meat’s exceptionality”

* State your Argument – Overall Theme (informed child consumers and meat’s exceptionality)
* Subtheme 1 (“meat’s central role in ideas of good mothering”, meat is “a topic of particular significance”)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 1 – Generalizing Across Sample (Meat nutritionally important) (All but three mothers in our study fed their children meat, and mothers from diverse backgrounds emphasized the nutritional importance of meat in a child’s diet.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, in a focus group discussion about cooking meat at home, Paige (white, lowincome) talked about feeding her 2-year-old daughter “a little bit of meat fairly regularly as one source of protein.” Cindy (white, middle-class), an interviewee, didn’t personally enjoy eating meat, but cooked it for her adolescent children, saying “I want them to eat meat because I think it’s pretty healthy for you.”)
		- Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern – Generalizing Across Sample (For many mothers, the nutritional importance of meat for a growing child’s diet was a matter of common sense.)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 2 (meat has an ethical significance) (Some made note of meat’s ethical significance, and expressed a preference for more humane options.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, Alejandra (Latina, middle-class) described during an interview how she aimed to feed her family “a diet that’s rich in veg and fruit, whole grains, and sustainably-raised, humanely-raised meat.” Another interviewee, Marissa (Black, middle-class), talked about shopping from a butcher where she knows “the chicken was raised better, and not fed all sorts of junk.”)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 3 (Poor mothers: Price and Quality) (For poor mothers feeding children on restricted budgets, price was the major factor shaping their meat consumption, but they also expressed a desire for what they saw as better quality meat.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (During an interview, Shannon (white, poor) expressed concern about antibiotics in industrially-raised meat and said, “I’d love to go to a butcher, but that’s just not happening.” Instead, she described strategies of cost-saving and conservation at a discount supermarket; “when there’s a sale I will pick up 50% off marked down meat ... and then we freeze it.”)
	+ Second Order Subthemes 1–3 Summary (In short, women from diverse class and race backgrounds saw meat as an integral part of a child’s diet, but worried about the ethics and healthfulness of industrially-produced meat—even if that was the meat they regularly ate.)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 4 (Given meat’s expense and perceived nutritional value, tensions arose when children refused to eat it.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (During a focus group discussion about the challenge of feeding children, Rosita (Chinese/Hispanic/Indigenous, poor) lamented that her toddler “won’t eat meat at all. When we make a soup that has meat in it, he’ll pick all the meat out.” In a different focus group where similar issues were raised, Theresa (mixed race, poor) remarked that her teenage son “won’t eat the beef from the butcher because it tastes too beefy.”)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 5 (While tales of “picky eaters” were shared with frustration or even shame, adventurous meat-eaters were a source of maternal pride and status.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, during an interview, Eva (white, middle-class) referred to her 7-year-old daughter as “the raw fish queen,” and described a recent family meal featuring homemade steak tartar.)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 6 (Our sample also included three mothers who were committed vegetarians, and who described ongoing efforts to raise children on a meatless diet.)
	+ Second Subthemes 1–6 Summary – Generalizing Across Sample (Thus, while mothers in our study were by no means unified in their approach to meat consumption, the topic consistently generated strong views and emotion-laden narratives about the work of feeding children. While we did not deliberately seek to investigate maternal attitudes towards meat, these conversations revealed its deep relevance to mothers’ conceptions of responsible foodwork.)
* State Your Argument – Overall Theme – Subtheme 2 (“Paradox of knowledge in maternal foodwork”) (the paradox of knowledge in maternal foodwork. First, in keeping with ethical eating discourse, mothers express considerable commitment to raising informed child consumers who know where food comes from. Then, we examine the other side of the paradox, and explore how mothers worry about their children knowing too much about how dinner arrived on their plate)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 1 (informed children) (Promoting food knowledge: raising informed consumers. Many mothers described efforts to teach children about where their food comes from—a concern that was especially (though not exclusively) prevalent among white, middleclass participants whose food practices weren’t shaped by severe economic constraints.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 1 (This included strategies like taking children to farmers’ markets and discussing their purchases.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Fran (white/Creole, working-class), who had an infant daughter, said during an interview, “now with a child... I want to instill in her the sense of relationship with food and where it comes from and how it’s cultivated and what it takes to get what’s on your plate.”)
		- Third Order Subtheme 2 (whole foods rather than processed foods)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (During a focus group discussion about how feeding children shaped mothers’ shopping decisions, Vicky (white, middle-class) described efforts to purchase whole foods rather than processed goods, in order to make their origins transparent to her adolescent children. “I don’t buy anything with a lot of packaging,” she said, “because I want my daughter to learn where things come from. And I don’t want her to learn that food’s from processed packages.”)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Vicky’s comments suggest it is not only through explicit lessons about the food system that mothers attempt to educate children about ethical eating. They also model these practices through their purchases, such that food shopping becomes a pedagogical project.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 3 – Generalizing Across Sample (ethical decisionmaking and the story behind food) (Like Fran and Vicky, many mothers talked about teaching children to make ethical decisions, and the development of this ethical consciousness was directly linked to an understanding of the story behind their food.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (During an interview, Carol (white, middle-class) shared a photo of her 7and 5-year-old at their local farmers market and said, “we go there every Tuesday. And, I let them pick stuff out.” She explained that a key factor in purchasing their house was its close proximity to an urban farm, which she saw as a valuable educational opportunity. “We wanted to live across the street from a park, from a farm. So the kids can see, you can go over there... you can milk the cow, you can get fresh eggs... They can see what’s what.” Another interviewee, Bronwyn (white, middle-class), also stressed the importance of educating her children (age 7, 4, and 2 months) to appreciate the food production process. “I want my children to grow up knowing how to grow food and have an appreciation for the amazingness of food and the amazingness of farmers,” she said. She noted that in a consumer society, “it’s so easy to go to the grocery store and buy something and of course we lose this groundedness.” Bronwyn felt that teaching her children that “it takes a long time for something to grow” was essential to fostering their development as ethical consumers.)
		- Second Order Subthemes Summary (These mothering practices align with a discourse of ethical eating that emphasizes knowledge and transparency. Through their shopping and feeding practices, these mothers attempt to reveal the food system to their children. Thus, the “good mother” is constructed alongside the informed child consumer—a child who knows where her food comes from, and uses this knowledge to make responsible, ethical choices. While teaching about food’s provenance was a key theme in our data, discussions of meat consumption involved a very different narrative centered on protecting children’s innocence.)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 2 (Limiting knowledge of meat’s origins: protecting children’s innocence. Despite the emphasis on raising informed consumers, knowing where meat came from was seen as a threat to the child—and a potential source of dinnertime conflict and increased maternal foodwork.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (In one focus group, Nina (white, middle-class) described the challenge of taking her children (age 7 and 5) to their grandparents’ farm where they raised chickens. She said, “I begged my in-laws not to tell them the truth. I just didn’t want them to turn instantly into vegetarians, or just be difficult about eating in any way.” Her sister Sue (white, middle-class), also a focus group participant, laughed and said, “that’s the danger of ever reading Charlotte’s Web to your kids.” Here, Sue references the popular children’s book by E.B. White featuring a lovable pig named Wilbur who is in danger of being slaughtered.)
		- Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Her joke implies that reading Charlotte’s Web to your children is one of the many ways a mother might rupture her child’s innocence by revealing the troubling reality that they are eating animals. Nina’s comment that she “just didn’t want them to become difficult about eating” speaks to the anticipated challenge of a child who knows too much—and thus, perhaps, refuses to eat the meat on his plate.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (In the end, though, Nina’s 7-year-old son expressed fascination, rather than distress, when he learned about the fate of his grandparents’ chickens, asking “did Nono kill the chickens himself, or does someone else do it?”)
		- Third Order Subtheme 1 – Generalizing Across Sample (preference of kids not becoming vegetarian) (While Nina’s worries appear to have been unfounded, she was not alone in expressing concern about accommodating a young vegetarian.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (In one focus group of young mothers, Selena (white, middle-class) described the expansive palate of her toddler, who was “eating oysters before she was two.” But recently, her daughter’s taste preferences had become more restricted. “The last few months she’s gone kind of veggie on us,” she said, adding, “she’s just made the connection.” In Selena’s account, it was discovering “the connection” between the food on her plate and the animals at the farm that prompted this shift in her daughter’s eating. She was not judgmental of her daughter’s decision, but said “it’s tough to find sources of protein other than cheese that she likes... She eats a lot of nuts.”)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (In Selena’s experience, her daughter’s new understanding that eating meat meant eating animals generated a new set of feeding challenges, as she sought to maintain the nutritional quality of her daughter’s diet without the protein available in meat.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 2 – Literature CONSISTENCY (Innocence and kids being “emotionally unsettled”) (Even when framed as an issue of workload or convenience, notions of innocence are implicit in maternal narratives of children’s meat knowledge. The anticipated burden of a child’s vegetarianism is rooted in the belief that children will be emotionally unsettled by the idea of animal slaughter. Thus, as noted by other scholars (e.g., Bulliet 2005), preserving a child’s ignorance of meat’s origins is simultaneously a project of protecting childhood innocence. Even mothers who explicitly advocated the importance of educating children about their food source made an exception for meat.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (“kind of awful for a kid to know” is being interpreted as “innocence”, which is how this quote links with the innocence theme) (During a focus group discussion about family food routines, Manuela (Latina, middle-class) said: Rice is a staple in our diet. Like, we eat rice every single day. ... So, they’re pretty good about that. And they do know that the garden provides and they do know what happens to the little seed and how it grows. But they don’t know about the meats. They don’t know that reality, yet. Which is kind of awful for a kid to know. Like, they might become vegetarian right away.)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern – Generalizing Across Sample (Reflecting upon her everyday feeding practices, Manuela highlights her children’s knowledge of food origins—“what happens to the little seed and how it grows”—but makes an exception for meat. Suggesting the “reality” of animal slaughter is “kind of awful for a kid to know,” Manuela invokes the notion that children must be shielded from difficult knowledge. Like others, she feared a disruption to her children’s innocence might lead to the inconvenience of feeding a young vegetarian.)
		- Reverse order (data then the subtheme) – Coming back to just the Second Order Subtheme 2 (the paradox) – Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Similarly, Vicky (white, middle-class) emphasized her commitment to purchasing unpackaged foods so her children understood their origins, but then described how her 12-year-old daughter’s increased food knowledge created tensions at home. “Lately it’s been crazy because my daughter turned vegetarian,” she said in a venting tone. Speaking in a focus group of close friends, she described the shift in their weekly fast-food ritual: All of a sudden one day she just stopped. She said, “I don’t wanna go.” I said, “Why?” She said, “Because, because, because McDonald’s is killing monkeys!” [laughter] She said, “Because of the grazing they’re cutting down forest,” or something. Anyways she just heard something about these poor monkeys and she loves monkeys [laughing]. And she says, “McDonald’s is killing monkeys!” [still laughing] Can’t even go near them anymore.... And she couldn’t even bear watching me and my husband eat. She’d put up barriers because she couldn’t stand to see the animals on our plate.)
			* Third Order Subtheme (3) related to that example just given (the kids can start judging the parents) – Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Vicky’s narrative highlights a tension within the project of raising an informed child consumer: equipped with new knowledge, children may pass judgment on their parents’ meat consumption. Sharing with sympathetic friends in the focus group, Vicky groaned at her daughter’s newfound vegetarianism, which she experienced as a source of irritation.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 4 (more foodwork for mothers) (While exploring parent–child relations surrounding vegetarianism exceeds the confines of our argument (see Beagan et al. 2015, pp. 105–115), it is important to note that children’s expanded knowledge of meat production can potentially create additional foodwork for mothers—especially for mothers who engage with an intensive-mothering ideology that entails nurturing individual preferences.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 5 (not telling kids something is meat) (With younger children, mothers sometimes developed creative strategies to obscure meat’s connections to animal flesh.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (In one focus group discussion about the challenges of feeding children, Cynthia (Asian, working-class) described her experience looking after a boy who refused to eat meat at age 3: He figured out where meat came from, right? But he’s three so he doesn’t really completely understand, like, tuna was tuna, but we were never ever supposed to say “tunafish” [laughter]. So one time his parents needed emergency childcare so I said, “okay, bring him over.” And the only thing I had to feed him because that’s what my kids were eating were hot dogs. So I gave him a hot dog, and then I had to phone up his mom and said, “I hate to tell you this, but the only thing I had was hot dogs, okay? So he ate a hot dog.” And she says, “oh, that’s fine. Just don’t tell him that!” [laughter])
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Cynthia’s story reiterates the idea that limiting children’s knowledge of meat is necessary to facilitate the regular flow of family food practices. Notably, it is not maternal concern about a child eating a hot dog that presents a problem in this scenario, even though hot dogs are frequently lambasted in popular discourse as unhealthy and filled with unpalatable meat scraps. Rather the mother’s worry centers on her child’s knowledge of what that hot dog contains, because that knowledge poses a potential threat to the child’s innocence, and in turn, to her own foodwork practices. This example is particularly striking in the context of ethical eating discourse, as the defetishizing of a commodity like a hot dog is precisely the kind of pedagogical project that is celebrated in raising an informed child consumer.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 6 (parents often over-worried about the turn to vegetarianism) (While knowledge of meat-eating did prompt some children to become vegetarians, this was not always the case. In fact, it was more often adults in children’s lives who assumed that knowledge of meat’s provenance would be emotionally destabilizing.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (During an interview, Deirdre (white, middle-class) shared a story that perfectly illustrated how adults project such feelings onto children, who they assume to be fragile in their innocence: I have a hilarious story about being in [our local] co-op. And picking up our organic free range turkey. And my five-year-old [daughter] saying “Mom, is that blood in the bag?” And thinking “Okay, here we go. This is the very end of eating meat for us, okay.” And holding the bag and saying to my five-year-old. “Yes, yes that’s blood in the bag, honey.” And my daughter saying [in a shaky voice] “Where did the blood come from?” And all the, you know, the vegetarians in the store all leaning in, hands on hips, “Okay! Tell your 5-year-old, lady! Yeah! Where did the blood come from?” And I say, “Well when they killed the turkey, sweetheart, it bled.” And she goes, “Oh, but they did not cut themselves?” And I go, “No, the people are fine.” And she goes, “Okay. La, la, la” [singing happily to herself]... So we kept eating meat.)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (In this story, the assumption that a child will be horrified by animal slaughter is shared among multiple adults. These include not only Deirdre, but also the other co-op shoppers who observe the interaction. Deirdre was someone who firmly prioritized ethical choices in her foodwork, as expressed through her selection of an “organic free range turkey.” Yet, in this moment, she feels the gaze of other co-op shoppers evaluating her as both mother and consumer. From Deirdre’s perspective, her fellow shoppers are united in the expectation that her daughter will see and appreciate the bloody carcass and then make the more ethical decision to resist the consumption of animals, highlighting Deirdre’s limitations as mother and ethical consumer. The fact that Deirdre’s daughter is untroubled by the link between the blood in the bag and the turkey she will be eating reveals that this assumption is rooted in an idealized conception of childhood, as well as a straightforward understanding of the relationship between knowledge and food preference.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 7 (parents wishing their kids cared more about the death of animals) (As with adults, not all children are emotionally troubled by the thought of eating animals, and some even relish the idea. In some conversations, parents described feeling sheepish and uncomfortable when a child departed from the expected reaction to the realities of meat consumption.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (This is evident in the following focus group exchange between Sue (white, middle-class) and her husband Tom regarding their 4-year-old daughter: Sue: our youngest one, she is kind of blood thirsty... Tom: yeah, like, our butcher will often be skinning goats in the front window and... Sue: and she comes in with this piercing little voice like, “are these all dead animals?” And like laughing. I was just like, “that doesn’t bother you?”)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Sue and her husband feel startled and somewhat mortified by their daughter’s laughter at the sight of dead animals in the butcher shop. Like Deirdre’s story, this interaction occurs in a public consumer setting, where children’s behavior assumes heightened significance, as an expression of both parenting and ethical consumption on display. Sue’s incredulity speaks to the violation of expectations in seeing a young girl delight—rather than recoil—at the sight of dead animals.)
		- Second Order Subtheme 2 Summary – Literature CONSISTENCY (Taken together, mothers’ narratives reveal that children respond to knowledge of meat-eating in varied ways—from nonchalance, to outrage and aversion, to fascination or even delight. These diverse responses challenge the universal conception of the innocent (and blissfully ignorant) child, as well as the idea that expanded knowledge about meat’s origins will generate predictable eating behaviors. Nevertheless, ideals of childhood innocence loom large in constructions of the good mother, a cultural ideal that operates beyond children’s diverse responses. When mothers protect children from the knowledge that meaty meals were once living animals, they become guardians of childhood innocence, even as these efforts contradict the ethical-eating ideal of showing kids where food comes from. The fact that this knowledge is perceived as a threat to children reveals the uneasiness consumers may feel when confronting their role in industrial meat production—a system that is spatially distant from urban consumers, yet associated with feelings of discomfort (Rothgerber 2015; Bulliet 2005).)

## Qualitative Sociology – Baldor 2022 – Analysis (4,499 words) – “Findings: Social Uncertainties in Collapsed Interaction”

* Subtheme 1 (I think? Not sure what the overall theme is, this might be it) (uncertainty) (Queer men’s acquainted stranger encounters are frequent yet marked by uncertainty.)
	+ Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (In an illustrative example, Stavros (28, gay) described an encounter that he experienced just hours before our interview wherein he discovered that he shared a mutual friend with someone he was talking to on Grindr: I go into [a coffee shop] and my friend stayed outside. And then when I got outside, he was talking with someone that I’ve been talking to on Grindr. And that person pretended that he had no idea who I was. So I reintroduced myself. And, uh, you know, now we like started talking in real life. And then I got his Instagram, so I don’t know if he’s gonna hit me up on Instagram, we’ll see. Maybe he didn’t even remember that we were talking on Grindr.)
* Subtheme 2 (impression management) – Literature CONSISTENCY (As face-to-face moments of context collision, these encounters tend to engender impression management as people contend with multiple audiences and contexts simultaneously (Baldor 2022).)
	+ This is for subthemes 1 and 2, and it introduces new subthemes as well! – Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (In this situation, Stavros and his acquainted stranger were accountable to one another in a new context as well as to their mutual friend who knew them separately. Within this collapsed context, Stavros’s experience highlights several interactional problems that render acquainted stranger encounters difficult to manage. As an initial interaction between two people in public, Stavros confronted two dilemmas around cognitive and social recognition (cf. Goffman 1963). First, Stavros grappled with whether the acquainted stranger purposefully or “innocent[ly]” did not remember him. In encounters where acquainted strangers do not acknowledge that they know one another from the apps, it is not clear whether this is an impression management strategy or a genuine “not knowing.” While Stavros recognized and could place the acquainted stranger within his digital sociality, he first asserted that the acquainted stranger “pretended that he had no idea” who Stavros was, and then second-guessed himself to acknowledge that “maybe he didn’t even remember” their digital interac- tions because they followed each other on Instagram, which seemed to suggest that this person was interested in fostering a connection. Second, Stavros grappled with whether he was afforded appropriate social recog- nition in the encounter. An important aspect of social relationships is the moral under- pinnings that bind them. As Goffman (1963) theorizes, different urban relationships convey different interactional norms and expectations.)
* Subtheme 3 (negative personal slights) (Queer men often framed these encounters as emotionally negative experiences when they felt acquainted strangers purposefully slighted them)
	+ Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (When I asked Stravros how he felt when it was apparent that this person was not going to acknowledge him, he responded: “I absolutely hate every single moment of it. Every time this happens, I feel like an idiot. I feel like I’m not important. I’m suspicious. I’m like, this is not inno- cent; it’s not like you didn’t recognize me!”)
	+ Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Here, Stavros returned to his initial interpretation of the encounter that this person did recognize him and chose to pretend he didn’t. However, there remains tension regard- ing cognitive recognition at the onset of the encounter. He felt like an “idiot” in this moment, which seems to stem from having unreciprocated knowledge or recognition of this person. This put him in the position to introduce himself since he did remem- ber their digital interactions. At the same time, he felt “not important,” which could stem from either this person genuinely not remembering him from the apps (e.g. “not important enough to remember”) or this person remembering Stavros and choosing not to obey normative rules around regarding acquaintances.)
* Subtheme introduction or signposting mid-section (In the following sections, I analyze interactional uncertainties around (1) cognitive recognition and (2) social recognition that queer men contended with in collapsed interaction. As illuminated in this section, these uncertainties are not independent. I separate them by the processual unfolding of interaction for clarity.)
* Subtheme 4 (“Cognitive Recognition Uncertainty”) (Cognitive Recognition Uncertainty. For an acquainted stranger encounter to be experienced as such, at least one person needs to cognitively recognize the other from the apps … In these instances, queer men struggled to reconcile the gap between knowing intimate details—learned directly through digital interaction or indirectly through social rituals of gossip or photo sharing—about someone online and not knowing them offline.)
	+ Second Order Subthemes Introduction (I identified three forms of [cognitive? unclear] rec- ognition uncertainty in my fieldwork, which help to explain why acquainted stranger encounters are often not openly acknowledged (cf. Baldor 2022). First, queer men questioned their own recognition of a person (e.g. “is that person from Grindr?)”. Second, queer men recognized someone, but they did not know whether the recog- nition was reciprocated. Third, queer men questioned what it means to “know” an acquainted stranger at all.)
	+ Literature CONSISTENCY / Literature PROVIDING CONCEPT (As Goffman (1963) notes, cognitive recognition involves “linking the sight of [an individual] with a framework of information concerning [them]” (113).)
	+ Second Order Subthemes 1 and 2 being discussed together
		- Third Order Subtheme applying to Second Order Subthemes 1 and 2 (Regarding the first two forms of uncertainty, a lack of recognition is not always strategic. This compounds the unpredictability of the encounter.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Mike (late 20s, gay) expressed that in public “there’s definitely still that sense of do we say hi or not?” which he attributed to “a disconnect” related to recognition that occurs from translat- ing digital contexts into in-person encounters: I have a strong memory. I could tell you pretty much everything we’ve talked about [from the apps], but sometimes there’s a bit of a disconnect between how people look in photos versus in real life, and that’s not an uglier or prettier kind of thing, but... there’s always a hesitancy on my part of like, is that that person?)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Mike’s account here is particularly striking because he dismissed a prominent aspect of context collapse as a threat to oneself—someone being “uglier or prettier” in per- son than how they present online—for a more foundational interactional concern: is that the person he thinks it is?)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 4 (completely not recognizing someone and not having any uncertainty but then realizing later)
		- Second Order Subtheme 4 (While queer men often described encounters where they recognized the other and were not sure the other recognized them, such as Stavros’s example above, they also recounted uncomfortable instances where they did not recognize the other.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Under- scoring how acquainted stranger encounters could occur across contexts, Nate (28, gay), a healthcare professional, described treating a gay patient at his workplace who may or may not have recognized him from an app: “[Eventually] he gets out, and then after the fact...” Nate nervously laughed and cupped his head in his hands before regaining composure, continuing, “He messages me on Scruff! And then I see the old conversations and was like, ‘Oh my god, I can’t believe I talked to this guy for like two weeks every day each morning and I didn’t remember at all.”)
			* Misplaced Information – data under a different subtheme, etc. (I asked if he thought this guy had recognized him, and Nate could not say for certain since he did not continue the interaction: “He just said, ‘Hey’ and I didn’t respond... Looking back through the messages, he was into weird stuff, and that’s why I stopped messag- ing him before.”)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (In this instance, Nate’s professional and personal identities collided in a way that he did not realize until the other person messaged him on the apps after- wards.)
			* Misplaced Information – data under a different subtheme, etc. (Because he was not interested in continuing the digital relationship with this person, the ambiguity of whether there was mutual recognition was never resolved.)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 5 (knowing too much) (In addition to asymmetry around mutual recognition, mobile app users expressed that they sometimes knew too much about people who they did not know offline.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For instance, one crisp fall evening I was sitting outside at a gay bar and people watching with James and Alex when a guy whom James had briefly interacted with on Tinder walked by. James took a sip of his drink while the guy passed, evading eye contact. We began to talk about why these encounters are “awkward:” Author: Do you say hi? Alex (early 30s, trans/nonbinary): No, I’m awkward about it and I’m like, pri- vately whispering to my friends, “I recognize that person oh my god, blah blah blah.” Author: Why is it awkward? Alex: You don’t actually know that person? James (mid 20s, gay): Sometimes you know too much about them for not hav- ing met them personally, and you know from people gossiping that what they’re presenting online is not actually a real thing. Alex: And if you say hi to someone, then you have to explain to your friends how the fuck you know that person.)
		- Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (These moments can be “awkward” because queer men learn a lot about other app users, whether through direct digital interaction or through gossip, and yet have not met or engaged in meaningful interaction in-person.)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 6 (Indirect relationships) – Literature CONSISTENCY (Furthermore, queer men routinely engaged in social rituals around their app use, which created indirect acquainted stranger relationships. These rituals ranged from gossiping about other users to sharing intimate photos and private conversations from the apps with friends. In some ways, this is a digitally mediated update to 1970s urban gay men’s sociability around “disco, drugs, dish [gossip], and dick” (Levine 1998, 70). Levine (1998) and other queer ethnographers show how rituals such as gossip or “spilling tea” demarcate boundaries of belonging within and between queer communities (e.g. Johnson 2012).)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For Andrew, socializing with friends around the apps is “one of [his] favorite activities:” “We’re coming down from the evening, sitting on the couch, and people just open up Grindr, and then everybody looks over their shoulder and is like, “Oh, what about that guy?” As a friend group we behave like cheerleaders for our one friend who’s trying to get it in that night, or who needs it the most that night, and that’s a fun aspect of it, you know?”)
		- Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Through using hookup apps socially rather than individually, queer men gained knowledge of other app users by looking over their friends’ shoulders rather than directly interacting with them.)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 7 (information sharing led to distancing) (In practice, gossip rituals brought established friends together through information sharing, but they did so by further distancing themselves from acquainted strangers.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (In practice, gossip rituals brought established friends together through information sharing, but they did so by further distancing themselves from acquainted strangers. For example, one night, Steven (28, gay) and I were waiting in a long line for the upstairs dancefloor at a gay bar. I overheard two white guys in front of us gossiping about some of the men they see around the bar. “See that guy on the stairs?” one said to his friend. “I’ve talked to him on Grindr and he says he’s a top, but he’s totally a bottom.” “Which one?” his friend asked. “In the white shirt.” I tried to catch Steven’s eye to see if he is also overhearing this, but his focus was elsewhere. Later, as we walked out of the bar, I mentioned this conversation and Steven said he saw him too and he knew whom I was talking about. Steven opened Grindr on his phone; the orange glow from the app loading briefly illuminated his face in the dark. He quickly pulled up the profile of the guy in the white shirt; he used to hook up with him and his ex-boyfriend last year. “He is, in fact, a top.” In full gossip mode, he shared that one of the guys who was standing in front of us in line has trouble getting erections. Steven “tapped” his profile, which sent the guy a fire emoji from Steven’s Grindr account. “I would hook up with him again,” he shrugged.)
		- Misplaced Information – data under a different subtheme, etc. (It is particularly strik- ing, and characteristic, that none of the bar patrons interacted outside their friend groups—at least face-to-face.)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 8 (nudes) (In addition, a common social ritual that produced indirect acquainted stranger relationships involved people sharing other app users’ “nudes” with friends.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, Jorge (26, gay) expressed that it was “really embarrassing” when friends would show him nude photos of guys who he later served at his job as a barista.)
		- Misplaced Information – data under a different subtheme, etc. – Connection between two subthemes (I say this is “misplaced” because the nudes are a natural subtheme of sharing information together, which was a previous subtheme—so it should have been a subtheme of that previous subtheme) (James’s words echo here: “Sometimes you know too much about [a person] for not having met them personally.”)
		- Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (While app users did not feel that they knew someone in these contexts, they did know a lot about them.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 1 (sharing nudes and ethics/law) – Generalizing Across Sample (This uncertainty is made more complex because the meaning of sharing nude photos varies in queer communities. Of course, sharing someone’s information and photos with friends raises important concerns about privacy and consent for scholars and laymen alike, and especially for queer social media users (Corriero and Tong 2016; Kennedy and Moss 2015; Renninger 2015). Some patrons expressed in inter- views that they no longer send others’ nude photos in group chats for this reason.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 2 (awareness of resending possibility) – Generalizing Across Sample (At the same time, some people were aware that sharing private information about themselves on the apps meant it might be shared with a broader audience than they intended.)
		- Third Order Subtheme 3 (Furthermore, the practice of sharing others’ nude photos could also be a form of identity work as people assert a positive queer identity.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (This was particularly apparent when Alex, a trans/nonbinary club-goer, discussed the divergent meanings of nude photos in the gay versus straight world. For them, seeing and sharing “dick pics” made them feel part of a gay world as “someone who is slowly crossing the gender divide:” “As a woman, I don’t want a dick pic. On straight-ish apps, if you send me a dick pic you’re fucking done, canceled, get the fuck out of here, inappropriate, and it’s rape culture in that setting... I think that’s why it’s fun because in gay world it’s not seen as gross because of a power dynamic. It’s coming from a place of, “Hey, I’m interested [in you], this is me, do you want this too? Let’s swap pictures.” ... I mean I just want to see dicks, I think they’re fun to look at or interesting... I feel like it’s entering into this taboo thing that I was raised as a woman to not want... I want to be part of some piece of gay culture that I felt like I couldn’t access before.”)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (While some queer men interpreted seeing nude photos as gaining an extraordinary amount of information about someone they did not know, Alex seemed to interpret seeing nude photos as much more ordinary in a queer male context and detached from the person’s identity (e.g. “I just want to see dicks, I think they’re fun to look at”). Both orientations towards nude photos seem to suggest problems for cognitive recognition in-person.)
	+ Literature CONFLICT – Subtheme summary (This section contributes to literature on hybridized queer socializing (e.g., Johnson 2012; Levine 1998) and raises interesting implications for classic sociological theo- ries of interaction in the digital era. For example, Erving Goffman stressed through- out his work that people strategically try to glean as much information from others as they can while trying to suppress unfavorable information about themselves in everyday interactions. My informants’ experiences, however, suggest that possessing too much information about others creates an interactional burden. Queer men not only engage in impression management to protect themselves in acquainted stranger encounters, but they also must engage in information management wherein they have to conceal the amount of knowledge they have about the other. This additional inter- personal task inhibits some men from acknowledging these people altogether. As my informants detailed, this can result in negative emotions or social stress (Baldor 2022).)
* Subtheme 2 (“Social Recognition Uncertainty”) (Social Recognition Uncertainty In contrast to cultural norms around navigating analog stranger relationships, a key theme that emerged in my fieldwork is the lack of consensus among queer men around whether digital interactions carry moral obligations to acknowledge the digital in- person.)
	+ Second Order Subthemes Introduction (Some queer men felt that there is no obligation to regard digital relationships offline, while others, especially when ignored by an acquainted stranger in public, expressed that there is some obligatory acknowledgement. Consequently, people can- not reliably predict how these types of situations, whether they occur in gay bars or elsewhere, might play out2.)
		- Example of all these Second Order Subthemes – Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, even when men tried to enact a social rule for themselves to at least wave to acquainted strangers on the street, not having that acknowledgment reciprocated could feel embarrassing or aggravating. One patron relayed: “I say ‘Hi’ and sometimes they don’t respond. It’s really awkward. They give me a cold stare and then I’m just a crazy person talking to myself.”)
	+ First Order Subtheme Argument – State Your Argument (I argue that this lack of consensus stems from conflicting definitions of the digital situation: are apps separate from, or a digital extension of, in-person gay community? Does the app place moral demands upon the individual? While people who framed the app through a community lens felt more pressure to acknowledge acquainted strangers offline, others framed the app through an individualistic lens and felt less obligation to acknowledge others offline.)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 1 (worlds are distinct) (Some users frame apps as distinct from their offline worlds, even those that are location aware like Grindr.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For example, Pi (30, trans/nonbinary) likened their approach to saying hi to acquainted strangers only when they feel like it (rather than feeling a social obligation to do so) as “similar to my approach that you don’t have to say hi to everyone.” They suggest that social contexts are distinct from public spaces like the sidewalk: There are a lot of times where there are people from the apps whom I pass on the street, and some people [I give] a smile and wave. Some people there’s no eye contact whatsoever, which is always kind of weird. But I also feel that, too—sometimes you don’t [want to acknowledge them], it’s kind of like social exhaustion. I’m hooking up with so many people. I’m not looking to add people [from the apps] into my life, into the social rolodex that I have... I don’t want to stop and have a conversation with this person, I’m just trying to get coffee or get to the gym.)
		- Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern – Literature CONSISTENCY (Pi framed the apps and the street as separate in part to manage “social exhaustion,” which evokes Milgram’s (1977) argument that familiar strangers do not interact to manage social overload. Milgram stated that “we permit a person to impinge on us perceptually, but close off any further interaction” (53). It is a management strategy to separate the apps from other contexts.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Similarly, Steven underscored how gay public spaces are fraught with social over-load due to apps and socializing in gay social networks by expressing that “there’s all this knowing.” To combat “knowing,” Steven tried to reassert that he does not actu- ally know most of these “strangers” he encounters, especially those from the apps: “I used to feel really shitty [when I saw someone on Grindr in the bars] because I was like, ‘Oh but you know me.’ I don’t really know them. They don’t really know me... They’re different worlds, at least in my head. I separate them.”)
	+ Second Order Subtheme 2 (Interdependent worlds) (In contrast to framing the apps as independent from other contexts, other users framed apps as interdependent with their local milieu.)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (For instance, some men expressed that once you acknowledge a digital interaction offline, the normative rules of socializing with acquaintances are activated. For example, one night, Chris and I attended a queer warehouse party located several miles from the Gayborhood. On the dancefloor, he recognized a guy from Tinder, who danced near us with his friends. Chris was not interested in interacting with him and purposefully avoided showing recognition: I saw him [on the dancefloor] and I was unclear if he had seen me. And my feel- ing right then was, “I don’t really want to engage with this person...” So I was like, “Okay, not gonna deal with that.” But then I realized that he was looking at his friends, who were standing right next to me. There was nobody between him and I. And my feeling was, “This is interesting. I know this person from the apps and I’m aware of their existence. Are they aware of mine?” I didn’t have the answer to that, but I certainly did not feel like I needed to say hi to him. But I did feel like there was a [tacit understanding that] if you both acknowledge that you are who you are, through eye contact or body language or a wave or a nod... then I would have felt like I needed to say hi. And as a result, I tried to avoid eye contact at all costs.)
		- Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern – Literature CONSISTENCY (In this situation, Chris wrestled with cognitive recognition yet leveraged its inher- ent ambiguity in these situations to avoid interaction. While perhaps giving a cold shoulder to the other person, Chris obeyed normative codes around what to do when confronted with an acquaintance, which suggested that he saw his digital interactions as intertwined with in-person commitments (Goffman 1963).)
		- Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (This interconnection was particularly illuminated when men framed the app con- textually based on where they were, which shaped how they interacted with people online and how they regarded acquainted strangers offline. For example, Stavros reported that he used to view Grindr, which he used exclusively to find sex, as an app separate from his social life until he moved to a gay neighborhood: “Before I moved, I was very much into the understanding that you don’t have to acknowledge people that you talk to on Grindr. You don’t have to say hi if you walk by them—who cares?” Living where many gay people live and socialize, he found that his digital interactions were inextricable from his offline interactions, which changed how he framed and used the app: I can’t [ignore people] anymore. Say you ignore someone, and then you go to a party, and they’re there and are like, your friend’s best friend. Then you leave the party, and they go, “Well, let me tell you a story about that shitty person.”... And I want to take it a step further and say, a lot of times, if I’m not interested in someone on Grindr, I just ignore them. I just don’t answer the messages. And then they’re your friend’s bestie. I learned to just answer and be nice. It’s a lot of work. It makes me be on Grindr less, that’s for sure.)
		- Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern – Literature CONSISTENCY (Stavros found that living and socializing in a physical gay community rendered an app that he used for casual sex a digital space that more closely approximated face-to- face contexts where interactions have “a distinctive moral character” whereby people “expect that others will value and treat [them] in an appropriate way” (Goffman 1959, 13). He suggested this was a negative shift (“It’s a lot of work”) and reported that he now only used Grindr late at night when “drunk or desperate.”)
		- Third Order Subtheme (daily rounds) (Others similarly felt that managing acquainted stranger relationships was “higher stakes” when encounters occurred in their daily rounds.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (While Stavros’s sense of accountability on and off Grindr increased when he moved to the Gayborhood, Andrew shifted his approach depending upon where he was: If I’m on a work trip and I am on Grindr... it doesn’t really matter if I ignore them [in public]. But if I don’t acknowledge somebody’s existence [in my neighborhood], or I don’t acknowledge that I have encountered this person on the apps, I might be putting myself in danger of doing something stupid or com- ing off as mean or dismissive to someone who may very well enter into my life by any other means... one of the weird things about living in large cities is like, if this person shows up on your grid, you probably have friends in common.)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (Even though apps like Grindr might seem to privatize cruising rituals (cf. Ahlm 2017), Andrew underscored how users are not as anonymous as they appear, even in big cities.)
		- Third Order Subtheme (same interaction code) (These two cultural frames for understanding apps and their moral demands conflict, which can generate tension when acquainted strangers are not operating from the same interaction code.)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (In an illustrative example of how these frames create fric- tion, Andrew shared a “consistently frustrating” experience of using Grindr through a neighborly lens to interact with someone in his building who did not seem to share his perspective. First, Andrew shows how issues around “being seen” (cf. Blackwell et al. 2015) can complicate in-person relations: I [first] encountered him in the elevator. I said, “Hi how’s it going,” and he did not respond to me, he did not look at me, he did not make eye contact with me... And then I noticed that he was also showing up on my [Grindr] grid. I don’t know how long this has been going on; I don’t know when he moved into the building versus when he showed up on the grid. He may have recognized me from the grid and been like, “I don’t want to talk to this person because they’re another fag in the building and I don’t want to encounter them” or “I’m afraid of having any type of relationship that goes beyond neighborly with my neighbor.” Andrew questioned whether his neighbor had seen him on Grindr before Andrew saw him, which could have explained why the neighbor snubbed him in-person. Andrew questioned whether his neighbor had seen him on Grindr before Andrew saw him, which could have explained why the neighbor snubbed him in-person. Regard- less, Andrew, framing the app as a community tool, messaged him on the app as part of his “neighboring” practice (Kusenbach 2006) because he was dog-sitting and knew his neighbor also had a dog: I messaged him on Grindr [about a doggy playdate]. No response, and I get it; in his bio he makes it very clear that he’s looking for something that is not me, and that’s fine. But... this is somebody who is a neighbor and I don’t have another way of reaching out to this person. I don’t know what apartment he lives in, I don’t know his name, and he won’t say hi to me. But I did feel like this is somebody who ostensibly would be part of my neighborhood commu- nity because he lives in the same building, he’s gay, and he, in this case, has a dog and he goes out and spends time on the roof just like I do. And all of those things, to me, combined to make somebody who maybe you would interact with outside of the apps...)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern – Literature CONSISTENCY (While Andrew framed, and attempted to interact with, his gay neighbor as a neigh- bor and not a potential sexual partner, their co-presence on a mobile app known for producing digital ambiguities (cf. Fitzpatrick and Birnholtz 2018) muddled his intentions)
			* Individual Example(s) – Describe data that typifies the pattern under discussion (Doubling down on his view that Grindr should not be an impediment to building contact with neighbors, he expressed: Maybe I’m too much of an idealist about what a neighborhood should feel like but like... you’re living in the middle of a neighborhood that is made better by people knowing each other and hanging out with each other and meeting people in the building feels like a good thing to do. It’s annoying to me that this person wouldn’t do that.)
			* Briefly explain how this example represents the larger pattern (It is a reasonable possibility that Andrew’s neighbor was trying to maintain boundar- ies of privacy by ignoring Andrew. If this was the case, both Andrew and his neighbor may have experienced one another as bad neighbors. Andrew’s experience unites the moral questions: What do we owe our neighbors, and what do we owe fellow mobile app users? The pairing of these two questions underscores how navigating acquainted stranger encounters are not confined to the public sphere. The stakes of whether to regard acquainted strangers not only mark interpersonal acceptance/rejection but community or identity-based belonging as well.)

# Discussion/Conclusion (1,000 words or less)

Calarco’s Outline with TJB edits

**1 – Title**

**2 – Summarize your findings**

2.1 Remind readers of the puzzle/gap in the literature that you are trying to solve

2.2. Remind readers of the specific research question that you have answered

2.3. Review what you found

2.4. Explain what these findings imply about the answer to your research question

**3 – Discuss the implications of your findings**

3.1. State Implication(s) of Findings (without doing any of the sub-tasks Calarco outlines) (TJB Reading-derived Section)

3.2. Explain how your findings solve the puzzle or fill the gap in the literature

3.3. Explain how the resolution of the gap/puzzle helps to clarify, challenge, or expand **existing knowledge or theory**

3.3. TJB Variation > Explain how implication of findings, themes and/or subthemes clarify, challenge, or expand exiting knowledge or theory

3.4. **Using existing literature**, explain why your findings are or are not surprising

3.5. TJB > Simply explain how previously published literature relates to your findings, without commenting on whether it is surprising relative to findings, and without saying that your data clarifies, challenges, or expands previous literature

3.6. TJB > Identify areas of social life where your argument likely applies

3.7. TJB > Draw out implications of your findings, without referring to literature

**4 – Identify possible explanations for your findings**

4.1. TB-derived section > Identify a possible explanation for your findings without referring to existing research

4.2. Use existing research to discuss the most likely explanation for your findings

4.3. Consider alternative explanations for your findings and explain (using your data and/or other research) why these alternative explanations do or do not seem plausible

4.4. Conclude by reviewing why these findings (and the larger puzzle/gap they address) are important

5 – Apply Findings

5.1. Evaluate social change strategy held by respondents or scholarship activism more broadly by referring to literature and/or through argument referencing the study’s data

6 – Discuss Limitations

7 – Future Research

8 – Generalizing Beyond Sample without Referencing Literature

## *The British Journal of Sociology –* Kennedy et al. 2018b – Discussion (~2,500 words) – “Discussion: understanding small-p politics”

* This section did not at all follow Calarco’s outline. Some of the parts are there, but not in the order she asked for them. But most of the elements are just missing. So Calarco’s outline is, already, clearly not universal. (20Feb2023).
* 2.3. – Review what you found (In the results presented above we identified pleasure, conviviality and pragmatism as three core ideals informing small-p politics, a form of everyday civic action prominent in community-building eat-local initiatives in our three sites. By inductively developing the category of small-p politics, our results illuminate the ‘small things’ end of a continuum of civic engagement that exists in the democratic imaginations of actors involved on the frontlines of eat-local initiatives. Importantly, our participants pejoratively associate the ‘big-P politics’ at the other end of the spectrum of collective behaviour with confrontation, top-down solutions, and antagonism. They deem such terrain off-limits in their work of creating a better food system.)
	+ Within that review of what was found, we see:
		- Major Subthemes (pleasure, conviviality and pragmatism)
		- Overall theme (informing small-p politics, a form of everyday civic action prominent in community-building eat-local initiatives in our three sites. By inductively developing the category of small-p politics, our results illuminate the ‘small things’ end of a continuum of civic engagement that exists in the democratic imaginations of actors involved on the frontlines of eat-local initiatives. Importantly, our participants pejoratively associate the ‘big-P politics’ at the other end of the spectrum of collective behaviour with confrontation, top-down solutions, and antagonism. They deem such terrain off-limits in their work of creating a better food system)
* 3.1. – State Implication(s) of Findings (without doing any of the sub-tasks Calarco outlines) (TJB Reading-derived Section) (We now discuss three observations aimed at making sense of the data presented above.)
* 3.1. – State Implication(s) of Findings 1 (without doing any of the sub-tasks Calarco outlines) (TJB Reading-derived Section) (The first conclusion is that small-p politics should be understood as promoting cultural change. By seeking fairly modest, incremental changes in cultural preferences for food production and consumption practices, this approach has several advantages. First, pleasurable, convivial and pragmatic political practices facilitate constructive relationships with political and economic elites. Second, a small-p approach creates an enjoyable atmosphere where engagement can be sustained over the long-term, cultivating a broad base of support that can (and does) achieve a great number of goals. Achievements to date (e.g., the growing number of community gardens, farmers’ markets, and municipal food policy councils) speak to a fairly widespread shift in cultural values around food (e.g., heightened support for local growers). We argue, as our participants did, that the practice of small-p politics likely helped to realize these achievements.)
	+ 3.3. TJB Variation > Explain how implication of findings, themes and/or subthemes clarify, challenge, or expand exiting knowledge or theory (This conclusion on cultural change does raise Szasz’s (2007) concern that the expansion of commodity-focused solutions to eco-social problems is a win for consumerism and may displace traditional forms of political engagement. Our participants’ efforts speak to their commitment to move beyond consumer solutions in their work lives; after all, these were people who spent tremendous energy organizing, mobilizing and growing. These efforts are aligned with their institutional responsibilities; actors in each sphere we examined indicated their organizations (civil, market, state) are committed to goals far beyond profit. Yet when seeking to realize their social and ecological goals, the leaders of these groups rarely imagined pathways other than consumer action in the marketplace. We suggest this does not reflect a strong value for commodity-focused solutions but that participants sense the acceptability and popularity of calls for individuals to become better consumers. While Szasz (2007) argued that consumer-focused solutions can ‘crowd-out’ traditional political activity, we offer a slightly different suggestion: perhaps it is the ideals of pleasure, conviviality and pragmatism that displace such ‘big-P’ political ambitions and practices. In other words, small-p politics is not ideologically fixed on market solutions, but a focus on winnable, cultural goals may inadvertently diminish efforts available for more contentious political strategies.)
* 3.1. – State Implication(s) of Findings 2 (without doing any of the sub-tasks Calarco outlines) (TJB Reading-derived Section) (Our second conclusion is that although those adopting small-p politics reject traditional political activity, they do so while engaging in the public sphere.)
	+ 3.3. TJB Variation > Explain how implication of findings, themes and/or subthemes clarify, challenge, or expand exiting knowledge or theory (Building on Bennett et al.’s (2013) findings, we nuance the notion of political disavowal by positing a connection between disavowal and the emergence of political engagement practices that are manageable and market-based – such as ethical consumption. That is, while disavowing contentious politics is productive of civic engagement, it is only productive of a certain form of engagement – small-p politics in our sites. This advance synthesizes the concept of political disavowal with Perrin’s (2006) democratic imagination: we argue it is possible that small-p politics uses political disavowal in order to achieve many small ‘wins’, but that these accomplishments may come at the expense of a thicker democratic imagination that envisions a broader repertoire of social-change strategies. In other words, when small wins require rejecting one end of the engagement continuum (the contentious end), the longer-term capacity of food politics to advance democracy may be compromised by dismissing tools for social change that directly criticize market mechanisms. In response to those endorsing the efficacy of prefigurative politics, we caution that the social location of those engaged in prefiguring may impact the success of such politics. For instance, in our site, where the majority of our participants occupy a space of relative privilege, it seems to feel very feasible to enact the ideal state of a localized food system. Achieving their ideals rarely (for our participants) requires challenging inequality in daily civic and political engagement. All three cities in the study have a sizeable base of affluent consumers who can engage with market-based food solutions (e.g., farmers’ markets), and there is enough demand to meet the supply of local food offerings. Many participants’ projects did not generate routine encounters with marginalized populations, or mass-market consumers uninterested in or unable to afford local foods. Living in a kind of local food bubble, our participants can imagine an incremental process of achieving their goals through pleasurable, polite and pragmatic political practices. Yet, by avoiding confrontational topics and frames such as justice, equality and the ecological tenability (and tenacity) of mainstream industrialized agriculture, our participants may be limiting the chance that their actions will create space for political tactics aimed at making ethical food widely accessible and eradicating ecologically unsustainable food practices.)
* 3.1. – State Implication(s) of Findings 3 (without doing any of the sub-tasks Calarco outlines) (TJB Reading-derived Section) (The final observation is that practitioners of small-p politics – regardless of whether they are located primarily in the civic, state or market realm – see the consumer as the ideal target for change. As they narrow their scope to consumers, we suggest participants may be reduced to hoping that someone (somewhere) is addressing their concerns about structural inequality and unsustainability in the food system as they go about the work of expanding mobilization.)
	+ Literature CONSISTENCY and/or INSIGHT (We return to Perrin (2006), who stresses the importance of how we talk about politics: when certain topics are deemed inappropriate because they are too confrontational or too idealistic, these topics are bracketed out of public life.)
	+ 2.3. – Review what you found (While the leaders we studied exhibit tremendous creativity when it comes to practical food system solutions, especially market-based solutions, we witnessed little in the way of strategies to tackle or even discuss structural barriers to sustainability and equity in the food system. We attribute this in part to a belief that political change is best achieved through winnable actions exercised in the (local) marketplace, and in part to a visceral aversion to raising topics determined to be too contentious, and goals determined to be too unrealistic.)
* 2.3. Review What you Found (The logic underpinning participants’ belief that systemic change can result without confronting powerful elites is bolstered by a sense that engaging in small-p politics feels good and by tangible examples of success (e.g., food policy councils, community gardens).)
	+ Literature CONSISTENCY and/or INSIGHT (Here we are reminded of philosopher Kate Soper’s (2004) work on alternative hedonism. Alternative hedonism refers to the pleasures that can be enjoyed through sufficiency (rather than excess), involving a rejection of capitalism’s call for a never-ending quest to have more. For example, the alternative hedonist rides her bike not simply because s/he wants to ‘save’ the planet, but because she enjoys the pleasures of commuting in the open air more than being cooped up in a car. Alternative hedonism bears resemblance to our notion of small-p politics in that there is a shared acceptance that one’s actions may not have a radically transformative impact, but such action involves a commitment to wield one’s (minimal) power nonetheless, developing experiences that are pleasurable, relational and sustainable.)
* 3.1. – State Implication(s) of Findings (without doing any of the sub-tasks Calarco outlines) (TJB Reading-derived Section) (In their belief that social change can result without confrontation, we note, first that it is important to articulate and evaluate the envisioned model of change and, second, to reflect on the discourse of small-p politics.)
* 2.3. – Review what you found (The model of social change suggested by our participants is one in which cultural change (effected largely through valorizing consumers’ tastes for local products) informs political change.)
* 5.1. Evaluate social change strategy held by respondents by referring to literature and/or through argument (While eat-local alliances may be generative of future organizing efforts that tackle structural issues in the food system, it is useful to reflect briefly on how a vision of incremental reform based on a movementmarket hybrid has served the organic food movement. In his far-reaching study of the organic sector in the US (which currently occupies 4 per cent of the market), Obach (2015) concludes: ‘growth in this sector is finite and certified products will remain a niche market indefinitely’ (p. 227, emphasis ours). The case of organics, fair-trade and other alternative food networks (Goodman et al. 2012) suggest that a hopeful vision of pre-figurative politics must be balanced with a realistic assessment of how much transformative potential alternative markets possess, particularly in an age of extreme income inequality. Finally, we observe that while Skocpol (2004) noted a within-organization tendency for professional staff to adopt non-partisan discourse, we see this narrative style adopted by representatives of both professional and volunteer-based organizations located in the state, market and non-profit sector. Participants credit this discourse with creating productive alliances; echoing McQuarrie (2015), we caution that the alliances forged with elites in eat-local initiatives are likely sustained by not upsetting the existing balance of power. In sum, the small-p politics model can be credited with many tangible achievements, but can also stymie other more systemic reforms by eschewing contentious framing of issues and focusing on winnable problems.)
* 6 – Discuss Limitations (Limitations. Our conclusions are shaped by the unique characteristics of our sample settings. As we described earlier, our participants are disproportionately female, white and well educated. Yet the excerpts reported in this paper slightly overrepresent male participants, suggesting a need for additional research on the gendered nature of small-p politics. Moreover, our sample characteristics shed light into how everyday food politics is reproduced when key leaders embody a certain degree of privilege, and who may expect – consciously or unconsciously – that others have the same opportunities. This limitation in sample diversity reveals a need for further inquiry into the impact of one’s position in the social structure on political imaginaries. While interviewing actors from multiple realms – civil society, the market, and the state – is a methodological innovation of this paper, it also presents a second limitation as it relates to the profit-motive. For farmers and market managers, advancing a more just and sustainable food system is tightly bound with selling and promoting locally grown products. An emphasis on product promotion in many ways necessitates a focus on the pleasures of the product; the emphasis on pleasure that informs small-p politics may be an artifact of a local food scene that is rooted in commercial practices and market mechanisms. Regardless of the logic linking markets and food pleasures, it is significant that we observed a prioritization of pleasurable political action in multiple realms including state and civic spheres. We recommend future research into (a) how local food organizations without a profit-motivation could potentially resist the prioritization of consumer pleasure and even advance the notion of consumer sacrifice; and (b) the extent to which themes of pleasurable, convivial and pragmatic politics are transposable to other arenas of collective behaviour (e.g., climate change advocacy).)
* 4.1. TB-derived section > Identify a possible explanation for your findings without referring to existing research (During a year immersed in local food politics we repeatedly asked ourselves why individuals passionately concerned about complex socio-ecological problems focused resolutely on winnable projects and anodyne political narratives. Our answer, put simply, is because this is what makes sense in the settings in which our informants act. There are two features of the realm of local food politics that may help these observations. First, food system change in consumer capitalism requires the production and consumption of a particular commodity – local food. Confrontational discourse and practice are not necessary for promoting – and may even circumvent efforts to promote – alternatives to conventional agriculture. Therefore, small-p politics may be in evidence in other contexts where change is pursued through the production and promotion of products with environmental or social virtues (e.g., fair-trade). Second, the small-p politics adopted by our participants may relate to their democratic imaginations. That is, participants generally believe that the benefits of localizing the food system are irrefutable and that we simply require more production and consumption of local food. Therefore, the political projects required for change need not entail confronting elites or challenging capitalism logics but rather involve setting feasible goals for incremental improvements yielding cultural shifts.)
* 4.4. Conclude by reviewing why these findings (and the larger puzzle/gap they address) are important (Our concept of small-p politics provides new insights into the rise of nontraditional political engagement practices. The small-p approach works well for those involved in food system change – they are able to see the impacts of their efforts, they enjoy their work, and as a result, they can sustain their engagement over time. In the realm of eat-local initiatives, ethical consumption extends seamlessly from the political ideals of pleasure, conviviality and pragmatism. While recognizing the logic of a small-p approach that embraces ethical consumption and eschews contention, we caution that narrowing the scope of tools and topics available for civic participation may compromise the ability for collective action to tackle barriers to justice and sustainability, even while engaged consumers feel content in the fruits of their political engagement efforts.)

## *Poetics* – Baumann et al. 2022 – Discussion/Conclusion (2,162 words) – “Discussion and Conclusion”

* 2.3. – Review what you found (Our analysis of individuals’ preferences and consumption choices regarding food and especially meat reveals four distinct orientations. These orientations vary according to how people prioritize concerns for high-status aesthetics and high-status morals. Put differently, a “good” meal for higher status consumers is both delicious and ethical, an orientation we term “moral aestheticism”. Our findings also show that these four consumption orientations vary in their demographic correlates, in how they are related to aesthetic and moral orientations beyond food, and in how they are connected to symbolic and social boundaries. Specifically, moral aestheticism is an orientation toward food that is more prevalent among women who are high-income, highly educated, politically liberal, relatively young, and have inherited cultural capital. Furthermore, people reflecting this orientation are more likely to hold this same orientation toward culture in general, beyond food. They are also more likely to hold a symbolic boundary regarding food and more likely to report a social boundary regarding food. We argue that our findings demonstrate that contemporary high-status tastes involve both aesthetic and moral evaluations.)
* 2.1 – Remind readers of the puzzle/gap in the literature that you are trying to solve (One of the enduring contributions of existing sociological research on aesthetics in the context of consumer preferences is unpacking the nature of high cultural capital aesthetics; we suggest a similar effort is needed in the domain of high cultural capital morality.)
* Literature REVIEW (Within aesthetics, Bourdieu (1984) identified the contrast between tastes of necessity and tastes of freedom as a key dimension that structures aesthetic preferences, with high cultural capital tastes oriented toward an appreciation for tastes of freedom. For example, in the realm of food, high-status tastes favor light, refined, and artfully-presented meals that signal distance from the necessity of maximizing the ratio of dollars spent to caloric value. Bourdieu elaborated the Kantian perspective that non-instrumentality is an essential quality of beauty. Holt (1998) moved this conversation into the North American landscape, noting that HCC consumers in the United States valued properties like idealism and cosmopolitanism. Other principles that have been identified as structuring high-status tastes include omnivorousness (Peterson and Kern 1996) and multivocality (Griswold 1987), as well as authenticity and exoticism (Johnston and Baumann (2007).)
* 2.2. – Remind readers of the specific research question that you have answered (But what are the moral qualities that higher status consumers prefer? What kinds of structuring principles can we discern among those moral qualities?)
* 2.3. – Review what you found (In our study of food, we observe that high cultural capital moral consecration reflects a particular set of concerns: an interest in having one’s consumption choices minimize harm to valued and vulnerable entities (e.g., animals, the environment) and an interest in promoting equity and fairness to actors and institutions affected by globalized corporate capitalism (e.g., laborers, small and local businesses).)
* 3.5. TJB > Simply explain how previously published literature relates to your findings, without commenting on whether it is surprising relative to findings, and without saying that your data clarifies, challenges, or expands previous literature (These two prominent themes call to mind existing work on moral foundations (e.g., Haidt 2012). Using multiple datasets collected on samples of Americans, Haidt and colleagues observed a relatively stable set of moral foundations: care, fairness, loyalty, authority, and purity. We find that in the context of food, and meat in particular, higher status consumers prioritize care, fairness, and purity. We see these foundations invoked in our participants’ comments about environmental health and animal welfare, concerns with how meat is produced, their perception that small livestock operations are cleaner, and their nostalgia for small, family-run farms.)
* Clarification (Food, and meat specifically, could be morally consecrated when purchased from a source deemed legitimately ethical (e.g., a farmers’ market, an independent butcher) or when labeled with a morally-consecrated designation (e.g., organic, pasture-raised).)
* 3.6. TJB > Identify areas of social life where your argument likely applies (We suggest similar patterns exist beyond the realm of food. For instance, clothes purchased from the ethical retailer Everlane have a moral cachet, as do clothes labeled “anti-sweatshop”, “eco-friendly”, or “Fairtrade”. There is a growing field of ethical classification where organizations compile information about the ethical practices of companies, which could play a key role in shaping processes of moral consecration. Across spheres as diverse as film, music, clothing, food and beyond, we suggest that HCC consumers may be oriented toward products that are not only aesthetically-consecrated, but that also signal a commitment to reducing harm and injustice.)
* 3.2. Explain how your findings solve the puzzle or fill the gap in the literature (The boundary work that we witnessed has implications for class inequality and political divisiveness. Scholars contributing to moral foundations theory (e.g., Haidt 2012) have demonstrated that political liberals are more concerned with care and fairness than with the other moral foundations. Conservatives also value these concerns, though not as highly, as they also incorporate respect for authority; loyalty to family, friends, and neighbors; and preservation of purity or sanctity into their sense of what is moral. The consecration of moral concerns that have a stronger appeal to liberals might be an under-examined driver of political polarization and divisiveness. If the parameters of what constitutes “ethical” consumption (and “good” food more specifically) is more heavily weighted toward liberal moral foundations and neglects conservative moral foundations, then the symbolic and social boundaries that higher status consumers draw may be perceived as unfair or “elitist” by people who do not share the same impulses. This argument is also made in the context of environmentalism (Kennedy and Horne 2020). Recall that the moral aestheticism orientation was negatively associated with political conservatism in our survey findings.)
* 3.3. Explain how the resolution of this gap/puzzle helps to clarify, challenge, or expand existing knowledge or theory (One question that arises in connection to our argument is the relative appeal of aesthetic versus moral consecration, and whether there are threshold effects for each kind of consecration. Take, for example, the films of Woody Allen. In an article in The Paris Review, Claire Dederer’s (2017) titular question is, ‘What do we do with the art of monstrous men?’, using Woody Allen as her “ur-example.” The article is referencing the fact that although the director’s films have long been aesthetically-consecrated, today it is problematic to express an appreciation for Allen’s films. The reason is the broad acceptance of the idea that Allen is a sexual predator alongside the recognition of misogyny in his work. Allen’s aesthetic consecration is in effect “vetoed” by the negative moral evaluation of him and of his work. His case raises the question, is there a threshold for aesthetic or moral consecration, above which consecration on one dimension cannot be negated by failure on the other? Conversely, is there a lower bound beneath which a cultural option cannot be redeemed by consecration on the other dimension? Similar examples exist in other domains that point to the complications related to tensions between aesthetic and moral valuation. The music of Richard Wagner remains aesthetically-celebrated, despite his established anti-Semitism, and Shakespeare remains in the literary canon despite ethnic and racial representations that do not meet contemporary standards. Returning to the case of food, products like veal, foie gras, and factory-farmed meat are falling out of favor with some higher status eaters. The unethical (harm) dimension of the product appears to have veto power over aesthetic qualities.)
* 3.3. Explain how the resolution of this gap/puzzle helps to clarify, challenge, or expand existing knowledge or theory (These examples also raise the question of how moral consecration processes unfold. Aesthetic consecration is a result of the work of actors in fields with the symbolic power to consecrate, such as elite producers and intermediaries connected to influential institutions (Bourdieu 1984). Booker Prize-winning authors and Michelin-starred restaurants are aesthetically consecrated. But how are cultural choices categorized as morally consecrated or morally unacceptable? In the case of food, certification as organic, local, or fair trade might serve this function. But many cultural realms lack formal certifications of ethical standards. For example, Lizzo’s music contains themes of feminism and racial equality that appeal to many higher status audience members, but these moral dimensions are not formally recognized in a parallel fashion to the aesthetic consecration Lizzo’s music has received through awards and positive reviews. Informally, however, it is possible that some agents working in the field are recognized as having not only the power to aesthetically consecrate consumption choices, but also the moral authority to confer – or deny – moral consecration. Future research should investigate how the moral status of cultural options is established in various fields and what degree of consensus is needed to support that status. For instance, Bourdieu’s cultural capital theory holds that HCC preferences are internalized in the habitus from an early age. It is an open question to what extent preferences for moral consecration are internalized over the lifecourse and internalized and naturalized at a subconscious level versus an explicit evaluation. Similarly, it is also an open question to what extent aestheticism and moralism are experienced as orientations that direct preferences and choices separately or together. Relatedly, just as research on cultural consumption has attended to the distinction between what people consume vs. how they consume (Jarness 2015), future research should apply this distinction to understanding HCC moralism in consumption.)
* 3.7. TJB > Draw out implications of your findings, without referring to literature (Our findings show that moral aestheticism is associated with younger age groups, a relationship that we think is suggestive of the dynamic nature of moral consecration. It is possible that sources of moral consecration, relative to aesthetic consecration, are newer and more contested, and that this context might be affecting the moral evaluations of food that younger people in our sample are making. We also note that ethical consumption discourse has recently become more prevalent, and it is a discourse the encourages moral evaluations in consumption choices. Younger people are potentially more readily socialized into this discourse, and they are also at a life stage when they are engaged in establishing their self-concepts and self-presentation, for which consumption can play a central role. Young people also tend to have less economic capital to draw on, and by making moral evaluations and choices that are high status, they both have and can signal the possession of cultural capital.)
* 3.3. Explain how the resolution of this gap/puzzle helps to clarify, challenge, or expand existing knowledge or theory (The constitution of cultural capital has always been dynamic and complex. Friedman and Reeves (2020:342) demonstrated this dynamism longitudinally and concluded that, “the aesthetic mode of cultural distinction may be changing”. Our analyses of symbolic and social boundaries indicate that both morals and aesthetics influence judgments of worth and social value. In this way, achieving distinction through high-status consumption choices is all the more difficult to achieve, as the most socioeconomically-privileged consumers incorporate aesthetics and morals in their consumption objectives. In this further-attenuated construction of cultural consecration, consumers are required to have literacy and an embodied orientation to longstanding criteria like authenticity, an ability to play with cultural forms, and an orientation to emergent criteria around care and equity. These qualities move high cultural capital consumption still further from tastes of necessity, and reproduce a problematic association linking “good” food (and good culture) with “good” people, who just happen to be affluent.)
* 3.3. Explain how the resolution of this gap/puzzle helps to clarify, challenge, or expand existing knowledge or theory (Another question of interest is how these evolving tastes interact with cultural omnivorousness. For instance, Peterson and Kern (1996) showed us that it is not enough to know highbrow culture to be a high-status consumer, that one also has to have a broad and diverse, yet still consecrated, profile of cultural preferences. It is unclear how omnivorous status hierarchies engage with processes of moral consecration. Can we understand better which lowbrow genres and cultural objects are incorporated into omnivorous cultural diets when we attend to processes of moral consecration? Certainly, consumers must have the cultural capital to differentiate between ethical and unethical cultural goods, and distance themselves from aesthetically-consecrated goods if they are morally-sanctioned. We expect that those with more privilege will be better-positioned to navigate this shifting terrain, and intuitively understand the interlinked processes of aesthetic and moral consecration. Yet the sort of ironic appropriation of lowbrow cultural goods seems unlikely to function as a form of cultural capital in the moral domain. The ways in which foodies, for instance, have shown an ability to play with highbrow and lowbrow options, are unlikely to translate to the same playful orientation to consumption choices deemed immoral (e.g., veal).)
* 3.6. TJB > Identify areas of social life where your argument likely applies (We look forward to research that builds on our findings. For instance, in order to more firmly establish the emergence of the higher status moral aestheticism position, we would like to see analyses from domains beyond food, such as visual art, fashion, music, literature, and architecture. While cost is a major factor in food choices, it is less salient in some realms such as television or music, which might affect the expression of moral aestheticism in realms beyond food. Since our qualitative case study on food and meat helped to illuminate the sub-dimensionality of moral consecration, we believe that similar case studies beyond food would help develop and refine the argument. Quantitative and qualitative studies beyond food would help to refine the dimensions of high-status moral consecration in cultural consumption.)

## *Journal of Consumer Culture* – Baumann et al. 2019 – Conclusion (468 words) – “Conclusion”

* 2.1 Remind readers of the puzzle/gap in the literature that you are trying to solve (This article provides novel findings about the culture of low-SES food tastes.)
* 2.3. Review what you found (By systematically analyzing a large sample of interviews with diverse consumers, we identify four distinct low-SES taste preferences: (1) abundance, (2) corporate brands, (3) familiar ethnic foods, and (4) healthy foods. The first three categories represent distinct low-SES tastes that were not routinely observed in our mid-/highSES consumer data. While a taste for health cuts across SES, the mode in which healthy foods are appreciated varied considerably, with low-SES groups seeing healthy foods as existing just out of reach.)
* 4.2. Use existing research to discuss the most likely explanation for your findings (We explain low-SES tastes by building on a Bourdieusian approach to habitus and tastes of necessity. A taste for abundance, corporate brands, and familiar ethnic foods all work to constitute an embodied habitus that values and finds pleasure in foods that are low cost and accessible. Our data affirm what Bourdieu (1984: 177) describes as ‘‘a virtue made of necessity.’’ Although Bourdieusian approaches remain deeply relevant, low-SES tastes can be fully explained as tastes of necessity. A fuller explanation requires reference to the broader food system and prominent cultural repertoires. First, a taste for corporate foods emerged within a branded industrialized food system that produces a panoply of tasty, well-marketed foods that are both desired and embodied at the level of taste. It is clear that entire societies have become ‘‘‘tuned’ to the taste of industrial food’’ (Carolan, 2014: 317), yet low-income populations have less opportunities to develop a taste for alternatives. Second, a desire for familiar ethnic foods must be understood with reference to broad patterns of immigration and the specific culinary context where certain immigrant communities offer ubiquitous, lowcost foods that are appealing to risk-averse eaters. Finally, a low-SES taste for healthy foods must be understood in relation to a far-reaching individualizing neoliberal discourse mandating personal responsibility for health through responsible food choices (Biltekoff, 2013; Cairns and Johnston, 2015).)
* 3.3. TJB Variation > Explain how implication of findings, themes and/or subthemes clarify, challenge, or expand exiting knowledge or theory (Theoretically, our findings and arguments speak to central questions in the study of cultural consumption. Specifically, we show how the Bourdieusian perspective emphasizing class position works in concert with what might be called dominant discourses or cultural repertoires. A simple class explanation comes up short. LowSES respondents’ tastes for ubiquitous corporate brands, familiar ethnic foods, and, most obviously, healthy foods are dependent on established cultural repertoires that frame food consumption as a vital channel to health and pleasure, leisure, and belonging. Overall, our research points to ways that structural conditions of poverty and dominant cultural repertoires generate specific classed taste patterns. To the extent that low-SES food tastes are part of a ‘‘culture of poverty,’’ we agree with Small et al. (2010) and Warde (2014: 282–283) that cultural tastes cannot be seen as abstract ideals; low-SES tastes develop in conjunction with the structural conditions and inequalities that shape and constrain the choices of poor consumers.)

## *Sociological Forum* – Oleschuk et al. 2019 – Discussion/Conclusion (919 words) – “Discussion and Conclusion”

* 2.1 Remind readers of the puzzle/gap in the literature that you are trying to solve (The psychological literature has made great progress in explaining why people continue to eat meat while simultaneously holding strong reasons for not doing so. Psychological strategies operate on a mostly preconscious level to justify meat eating using the 4Ns: as nice, normal, natural, and necessary (Joy 2010:96–97; Piazza et al. 2015). We endorse the psychological findings and find strong evidence to support them in our interview data. However, our sample allows us to see explanations for meat eating that rest in supraindividual repertoires circulating culturally (Lamont and Swidler 2014) that individuals can draw on in order to choose to eat meat in a way that holds meaning for them. In building off prior psychological findings, the identification of these cultural repertoires allows us to understand more fully how and why people maintain their meat consumption—even in the face of growing public discourse about meat’s significant health, environmental, and social risks. Others have argued that meat eating can be connected to gender norms (see, e.g., Adams 1990; Rothgerber 2013; Sobal 2005) or cultural backgrounds (e.g., Ali 2015; Tian, Hilton, and Becker 2016). However, ours is the first study using interview data to identify cultural repertoires that are then integrated with prior psychological findings as ways to explain the meat paradox. A sociological approach encourages an analysis of justifications and explanations for meat eating that foregrounds the subject positions of individuals. When respondents indicate that meat eating is “normal,” a sociological analysis first asks, “normal for whom?” It considers the social benefits encompassed in conforming to normative gendered and cultural meat-eating practices alongside their influence over the taste or “niceness” of those meals. When meat eating is justified as “nice,” a sociological approach does not take an evaluation of “niceness” as a given but instead asks how people construct what is nice as a function of particular, shared evaluative standards. A sociological approach also looks at how cultural scripts informing contemporary consumer politics such as consumer apathy and consumer sovereignty bolster the acceptability of cognitive disengagement and offer justifications for individualized, rather than collective, orientations to consumer practices. Together, an examination of meat maintenance through the lens of cultural repertoires allows for recognition of psychological mechanisms underpinning the attitude-behavior gap, while situating them within broader cultural scripts that give actions meaning, and allow practices to persist despite conflicting evidence. Our approach foregrounds culture by recognizing that the meanings people attribute to their actions are in a fundamental sense explanations for how they understand their actions. The meat paradox is one instance of a larger class of phenomena where there are inconsistencies between attitudes and behaviors, and people struggle to develop a coherent lifestyle narrative (Kollmuss and Agyeman 2002; Lorenzen 2012). Furthermore, it is like other phenomena, such as climate change, where change is impeded by the meeting of competing and contradictory values and beliefs (Gifford 2011; Leiserowitz 2006; O’Neill and Nicholson-Cole 2009). The cultural repertoires concept grew out of a need to understand how cultural resources factored into the inconsistent relationship between values and actions (Swidler 2001), where it had long been observed that we cannot predict people’s behaviors based on what we know about what they value. Both meat consumption specifically, and food consumption more generally, are topics where the contradictions between people’s beliefs, knowledge, and desires are often not aligned with their behaviors. Our research contributes to this literature by demonstrating the value of the cultural repertoires concept for explaining the gap between consumer concern and behavioral modifications that addresses it.)
* 3.3. Explain how the resolution of this gap/puzzle helps to clarify, challenge, or expand existing knowledge or theory (It also advances this literature by demonstrating the variability within cultural repertoires. We show that some repertoires— identity repertoires—are deployed on a personal level, tied to specific anecdotes and embodied experiences that are used to explain people’s affiliation to identity groups. We contrast these with liberty repertoires, which are deployed on a more abstract level, to signal people’s ideas about themselves within society and the rights or freedoms they possess by virtue of their participation as consumers in the marketplace. By distinguishing liberty repertoires from identity repertoires, we therefore differentiate between cultural scripts that are broadly shared (e.g., consumers’ right to choice) from those that are more closely tied to social groups, bounded, for example, by gender, class, and ethnocultural boundaries.)
* 2.3. Review what you found (Last, our data suggest that the type of repertoire being deployed reflects different forms of engagement with the ethical implications of consumption acts. We find that the abstract, impersonal nature of the liberty scripts facilitated participants’ disengagement with the ethical implications of their actions. This was most obvious in the consumer apathy script but was also present in the consumer sovereignty script that offered a simple, mechanical justification for defending individual choice, regardless of broader collective consequences. In contrast, identity scripts were frequently deployed by people who had considered the ethical implications of their eating and had maybe even tried to reduce their meat consumption but reverted to previous practices because the social ramifications for changing were too strong (e.g., it caused tension in their families or resulted in teasing from their friends).)

## *Journal of Rural Studies* – Johnston et al. 2022 – Discussion/Conclusion (~2,300 words) – Discussion

Discussion

* 2.2. Remind readers of the specific research question that you have answered (We have sought to better understand how small-scale alternative producers perceive their role producing ethical meat, especially in relation to issues of scale, sustainability, and food system transformation.)
* 2.3. Review what you found (We have two primary findings. First, we find that scaling up is both hard to do and hard not to do. On the one hand, there is an intimacy that is highly valued amongst small-scale producers. Raising and processing animals in small numbers is connected to close relationships between people, animals, and the land. Valuing these small-scale relationships, and having meaningful work producing a high-value, ethical food source, is seen as a key motivation and reward for doing this work. In most of our interviews, these value-based motivations loomed larger than a desire for profits. Put simply, producers thought of their work as meaningful, and saw their work as a small part of a much bigger project of building a sustainable food system. On the other hand, while producing ethical meat was seen as meaningful work, producers were acutely aware of the limits placed by the small-scale nature of most of their operations. There are strong incentives to scale up, but doing so requires addressing significant logistical and financial obstacles. The issue of scale was linked to multiple challenges in our interviews – challenges that ranged from rodent infestations, insufficient and inconsistent supply for restaurants, potential threats to grasslands if a herd grows too big, as well as numerous challenges related to markets, slaughterhouses, government regulations and quota systems. Many small producers struggled to make ends meet and worked long hours, and only a few had ample capital available for an expansion to grow into a mid-sized operation.)
* 2.2. – Remind readers of the specific research question that you have answered (In line with previous literature, producers spoke of multiple structural hindrances that impeded their financial stability, growth, and even their economic survival; they need greater and more affordable access to nearby slaughterhouses, food safety regulations tailored for small operations, access to affordable land and market training, and greater economic rewards, perhaps in the form of state subsidies, for the ecosystem benefits their production systems generate (e.g., Brynne 2020).)
* 3.1. State Implication(s) of Findings (without doing any of the sub-tasks Calarco outlines) (TJB Reading-derived Section) (The obstacles facing ethical meat producers suggests that scaling up small-scale meat to reach a larger percentage of the meat-eating marketplace represents a profound challenge; it also casts doubt on the assumption that small-scale meat projects can make a significant dent in the reach of large-scale industrialized agriculture built on highvolume, confined animal feeding operations. By highlighting the challenges of scaling up small enterprises, our data indirectly speaks to the possibilities and limits for an expanded “agriculture of the middle”. This is a pressing issue given that the North American food industry – including the meat sector – is increasingly being split between the consolidation of land and corporate power at one end of the spectrum, and at the other end small-scale enterprises that experience numerous structural disadvantages (Qualman et al., 2018; Stinnett and Jennifer, 2018).)
* 2.3. Review what you found (Our second finding relates to the idea of a cultural imagination. Drawing from work on the rural imaginary and the democratic imagination as they relate to food production, we investigate the range of imagined potentials that exist in the space of ethical meat, specifically how ethical meat could relate to the broader food system. Within the context of practical, ethical, and emotional obstacles to scaling up, a dominant idea did emerge: consumers should eat less meat, but they should eat better quality meat – meat from animals raised on small and medium-sized operations that are sustainable and have close ties to caring farmers and well-tended ecosystems. At the same time, two highly divergent perspectives co-exist alongside the majority “less meat, better meat” perspective. On the one hand, some producers are reluctant to critique industrial agriculture and are more worried about falling rates of North American meat consumption than climate change. This perspective seems rooted in an impression that the meat industry is on the ropes, and that rural meat producers are undervalued and misunderstood by government, consumers, and science. On the other end of the spectrum, another minority perspective makes the suggestion that meat has too much cultural power. Producers articulating this perspective made the relatively radical suggestion that meat is not central to human health or food system sustainability, challenging the cultural hegemony of meat in everyday diets. Faced with the day-to-day realities of living with, raising, and killing animals, a minority of producers conclude that meat should be an exceptional or occasional food choice, and not a standard or taken-for granted everyday food that consumers are guaranteed to enjoy, especially at a cheap price. From this perspective, farm animals should be viewed as partners in sustainability projects, providing valuable fertilizer to improve ecosystems, rather than instrumental entities raised primarily for the ends of human consumption. Ethical meat is imagined as nextbest-thing or a pathway to the shift away from a diet centred on meat.)
* 3.7. TJB > Draw out implications of your findings, without referring to literature (The diversity of these findings speaks to the importance of studying not just food and agricultural practices, but also the ideas and values that form part of producers’ cultural imagination. Many of the participants in our study adopted similar kinds of livestock management strategies (e.g., rotational grazing, raising heritage breeds, giving animals ample outdoor access), and all of them shared a sense that meat production could be meaningful work. At the same time, they thought very differently about how meat fits into a sustainable food system. The concept of cultural imagination is useful for capturing this variation. Moreover, while there is a wealth of important research on the politicaleconomic conditions of rural food producers, there is less scholarship on the cultural dimensions of this work. Through a focus on the perceptions, values, and beliefs of ethical meat producers, this article brings needed analytic focus on the culture of food producers.)
* 3.4. Using existing literature, explain why your findings are or are not surprising (As noted by Kennedy et al. (2016), actors in alternative food systems can have relatively “thick” structural understandings of food system complexity but display a relatively a “thin” democratic imagination when it comes to finding solutions. Ideas for transforming the food system are often limited to market-based, ‘shopping for change’ strategies – buying local and supporting individual producers that produce sustainable products. While our findings generally support this conclusion, we also identified a subset of actors that had a relatively thick imagination when it came to imagining ways forward; they adopted a paradoxical position of raising animals for meat, while critiquing the idea that meat-eating should be a normal, everyday occurrence, and even advocating more vegetarianism (position #3). Even actors espousing the second, “less meat, better meat” perspective demonstrated a cultural imagination that involved a relatively countercultural position in a food system where it is normal to eat a lot of meat: consumers should cut back on how much meat they consume, eschew “cheap” meat, and spend more money on small quantities of quality, ethical meat.)
* 3.3. Explain how the resolution of this gap/puzzle helps to clarify, challenge, or expand existing knowledge or theory (Of course, all meat producers rely on consumers to eat meat to support their respective endeavours. Without consumer support, ethical butchers, whole-animal focused chefs, pastured-poultry farmers, and grass-finished cattle cannot exist. This speaks to a profound tension involved not only with ethical meat, but with the cultural imagination of alternative meat producers in neoliberal economies reliant on marketbased strategies for making eco-social change. As Kennedy and colleagues write of their own research findings on the democratic imagination and the eat-local movement, thinking about imagination can “yield important insights about the structural tensions” facing food activists that seek to “simultaneously garner consumer support while seeking far-reaching goals of sustainability and social justice” (2016: 163). Some meat producers might imagine a future world where farm animals are minimally consumed and consumers eschew their meat habits, but for now, ethical meat operates within a competitive marketbased system reliant on consumer sales amidst a bevy of cheap meat offerings.)

Conclusion

* 2.1 Remind readers of the puzzle/gap in the literature that you are trying to solve (We started this paper with a simple premise: meat is a highly contested food. In today’s food system, the externalities relating to meat are well-known, and many consumers have concerns about how animals are raised and slaughtered in the industrialized food system. While scholarship has revealed some of the complex feelings around meat consumption and the rise of conscientious omnivores (e.g., Rothgerber 2015), less is known about how producers think about these debates and their work to produce meat in a context where meat is contentious but also widely consumed.)
* 2.3. Review what you Found (Empirically, we document producer perceptions regarding the issue of scale and the relationship of ethical meat to the larger food system. While there was consistency in the experiences and perceptions of producers regarding scaling up, there was variation in perspectives on the relationship of ethical meat to the larger food system. Conceptually, we employed the idea of a cultural imagination to make sense of the disjuncture between producers’ consistent experiences vs. their variable perspectives and to capture the wide range of ideas producers hold about the role meat should play in a sustainable food system. We document three perspectives that display a cultural imagination that ranges from 1) a relatively “thin” status quo perspective to 2) a dominant middleground position that advocates for less meat, but higher quality ethical meat (scaled up to reach more consumers), to 3) a relatively “thick” cultural imagination that challenges the role of meat as a fundamental dietary staple. This third perspective was unexpected in our study, especially since these same producers relied on consumer sales of meat for their livelihood.)
* 4.4. Conclude by reviewing why these findings (and the larger puzzle/gap they address) are important (This finding suggests the importance of research that examines the cultural ideas and meanings of food producers and investigates a diversity of views even when similar practices are present (see Obach 2015).)
* 7 – Future Research (In terms of future research on meat, the diversity of perspectives we document here speaks to the importance of empirically investigating how alternative producers think about this controversial product. Do these three ideal-type perspectives on ethical meat exist in other national contexts, or within specific markets (e.g., for pastured poultry, or heritage pigs, or nose-to-tail butchers?). Our sample did not identify specific socio-demographic traits attached to each perspective, beyond the finding that the first, status quo perspective was more common amongst white Alberta ranchers. Future work could investigate which kinds of producers tend to exhibit different cultural imaginations on meat, including not only entrepreneurs but hired workers. More broadly, we believe that given the contemporary problem of political polarization (e.g., Hochschild 2016), an issue that often overlaps with a rural-urban cultural divide, it seems important to understand rural subjectivities; this includes the deeply held ideas, values, and beliefs of people who produce culturally significant staples, like meat.)
* 4.4. Conclude by reviewing why these findings (and the larger puzzle/gap they address) are important (For us, this has meant investigating how producers imagine that meat can (or cannot) contribute to a broader goal of creating a food system that is fair to farmers, humane for animals, accessible to consumers, and sustainable for the planet)

## *Agriculture and Human Values* – Cairns and Johnston 2018 – Discussion/Conclusion­­ (1,028 words) – “Discussion and conclusion”

* 2.3. Review what you found (This research illustrates the fraught position of the informed child consumer within ethical eating discourse.)
* 3.5. TJB > Simply explain how previously published literature relates to your findings, without commenting on whether it is surprising relative to findings, and without saying that your data clarifies, challenges, or expands previous literature (This tension has relevance to feminist studies of maternal foodwork, as well as scholarship on ethical eating and meat consumption.)
* Generalizing Beyond Sample without Referencing Literature (As urban Canadian and American consumers are encouraged to understand how meals arrive on the plate, educating children about “where food comes from” has become central to an idealized performance of maternal foodwork. In the context of meat eating, the project of teaching about food’s origins conflicts with the notion that children should be shielded from difficult knowledge. The truth of animal slaughter is viewed as a threat to children’s innocence.)
* 2.3. Review what you found (Notably, we did not set out to investigate the tension between education and protection in maternal foodwork. We didn’t ask mothers if or how they talked to children about animal slaughter. Instead, this issue was brought to our attention by mothers who articulated it as a source of tension.)
* 7 – Future Research (The salience of this paradox for white middle-class mothers in our study suggests the need for further research investigating the racialized and classed dimensions of a knowledge paradox within “intensive feeding ideology” (Brenton 2017).)
* 2.3. Review what you found – Clarification (We want to be clear that while acknowledging a pattern in our data, we are not claiming a straightforward link between race and feeding ideology. Consider the example of Manuela, a woman of color, who shared that her kids know about “the little seed and how it grows,” but that an understanding of meat production “is kind of awful for a kid to know.” It’s possible that if we had asked mothers directly about whether they discuss these issues with their children, we would have found this tension to be just as prevalent across race and class backgrounds. Or, perhaps women of color are less invested in ideologies of intensive mothering and childhood innocence that have longstanding links to whiteness and racialized exclusions. While white, middle-class mothers in our study appeared more engaged with intensive feeding ideology and its associated tensions, women from diverse class and race backgrounds raised concerns about industrial meat—although middle-class women had greater flexibility and resources to act on these concerns.)
* 7 – Future Research (Future work should continue to investigate how differently positioned mothers negotiate ethical eating discourse in their everyday foodwork.)
* 3.3. Explain how the resolution of the gap/puzzle helps to clarify, challenge, or expand existing knowledge or theory (More broadly, our findings add complexity to existing research on the challenges of maternal foodwork. Past research has shown the powerful pressures of intensive mothering, and the close links between foodwork and performances of femininity (Hays 1996; DeVault 1991). More recent research shows how many mothers feel personally responsible for protecting children’s “purity” in the context of an industrialized food system—a commitment they pursue by investigating production practices, reading labels, and making baby food from scratch (Cairns et al. 2013; MacKendrick 2014). These practices of “intensive feeding” constitute key ideals of white, middle-class motherhood (Brenton 2017), yet they also raise the stakes of socially-acceptable food practices for all mothers who experience pressure to conform to these standards (Cairns and Johnston 2015). Our case study of meat-eating further illuminates the challenges of intensive feeding standards. While mothers feel pressure to teach children about food’s origins, they also attempt to protect children from harsh food truths—like the connection between meat-based meals and the pig protagonist in Charlotte’s Web. Taken together, this research suggests food knowledge is paradoxically constructed as both key to preserving the child’s purity (in the case of protecting children from contaminated, “unclean” food), and a threat to this very purity, when it comes to knowledge of eating animals. This finding reveals yet another dimension in the seemingly impossible balancing act of performing the “good” mother through foodwork, a finding that speaks to the gendered inequalities that make it so difficult for women to achieve a sense of satisfaction in their maternal efforts (Cairns and Johnston 2015).)
* 3.3. Explain how the resolution of this gap/puzzle helps to clarify, challenge, or expand existing knowledge or theory – 7. Future Research (Building upon Cook’s (2008) assertion that an analysis of childhood can bring new insights to consumption scholarship, we suggest the significance of this contradiction extends beyond the practice of feeding children. While knowledge of meat-eating is perceived as a threat to childhood innocence, this tension speaks to a broader uneasiness with eating meat. This uneasiness has been documented in food scholarship (e.g., Bulliet 2005; Loughnan et al. 2014; Holm and Mohl 2000; Tian et al. 2016), but requires further investigation in the context of global meatification, growing concern about the environmental implications of industrial meat production, and questions about how to reshape consumer habits in more sustainable directions. The reluctance to teach children about the relationship between meat and animals likely reflects a lingering discomfort with the route meat takes to arrive on most urban dinner tables—not through bucolic family farms and small-scale butchering, but through highly industrialized, corporate-controlled confined animal feeding operations and massive slaughterhouses. Studying maternal perceptions of what children should (not) know about their food can generate insights not only into cultural constructions of childhood, but also into the tensions undergirding contemporary meat consumption.)
* 5.1. Evaluate social change strategy held by respondents or scholarship activism more broadly by referring to literature and/or through argument referencing the study’s data (Food scholarship and activism frequently assumes an “if only they knew” approach to ethical eating. In this formulation, greater knowledge of food production practices motivates changed behavior. When we learn of the suffering involved in confined animal feeding operations, the feelings that follow might inspire consumers to change their consumption practices. However, our research paints a more complex picture. Knowledge of meat’s origins can produce a variety of emotions—as showcased by the variety of children’s responses shared by mothers in our research. These children not only challenge the universal conception of the innocent child, but also challenge a core assumption of ethical eating discourse: the notion that consumers always want to know where their food comes from, and that knowing more will change food practices—an assertion not always backed by empirical evidence (Holm and Mohl 2000). In an environmental context where global meat consumption continues to expand, even as plant-based diets are lauded for their ability to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (e.g., Weber and Matthews 2008), our research suggests the limits of consumer-focused, knowledge-based strategies for change. As we have shown, such strategies call on individual mothers to educate young consumers and protect childhood innocence, all while getting ethically-sourced meals on the table.)

## Qualitative Sociology – Baldor 2022 – “Discussion” (822 words)

* Generalizing Beyond Sample without Referencing Literature (The hybridization of everyday life is producing novel digitally mediated social relationships, which produces new interactional dilemmas around how to navigate and manage them in analog encounters. In contrast to the routine and generally predictable rituals of co-present strangers prior to the digital age, people now rou- tinely encounter acquainted strangers in-person and experience these encounters as unpredictable despite their frequency.)
* 2.3. Review what you found (Incorporating both new media and sociologi- cal theory, I argue that acquainted stranger encounters are moments of context col- lision that complicate two interactional processes of initial interaction—cognitive and social recognition. I find that cognitive recognition between acquainted strangers is marked by several forms of relational uncertainty (e.g. “I know them but do they know me?”), which affects social recognition (e.g. “I do not know how to interact with this person because I do not know what our relationship is”). In some instances, queer men questioned what it means to “know” an acquainted stranger at all as they struggled to reconcile the gap between knowing intimate details—learned directly through digital interaction or indirectly through social rituals of gossip or photo shar- ing—about someone online and not knowing them offline. Furthermore, I find that queer men variably frame digital interaction as necessitating offline social recogni- tion. Queer men I spoke to had varied perspectives on whether digital acquaintances are simply in-person strangers, and thus can be ignored as such, or whether they are more than strangers and thus must be acknowledged. This variation or lack of con- sensus produces uncertain situations, which I argue stems from conflicting definitions of the digital situation: are apps separate from, or a digital extension of, in-person community?)
* 4.3. Consider alternative explanations for your findings and explain (using your data and/or other research) why these alternative explanations do or do not seem plausible (There may be other explanations for why these encounters are routine yet uncer- tain, such as app users managing stigma around promiscuity (cf. Ahlm 2017). How- ever, stigma cannot fully explain these findings. First, most queer men I spoke to did not frame using hookup apps as shameful or embarrassing. Most were openly, visibly on the apps and resided in generally gay-friendly urban neighborhoods. Even men who used their face photos on the apps, and who connected their personal social media accounts such as Instagram to them, experienced uncertainty in the presence of acquainted strangers.)
* 3.3. TJB Variation > Explain how implication of findings, themes and/or subthemes clarify, challenge, or expand exiting knowledge or theory (This study’s focus on queer mobile hookup app users colliding with one another in non-sexual, public encounters contributes to understandings of how the digital shapes—and complicates—queer belonging (e.g., McGlotten 2013; Mowlabocus 2016). As a theoretical case, these lessons can extend to other mobile dating and hookup app contexts and beyond. For example, Lundquist and Curington (2019, 24) find that college students who use dating apps manage acquainted stranger encounters on campus, including in class, at affinity group student meetings, and in their dorms. Given that regarding acquainted strangers mark not only interpersonal acceptance but also broader forms of belonging (e.g., belonging to a queer collective, neighborly community), acquainted stranger encounters may meaningfully shape college stu- dents’ experiences and wellbeing on campus)
* 3.6. TJB > Identify areas of social life where your argument likely applies (Beyond dating and hookup apps, we generate acquainted stranger relationships as we interact with wider audiences than ever before through social media. We can also see conflicting views of mobile apps and how they relate to in-person commitments in other contexts, such as co-workers friending one another on Facebook (Frampton and Child 2013). In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated the extent to which we generate and sustain exclusively virtual social connections (Nguyen et al. 2021). The shift to remote work and school creates contexts where people have never interacted with others face-to-face whom they would have had close in-person contact otherwise. Clubs, meetings, and events of all kinds can now take place on digital platforms rather than in-person, even when participants are geographically proximate. When we run into these digital acquaintances in-person, we may wonder whether that is the person we think it is. We may also wonder whether we should say hi to them, or whether they would want us to say hi to them. From the other’s perspective, we may come off as cold or flippant if we ignore them, or intrusive if we regard them.)
* 3.6. TJB > Identify areas of social life where your argument likely applies – Generalizing Beyond Sample without Referencing Literature (This paper underscores how all ethnographies are digital ethnographies in the digital age. I did not initially conceive of this project as a digital one. However, my attention to face-to-face interactions inductively led me to digital issues as queer men’s in-person interactions were inextricably linked to their digital selves, interac- tions, and relationships. Beyond the case of nightlife, consider the classroom. The digital age can both facilitate and impede learning. As an educator, my students bring theories and concepts from TikTok and Twitter into class with them, which produces engaging discussion. At the same time, I compete with social media for their atten- tion. Studying my classroom without attending to my students’ digital lives would render that social reality woefully incomplete. The ubiquity of social media renders all institutional contexts hybridized, and this is ripe for further sociological inquiry.)