This article draws on interviews with “foodies”—people with a passion for eating and learning about food—to explore questions of gender and foodie culture. The analysis suggests that while this culture is by no means gender-neutral, foodies are enacting gender in ways that warrant closer inspection. This article puts forward new empirical findings about gender and food and employs the concept of “doing gender” to explore how masculinities and femininities are negotiated in foodie culture. Our focus on doing gender generates two insights into gender and food work. First, we find that doing gender has different implications for men and women within foodie culture. Alongside evidence that foodies are contesting particular gendered relations within the food world, we explore how broader gender inequities persist. Second, we contend that opportunities for doing gender in foodie culture cannot be considered apart from class privilege.

Keywords: class/stratification; culture; men/masculinity; theory

From macho TV chefs like Gordon Ramsay to charming culinary craftsmen like Jamie Oliver, images of men cooking are now commonplace in Western popular culture. Anyone familiar with food media and foodie culture generally might think that gender has become less relevant to the world of food, with both men and women thinking, eating, and acting like “foodies”—a category commonly assigned to individuals who are passionate about the pursuit of “good food.” The apparent influx of men into the domestic kitchen raises questions about how people’s involvement in food and cooking is gendered. Common belief and sociological research agree that women rather than men primarily plan for, purchase, and cook food in the home.
(Beagan et al. 2008; Bugge and Almas 2006). While there is a rich literature exploring gendered food work within the general population, we know little about how gender plays out in foodie culture—that is, in the specific cultural context in which men appear to be more actively embracing food-related identities. How do foodies define the importance of food in their lives, and how (or to what extent) are these food identities gendered?

This article draws on interviews with foodies to explore questions of gender and foodie culture. We characterize foodies as people with a long-standing passion for eating and learning about food but who are not food professionals. While the appropriateness of the term foodie is hotly debated amongst foodies themselves (see Johnston and Baumann 2010, 59-60), we use the term empirically rather than normatively. We think of the term foodie culture as referencing a new, omnivorous cultural interest in a wide range of foods ranging from high-brow classics (e.g., duck à l’orange) to low-brow culinary treasures (e.g., handmade tacos). Our analysis demonstrates that while foodie culture is by no means gender-neutral, foodies are enacting gender in new ways that warrant closer inspection. Alongside evidence that foodies are contesting particular gendered relations within the food world, we explore how broader gender inequalities persist.

GENDER, FOOD, AND IDENTITY

A robust literature in feminist scholarship explores how social and cultural meanings attached to food serve to perpetuate unequal gender relations. These studies interrogate the historically naturalized connection between food and femininity that has served to legitimize women’s disproportionate food labor and to reproduce gendered divisions between the public and private spheres. In her classic study Feeding the Family, Marjorie DeVault (1991) explores the centrality of women’s “caring work” in the production of the heteronormative family. Beyond the basic provision of nutritional sustenance, feeding the family demands care, connection, and sensitivity to the needs of loved ones, for “the food provided for a family cannot just be any food, but must be food that will satisfy them” (1991, 40). Through a careful analysis of how women become invested in relations of care that contribute to their oppression, DeVault demonstrates how cooking as caring operates as a form of doing gender in which “a woman conducts herself as recognizably womanly” (1991, 118).

Building on DeVault’s insights, studies of food and gender explore the emotional significance invested in feminine ideals of care (Lupton 1996)
and the long-standing tendency for women to define their own food identities through the imperative to cook for others (Charles and Kerr 1988). Dominant ideals of femininity and social reproduction emphasize the maternal practice of “feeding children and socializing them into culinary competence” (Hollows 2003a, 186), and research indicates that women’s memories of their mothers often serve as a reference point for their own dinner practices (Bugge and Almas 2006; Lupton 1996). Contemporary scholarship suggests that despite the prevalence of discourses of gender equality, women continue to do the majority of food work (Aarseth and Olsen 2008; Hook 2010, 1494). This disproportionate division of labor is rationalized through implicit gendered assumptions, such as women’s apparently natural proclivity for maintaining family health (Beagan et al. 2008).

In addition to historical associations between femininity and restraint, dominant representations of women’s bodies have worked to further distance women’s food practices from the pursuit of food pleasures, idealizing a femininity based upon diet restriction, rather than indulgence (Lupton 1996). Mindful that gender is always relational, feminist scholars have demonstrated how the cultural association of body, emotion, and femininity have historically served the construction of contrary masculine ideals of rationality (Grosz 1993; Jaggar 1996; Lloyd 1984). To quote Lupton, “Emotions, like food and eating, are commonly regarded as the preserve of the embodied self rather than the disembodied, philosophizing mind. Like food and eating practices, the emotions are traditionally linked with the feminine, with the disempowered and marginalized” (1996, 31).

By contrast, men’s relationship to cooking has traditionally been defined as a hobby (Coxon 1983); a means of “helping out” for special occasions (DeVault 1991); or as the domain of the professional chef—a “talented and competent craftsman” (Fine 1995, 248) who is located in the public sphere. Studies analyzing the gendering of foods have examined entrenched associations between masculinity and meat (Adams 1990; Inness 2001; Neuhaus 2003) and how “hard” masculinities are constructed in opposition to supposedly feminine discourses of gourmet food (Roos and Wendel 2005) and dieting for weight loss (de Souza and Ciclitira 2005; Gough 2007). Julier and Lindenfeld note that, while food studies and masculinity studies have each become major fields in their own right, “there are very few academic analyses of men and food” (2005, 2). Their coedited special issue of *Food and Foodways* begins the crucial work of “Mapping Men onto the Menu,” with articles exploring public articulations of masculinity and food (Parasecoli 2005), as well as everyday performances of masculinities through practices like negotiating food choice in marriage (Sobal 2005). Recent
studies suggest that even as men become more involved in domestic food work, dominant gendered discourses continue to influence how these practices are understood, as men’s cooking practice is not “tied to the traditional connection between food, care, and femininity, including a relationship of obligation and responsibility around food” (Aarseth and Olsen 2008, 282).

Studies of personal food narratives are complemented by research on representations of gender in cookbooks, advertisements, and other food media (Inness 2001; Neuhaus 2003). It is within this subset of the gender and food literature that scholars have begun to explore foodie culture. Focusing primarily on television, recent studies examine how men and women are depicted in popular food programming (Ketchum 2005; Swenson 2009). In her analysis of celebrity chef Jamie Oliver’s popular television program, *The Naked Chef*, Hollows explores the production of a “culinary masculinity” that is distinct from the traditionally gendered figures of the masculine professional chef and feminine domestic cook. For Oliver, “domestic cooking is experienced as a form of creative leisure,” characterized by entertaining guests and far removed from the labor of daily food preparation (2003b, 243). Despite some reworking of traditional gender identities in dominant representations of foodie culture, studies conclude that these shifts do little to reorganize gendered social relations (Swenson 2009). With the rise of food celebrities, we see long-standing ways of doing gender reflected in instructional demonstrations by women in highly domestic settings, followed by exciting evening programs featuring men engaging with food outside the home (Ketchum 2005).

Studies of food television tell us something about dominant representations of gender in foodie culture but do not help us understand how foodies enact gender in their everyday lives. Our intended contribution to the literature on gender, food, and identity is twofold. First, we add to studies of gender and food by speaking directly to the experience of foodies, a group that is renowned for bringing men into the realm of food work (Hollows 2003b; Swenson 2009). Focusing on the experience of foodies provides an important perspective that is missing in studies of food media and adds to existing studies of personal food narratives by focusing on a relatively privileged class of food consumers who are strongly invested in gourmet food.

Second, the article contributes to gender studies by exploring how both men and women describe their participation in foodie culture and how gender is enacted within this culture. Within the literature on food and identity, “studies focusing on men’s ideas, viewpoints and accounts are rare” (Roos, Prattala, and Koski 2001, 48). As mentioned above, a small literature on food and masculinities has begun to address this oversight, and our research adds to
this emerging area of interest. In addition to offering new empirical find-
ings drawing on interviews with both men and women, the article employs
the concept of doing gender as a way to explore how masculinities and femi-
ninities are negotiated in foodie culture.

DOING GENDER IN FOODIE CULTURE

Our approach to gender is informed by the work of scholars who theorize
gender as a practice that is continually enacted in social relations, rather than
a stable ontological property residing in individuals (Connell 2005; West
and Fenstermaker 1995; West and Zimmerman 1987). In “Doing Gender,”
West and Zimmerman advance a sociological approach to gender as a “routine
accomplishment embedded in everyday interaction” (1987, 125). Distingui-
guishing the study of “doing gender” from gender role theory, West and
Zimmerman examine “the interactional work involved in ‘being’ a gendered
person in society” (1987, 127). Central to their formulation of doing gender
is the concept of accountability, as gender is accomplished through situated
enactments that are accountable to the prevailing gender order (1987, 135).
Although critics have questioned whether conceptions of doing gender are
able to theorize resistance and social change (Moloney and Fenstermaker
2002; Risman 2009), West and Zimmerman argue that, in fact, “gender is
not undone so much as redone” (2009, 118, italics in original). They explain,

The normative system involved in gender accountability (including the
patriarchal system) cannot be regarded as “free floating” and changes in it
involve both changes in persons’ orientation to these norms and changes in
social relations that reflexively support changes in orientation. (2009, 118,
italics in original)

In other words, the dynamism of gender relations must be situated within a
larger understanding of institutions and social structures. Thus, asking how
gender is done facilitates an analysis of historical shifts in accountability
structures while also attending to the ways that gender continues to shape
and legitimate inequitable social relations. In this article, we share West and
Zimmerman’s emphasis on the “situational character of gender account-
ability” (2009, 118) as we examine how foodies reinscribe particular under-
standings about gendered food practices, even as they negotiate cultural
norms mandating gender equality.

Studies of doing gender must be rooted in a critical interrogation of
inequality, for “to do gender is often to do power” (Brickell 2005, 38). This
requires attending to intersecting systems of inequality that shape how
gender is done. In our research with foodies, we pay particular attention to
how participants’ gender performances are facilitated by their privileged
social status. The links between food culture and class are long established
that a key part of elite class culture was not simply what one ate, but the
particular manner or aesthetic disposition that was used to approach food;
high-status food cultures eschew an understanding of food as a banal neces-
sity and instead conceptualize food through aesthetic terms—as something
to be appreciated, critiqued, and admired (see also Johnston and Baumann
2007). We argue that foodies’ gendered performances must be understood
within the context of their class positioning, particularly in relation to a larger
U.S. sociocultural context marked by sharp income inequalities and significant
(but often unacknowledged) class divides (Johnston and Baumann 2010).

Building on the insight that “class is not a given but is in continual pro-
duction,” Beverley Skeggs’s (2004, 3) analysis of “making class” provides
a fitting complement to studies of doing gender. While our data do not allow
cross-class comparison (given that almost all of our respondents are relatively
privileged), we draw on these interviews to explore how idealized notions
of masculinity and femininity are inscribed through food, linked to specific
kinds of economic and cultural capital, and valued by privileged men and
women. A key point for Skeggs is that class is linked to attributions of value
toward particular gendered ways of being. She explores how certain classed
and gendered bodies are pathologized through moralizing discourses that
serve to solidify boundaries around “who is a proper and responsible citizen”
(2005, 968). Food is intimately connected to classed ideas about health,
socialization, and status (Bourdieu 1984), and concern over eating habits is
central to contemporary debates about what kind of subjects are socially
valued (e.g., thin, white, healthy, affluent) (Skeggs 2005, 967; see also
Guthman and Dupuis 2006). We use our interview data to explore the con-
struction of (often idealized) gendered food identities for privileged men and
women and examine how certain gender ideals are held up by foodies as
visions of the good life—a life characterized by elite masculinities and femi-
ninities that have broad cultural resonance, even though they are more readily
accessible to those with high levels of economic and cultural capital.

FOODIE DISCOURSE AND DATA

In this article, we analyze how participants describe the significance
of food in their lives, and we approach our interview data as enactments of
foodie discourse. Discourse is a system of knowledge that is continually articulated and reshaped through individual practice but that is also fundamentally shaped by institutional structures, such as the mass media, markets, and other knowledge producers. Foodie discourse is articulated in daily life, but it is shaped and structured by other institutions and actors in the gourmet foodscape, such as chefs and food television. We align our work with critically oriented scholars of discourse who view discursive practices as integral to the production and legitimation of systems of power (Fairclough and Wodak 1997; Phillips and Hardy 2002). From this perspective, participants’ articulations of foodie discourse can be interrogated for how they contribute to, and potentially disrupt, historically constituted understandings of gender and food.

During the period of January to July 2008, we conducted in-depth interviews with 30 participants in 11 different states in the United States as part of a larger study on foodie culture (Johnston and Baumann 2010). Our eligibility criteria required that participants identify as having a strong interest in or a passion for learning about and eating good food and that they not work in the food industry. We obtained participants through the method of snowball sampling, beginning with three different leads, and interviewed a total of 17 women and 13 men. Participants tended to have above-average levels of education and income, most worked in upper-middle-class professions (e.g., lawyers, journalists), and the vast majority of our sample is white (see the appendix). Although our sample clearly does not represent the general population, it does correspond to the cluster of demographic characteristics commonly (although not exclusively) associated with foodies (Johnston and Baumann 2010).

Participants were asked a series of open-ended questions about the role of food in their lives, and interviews generally lasted 40 minutes to one hour. We asked questions about their use of food media, their cooking practices and dining preferences, as well as their beliefs on the ethical aspects of food consumption. The open-ended nature of the questions allowed participants to provide justification for their food practices and to expand upon those aspects that were most significant to their identities. All interviews were transcribed and then inductively coded.

In general, the foodies we interviewed understood their passion for food as a long-standing interest and central to their sense of self. Our interviewees talked about food in their spare time, read cookbooks for fun, looked up multiple versions of the same recipe online, and/or bonded with friends and family over food and food “talk.” In the words of 54-year-old Fiona,

I would say that I have been interested in food my whole life. I am a person who has always loved eating... I love to cook. I think about cooking as I’m going to sleep at night, I think about what I’m going to cook the next day.
Several of the participants had food blogs where they shared their food knowledge with others, and all of them possessed a considerable degree of food knowledge—whether an extensive knowledge of cooking skills; high-end restaurants and renowned chefs; various strategies around ethical eating; or specific food items or categories, like “meat,” lemon sorbet, and hot dogs. While there were many differences in our participants—not all of our participants embraced the term *foodie*, for example—they all thought of food as a key part of their identity.

The article proceeds with a discussion of three interrelated thematic areas where we found evidence that foodies are doing gender through their food practices: (1) pleasure, (2) care work, and (3) knowledge and expertise. An exposition of these themes provides a canvas on which to develop our argument about the deeply gendered nature of foodie culture. Throughout these three dimensions of foodie discourse, we find some evidence that traditional conceptions of gender are reinforced and some evidence that such conceptions are challenged. Rather than categorizing these dimensions as traditional or progressive, we present them as collective evidence of the particular ways that foodie discourse offers opportunities both to do and to redo hegemonic gender norms.

**PLEASURE**

The foodie men *and women* we interviewed consistently described food as a source of intense pleasure in their lives. Just as Bourdieu (1984) saw privileged understandings of food as distant from “foods of necessity,” our participants distinguished themselves from people who simply “eat to live.” The foodies emphasized that, for them, food is a site of immense personal investment. In the words of Neil, a 25-year-old who works in digital media, a foodie is someone who “gets as much pleasure out of eating food, cooking food, eating with friends, serving food and finding new things, as much as they do anything, any other hobby in their life.” Participants characterized eating as a “sacred act” (Karen) and described a personal commitment to “slowing down and savoring and tasting things” (Nancy). Participants’ emphasis on pleasure is relevant to a gendered analysis of foodie discourse because it challenges a simple gender binary that suggests that men seek pleasure through food while women repress their own desires and achieve pleasure only by serving food to others.

In our interviews, the theme of food pleasure centered on the sensual aspects of food consumption for both men and women participants. Timothy articulates a common sentiment:
I want my food to really taste like something. That’s what eating is all about, so you taste something and you think, “Wow. That really tastes like a tomato,” or whatever. . . . So, taste I’d say is paramount.

Some participants elevated the pursuit of pleasure above all else. For instance, Catherine admits that she is aware of ethical concerns related to food but is “too interested in my pleasure to actually impose them on myself.” One of our youngest participants, Pedro, prioritizes pleasure over cost and explains that “spending money on food for me is very important.” Fiona laughs when reflecting on her own food practices and concludes, “Clearly I’m interested in taste, not health.”

Because femininity has historically been associated with restraint of, or a pathological relationship to, food’s pleasures, it is noteworthy that the women in our study actively embraced the pleasurable aspects of eating. Consider the following quote from Gillian, a journalist in her late forties:

I’m very into what ingredients I buy and what I put into my body and my mouth. I’m kind of a snob about food . . . it’s very important to me to make a good meal, it makes me happy. When I eat a junky meal or a not very good meal it actually affects my mood and stuff like that. So I would say a foodie is someone who really cares about what they eat. (Gillian)

Gillian’s description of herself as a food “snob” departs drastically from dominant food femininities that downplay the significance of the self. The fact that Gillian is able to express such pleasure-driven sentiments suggests that foodie culture affords some flexibility in terms of the historically restrictive boundaries surrounding femininity and food. However, in considering the ways in which women participants are redoing gender through the pursuit of pleasure, we must not overlook the fact that such selective food consumption is enabled by class privilege. It requires considerable economic and cultural capital to fulfil the performance of food “snob,” to make every meal “count”; and in doing so, foodies may reinscribe classed boundaries even as they contest normative ways of doing gender.

While emphasizing food’s pleasures, a few of the women we interviewed acknowledged persistent pressures in relation to dominant representations of feminine embodiment. One young woman in our study, Sarah, offers an explicit critique of how ideals of femininity work to discipline women’s relationship to food and how foodie women’s pursuit of pleasure occurs in this broader cultural context. She explains that although men or women can be foodies, this identity is more easily embodied by men:
I think that our culture is still uncomfortable with the female appetite. And to be a foodie as a woman is to be seen as sort of piggish and to overeat and to indulge your appetite, which really you should be working to constrain and control. And so men, our culture is much more comfortable with their appetite and consumption of food . . . but there are absolutely both female and male foodies. (Sarah)

The prevalence of the theme of pleasure among both men and women suggests that foodie culture may open up some possibilities for reworking gendered boundaries. The women in our study redefine their own pleasure as a legitimate site of fulfilment, rather than a dangerous drive in need of containment. Notably, though, this is a refined pleasure limited to the selective consumption of “good food” and, thus, requires the cultural capital to discriminate between foods deemed worthy and unworthy. Furthermore, even as the emphasis on pleasure challenges normative discourses of food and femininity, it does not replace them. That is, the women we interviewed were not entirely free to pursue their own pleasure above and beyond all other food practices. Instead, as the next section demonstrates, many foodie women face the challenge of negotiating contradictory ideals of pleasure and care in their everyday lives.

**CARE WORK**

In addition to performing femininities that embrace self-oriented aspects of food consumption, the women in our study also articulated dominant discourses of femininity centering on the theme of care work. Many offered narratives of social reproduction that focused on providing children with good food and cultivating their appreciation for it. Melissa describes this form of care work as an explicitly gendered responsibility:

> My big peeve in the world is moms who don’t cook. That’s one of my big peeves because there’s so many ways that you can do wonderful things with food that are fast and that are easy. And then you can be with your family and you all eat together instead of just take-out pizzas or McDonald’s. And so I think it’s tied in with enjoyment of life. And I think if you love food you tend to sit down and you tend to share it with people and you love life with it. (Melissa)

In her condemnation of “moms who don’t cook,” Melissa contrasts the figure of a caring mother who prepares sit-down dinners for her family with a less desirable mother who orders take-out. Symbolized by “take-out pizzas” and
“McDonald’s”—foods commonly linked with working-class lifestyles in the public consciousness—this classed femininity is seen to fail in the feeding work that is vital to one’s identity as a mother, illustrating how the relationship between food and femininity is intimately linked to class. While this was one of the only times that a participant made such an overt appeal to gender norms, other participants invoked implicitly gendered understandings while articulating their investments in socialization through food. For instance, Catherine praises the “authenticity” of the Silver Spoon cookbook on the grounds that “it is the book that Italian mothers give their daughters when they get married.” She continues, “And sometimes it’s interesting, but to me, a return to the sort of classics is welcome.” In Catherine’s narrative, authenticity is constituted by a return to traditional culinary socialization of daughters by their mothers, a relationship that is very much about doing gender.

In the following subsections, we demonstrate how the gendered theme of care work was articulated in relation to several aspects of participants’ foodie identities, including childhood memories, family health, and cooking for others.

**Foodie Memories**

We began each interview by asking, “How and when did you become interested in food?” This query generated rich narratives about the contexts, events, and people who had contributed to shaping participants’ foodie identities. These stories tended to emphasize the role of food within the family home and almost universally revolved around mothers. Whether she was described as simply “a really good cook” (Gillian), especially “health and environmentally conscious” (Keith) or holding “a very strong set of beliefs about food” (Dennis), the foodie’s mother played the central role in these stories. Even participants who bemoaned the lack of good cooking in their childhood home still referenced their mothers as a significant figure in their development as foodies. Timothy, a recently retired attorney, states, “I’ve often described my mother as being the worst cook in the world.” Catherine references her mother’s cooking when describing an elaborate meal that she prepares each Christmas: “It’s my food thing come full circle. It’s the same meal that my mother would make at Christmas, only it’s so different [laughs].” In these cases, it is by defining themselves in opposition to their mothers’ unrefined cooking skills that participants distinguish their foodiness.

Despite the decided emphasis upon mothers in foodies’ upbringing, these memories were also sometimes about men. Unlike the care work performed by mothers, fathers and grandfathers entered these narratives as public food
professionals. Participants spoke fondly of grandfathers who were professional chefs (Melissa and Kelly) and a father who developed industrial foods (Fred) or traveled the world as a food chemist (Faye). Nancy believed her father’s training as an artist brought a critical sensibility to the dinner table, such that she “grew up being discerning about flavor.” Only one participant spoke of his father as the primary cook within his childhood home. In all other cases, men entered into foodie memories with traditionally masculine performances as cooking professionals, intrepid explorers, and culinary artists.

Thus, while we find that men and women deploy similar narratives to articulate their foodie origins, these narratives rearticulate dominant ways of doing gender that are organized around the boundaries of domestic and public spheres. Even if these narratives are located in the past, they remain important sources of identification for our participants. Furthermore, our finding that mothers figure centrally in the food memories of both women and men suggests that the practice of doing gender through food memories cannot be explained as the straightforward reproduction of gender responsibilities. Rather, we interpret repeated references to foodies’ mothers as evidence of the enduring positive social evaluations of mothers as providers of care through food. By reiterating this connection between mothers and food, foodies reconstitute a discourse linking femininity with food socialization, even though historical narratives of stay-at-home mothers do not photographically represent contemporary food realities. While the discourse of femininity and food socialization is reinforced, the fact that men are referencing their mothers to articulate their own foodie identity might suggest new space for men to appropriate the private realm of domesticity into masculine incarnations of foodie culture.

**Protecting Family Health**

One of the most common forms of care work mentioned by women in our study was that of protecting family health. Even though both men and women foodies referenced their mothers as key food influences, the idea of serving as health guardians was more often taken up by women as an important factor driving their food practices. For instance, the decision to buy organic foods was commonly explained in health terms, as participants expressed a commitment toward “the health and well being of the earth as well as my family” (Karen). When asked why she chooses organic produce, 50-year-old Nancy responds, “Because I think you are what you eat and I think there’s so many awful things in the world from the bioengineered crops, and because I have children.” Many similar examples can be found in our interviews with women, who consistently enacted foodie femininities.
through the practice of protecting familial health. This is a privileged gender identity, as it demands that one can afford to make the choices required to perform an (upper-) middle-class femininity defined by healthy food provision. Expensive goods like organic produce are out reach for many mothers; thus, no matter how committed they are to providing the best for their children, they are unlikely to enact the elite femininities that are taken as common place among our participants.

Some women we interviewed expressed genuine concern over what they saw as a widespread decline in the quality of family dining. Sixty-four-year-old Faye, who works part-time as a landscape designer, insists that she is “very concerned about what’s happening with the next generation” and offers the following assessment of American families’ eating habits:

[People are] buying all this packaged, premade stuff, and you know, I think that they’re sort of dumbing down their palate. Clearly somewhere along the line, kids took over and declared that families will only eat hot dogs and hamburgers and stuff they like as opposed to exposing kids to really good stuff and expecting them to eat that. (Faye)

Faye’s concern that no one is “exposing kids to really good stuff” suggests that someone is failing to protect the well-being of the family, a duty that involves socializing children into healthy eating habits. This responsibility continues to fall disproportionately on the shoulders of women, despite the relative absence of overtly gendered rationales in Faye’s account. Furthermore, Faye’s distress over the declining quality of family dining works to secure the performance of a particular, classed femininity. Warde (1999, 518) notes that “the idea of convenience food is tinged with moral disapprobation,” as it is seen to conflict with ideals of care. In addition to reproducing gendered expectations regarding women’s feeding work, the opposition between convenience and care expresses class boundaries: the frequent consumption of quick and easy meals tends to be associated with a working-class lifestyle that fails to fulfil middle-class ideals of “quality time” (1999, 524). By rejecting an approach to feeding work that relies heavily upon “packaged, premade stuff,” Faye distances her own elite femininity from one that she finds morally reprehensible.

By contrast, the theme of family health was notably absent among men we interviewed. The few men who did mention health tended to discuss it solely in individual terms and did not relate it to their children or mention family health as an area of relevance to their foodie identity. This pattern reveals one aspect of foodie discourse in which foodies appear to be doing gender in ways that uphold historically dominant associations between femininity, food, and family health.
Cooking for Others

Another aspect of care work that emerged in our interviews with women was the frequently professed enjoyment of cooking for others. Indeed, some of our women participants boasted of their ability to satisfy family members’ diverse preferences. For instance, Kelly says that cooking at home is “complicated because my husband’s of a different, you know, sort of balances different tastes and things like that.” Similarly, Nancy chuckles while admitting, “I do a lot of ridiculous things to try and feed my kids.” Although these culinary balancing acts require a great deal of work, many women described a sense of personal satisfaction from feeding others. Fiona, an older woman in our sample with grown children, recalls with nostalgia the days when she was cooking for a full house: “I certainly love cooking for people, and I do miss the fact that my children are gone because they’re a great audience, I mean, they really enjoy it.”

Yet this traditional feminine performance of cooking for others sometimes came into conflict with the foodie ideal of pleasure. For instance, Faye describes a sense of liberation brought about by her children’s independence, since she no longer has to “deal with all their whiny issues about what they want to eat.” Taking this point a step further, Karen asserts that she “never made two different meals for my kids,” insisting that “they’ve always eaten what I ate, much to my sons’ chagrin.” Here, the women’s identification with foodie pleasure complicates dominant ways of doing gender by catering to family tastes. While participants varied in the extent to which they privileged one over the other, the challenge of negotiating conflicting ideals of pleasure and care was apparent in women’s accounts of their own food philosophies. Trish, a librarian in her early thirties, articulates a commitment to both self-oriented and caring aspects of her food identity when she says, “For me... it’s about pleasure, it’s about ethics and it’s about the kind of like, it just fits within a larger part of human experience.” Women enact foodie femininities at the intersection of these contradictory discourses. Thus, even as these women may contest gendered boundaries by embracing pleasurable aspects of eating, their foodie identities are also shaped by prevailing gender structures associating femininity and care for others.

Several of the men we interviewed also spoke of cooking for others, but their narratives are not centrally characterized by the theme of care work and are, instead, dominated by a sense of cooking as leisure. These foodie men tended to speak about their relationship to food as more of a hobby than an obligation. For example, Neil, a young journalist, approaches cooking as
a leisure activity that he justifies by hosting friends: “so I tend to really cook when I make an excuse to have people over.” Other men describe the elaborate preparations that go into a special meal:

Well there’s a dish from Southwestern France that is, the English name of it is Chicken with Sauterne and Garlic Pearls. And that takes me about two days to cook. Typically what I’ll do is, and my wife complains about this by the way, but I’m not what you call a shortcut cook. So I’ll make all my own stock, make everything from scratch. (Timothy)

To be clear, we are not suggesting that the women in our study did not like to entertain—many did. Our point here is that while both men and women spoke about cooking for others, they constructed this practice differently, and these differences closely reflect historically dominant ways of doing gender. Women tended to describe cooking for others through ideals of care that prioritize the daily nourishment of the family. By contrast, men’s narratives framed cooking as a leisure activity, even when they were also engaging in daily food preparation within the home. The one exception to this pattern was Harry, a single father who emphasized feeding his two little boys as an important part of his personal relationship to food.

When women did speak about hosting dinner parties, their narratives were often laced with a sense of anxiety that differed from more masculine tales of leisure. For example, Catherine describes how she will “obsess over” the preparations for a large Thanksgiving party she hosts each year, admitting that she has “already started obsessing about next year” at the time of our February interview. We might interpret Catherine’s self-described “obsessing” as an expression of the demanding expectations placed upon her gendered positioning in terms of fulfilling domestic ideals for “feeding work” that are not commonly demanded of men. Contrast Catherine’s statement above with Norman’s comment that “short ribs, which are like the easiest thing imaginable, people are really impressed by those.” Timothy demonstrates similar self-assurance when he confides, “My wife says I make the best rack of lamb she’s ever eaten at any restaurant or anywhere.” Admitting that he is sometimes bored with the lack of challenge posed by his culinary endeavors, he responds to his wife when she requests certain dishes, “Oh gosh, you want that again? It’s so easy!”

In a pattern that appears to reflect these differing gendered expectations, the men in our study focused less on care responsibilities surrounding food and tended to articulate their foodie identities through performances emphasizing knowledge and expertise—a theme we turn to next.
KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERTISE

Participants gave varied interpretations of what it means to be a foodie, but virtually all of them listed a strong desire to learn about food as a defining quality. The following response from Timothy stresses the significance of the possession and pursuit of food knowledge:

I think of foodie as a term that just means somebody who’s really deeply interested in food and I guess also educated about food. So that they aren’t just people that go out and spend a lot of money going to restaurants and stuff like that, but that really know what, really have educated palates and really know good food from bad food and have educated tastes. (Timothy)

Participants spoke of an ongoing commitment to self-education, often described in terms of “educating your palate.” Among these educational pursuits were learning new cooking techniques; trying new restaurants; and attending food shows; as well as reading magazines, cookbooks, culinary history, and food blogs. Foodies spoke of their ever-growing food knowledge as a kind of cultural capital that positioned them apart from the average food consumer and served as a form of cultural distinction. This intense curiosity was articulated by both men and women, but our data reveal a gendered difference in the relative significance of this investment to participants’ foodie identities. Namely, it was more often the men we interviewed who drew heavily upon ideals of knowledge and expertise to articulate their personal relationship to food. For these men, continually refining their food knowledge, seeking out new sources of information, and sharing their expertise with others constituted the defining features of their foodie identity.

Beyond reading widely about food and seeking out new culinary experiences, some men described “projects” that they had designed to enhance their own knowledge and skill level. For instance, Fred says that he once spent “six months trying to come up with the world’s best sorbet recipe” to take full advantage of the lemon tree in his backyard. Similarly, Nathaniel, an engineer in his late thirties, explains that his reading is driven by whatever project he happens to be working on:

Like, a couple months ago I was starting to learn about chocolate and I wanted to make some caramels that I could dip in chocolate, so I had three or four books about candy-making and chocolate. . . . Or if I was in a phase where I was cooking Thai food I might have a book or two about Thai food.
Or if I’m looking into the history of something I’ll grab a book about history. Like this weekend I’m doing a project for one of the blogs that I write for about sugar and high fructose corn syrup and so I’m gonna look for some books about the history of sugar. So it’s kind of a need to know, or as knowledge is needed sort of thing.

One of our youngest participants, Keith, recently completed an internship at a culinary library. Keith speaks with enthusiasm about the resources that are available but worries that because of this insatiable curiosity he might “reach the point where my knowledge of food precluded my enjoyment of a wide range of it.” Keith’s reflection highlights the potential conflict that foodies may encounter when balancing their commitment to ever-expanding knowledge with the foodie emphasis on pleasure. But at least for now, he is happy to say that “the eating interest and the research interest overlap.” Of course, enacting a foodie masculinity through ongoing self-education must be understood as a classed performance of gender. For instance, Fred’s tale of journeying to sorbet perfection expresses a type of privilege, considering the cultural capital it evinces in tandem with the leisure time required to comfortably devote six months to what many would consider a frivolous endeavor.

In other cases, men spoke about the learning opportunities they discovered through encounters with the professional food world. Chad recalls hanging out in the kitchen in the restaurant where he worked as a waiter so that he could ask the chef questions and watch the staff prepare meals. Although Timothy never worked in the food industry, he developed his own knowledge of Laotian, Indonesian and Southern Thai cuisines by going to restaurants and making an effort to “engage with either the owner or the chef or somebody and really have them talk to me and teach me about their food.” In Timothy’s narrative, these food professionals constitute a potential resource for his own culinary education: “I mean, there’s a lot of people who have devoted a lifetime to testing and studying, and I want to learn from them and take advantage of their knowledge.” He also described with pride his ability to perform as a sous-chef to a celebrated chef at a charity event, even though he works professionally as a lawyer: “[This] was sort of a validation that even though I hadn’t been professionally trained that I’d, you know, picked up enough skills to pass muster under [the chef’s] eyes.” Timothy’s high regard for cooking professionals reflects an evaluation that is both gendered and classed, as he elevates the paid work of a “professionally trained” chef (a credentialed occupation that has been historically dominated by men) over the unpaid feeding work performed in the historically feminine domestic sphere.
When performing foodie masculinities through the theme of knowledge and expertise, men often constructed the figure of the culinary artist as the ideal motivating their educational pursuits. By evoking metaphors of artistry, these men enacted foodie masculinities professing an “aesthetic disposition,” thus further displaying their classed distinction (Bourdieu 1984, 5). When we asked participants if they had a favorite chef, the names most readily available tended to be prominent men in the food world cooking at upscale restaurants, as in this response from David, a newspaper editor in his early thirties:

I mean Danny Meyer is a great example, he’s not a chef, he’s a restaurateur. But his restaurants Gramercy Tavern, the East Square Cafe, they’re all very, just really solid and you can kind of count on them being really good. Um, Joël Robuchon definitely is a genius, and his place L’Atelier in Paris is fantastic. The one in New York isn’t quite as good, but it’s also good. Um, and Dan Barber who runs Blue Hill and Blue Hill at Stone Barn which is up in Westchester is another guy who I love, and I have a lot of respect for.

It was not uncommon for the men we interviewed to speak at length about a particular chef whom they admired (and who was almost always a man and of European ancestry), describing in great detail his use of “experimental” techniques or “creative” combinations. Some of the women we interviewed expressed interest in particular food celebrities, but few evoked metaphors of artistry that were common among men.

Alongside these depictions of artistry were narratives of braving new culinary territory. For instance, David praises a rising New York chef who specializes in “weird combinations,” such as uzu foam paired with seared pork belly, and explains that he has “a lot of respect for him for kind of pushing the boundaries of what makes good food.” Indeed, many of the men we interviewed enacted the masculine identity of the intrepid foodie who invests time and money seeking out exotic dishes, while positioning themselves as cultural connoisseurs knowledgeable about the cutting edge of culinary trends. The majority of these heroic tales featured an unusual animal dish, reconfirming gendered narratives of man’s voracious appetite for meat. Participants’ stories of dining on “brain and cat ear” or “fried pig intestines,” or reporting to the interviewer that “you caught me on a day when I am preparing beef tongue in a sweet sour sauce,” valorize traditional masculinities associated with an exploration of the unknown. Pedro describes a concerted effort to become “more open to trying new,
I guess I would say unusual, experimental dishes.” Fred puts it a little more bluntly when he states, “It’s kind of weird and cool to say I’ve had goat testicles in rice wine.”

While it was much more common for men to describe these sorts of culinary adventures, our interviews with women also contain a few examples of this theme. Most striking among them was Faye’s tale of driving her family halfway across the country to sample the Navajo stew served at a hospital cafeteria. “I think I’d read about it in one of my—I really like to travel, I’m an obsessive traveler, so in one of my travel books probably,” she explains. “You know, off the beaten track type of book where they talk about, you’ve gotta go to this place in Page, Arizona.” As a self-described “obsessive traveler,” Faye references an upper-middle-class lifestyle characterized by extensive mobility, allowing for exotic cultural experiences in “off the beaten track” places. That she would craft her family’s vacation plans to suit her own culinary curiosity flies in the face of ideals of food and femininity based around selflessness and domesticity. Thus, while our data support the argument that narratives of adventure and discovery facilitate the performance of particular masculinities, it also suggests that foodie culture may provide a space for women to enact these intrepid identities in ways that also exhibit their class privilege.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

In this article, we investigate the gendered dimensions of foodie discourse to make claims about doing gender beyond the case at hand. Foodies see their involvement with food as integral to their identity, at the same time that gender also remains central to their sense of self. Our interviews allow us to draw on the experiences, preferences, and justifications of men and women foodies to develop a clear picture of how gender influences and is influenced by foodie discourse. We identify three broad themes in foodie discourse where this mutual influence between gender and foodie identity is visible: (1) pleasure, (2) care work, and (3) knowledge and expertise. For each of these themes, we specify instances where gender is done, and we argue that we see evidence in foodie discourse of a need to move beyond a binary frame of reproduction or resistance. On one hand, foodie discourse is often at odds with historically dominant ways of doing masculinity or femininity. On the other hand, the discourse is still constrained by a broader system of conventional gender relations, a system that is also conditioned by the economic and cultural implications of class positions. The
women and men in our study enact classed masculinities and femininities—knowledgeable, aesthetically discerning, self-fulfilling, yet appropriately nurturing—that provide glimpses of both continuity and change in the gendered doing of foodie discourse.

If foodie discourse allows for both reproduction and resistance, can we argue that foodie culture is a fluid and open realm where gender can be freely performed and contested? In fact, our findings reveal that it is women rather than men who are left facing the more challenging contradictions of gender norms. For example, while women and men are able to pursue their own pleasure in foodie discourse, the ability to do so is hampered for women by the gendered expectation to care for others. In practical terms, these are competing goals. Because care work expectations for men are lower, the opening of a space for men to perform this work provides an opportunity for them to score bonus points. The men we interviewed did not express concern about failing on these scores; if being a foodie meant having to privilege personal pleasure, then so be it. We were struck by the contrast between our women and men interviewees in how they expressed concern about negotiating these dimensions of foodie discourse. Although they were not framed as competing by our interviewees, we argue that our three themes encourage divergent preferences and choices for allocating time and resources. It was the women in our sample who were faced with difficulties in trying to embrace the full diversity of elements of foodie discourse. The men, however, found it easy to position themselves as free to pick and choose precisely how to be a foodie. The fact that women foodies embrace qualities traditionally associated with masculinity must not simply be celebrated as an unproblematic freeing of previously gendered terrain. Rather, women’s efforts to perform foodie identities that balance both pleasure and care, knowledge and emotion, might be interpreted as a reflection of postfeminist discourses that claim that women can now “have it all.” In this context, Ringrose and Walkerdine suggest that “the new work of ‘doing’ feminine that girls and women must perform is to somehow juggle traditionally feminine qualities . . . with traditional masculine subject position- alities” (2008, 231). While foodie discourse opens up possibilities for both men and women to retool gendered performances, women are more likely to be positioned between competing discourses, making it harder for them to negotiate this process, particularly women who have limited economic and cultural capital to draw on. Thus, even as we highlight how foodies are reworking some aspects of the relationship between gender and food, we must not overlook persistent power imbalances that shape who is doing and redoing gender, and with what consequences.
APPENDIX

Interviewee Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee Pseudonym</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Occupation or Industry of Employment</th>
<th>Living Situation</th>
<th>Household Income ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Quilter</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Entertainment industry</td>
<td>Single; adult children</td>
<td>Over 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Tucker</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>Partnered</td>
<td>50-100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Teitelbaum</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Over 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Nolan</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Software engineer</td>
<td>Partnered</td>
<td>100-150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faye Taggart</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Landscape designer</td>
<td>Married; adult children</td>
<td>100-150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fern Osborne</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Over 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fionia Callworth</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>Married; adult children</td>
<td>100-150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Nagy</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Administrative assistant</td>
<td>Married; adult children</td>
<td>100-150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Huntington</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Software engineer</td>
<td>Partnered</td>
<td>Over 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillian Edelman</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>Married; two children</td>
<td>Over 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Quinn</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td>Single; two children</td>
<td>100-150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Bowes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>Partnered</td>
<td>Over 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Weiss</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Homeopath</td>
<td>Married; two children</td>
<td>50-100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Crawford</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>50-100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Lee</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mixed race</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Partnered</td>
<td>50-100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Jones</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Priest</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>100-150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin D'Angelo</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Over 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Trent</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Juris doctor</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Over 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Quinlan</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Systems analyst</td>
<td>Partnered</td>
<td>100-150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Light</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Married; two children</td>
<td>Over 150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee Pseudonym</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Occupation or Industry of Employment</th>
<th>Living Situation</th>
<th>Household Income ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nathalie Underhill</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Administrative assistant</td>
<td>Single; adult children</td>
<td>25-50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Snider</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>100-150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Taverna</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Digital media</td>
<td>Two roommates</td>
<td>50-100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Arbus</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Juris doctor</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Partnered</td>
<td>Over 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Maradona</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Partnered</td>
<td>25-50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Driscoll</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Two roommates</td>
<td>Under 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Darby</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Married; adult children</td>
<td>Over 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Callebaut</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Administrative assistant</td>
<td>Married; adult children</td>
<td>Over 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Bauer</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Juris doctor</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Over 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trish Lincoln</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>Moving in with partner</td>
<td>25-50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES

1. We limited our participants to foodies who were not currently working within the food industry, but some had prior experiences working in restaurants or food co-ops.

2. In fact, one of the men we interviewed hosted a blog focused exclusively on meat.

3. In addition to a classed performance, this travel narrative is often an expression of whiteness. Elsewhere, we explore how ideals of exoticism in foodie discourse reproduce a neocolonial desire for the culinary Other, whereby foods associated with ethnically marginalized communities are viewed as a cultural resource to be consumed by white, cosmopolitan subjects (Johnston and Baumann 2010, 97-126).
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