

Food education in the promotion of global and cross-cultural health¹

EVA ZAFRA APARICI²

INTRODUCTION

The growing interest in the food education of children and adolescents has been represented in the design of several policy strategies. Among these strategies, we can find the *Global Strategy on Diet, Physical Activity and Health* developed by the World Health Organization; the White Paper *A Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related Health Issue*; the *Strategy for Nutrition, Physical Activity and Obesity Prevention*, and the Program «*Cuidate+2012*» [Take Care of Yourself] implemented in Spain. In addition, the Generalitat de Catalunya (the Autonomous Government of Catalonia) releases, quite frequently, pedagogical materials targeted at schools and families in order to promote healthy eating.

Nevertheless, most of these policies on food education do not take into account the sociocultural context in which food is immersed, or the fact that what children eventually eat or do not eat (their actual intake) is strongly influenced by factors such as: gender; ethnicity; ideology; the educational, normative, organizational and dynamic context of the family, school or community space where food is eaten; the decisive role of pleasure, comfort and health; perceptions and attitudes relating to eating and the body; and, finally, the way of thinking and rationalizing eating (Tibbs et al., 2001; Rozin & Hormes, 2009; Zafra, 2005, 2010, 2011; Atie, Contreras, Zafra, 2011; Contreras, Gracia, Atie, Pareja, Zafra, 2012). In overlooking most of the sociocultural factors that determine our eating behavior, the diagnoses established by health and education policies lose merit, thus reducing the probability of their effectiveness.

Eating is more than nutrition. By eating food, we receive nutrients – but we also communicate, express ourselves and relate with one another. We do not eat everything that is biologically edible, and this means that economic, political, social and ideological factors condition our food choices, as do the possibilities connected to food access and availability (Fischler, 1995). In the same way, we can better understand the lifestyles of the general population by studying their eating behavior (Contreras & Gracia, 2005).

Marcel Mauss describes eating as a «complete social fact» (Mauss, 1950) which, as a result, is loaded with the same diversity and complexity found in any other social phenomenon and should be studied as such. This article will pay special attention to how to approach precisely such diversity and complexity, since one of the main characteristics of our present-day society is the existence of multiple ways of thinking about, feeling toward and making food (functional, therapeutic, ecological, local, sustainable, responsible, hedonist, restrictive, autonomous, charitable) which, in turn, represent the great variety of ways of thinking and making the world that, in their multiple manners and levels of interaction, often lead to controversies and conflicts that are not always easy to settle.

In this respect, Francesc Muñoz (2008) highlights that when complexity is added to diversity, conflict will inevitably arise; in terms of food, such conflict is emerging in different ways in our present-day society. On the one hand, we have conflicts and controversies relating to our food choices within a

1 [Educación, alimentación y Salud: La educación alimentaria en la promoción de la salud global y transcultural]. The following article has been published in the *Salud Colectiva* journal, 2017, 13 (2): 295-306 (doi: 10.18294 / sc.2017.1191). The editorial committee of the journal allows the author to publish it in this book.

2 Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Spain

context of unprecedented abundance. In this sense, today more than ever, it seems that eating according to one's tastes, preferences, pleasure, aesthetics, or economic resources, without these criteria coming into contradiction with one another, is not easy; the everyday eater is put into a difficult frame of mind (Fischler, 1995) which should be studied in order to be able to *educate*.

Furthermore, over the last years, another food controversy/conflict has arisen that shakes the democratic foundations and principles of our Welfare State: the increase in food insecurity with respect to access and availability. In this regard, statistics show that one-third of all children in Spain live in risk of social exclusion and 30% are considered to be at nutritional risk (Save the children, 2014). This may be the time for policies toward nutritional education to deal not only with the challenge of teaching how to choose foods, but also with food access and availability. It seems absurd to expect anyone to teach how to make choices without taking into account the inequalities that make it difficult to have access to foods.

All this complexity surrounding food raises a number of issues: What are the sociocultural factors and inequalities that right now determine food choices and access on the part of our children? What difficulties or conflicts are arising in this regard? And, consequently, should educational messages refer to nutrients or foods and their types of production, distribution, commercialization and consumption? How can we make food education effective and responsible in a society with these characteristics and what criteria should we use to assess such education?

In addition, there is another problem: most policies and actions in nutrition education often overlook that learning about foods is not a process that consists of or solely depends upon the nutritional information that may be acquired by an individual; rather, such learning is framed within a process of child education and socialization in the broadest sense (Del Valle, 1992). Education is more than just providing information or training, it is about shaping and developing people's abilities – in accordance with their culture and society – so that they may become capable of living together in the most autonomous and responsible way possible.

For all these reasons, by connecting theories of social conflict with medical anthropology and the findings of several studies conducted by our research team (the Food Observatory at the University of Barcelona), this article intends to reflect on how food can be a tool for education as well as for food and social transformation. In this sense, we propose a new theoretical and methodological approach to food education which goes beyond the nutritional and individualistic perspective, introducing a political, economic, sociocultural and participatory perspective that will bring us closer to an innovative understanding of the phenomenon: food as a tool for the analysis and diagnosis of social and food-based realities, but also as a tool for socio-educational intervention and change. To that effect, our aim is a food education in which adequate eating is the end (educating to learn how to eat), but also a means help children to be able to solve conflicts (whether personal or collective) and to integrate themselves into their social and food contexts in the most autonomous, critical and responsible way possible. We think that, by so doing, we can promote healthier societies globally speaking, that is, not only from a nutritional point of view, but also from a social perspective: taking into account dialogue, respect, equality and social cohesion.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The article is the result of several research projects conducted since 2004 at the Food Observatory (University of Barcelona)³. These research studies used a qualitative approach, applying ethnographic

3 «Eating and its circumstances: pleasure, coexistence and health [*La alimentación y sus circunstancias: placer, conveniencia y salud*] (2004-2006),» (International Forum on Food, 2004); «Learning how to eat: processes of socialization and eating behavior disorders» [*Aprender a comer: procesos de socialización y trastornos del comportamiento alimentario*] (Zafra, 2008); and «Eating at school and its circumstances: learning, culture and health» [*Comer en la escuela y*

and comparative techniques. They were based on field work carried out in eight educational institutions located in Catalonia (Tarragona and Barcelona), which have different sociocultural characteristics according to the school's sociodemographic situation (located in the centre of the city or in peripheral neighbourhoods), ideological characteristics (religious or secular), and the presence of the State (fully state-owned or partially state-owned).

In addition to consulting documentary and bibliographic sources, we conducted nonparticipant observation in the different settings associated with the children's eating behaviour within educational institutions (corridors, playgrounds, school entrances and exits, and school dining halls), as well as semi-structured interviews, in-depth interviews and discussion groups. We held 117 semi-structured interviews with children aged 6-16 years regarding their eating attitudes and habits. We carried out more than twenty in-depth interviews with children aged 6-16 years aimed at exploring the causes (Taylor & Bogdan, 1992) of their eating practices and attitudes. We also organized five discussion groups with different agents participating in children's food education: three discussion groups with monitors and staff in charge of school dining halls, a discussion group with teachers and a discussion group with parents.

In the case of underage participants, the relevant parental informed consent was obtained through the authorities in each educational institution, and the teachers informed parents of the goals and scope of the information. The adult study participants were informed about the goals and research methods and each of them signed the pertinent informed consent. All participants were guaranteed anonymity and confidentiality regarding the data they provided throughout all the different stages of the process.

The interviews were transcribed literally, reviewed and given confidential treatment. Data were then organized into a hermeneutical unit, coded and exploited in a systematic and exhaustive way through the qualitative analysis software MAXQDA.

SOME ASSUMPTIONS REGARDING SOCIAL CONFLICT

Diversity and multiculturalism in Europe is an inescapable and continuously increasing reality. Andreas Kaplan (2014) describes Europe as a continent embracing maximum *cultural diversity* at *minimal geographical* distances. This diversity is found in different spheres of everyday life such as art, culture, religion, education, and food. However, in the presence of this enriching diversity, some (new) ways of discrimination and inequality are also emerging which, in turn, create different types of conflicts.

In this sense, many experts agree that when complexity is added to contexts of diversity, conflict will inevitably occur (Muñoz, 2008). Such conflict often occurs as the result of social interactions that trigger disagreements, inequalities, and even situations in which difference is not recognized as a personal or social right.

In this sense, order and social integration have been, and still are, core debates in the history of social theory. Indeed, social conflict has been the central subject of reflection within such disciplines as philosophy, sociology or anthropology, and is taken as the basis of the present work to articulate our final proposal.

On the one hand, we consider the notion of *conflict* from perspectives such as those developed by Simmel (1977), Giner (1978) or Tejerina (1991), who understand it as an ever-present phenomenon in any society that both changes and provokes social changes. In this sense, social conflict may be seen as something paradoxically necessary to promote social transformation and to move toward a society with more cohesion. Similarly, it should be understood that every social conflict is part of a larger social reality; therefore, conflict can operate as a mechanism of production of a society and

sus circunstancias: aprendizaje, cultura y salud] (2009-2012), financed by Spain's Ministry of Science and Innovation (CSO2009-08741).

as a form of socialization (Tejerina, 1991). Also, many contend that the study of social change has developed schemes and theories based, precisely, on social conflict (Giner, 1978). Both reflections lead to the idea that social changes often involve prior conflicts that promote social changes because they help to settle disagreements and reach new models of social integration. In this sense, social conflict would be considered an integrating phenomenon, which facilitates cosmopolitanism, respect and coexistence, and not necessarily a factor of social dissolution.

Nevertheless, to reach a resolution, social conflict needs a context of sociocultural dialogue. In this sense, several authors (Aron, 1963; Robbins, 1994; Suárez, 1996; Fisas, 2002) highlight that every conflict necessarily involves a process of verbal, written or bodily communication in which incompatibilities of interests emerge involving two or more people that interact with one another. They further state that in order to negotiate and solve a conflict, both parties have to lose and win something. In this process, the people, groups or communities at stake must relate, interact and dialogue with one another so that they can get to know, understand, respect and negotiate the reasons for which each one is defending their position.

FOOD CONFLICTS IN OUR PRESENT-DAY SOCIETY

According to the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO, 2016), the right to adequate food is an international human right that has long existed and that many countries have committed to protect – but that is far from being covered. According to data provided by this organization, there are more than 793 million people that go to bed hungry every night. In Spain, one-third of children live at risk of social exclusion, 30% are at nutritional risk and one out of four children does not eat fruit or vegetables on a daily basis (Save the Children, 2014). The number of children who do not have lunch before going to school has also increased, as have the social and non-governmental initiatives for distributing food in schools.

Furthermore, food conflicts have another, subtler face which goes beyond the macroeconomic inequalities in food access and availability. We will refer to them as *food microconflicts*, following the micro-macro scheme of sociological theories. Unlike the ones discussed above (which could be called *food macroconflicts*), food microconflicts include those characterized by their lack of homogeneity and the logic of separation and exchange, in which the individual prevails over the group (without losing contact with the group or the social structure by which the individual is determined), and have to do with the more personal, internal and symbolic dimension of food choices. More precisely, we are referring to the numerous contradictions that place our everyday eater in a difficult and/or conflictive situation when choosing what and how to eat in a social and food environment like ours, characterized by an unprecedented abundance but also commercialized and biopoliticized (Foucault, 1992). With the term *biopoliticized* we refer to the Foucauldian perspective (Foucault, 1992) regarding government control and the power exercised over the bodies of the population through food, including pharmaceutical laboratories and large companies that try to monopolize food production (such as the transgenic industry), as well as the commercialization of our bodies through a large supply of foods with varying purposes: esthetics, health, pleasure, comfort, among others.

In our present-day society we can find foods ranging from ready-to-cook products that are useful for saving time in a society characterized by haste, everyday stress and productivity, to products that serve precisely to palliate the effects of all that and that promote pleasure and comfort. Moreover, along with this homogenizing supply, we have private and social initiatives that seek to give identity and distinction to certain foods and their consumers. In turn, we also have functional foods and ecological initiatives that are intended to improve our health (Barcelona, for instance, has declared itself to be a *veg-friendly city*). Nevertheless, this wide range of possibilities often entails contradictions like the promotion of aesthetic products that rebut the medical nutritional and health discourse (Fis-

chler, 1995; Contreras & Gracia, 2005). In fact, several of our research studies (International Forum on Food, 2004; Zafra, 2008) revealed controversies many parents have to face when teaching eating habits to their children:

The truth is that the society itself is a contradiction... You see the ads on TV and they tell you this or that product is good for your child's health, that such and such yoghurt has lactobacillus, and stuff like that, and you don't even know what they mean, but it is supposed to be healthy. But then your doctor tells you not to pay attention to those things. The same happens with chocolate, right? You're told that it is rich in this or that, right? And, also, that a little bit of chocolate is not a bad thing, you have to eat a little bit of everything... So...when my son comes with a Kinder Surprise, which supposedly is not very good for his health, but which he really likes, but if he eats just a little nothing bad will happen... What should I tell him? Do I have to prohibit it or not? Where is the line between the good and bad foods? (Discussion group, parents).

In short, eating in terms of pleasure, likes and dislikes, health, esthetics or economic resources, without contradictions among these criteria, is not easy and puts the everyday eater in a difficult frame of mind, often creating controversies and conflicts in which, in our view, it is necessary to intervene and provide education.

FOOD AND COMMUNICATION, FOOD AND EDUCATION: FOOD IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION

It is a unanimous opinion, at least within the disciplines that study food from a social and human perspective, that eating is more than nutrition. Through eating we obtain nourishment, but, in addition, we also communicate, express ourselves and relate with one another. We do not eat everything that is biologically edible, and this means that economic, political, social and ideological factors condition our food choices, as do the possibilities of food access and availability (Fishchler, 1995). In the same way, by studying the eating behavior of a population, we get a better understanding of their lifestyles (Contreras & Gracia, 2005). Mauss (1950) defines eating as a «total social fact,» and Douglas highlights that the principles of choices that guide a human being into selecting their food resources are not physiological, but cultural (Douglas, 1995).

According to *what we eat* and *how we eat it*, we may be individually or collectively identified, according to whether we are male or female (gender), whether we were born in one place or another (ethnicity), whether we belong to one social class or another, and so forth. That is why we can affirm that eating is a powerful communication system that emits meanings of the society within which it occurs: what we eat depends on what we are (on the ways of living – thinking and doing – of a people or of a culture), but we can also come to discover what we are like by what we eat, since each eating behavior or attitude – either individual or collective – has a specific meaning that only makes sense within the society and the culture in which it takes place (Contreras & Gracia, 2005).

Eating is a powerful system of communication that transmits information about the characteristics of every person, group or community. Through the food that we eat, we transmit what we are. Each dish, each food, each ingredient, the way in which we combine them, the categorizations of different foods, the principles of exclusion and association among different foods, the traditional or religious prescriptions and prohibitions, the meal practices and cooking rituals (recipes), the different uses of foods, the order in which they are eaten, their composition, the timing and the number of daily intakes, and so forth, are sending information about a society and its population (Contreras & Gracia, 2005). Moreover, the different manners of eating may constitute a means to identify oneself, to make oneself known or to reaffirm oneself in front of the other, to affirm one's own status, to acquire prestige or not, to promote oneself socially, to express emotions, acceptance or rejection, among others.

In short, eating constitutes one of the cultural characteristics that survives more easily in contact with other cultures and that is hailed strongly as a sign to mark and transmit self-identity (Bourdieu, 1988; Hubert, 2000; Lacomba, 2001). Therefore, given its charge full of meanings, eating can also be signaled as a powerful tool for dialogue and, consequently, for conflict resolution.

FINAL DISCUSSION. FOOD EDUCATION OR FOOD AS A WAY OF LEARNING: PROPOSALS FOR AN INCLUSIVE AND CROSS-CULTURAL FOOD EDUCATION

In the previous pages, we have been able to show the great diversity and complexity surrounding food in our present-day society. There are different ways of thinking about, feeling toward and making food which, in turn, represent the diverse ways of thinking and doing all over the world that, in their multiple ways and levels of social interaction, often lead to controversies and conflicts (*food macroconflicts and microconflicts*) which are not always easy to settle. Likewise, we could see that food conflicts and controversies have to do with inequalities in food access and availability, and also with biopolitical (Foucault, 1992) and market subtleties that make food choices difficult.

In this sense, addressing emerging food issues using social conflict theories has allowed us to better grasp and understand them from a social viewpoint, but it has also offered us clues regarding their potential at the time of settling or solving such conflicts (conflict resolution). On the one hand, this analysis has served to understand social conflict as an ever-present phenomenon in any society, which is necessary to promote social transformation and to develop societies with more cohesion (Simmel, 1977; Giner, 1978; Tejerina, 1991). On the other hand, we saw that when it comes to conflict resolution dialogue and communication are fundamental (Robbins, 1994; Suárez, 1996; Fisas, 2002). Moreover, we could see that eating is a powerful communication system, full of meanings regarding our individual and collective identities.

As noted above, social (and also food) conflicts are necessary for social (and also socio-alimentary) change and transformation; communication and dialogue are tools for conflict resolution; and eating is a powerful communication system. Therefore, we propose a new approach to food education that makes the most of the dialogue and socioeducational potential found in eating to solve problems and conflicts, and also for social transformation and promotion of social cohesion.

In this sense, our proposal is aimed at two parts of the process of any social intervention, in this case a socioeducational one: (a) the first part is the study and diagnosis of the problems, in this case, social and food issues; and (b) the methodological design that we use to intervene in these problems and to transform them (to eradicate them, to improve them, and so on).

Regarding the first phase, centered on the study-diagnosis of food problems and conflicts, we propose more inclusive socio-alimentary diagnosis models that go beyond the study of nutrition as the only factor leading to health, since eating is more than nutrition and health has to do with a person's physical but also psychosocial wellbeing. In this regard, we saw that most food education plans, projects or campaigns focus on the nutritional dimension, overlooking or relegating to second place the sociocultural factors – social, political, economic, historical and ideological – which are precisely those that condition a person's food choices, as well as food access and availability (Fischler, 1995; Rozin & Hormes, 2009; Contreras, Gracia, Atie, Pareja, Zafra, 2012). That is why we need diagnostic research methods that will allow us to go beyond foods and their nutritional elements, in order to also study the teaching-learning processes in which they are found. We are referring to a method of inquiry regarding what children eat, but also about where, when, how, with whom and why they eat what they do. Therefore, it is about delving into the diversity and complexity of eating practices and attitudes for each person, group or community, and in the different socioeducational situations, circumstances and contexts in which they are framed. This also involves thinking about specific data collection and qualitative data analysis techniques, which are less simplifying, able to take into account

the nutritional part of foods in relation to the sociocultural context of their production, distribution, elaboration and consumption. Only in this way will we be able to unravel the possible inequalities that are determining the various eating practices and attitudes, as well as the causes of the personal or social conflicts in which they are resulting.

Regarding the second step of sociocultural intervention, centered on the design and elaboration of a methodological proposal of socioeducational intervention, we suggest using food as a tool for education, in this case, to educate in and for social coexistence and cohesion. We are referring to the importance of teaching how to eat, but also, of using food as a socioeducational means. Given the dialogical potential surrounding food, we are considering the possibilities that may be offered through a type of food education which generates spaces for dialogue in which the children themselves can exchange their eating experiences linked to specific personal and collective situations that explain those experiences: economic, historical, political, ideological situations, among others. With different food-related motives (celebrations, birthday parties, school meals, family meals, picnics, excursions, trips, etc.), we can generate spaces for coexistence and reflection in connection with food production, distribution, elaboration or consumption, so children may develop their critical abilities and, by so doing, become the direct protagonists of their own food learning process, as well as of the changes and transformations that this autonomous learning involves in the broadest framework of their/our society.

All in all, a qualitative analysis of eating will help us study and understand the causes of eating behaviors, as well as the individual and collective experiences that give them meaning. At the same time, food can be used to educate about, based in and in benefit of the social. Therefore, eating can be a magnificent tool to encourage reflection and critical analysis and, as a result, the individual and social empowerment of people, groups and communities that seek to attain and enforce their social and health rights. In this sense, food allows us to detect and unravel the causes of many inequalities and personal and social conflicts, as well to make socioeducational interventions so as to eradicate them or, in any case, to favor more inclusive food education policies that promote healthier societies in global terms, that is, not merely nutritional but also, socially speaking, based on integration, equality and social cohesion.

REFERENCES

- Agencia Española de Seguridad Alimentaria (2005). Estrategia NAOS: Estrategia para la nutrición, actividad física y prevención de la obesidad [Internet]. Madrid: Ministerio de Sanidad y Consumo. Available in: <https://tinyurl.com/y9xqsde5>.
- Agencia Española de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutrición (2012). Plan Cuídate+2012 [Internet]. Madrid: Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e Igualdad. Available in: <http://www.plancuidatemas.es>
- Aron, R. (1993). *Paz y guerra entre las naciones*. Madrid: Revista de Occidente.
- Atie, B., Contreras, J. & Zafra, E. (2011). Comer en la escuela y sus circunstancias: aprendizaje, cultura y salud. *Zainak*, 34, 61-74.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *La distinción: Criterios y bases sociales del gusto*. Madrid: Taurus.
- Comisión de las Comunidades Europeas (2007). Libro Blanco: Estrategia europea sobre problemas de salud relacionados con la alimentación, el sobrepeso y la obesidad [Internet]. Bruselas. Available in: <https://tinyurl.com/yadekrzp>.
- Contreras, J. & Gracia, M. (2005). *Alimentación y cultura: Perspectivas antropológicas*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Contreras, J., Gracia, M., Atie, B., Pareja, S. L. & Zafra, E. (2012). Comer en la escuela: una aproximación etnográfica. In: Martínez JR. *Nutrición y alimentación en el ámbito escolar*. Madrid: ERGON.
- Del Valle, T. (1992). Mujer y nuevas socializaciones: su relación con el poder y el cambio. *Kobie.*, 6, 5-15.
- Douglas, M. (1995). Las estructuras de lo culinario. In: Contreras J. *Alimentación y cultura: Necesidades, gustos y costumbres*. Barcelona: Publicaciones de la Universitat de Barcelona.

- Fisas, V. (2002). *Cultura de paz y gestión de conflictos*. Barcelona: Icaria Ediciones.
- Fischler, C. (1995). *El (h)omnívoro*. Barcelona: Anagrama.
- Foucault, M. (1992). *Vigilar y castigar*. Madrid: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Giner, S. (1978). *El progreso de la conciencia sociológica*. Barcelona: Península.
- International Forum on Food (2004). *La alimentación y sus circunstancias: placer, conveniencia y salud*. Barcelona: V Foro Internacional de la Alimentación.
- Hubert, A. (2000). Alimentation et santé: la science et l'imaginaire. *Cahiers de Nutrition et de Diététique*, 35(5), 353-356.
- Kaplan, A. (2014). European Management and European Business Schools: Insights from the history of business schools. *European Management Journal*, 32(4), 529-534.
- Lacomba, J. (2001). *El Islam inmigrado: Transformaciones y adaptaciones de las prácticas culturales y religiosas*. Madrid: MEC.
- Mauss, M. (1950). *Sociologie et Anthropologie*. Paris: PUF.
- Morton, H. (1996). *Becoming Tongan: An ethnography of childhood*. Honolulu: University of Hawai Press.
- Muñoz, F. (2008). *Urbanización: paisajes comunes, lugares globales*. Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili.
- Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Alimentación y la Agricultura (2016). *Derecho a la alimentación* [Internet]. Available in: <https://tinyurl.com/y8sut54n>.
- Organización Mundial de la Salud (2014). *Estrategia Mundial sobre Régimen Alimentario, Actividad Física y Salud* [Internet]. Available in: <https://tinyurl.com/y9tecwm9>.
- Robbins, S. P. (1994). *Comportamiento organizacional: conceptos, controversias y aplicaciones*. México: Prentice Hall.
- Rogoff, B. (1993). *Aprendices del pensamiento: El desarrollo cognitivo en el contexto social*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Rozin, P. & Hormes, J. (2009). Food preferences and aversions. In: Shweder RA, Bidell TR, Dailey AC, Dixon SD, Miller PJ, Modell J. *The Child: An Encyclopedic Companion*. Chicago: Univer.
- Save the Children [Internet]. Available in: <https://www.savethechildren.es>
- Simmel, G. (1977). *Sociología: estudios sobre las formas de socialización*. Madrid: Revista de Occidente.
- Suárez, M. (1996). *Mediación: Conducción de disputas y técnicas*. Buenos Aires: Plaza Edición.
- Tejerina, B. (1991). Las teorías sociológicas del conflicto social: Algunas dimensiones analíticas a partir de K. Marx y G. Simmel. *REIS*, 55, 47-64.
- Tibbs, T., Haire Joshu, D., Schechtman, K., Brownson, R., Nanney, M., Houston, C. H. & Auslander, W. (2001). The relationship between parental modeling, eating patterns, and dietary intake among African-american parents. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 101(5), 535-541.
- Tylor, S. J. & Bodgan, R. (1992). *Introducción a los métodos cualitativos de investigación*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Zafra, E. (2005). Comer en la escuela: el modelo de educación alimentaria en el comedor escolar. *Trabajo Social y Salud*, 51, 361-382.
- Zafra, E. (2008) *Aprender a comer: procesos de socialización y trastornos del comportamiento alimentario* [Tesis doctoral]. Barcelona: Departament d'Antropologia Cultural i Història d'Amèrica i d'Àfrica, Universitat de Barcelona.
- Zafra, E. (2010). ¿Reeducar para educar? La (re)educación alimentaria en el comedor escolar: dificultades en el aprendizaje de la dieta equilibrada. In: Martorell, M. A., Comelles, J. M. & Bernal, M. *Antropología y enfermería*. Tarragona: Publicacions URV.
- Zafra, E. (2011). La transversalidad de los procesos de socialización en los comportamientos alimentarios de niños y niñas. *Zainak*, 34, 33-60.