

https://dspace.org/

The gendered production of food-related identities as interactional phenomena: an investigation of talk-in-interaction at the South African braai

Lewis, Ilse

2018

https://hdl.handle.net/10539/27116

Lewis, Ilse (2018) The gendered production of food-related identities as interaction phenomena: an investigation of talk-in-interaction at the South African braai, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, https://hdl.handle.net/10539/27116

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

The Gendered Production of Food-Related Identities as Interactional Phenomena: An Investigation of Talk-In-Interaction at the South African Braai.

By Ilse Lewis

Supervised by Professor Kevin Whitehead

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Social and Psychological Research

March 2018.

Plagiarism Declaration

Surname:	Lewis
First Name:	Ilse
Student Number:	721020
Supervisor:	Professor Kevin Whitehead
Title:	The Gendered Production of Food-Related Identities as Interactional Phenomena: An Investigation of Talk-In-Interaction at the South African Braai.
Word Count:	29049

I, Ilse Lewis, declare that this research proposal is my own, unaided work. It is submitted for the degree of MA in Social and Psychological Research in the Faculty of Humanities, at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination at this or any other university.

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Abstract

This study explores the intersectional production of the social categories of gender and food-related identities, as they emerge as interactional phenomena. The dataset consists of approximately five hours of recorded participant interactions at a residential braai – a common social event in the lives of everyday South Africans. My analysis follows feminist conversation analytic principles, and demonstrates how participants establish and manage their food-related identities, as intersecting with gender, in interaction. It illustrates how various interactional strategies are employed toward managing potential incipient identity-related interactional conflict. This systematically results in the achievement of group solidarity, whilst steering the interaction away from confronting the wider-ranging ideological concerns that underpin this potential conflict in the first place. Thus, the wider political; environmental; and socio-economic matters related to individual choices regarding food consumption, are effectively abandoned in interaction, and thus left uncontested. I conclude with a discussion regarding the implications of these findings for the everyday resistance of dominant cultural discourse, related to the gendered politics of food consumption.

Keywords: food-related identities; gender; feminist conversation analysis; interaction

Acknowledgements

First and foremostly, I would like to express my unending gratitude to my supervisor. Kevin, for all your support, guidance, motivation, patience, and good humour, thank you. Your exhaustive and measured approach to every meeting, every email, and every opportunity to provide feedback on my writing has not gone unappreciated. Further, for your insight and sensitivity toward grounding my intellectual passions for this field of study, in a manner that will surely benefit my future endeavours, I am eternally grateful.

To the remarkable women who I am lucky to consider my closest friends, and who have provided me with the understanding, support, wine, adventures, and laughs, to persevere through what has been an exceptionally challenging year, thank you. You inspire me every day and your friendship is valuable beyond measure.

Finally, to my beautiful, loving mother, and my biggest supporter, Wes. Without your unwavering, and unconditional love and support, the completion of this project would not have been possible. Thank you.

Table of Contents

Plagiarism Declaration----------2

Abstract----------3

Acknowledgements----------4

Introduction----------6

Literature Review----------9

- **Introduction**----------9
- **Social Categories as Interactional Phenomena: Food-Related Identities**----------9
- **Social Categories as Interactional Phenomena: Gender Performativity** ----------12
- **Gender and Food-Related Identities as Interactional Phenomena: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Perspective**_____14
- **The Braai as a Feature of Everyday South African Social Life: A Sphere for 'Embattled Conversations'**---------- 16

Methods----------22

- **Sampling and Data**---------- 22
- **Method of Analysis**---------- 26
- **Ethical Considerations**----------28

Analysis---------- 30

- **Managing Food-Related Identities**---------- 31
- **Managing Conflicts Relating to Food-Identities**----------45
- **The Intersectional Orientation to Gender and Food-Related Identities**----------63

Discussion and Conclusions----------74

References----------79

Appendices---------- 87

- **Appendix A: Ethical Clearance Certificate**----------87
- **Appendix B: Participant Information Sheet & Informed Consent Forms**---------89

Introduction

Matters related to food consumption present a field of inquiry that spans cross-disciplinary concerns, in that food consumption connects personal behaviours (the micro-interactional sphere) with larger (macro-environmental) consequences. Thus, considering the plethora of current global challenges that are connected to the systems of human food production and consumption, such as the global health crisis (Chan, 2008; Council on Foreign Relations, 2014) and the negative impacts of meat consumption on human health in particular (Clonan, Roberts, & Holdsworth, 2016); climate change (Goodland, 2009; Eshel & Martin, 2005); and animal rights and biodiversity conservation (Machovina, Feeley, & Ripple, 2015; Adams, 2010a; 2010b), amongst other relevant issues, there exists an urgent need to understand, and challenge, the interlocking systems that structure the social organisation of human food consumption practices. As such, this study presents an attempt toward investigating one such aspect of this multifaceted, multi-disciplinary, complex field of inquiry. As noted by Bell and Valentine (1997):

> For most inhabitants of (post)modern Western societies, food has long ceased to be merely about sustenance and nutrition. It is packed with social, cultural, and symbolic meanings. Every mouthful, every meal, can tell us something about ourselves, and about our place in the world... In a world where self-identity and place-identity are woven through webs of consumption, what we eat (and where, and why) signals, as the aphorism says, who we are. (p. 3)

Throughout investigations toward understanding 'who we are', in relation to 'what we eat', scholars have largely approached individual food consumption differences in the same way they have other social categories, such as gender or race: as (fixed) markers of difference (captured as socio-demographic variables) that are treated by investigators to reflect *a priori* established positions, which might explain some other phenomena under investigation (see for example Charles & Kerr, 1988; Lockie, 2001; and Lindeman & Stark, 1999, 2000). This study however, approaches food consumption as an inherently symbolically-laden, or more specifically, identity-laden (Stapleton, 2015) practice. As such, food-related identities, as they demarcate individual (and group) differences in food consumption practices associated to ideological constructs, are understood as the situated discursive social practices (in the micro-

interactional sphere) (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Schegloff, 1987; Schegloff, 1992) whereby social organisation (in the macro-environmental sphere) is achieved, and continuously negotiated (West & Zimmerman, 1987).

In addition, in this study I approach gender identity relations as an *omnirelevant* and *unavoidable* component of mundane social life, and thus as an interesting topic for investigation in the interactional sphere, due to the social consequences related to the naturalistic 'doing' of gender (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Subsequently, considering the theoretical orientation toward the *gendered politics of meat consumption* (and gendered food consumption more generally) that Adams (2010a) provides, this study has aimed to explore the intersectional production of the social categories of gender and food-related identities, as they emerge as interactional phenomena (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Schegloff, 1987; Schegloff, 1992). This topic of analysis is explored within the situated context of the South African *braai* (the South African equivalent of the barbeque) as a social event. This context was chosen as the braai presents a social arena where social interaction typically (or normatively) includes interaction related to food preparation, food consumption, and/or food preference. Thus, through an inductive approach to data collection and analysis, within the setting of the braai, I have aimed to uncover the discursive processes that operate during the production and negotiation of food-related identities, as they intersect with the production of gender identities in interaction.

This intersectional view between the two social categories of interest provides the study with an approach to identity that grounds it in interaction, as an embedded and performative feature of social relationships (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Thus, through the present inquiry into the gendered ways in which food-related identities are reproduced, links can be examined between the institutional and the interactional levels of asymmetrical social organisation (West & Zimmerman, 1987). An analysis of talk-in-interaction at a normative South African social event (the braai), provides an opportunity for the interrogation of taken-for-granted social phenomena at the level of the interactional components of social structure. This echoes Sacks' (1984) aim to discover 'order at all points' originating in the micro-sociological sphere. In addition, to subsequently reveal something about the macro- sociological 'orderliness' of the (asymmetrical) gender dynamics involved in food consumption within the South African

context, this study draws from Adams's (2010) feminist-vegetarian critical theoretical lens[1], since this approach provides much insight into the gendered politics involved in food (and particularly, meat) consumption.

Although this study presents some insight into a problematic aspect of social organisation, and a possible entry point toward understanding the larger scale concerns relating to the discursive processes that underpin the gender relations involved in the promotion and practices of food consumption, it has not aimed to uncover any objective, absolute universal truths regarding the nature of reality. Rather, simply to understand the ways in which social processes, or relations, are actively constructed through interaction and how such constructions can be understood to relate to concerns of social organisation, since the research participants are understood to be actively constructing the reality that they engage in (Weatherall, 2015; Potter, 2004; Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; West & Zimmerman, 1987; Garfinkel, 1967; West & Fenstermaker, 1995). Thus, considering the global challenges related to food consumption practices (as mentioned above), this research presents a possible contribution to the dearth of literature spanning interdisciplinary concerns related to ecological, psychological, and social justice imperatives. Further, this research presents a response to the American Psychological Association's international call for psychological research to address the human actions that influence climate change, specifically in relation to the cultural characteristics (gendered politics of meat consumption) and the resistance movements (e.g. vegetarianism/veganism) that influence patterns of consumption (The American Psychological Association Task Force on the Interface Between Psychology and Global Climate Change, 2017).

[1] Terminology for this theoretical lens varies across the literature. For example, 'vegan feminism' and 'eco-feminism' are terms often used interchangeably with 'feminist-vegetarian critical perspective'. However, for the purposes of this study, I have chosen to use the terminology coined by Adams (2010), since I draw largely from her theoretical work.

Literature Review

Introduction

To provide a brief outline for what is to follow, the literature review provides a discussion of social categories as interactional phenomena, with a specific focus on food-related identities in the first section, and gender performativity in the second section. The third section provides a discussion that ties together the interactional production of gender and food-related identities as intersectional phenomena, which is informed by a feminist-vegetarian critical theoretical lens (Adams, 2010a). Lastly, the final section discusses the significance of the braai in everyday South African social life, as a site of the production and negotiation of interactional phenomena in the private sphere (Verwey & Quayle, 2012), toward providing the necessary contextual grounding regarding the research setting, in which we can observe the production of gendered food-related identities.

Social Categories as Interactional Phenomena: Food-Related Identities

Food-related identities can be understood to represent a continuously negotiated participants' resource that is used to legitimise social action (Widdicombe, 1998; Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Edwards, 1991). As such, in this study I have aimed to uncover some of the ways in which food-related identities emerge, and are utilised in interaction (Schegloff, 2007b; Schegloff, 1997), through examining how these identities are invoked, responded to, negotiated, and implied in the sequential organisation of food-related interaction. Of course, an individual can reasonably be described via multiple identity categorisations, at any given time, for example in relation to their race; gender; ethnicity; political principles; religion; and food-related identities. However, with an interaction-analytic approach to the study of identity, what becomes important is to uncover which of the multitude of available identity categories is/are actually utilised in interactional work by the participants themselves – as opposed to imposed by the analyst (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998).

That is to explore how participants ascribe, or reject, align with, or disavow, and display, or ignore, specific identity categories, at specific times within interaction, within a specific context. Further, once an identity has been oriented to, the analyst needs to ask "why that now?" (Schegloff, 1980; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). The answer to which should be located "entirely within the structural logic of interactive practice itself" (Prevignano & Thibault, 2003, p. 69),

meaning that there are features of talk-in-interaction that operate consistently, independent of context, and it is here that the analyst can access the purpose toward which any particular action in social interaction was formulated - as opposed to 'importing' interpretive assessments regarding (ephemeral) participant motivations. For instance, as one might ask a question, to which the following action in mundane conversation would usually be an answer from a fellow interactant, or as a compliment typically assumes a following show of gratitude, similarly, the invocation of an identity category is performed actively and toward some interactional purpose, which the analyst can assess via the analysis of what unfolds following such an invocation (Prevignano & Thibault, 2003).

In discursive practice, participants' ascription of membership to an (identity) category makes available certain inferences, as each membership category is associated with particular activities and features (Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 2007b). Additionally, certain rights and privileges are associated with identities as specific knowledge or experience can be claimed in relation to an identity category (Sacks, 1992; Potter, 1996). Thus, the analyst's quest is to discover which identity category/ies is/are oriented to, and thus made relevant within the interaction, by the participant, as well as to uncover *why* the participant is doing so, i.e. toward what purpose? Since, although any membership category oriented to might have 'common sense' (or normative) features associated thereto, what is important is to uncover which of these features are made relevant (aligned to, disavowed, etc.) within the interactional context, by the interactants themselves, and toward what purpose (as gauged by the procedural unfolding) (Antaki & Widdicome, 1998). Thus, in the context of this study, food-related identities are explored as a participant's resource, rather than an analyst's (imposed) category.

Existing social scientific study on food-related identities has focused on uncovering the ideological reasons underlying certain dietary decisions. For example, vegetarians (no consumption of meat products) and vegans (consumers of plant-based foods only – i.e. no meat, dairy, eggs, or any other animal by-products) describe many motivations for their dietary decisions, such as environmental, ethical, animal welfare, and health concerns (Beardsworth & Keil, 1992). Lindeman and Stark (1999, 2000) assert that one's food preferences may be associated with personal identity expression, while Giddens (1991) and Larsson, Rönnlund, and Dahlgren (2003) explain that vegetarianism and veganism are also described as part of a chosen symbolic life project. Larsson et al. (2003) report that Swedish vegans, for instance, are motivated by health concerns, a distaste for meat, and a preference for vegetarian food. And

Chuck, Fernandes, and Hyers (2016) report that ascription to a 'dietary subculture' results from an 'encounter' that leads to an "awakening into a politicised identity" (p. 425). Further, scholarship has largely approached individual food consumption differences in the same way they have other social categories, such as gender or race: as (fixed) markers of difference (captured as socio-demographic variables) that are treated by investigators to reflect *a priori* established positions, which might explain some other phenomena under investigation (see for example Charles & Kerr, 1988; Lockie, 2001; and Lindeman & Stark, 1999, 2000). In doing so, food-related identities have largely been treated as static, consistent, explanatory variables, as an individual cognitive concept, whilst their action-orientedness has been left widely unexamined.

Discursive psychology has made some progress toward examining food-related identities as performative features in interaction in recent years. For example, Sneijder and te Molder (2006) studied how 'gourmet' identities are performed in online culinary forums; Wiggins (2004) examined food consumption-related negotiations between parents and children; and Sneijder and te Molder (2009) studied how veganism is oriented to and negotiated in online forum discussions, toward uncovering the category-bound features of performed food-related identities. Whilst existing literature provides some ideological explanation for the relationship between food-related decisions and identity, as well as some explanation for the ways in which food related identities are utilised as a discursive resource in everyday interactional work, this remains an underexplored field that might benefit from further inquiry. More specifically, to my knowledge, no investigation has been made toward the ways in which food-related identities are established and negotiated, as performative features of social interaction, in a common South African social setting – such as the *braai.* Thus, this study represents a unique contribution to this field of inquiry, and whilst it does not claim to present any absolute universal truths regarding the nature of food-related identities, it does represent a means toward gaining some insight into an aspect of (problematic) social organisation, on the micro-interactional level, that relates to wider issues of political divergence.

In conclusion, food-related identity, when viewed as a participants' resource, can be understood as a tool that is utilised to create and maintain social relationships, and social 'order at all points' (Sacks, 1984), and thus where the 'personal is political' (Hanisch, 1970), in the sense that making dietary choices presents an everyday personal (and social) practice that is laden with discursive and ideological motivations (Adams, 2010a; Izmirli & Phillips, 2011). In

this sense, the construction and negotiation of food-related identities in micro-interaction ultimately relate to, and have implications for, global macro-level social justice and political issues. This study thus aims to provide insight into the micro-interactional social organisation or food-related identities, as a possible entry point toward understanding related, larger scale concerns.

Social Categories as Interactional Phenomena: Gender Performativity

Corresponding to the way in which food-related identities are approached in this study, gender is also understood as something that is *used* in talk: "something that is part and parcel of the routines of everyday life, brought off in the fine detail of everyday interaction" (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998, p. 1). In this view, social categories, such as gender, cannot be utilised as an *explanatory resource* that might explain specific interactional phenomena, but rather, it must be treated as a *participants' resource* that necessitates rigorous analysis, once it has been made relevant within an interaction (Anataki & Widdicombe, 1998). Thus, as with food-related identities, this study adopts a view of gender identity as a situated discursive social practice that is actively constructed and negotiated in interaction. In this sense, individuals constantly formulate and reformulate their identities within interaction, to perform various social actions and present themselves as belonging to a specific category, or categories, of person(s), which, in effect legitimates possibly questionable activities, as well as all kinds of mundane activities (Widdicombe, 1998; Edwards, 1991).

Gender, as one of the many possible social categories one can belong to (Schegloff, 2007b), is viewed not only as one of the interactional resources that are available to participants in performing their interactional business, but also as a product of the construction of identity categories in situated interaction (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Gender represents "…the activity of managing situated conduct in light of normative conceptions of attitudes and activities appropriate for one's sex category" (West & Zimmerman, 1987, p. 129), as well as a powerful ideological tool that operates on the micro-sociological level to constantly construct and legitimate specific social arrangements on the macro-sociological level. Thus, "doing gender furnishes the interactional scaffolding of social structure, along with a built-in mechanism of social control" (West & Zimmerman, 1987, p. 147). Gender can be understood to present such a fundamental, omnipresent feature of social interaction, that "…doing gender is unavoidable" (West & Zimmerman, 1987, p. 137). The *omnirelevance* of gender relations as

an *unavoidable* component of the happenings of everyday life, therefore presents as an interesting topic for investigation in the interactional sphere, due to the social consequences related to the naturalistic 'doing' of gender (West & Zimmerman, 1987).

Considering this, the focus on gender in this study, presents a *relevant* and *procedurally consequential* (Schegloff, 1992) aspect of talk-in-interaction, and thus topic of analysis, within the context of the *braai*, as a normative South African social occasion. It is important to reiterate, that although gender is considered to represent an *omnirelevant* component of social interaction, that this (and any other) membership categor(y/ies) has only been selected for analysis in the present study if and when it presents as a participant resource, as opposed to an analyst-imposed category (Schegloff, 2007b; Schegloff, 1997). This commitment concurs with the Conversation Analytic (CA) stance, which Schegloff (1992, p. 128) echoes in his assertion that "it is not for us to *know* what about context is crucial, but to *discover* it…". Antaki and Widdicombe, (1998) outline the following five general CA principles in relation to the study of social categories in interaction: (1) for an individual to 'have an identity', is to be cast into a *category with associated features;* (2) such a casting is *indexical and occasioned*; (3) it *makes relevant* the identity to the interactional business going on; (4) the force of 'having an identity' is in its *consequentiality* in the interaction; and (5) all this is visible in people's exploitation of the *structures of conversation.* Considering these principles, CA provides the present research with an analytic orientation to the study of gender, as a social category, that embeds it in interaction, complementing the feminist lens relating to gender performativity. This provides the feminist-informed researcher with the opportunity to uncover the ways in which seemingly natural aspects of social life attain, legitimate, and maintain, their consistent influence in creating the primary divisions of our society. Further, this provides the ability to challenge existing arrangements, to treat the categorisation of participants as problematic (Schegloff, 2007b) and subsequently, to deliver support for resistance movements to explore alternatives (West & Fenstermaker, 1995).

As opposed to the stark lack of inquiry regarding food-related identities as performative features in interaction, much interest has been generated in relation to the study of gender in these terms (see for example, Baxter, 2003 Holmes, 2006; Sheriff & Weatherall, 2009; Weatherall & Gallois, 2003; and Weatherall, 2015). Further, since the original publication of *The Sexual Politics of Meat* (Adams, 2010a) in 1989, there has been a growing interest in recent decades toward exploring the relationship between gender and food-related identities. For

example, beyond Adams's own subsequent work in this field (Adams, 1993; 1994; 1995; 2003; 2006; 2009; 2010a; 2010b 2012; and 2014), many other scholars have investigated this link – logically with varying theoretical and methodological foci (see for example, Bailey, 2007; Deckha, 2006; 2007; 2012; Fraiman, 2012; Harper, 2010, and Parry, 2010). Whilst there is much debate in this field regarding the value of particular arguments as originally represented by Adams (see Hamilton, 2016 for a more detailed discussion), there is no denying the central role that Adams has performed in drawing attention to the "need to challenge the anthropocentrism evident in much feminist theory" (Hamilton, 2016, p. 112). Thus, there is a need to engage in critical work regarding the relationship between food-related identities and gender. Further, since (as mentioned above), much has been accomplished in the study of gender in interaction-analytic oriented work, whilst the opposite is true in the study of food-related identities, this study presents an opportunity to investigate these two identity categories in a way that contributes toward closing a gap in the knowledge-base. I.e. to map the critical theoretical work at the intersection of gender and food related identity categories (to be explored further below), onto observable phenomena in interaction (Weatherall, 2015), toward providing new insights into the ways that we understand not only the micro-level management of these two identity categories, but also potentially as this relates to the problematic macro-level social organisation thereof.

Gender and Food-Related Identities as Interactional Phenomena: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Perspective

Considering the theoretical and methodological approach in this study, to identities as interactional phenomena, it also needs to be understood that different social categories operate as intersectional productions and negotiations (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Schegloff, 1987; Schegloff, 1992). In the context of the present study, Adams's (2010) *feminist-vegetarian critical* lens provides a theoretical orientation to understand how gender, (and gendered) discourse, underpins the processes involved in the promotion and practices of meat consumption in particular, and in food consumption more generally. Thus, such a theoretical framework provides a means to understand the two intersecting social categories of gender identities and food-related identities, as grounded in interaction, and as an embedded and performative feature of social relationships (West & Zimmerman, 1987).

Adams (2010a) notes that the norms of human food consumption are intimately related to notions of gender identity. Specifically, it is understood that societal norms surrounding meat consumption are certainly not neutral, or more specifically, not gender-neutral (Midgley, 2007), but rather that they are representative of the social asymmetries produced by patriarchal discourse, in that "meat consumption defines masculinity and the place of women in patriarchal cultures" (Gomes Costa Filho, 2014, p. 58). Where meat consumption is associated with virility, and masculine strength and power, vegetables (and vegetarian or vegan, i.e. meatless diets) are associated with femininity (read lack of power) (Twigg, 1979; Adams, 2010a; Rogers, 2008; Rothgerber, 2012). Further, Turner, Ferguson, Craig, Jeffries, and Beaton (2013), in their study on 'gendered identity negotiations through food consumption', found that masculinity is established and negotiated through what men *are* eating, whilst femininity is grounded in what women *are not* eating. In this sense, normative assessments regarding what does and does not constitute 'appropriate' or 'adequate' diets for men and women differ - not necessarily in relation to biological terms, but rather as it relates to ideological orientations regarding men and women's bodies. As such, 'female' diets are (normatively) more restrictive than men's diets, not only with regards to the quantity being consumed, but also in relation to *what* is being consumed (Chaiken & Pilner, 1987; Mooney et al., 1994; Mooney & Lorenz, 1997; Turner et al., 2013). As Bourdieu (1984, p. 192) explains: "men eat more and eat stronger things", since, (in Western society) sexual attractiveness is associated with muscularity and strength in men, and with being slender (and weak) for women (Adams, 2010a).

Thus, human dietary decisions (and hence food-related identities) relating to the consumption of animals and animal by-products are highlighted via a feminist-vegetarian critical perspective as a politicised, symbolically-laden, gendered, and thus feminist issue. Further, although feminist thinking and vegetarian/vegan thinking might diverge in their respective foci with respect to societal transformation (i.e. human gender relations vs. human to non-human animal relations), the shared moral philosophy at the core of both theoretical frameworks provides for their integration. As Hamilton (2016, p. 114) notes: "it is this commitment to non-violence as the basis for an ethics of eating - and of living -…that makes veganism a feminist issue". That is, the feminist-vegetarian critical theoretical lens highlights the need to engage beyond the level of human-to-human relations, and thus challenges the anthropocentrism present in much feminist thought, toward addressing the social asymmetries produced by patriarchal discourse more holistically. In this sense, identity categories that are understood to intersect with gender,

such as race and class, are expanded to include food-related identities, as they relate to the relational dynamics between humans, as well as between human and non-human animals.

An analysis of the intersecting identity categories related to gender and food consumption, thus may potentially provide various insights into the associated pervasive, subtle, and normalised culturally embedded forms of prejudice (Bastian & Loughnan, 2016). This approach provides the opportunity to examine taken-for-granted social phenomena that might reveal something about the macro- sociological *orderliness* (Sacks, 1984) of the asymmetrical gender dynamics involved in food consumption, within the South African context. Importantly, due to the inductive, interaction-analytic approach to data collection and analysis, this study provides the opportunity to uncover such taken-for-granted social phenomena as they emerge in interaction, as opposed to analytically 'imposing' theoretical explanations to the data at hand. Hence, throughout the analysis, it is participants' orientations to prejudice; judgment; unfairness; etcetera, that is analysed as such, as opposed to theoretically imposing explanations of "prejudice" upon what might simply be opposing (but not ideologically-laden) choices or actions. Further, whilst the (feminist-vegetarian critical) theoretical lens might aid in drawing connections between the micro-and-macro-sociological spheres, and in so doing aid in reaching an understanding of the interactional phenomena under analysis, it is also understood that interactionally performed 'prejudice', for instance, does not necessarily represent a matter of 'individual-level prejudice'. Rather, this may present the operation of macro-level structural matters as they may present as 'individual choices', to continuously reproduce the dominant culture. This is particularly relevant within the context of the research setting in this study, as the South African braai is a normative social event in the lives of South Africans, that is characterised by particularly gendered social practices, in relation to food preparation and consumption - as is discussed below.

The Braai as a Feature of Everyday South African Social Life: A Sphere for 'Embattled Conversations'

The South African *braai* can be understood as a "distinctive social arena associated with alcohol, rugby, hunting, meat, and hypermasculinity" (Verwey & Quayle, 2012, p. 558), and presents a common feature of South African social life where interactional phenomena are produced and negotiated in the private sphere (Verwey & Quayle, 2012). Furthermore, due to its centrality to South African social life, the common social occasion of the braai with its

established interactional practices, provides an opportunity to study identities in an interactional setting that "sets the stage for the depictions of 'essential' sexual natures" (West & Zimmerman, 1987, p. 138), and thus for the exploration of the intersection of gender identities with food-related identities.

In the context of this present study, the South African braai does provide a particularly relevant setting for the investigation of the discursive construction of gender dynamics in relation to food-related identities, specifically as associated with meat consumption. Firstly, in the sense that the South African braai represents a national pastime that is so integral to South African social life that the national public holiday: Heritage Day, is commonly referred to as 'National Braai Day' (Heritage Day, n.d.). Secondly, in the sense that the braai contains deeply embedded and explicitly observable (gendered) social norms that are frequently described in popular culture references, for example:

> In black and white South African culture, women rarely braai (cook) meat at a social gathering, as this is normally the preserve of men. The men gather round the braai or braaistand (the fire or grill) outdoors and cook the food, while women prepare the pap, salads, desserts, and vegetables for the meal in the kitchen. The meal is subsequently eaten outside by the fire/braai, since the activity is normally engaged in during the long summer months. The braaing (cooking) of the meat is not the prerogative of all the men attending, as one person would normally be in charge. He will attend to the fire, check that the coals are ready, and braai (cook) the meat. Other men may assist but generally only partake in fireside conversation. The person in charge is known as the braaier (chef), and if his skills are recognised, could be called upon to attend to the braai (BBQ) at other occasions as well (What is a braai?, 2009).

Thus, the relevance in utilising the South African braai as a research setting in the context of this research, lies in the centrality of the role of meat (and other food) preparation, and consumption practices, and its intersection with gender performativity, as a feature – and participants' resource - of social organisation on the interactional level. Further, considering the central focus of meat at a braai, and the prevalence of braaing in South African social life, this setting presents a unique opportunity to explore interactional negotiations related to normative and non-normative (read meatless) dietary choices or practices, and thus food-related identities, such as vegetarian or vegan identities. Specifically, since the practices related

to braaing are "not just a means to an end, but [are] important social activit[ies] that strengthen the inter- and intra-relations of communities" (Venter, Jaars, Booyens, Beukes, van Zyl, Josipovic, Hendriks, Vakkari, Hellén, Hakola, Aaltonen, Ruiz-Jimenez, Riekkola & Laakso, 2015, p. 181). This can be seen in the way that the South African braai is unique compared to (the comparable) barbeques in other nations, in that it presents the 'go-to' practice for many different types of social occasions – from birthdays, to religious gatherings, to corporate events (Venter et al., 2015), whilst the barbeque (in other nations) is usually reserved as a unique occasion in its own right. Thus, the braai represents not only a well-established normative social event with established (gendered) food-related interactional practices, but also a very regular one. Hence, this is an interactional space that necessitates the negotiation of food-related identities on a regular basis, which has resulted in the creation of popular culture 'braai survival guides' for non-meat-eaters, for example:

> …the evenings are warming up and the sun stays up late – and that means lots of braai's (barbeques) and beers at friends and families' houses. With this, comes a whole bunch of questions that you have most likely not had to put up with for a few months while you were hermited away in your flat. A vegetarian at a braai, is a bit like a hippie at Caprice (the oh- so-sophisticated bar in Camps Bay, Cape Town) – it's just not done. So, if you are getting ready to head out on the social circuit, I thought I would provide you with a few tongue-in-cheek answers to the questions that all of you have probably been asked at a braai. And yes, even though you have been asked them a million times, it seems that we're still in for decades of repetition (Surviving the Braai, 2010, para. 1-3).

Similarly, such guides extend to meat-eaters and hosts of braais as well, which present as 'how to' guides toward catering for non-meat-eaters, for example:

> The weather forecast looks good, you've invited some friends over and the plan is to treat them to a good old braai and some beer.
>
> You start a shopping list –boerie, bread rolls, chops, garlic bread and then remember that there will [be] a vegetarian in attendance as well and no matter how much the thought of catering for a meat free visitor baffles you, you know you can't leave the person to eat nothing but bread. Luckily you don't have to.
>
> *Here is a list of easy vegetarian braai ideas to pop onto the coal* [sic]*:*
>
> (Konig, 2017, para. 1).

Such ‘survival guides’ and ‘how to guides’ illustrate that “in this unique social setting, the vegetarian is often not really understood which can lead to some interesting conversations” (Surviving the Braai, 2010). Adams (2010a) echoes this as she explains that vegetarianism (or performing a vegetarian identity) provokes conversation, as to abstain from meat-eating (and thus dominant dietary conventions) inevitably draws attention to the vegetarian, especially at an event that (normatively) places a lot of focus on meat consumption, such as the braai. She explains that for vegetarians to discuss their dietary choices, is inevitable as “they are continually called upon to defend their diet” (p. 71). She also explains that the most prevalent time and place for vegetarians to experience conflict regarding their dietary choices (and thus their identities), is during mealtimes, as this represents an occasion when “the texts of meat are simultaneously broached conversationally and incarnated on the plate” (p. 71). As a result, Adams outlines that once attention has been drawn to the vegetarian (or other non-meat-eating food-related identity), and their dietary choices have been topicalised, that they often face hostility in the form of outrageous questions; teasing; or trivialisation, amongst other phenomena in-interaction. The ‘braai survival guide’ for non-meat-eaters, mentioned above, illustrates this type of interaction – not from one or another particular recorded interaction, but rather as a representation (albeit satirical) of the normative ways in which such “interesting conversations” (as the guide labels them), or ‘embattled conversations’, as Adams (2010a) labels them, regularly occur within the setting of the South African braai. For example:

> [Random guy at braai] Hey Bru, howzit going?
>
> [*Endangered vegetarian at braai*] *It’s all good. Beautiful afternoon, pity about the wind. But I guess it’s not unexpected – this is Cape Town. How you doing?*
>
> No worries. Can’t complain. Hey what’s going on with all that salad, hey? Don’t you want some meat? The boerewors is almost ready, there’s plenty to go around, it’s really juicy so you must just help yourself.
>
> *Thanks, but I don’t really eat boerewors. Got myself some veggies. [And this is where the clash begins. It’s recommended to change the subject here if you can.] Did you watch the rugby yesterday?*
>
> Ag, ja. But lets not talk about it. The ‘*boks* are not at their best, hey. [Looks down despondently] But listen – are you sure you don’t want some wors? You’re not going to get full on just that green stuff, hey?
>
> *I’m really fine thanks, happy with my veggies.*
>
> Man, how can you say no to such awesome boerewors. Is there something wrong with you?

No there is nothing wrong with me, I'm a vegetarian. Great afternoon though…
Seriously? A vegetarian? No ways, bru. What do you eat?
[The endangered veggie can't help trying to change topic again, but at this point, there's just no way out…] Everything except meat….
…That's just weird… but how can you not eat meat? Don't you miss it?
Well, I was brought up vegetarian. So, no, I have never really eaten meat, just a few times by mistake. Like when restaurants put bacon on your pizza by mistake. So, you can't miss what you've never had.
Yes, but bacon is not really meat – it's like breakfast. The only real meat is ribs – only girls eat bacon. [There is a look of total incomprehension growing on his face] Are you gay, I mean real men eat meat?
No, I am not gay. [Notice that the endangered vegetarian is drinking a very manly beer (Windhoek is advertised as the real beer for real men, whereas Castle is just crap.)] I just don't like meat and don't eat it.
[Shaking head in disbelief] Wow, I just don't understand. I mean what do you eat? I eat steak and potatoes, burgers and chips, boerewors and buns… that's all meat. If I just ate salad I'd be hungry the whole time! That's not a meal.
Well, I eat potatoes, chips, buns and that nice salad that your girlfriend made over there. [Who is pretty cute by the way] Take a look at the coals. Check that bag of foil under all the meat? That is full of potatoes, onions and a bunch of veggies, chopped up finely, with really nice spices and interesting flavours. I actually picked some of those herbs from my own balcony. It's going to be awesome.
Suit yourself, bru, I reckon you're just a bit of a weird hippie, hey? That boerewors looks frikken amazing. Anyway cheers, till later… [Shaking his head and walking off to the boys]
Sure – cheers. (Surviving the Braai, 2010).

Of course, the above representation of an hypothetical 'embattled conversation' between a meat-eater and a vegetarian, does not provide empirical evidence of such *actual* interactions. However, it does indicate is that this type of interaction is not only something that theorists like Adams have outlined abstractly, but that it is something that has been reported in popular media to occur in the lives of ordinary South Africans. Furthermore, without delving into a full analysis of the blog post example above, one can see therein that the type of intersection between gender and food-related identities that I have theoretically outlined above, does seem

(popularly) relevant in expressions such as: “real men eat meat”, for example. Thus, the present study has taken such anecdotal examples from ordinary life as a point of inspiration, in combination with the scholarly work that has been done in the areas of gender identity and food-related identity. However, considering this study’s inductive, interaction analytic orientation to the exploration of the identities of interest - as intersecting performative features of social interaction- it presents an opportunity to ground the hypothetical, and theoretical, in empirical investigation. Importantly, it presents the opportunity to do so regarding a topic of inquiry that not only represents the types of social phenomena that feature prominently in everyday South African life, but also relate to global concerns that are connected to the systems of human food production and consumption.

Methods

Sampling and Data

Throughout this study, I have employed a qualitative, naturalistic design, and the analysis that follows is based on a dataset consisting of approximately five hours of recorded participant interactions at a residential braai- a common, naturalistic event in the social lives of South Africans. Theoretical and empirical investigation within the tradition of conversation/interaction analysis emphasises the importance of deriving descriptions of the social organisation of interactional practices from naturally occurring interactions (Sacks, 1984a; Potter, 2002; Potter & Wetherell, 1995; Speer, 2002). Thus, within this tradition, I have used recordings of actual events, to provide a source of data that preserves the original contextual features of the social interactions under investigation (Sacks, 1984a; Mondada, 2006). It should be noted, as a limitation to this study, that it would have been ideal to utilise audio-visual recordings for the analysis, since the research setting was one where participants were co-present and visible to each-other, thus they may have been using both talk and embodied, or vision-dependent performative practices toward socially interacting. However, due to technical difficulties at the beginning of the recording process, I decided to focus on simply capturing whatever representation of the interaction I could, without trifling over the recording equipment, toward minimising any focus on the setting as a 'research setting' and thus allowing for the recording of events to be as unobtrusive as possible (more details regarding the use of recording equipment to follow later in this section). The result was that, although I did manage to obtain audio-visual recordings of some interactions at the event, the majority of the interactions are only represented via audio recordings. Thus, for the sake of parity, I opted to only use the audio data, throughout the entire event. The implication of this is that the analysis to follow may suffer a loss of data that might have been analytically relevant, however, even with the lack of visual data, the (audio) data that was captured, still represents the actual, naturalistic events that transpired, and thus can still be analysed as such.

In this sense, the data source for analysis (the recordings) represent a documentation of social practices as they ordinarily occur, without the interference of the researcher 'getting-up', or 'contriving' (Potter & Wetherell, 1995; Speer, 2002) the data. This, however does not imply that the researcher should be entirely absent during the production of naturalistic recordings,

but rather that the type of researcher involvement that is often found in social science interviews/ focus groups - where researchers impose social science agendas; topics; or tasks, modify the context, or spatial set-up, and yet generally have not considered these elements as integral to their analytic interpretations of what is essentially an interactional product (Speer, 2002; Potter & Hepburn, 2005; Holstein & Gubruim, 2004; Smithson, 2000) – should be approached with caution. Thus, I have approached the data collection process inductively, with an understanding that it is participant interaction that will drive the research agendas, not the researcher. Accordingly, there were only two occasions throughout the unfolding of the events at the braai, where I notably performed a 'researcher role'. The first such occasion included the setting-up and dismantling of the recording equipment, which (although one of the hosts was present, since the event took place at their residence) occurred before any guests arrived, and again after all guests had departed. The second such occasion was during two very brief conversations at the beginning and end of the event, respectively. Firstly, once all guests had arrived, I received some participant's signed documents providing their informed consent to participate in the study (others had already provided these digitally before the event), and explained (upon being asked) that the recording equipment had been set up, but that participants are encouraged to simply behave as they ordinarily would without any concern about being recorded. I also assured participants that their anonymity will be guaranteed throughout the research process, since one participant raised the matter. Secondly, at the end of the event, whilst guests were preparing to depart, I briefly thanked all present for their participation. Beyond these occasions, in which it was clear that I was performing the role of a researcher, all other interactions throughout the course of events on the day, proceeded without my 'researcher status' becoming relevant, nor consequential in any manner, as I simply engaged with participants in the same fashion I ordinarily would, at such an event.

Thus, due to a naturalistic, interaction-analytic orientation to data collection throughout the research process, I did not arrange the research setting - the social event of the braai – as a 'research occasion', but rather, in the same way this occasion would ordinarily be arranged between friends, while realising that the process of recording the event is *integral* (Zimmerman, 2012) to the research process. Thus, in arranging the event, I approached a friend whom was willing to host the braai, for assistance in gaining participants. The host approached the invitation to the braai, and the arrangement of the practical details associated, in the same manner she ordinarily would – via creating an instant messaging 'chat group' (on WhatsApp) consisting of a few close friends. She included an explanation to her friends (via the WhatsApp

group invitation) that the event would form part of my research project, and that they could address any relevant questions they might have, to me (via the chat group). Naturally, I followed to explain that the event would be recorded, and that, should they consent to this, that they will receive more information[2] from me via email.

Importantly, regarding the invited participants, there were no particular inclusion or exclusion criteria, since the sample consists of the interaction at a setting, and is not focused on the particular people attending. In this sense, toward pre-empting any possible critique regarding the demographic characteristics of participants as 'relevant' information, it should be mentioned that I have not provided a 'demographic profile', or characteristics of the participants in this study. This is due to, and in accordance with, the inductive, interaction-analytic approach (see for example: Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998 and Schegloff, 1997) to the sampling and data. Thus, I only refer to demographic categories in relation to participants in cases where they themselves have demonstrably oriented to such categories, since: "the identity category, the characteristics that it affords, and what consequences follow, are all knowable to the analyst only through the understandings displayed by the interactants themselves" (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998, p. 2). Thus, toward the purposes of this study, my sampling strategy included identifying instances in the dataset where participants observably orient to identity categories, in relation to food-related identities, and/ or gender identities. These instances were, after preliminary analysis, categorised based on the specific unfolding phenomena that they most saliently represent. Consequently, I arrived at three predominant analytic foci, and structured the analysis accordingly. Thus, due to pragmatic constraints inherent in this level of study, not *all* instances in which the phenomena of interest in this study were made relevant, were included in the sample. However, the excerpts that were included are representative of the most predominant and recurring interactional phenomena across the dataset. Further, it should be noted that, via the sampling and data collection strategies I have employed throughout this study, I have not aimed to provide a statistically representative sample of interactions at all braais, nor of South African social occasions more broadly. Thus, although this study may provide insight into the intersectional production of the social categories of gender and food-related identities as they emerge as interactional phenomena in *other* social settings, it was not designed to make any claims regarding cross-setting or distributional

[2] Such as participant information sheets, and informed consent forms, which can be accessed in Appendix B.

generalisations. Such comparison or exploration does however remain a possible avenue for further exploration.

Further, regarding the practical set-up of the research setting, the event was arranged as a 'bring-and-braai' - a common South African way of arranging a braai, similar to a potluck event, where everyone attending brings along their own meat (or alternative food choice) and drinks. Often, duties are also divided in terms of the preparation of side dishes and desserts, but generally the host provides for these (What is a braai?, 2009), and at this particular event the host did provide for most of the side dishes, but instructed that if anyone attending would like something in particular – beyond what she was preparing – that they bring this along. Furthermore, during the braai, (to return to the earlier discussion regarding the recording equipment) the recording equipment was placed statically, and (as mentioned previously) as unobtrusively as possible, so that it did not alter the natural social arrangement of the braai. Thus, I simply aimed to record interactions as they naturally emerged from, and were occasioned within, the setting. I did not actively prompt participants into topical discussion or 'conceptual rumination' (Potter & Hepburn, 2005) -for example about their food preferences or ideas about gendered consumption, as would be expected during an interview. Instead, I simply recorded the interaction as it emerged. The recording equipment was strategically placed to capture as much of the framework of participation, including as much of the participant talk, gestures, facial expression, and gaze-interaction as possible, across the area that was utilised during the occasion. Thus, although I followed all the necessary steps to secure both audio, and visual recordings of the occasion, as mentioned before, due to unforeseen technical issues, this was not possible.

Nonetheless, in my efforts to accomplish these aims, I utilised several recording devices, placed around the various 'focal' areas of the residential space wherein the braai took place. These included areas that I foresaw would most likely be utilised by participants for interaction purposes, such as the kitchen and the outdoor area surrounding the 'braaing' equipment, as these two areas ordinarily feature as areas of convergence between food preparation and socialisation. Further, the areas generally used for 'lounging' and socialisation, as well as for dining (thus sites rich in talk-in-interaction), such as the patio space, and the dining area, were also included as focal areas. The decisions regarding which areas to include as 'focal' points for recording, understandably have implications regarding the areas that were excluded, since some of the interactions on the day did occur in spaces that were not being recorded. Thus,

again, the analysis may suffer a lack of potentially relevant data due to this. However, since most of the interaction at this social event did take place in the 'focal' areas (in the context of a social event that spanned approximately five hours), the features of the interaction that were captured via this type of focused recording provided an enormous amount of rich recorded data that could be utilised for analysis. Further, considering that such a large volume of data was made available from a single braai event, it was only necessary, for the purposes of this research report, to arrange (and capture via recording) one such event.

Considering these practical implications of the setup of the event, a theoretical, as well as a pragmatic argument can be made for limiting the number of participants to a small group, which in this case consisted of six participants. On the theoretical level, CA has traditionally privileged interactions between more than two participants, as this allows for the analysis of turn-taking and other participatory elements of interaction (Schegloff, 1995), while being aware that very large groups creates additional contingencies that may complicate the analysis. This relates to the sense that, in large groups, the interactions are often loaded with frequent divisions and parallel interactions, which can make for very complex and confusing recordings (and subsequent transcriptions) – especially if these are only audio recordings (Egbert, 1997). On a pragmatic level too, by limiting the amount of participants, the conversation is generally likely to be more directed between participants, with less fragmentation or divergence between topics of discussion, fewer split, or parallel conversations, more in-depth engagement in specific conversations, and participants' voices also tend to be clearer on recordings, since there would be less 'background noise'. Thus, after considering these arguments, I instructed the host to invite only a small number of potential participants, which resulted in a total of six in attendance. To capture as much potentially important contextual information (besides what was omitted from the focal points of the recordings) as possible, the event was recorded continuously, from the commencement thereof – a few minutes before participants arrived at the door, until the end – when the last participant had left.

Method of Analysis

The analysis firstly, follows from a general CA approach (Sacks, 1984a; 1984b; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 2007a) to data analysis, with detailed transcriptions, produced according to Jeffersonian transcription conventions (Jefferson, 2004), accompanying the recorded data. In this tradition, it is understood that the analysis of social interaction presents a unique opportunity to examine the 'order at all points' (Sacks, 1984), on the 'micro-

level' of social interaction, which advances insights into the building blocks of social order at the 'macro' or broader structural level of social relations. CA thus aims to examine the ways in which structural order both creates, and is created by, micro-level social interactions (Sacks, 1984a; Heritage, 1997). It is thus fitting to this study, as I have explored the intersectional production of the social categories of gender and food-related identities, as they emerge as interactional phenomena. Specific CA techniques are available to the analyst, to explore the intricacies of naturally-occurring talk-in-interaction in relation to its structural organisation and contextual orientation (Heritage, 1984; Heritage, 1997; Schegloff, 2007a). Furthermore, this approach to identity study converges with the analytic resources offered throughout the literature on membership categorisation (Schegloff, 2005; Schegloff, 2007b; Stokoe, 2009a; Stokoe, 2009b; Whitehead, 2009; Whitehead, 2012), which make apparent a range of features of social categories that may be explored in analysis. In addition, Stokoe and Edwards's (2006) work on story formulations in talk-in-interaction; as well as Heritage (1984); Schegloff (2007a); and Whitehead's (2015) work regarding the CA features of preference organization, provided particularly valuable insights toward data analysis in this study. Following a fundamental guiding question in CA practice (as mentioned throughout the discussion in the literature review), which is to ask: "why that now?" (Schegloff, 1980; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), I have utilised a combination of the aforementioned CA techniques inductively (as the unfolding interaction rendered each technique relevant) to understand the purpose toward which each action in the interaction was formulated. Thus, the analysis focused on the structural features of the unfolding interactions, rather than inferring participants' psychological motivations or other 'internal' states.

Secondly, beyond the general CA (and complimentary membership categorisation) principles that have guided this study, more specifically, I have followed *feminist* CA principles (Kitzinger, 2000; Weatherall, 2015; Speer, 2005; Speer, 2012), as this has provided a unique discursive approach to CA that has allowed me to map feminist-vegetarian critical discursive concepts (Adams, 2010a) onto observable phenomena in interaction (Weatherall, 2015). Feminist CA as an analytic approach has not been without controversy (Kitzinger, 2008; Speer, 2012; Weatherall, 2012; Wowk, 2007), while either being criticised for being too analytically narrow to be useful for political ends and macro-sociological interpretations (Wetherell, 1998), or for being too politically positioned to adhere strictly to inductive CA principles (Wowk, 2007). However, as Weatherall (2015, p. 411) beneficially points out: "Nevertheless, feminist conversation analysis has produced new insights into key matters, such as how normative

heterosexuality is accomplished…". Thus, regardless of the contradictory theoretical and technical debates regarding feminist CA, in a pragmatic sense the benefits of using its principles in the context of this research has outweighed any perceived technical drawbacks. Especially since I am motivated by the awareness that the kind of scholarship that Adams (2010a) calls for, namely scholarship that understands and makes explicit the connections between systems of interlocking oppressions and that works to confront the deeply problematic inconsistencies within social justice movements, is ultimately imperative to the contemporary interdisciplinary concerns related to urgent ecological, psychological, and social justice priorities. In this sense, a feminist CA approach has provided me with the analytic tools to literally implement the feminist principle that the *personal is political*, in the sense that empirical insights from the micro-environment, in the everyday interactions (the *personal*) that have been analysed here, provide the grounding for the macro-environmental (the *political*) theorising that authors such as Adams (2010a) have provided. Thus, this study represents an effort toward 'closing the gap' between the available theoretical literature, and the dearth of empirical study, regarding the topic at hand, as well as toward providing possible entry points for unexplored theoretical areas.

Ethical Considerations

Before embarking on the study, ethics clearance (see Appendix A) was obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committee at the University of the Witwatersrand. Once ethics clearance had been secured, potential participants were contacted (by the host) via an instant messaging group discussion (on WhatsApp). Once the participants had been secured, I provided participant information via email (see Appendix B). This clearly stated that participation is entirely voluntary and participation may be withdrawn at any stage of the research process, up to the point where data analysis has commenced, without any negative consequences. All further practical details for the event, were arranged as is ordinarily done between friends (via instant messaging groups), in advance of the braai.

Following the event (and thus recording thereof) I have taken care to safeguard the data on a password-protected hard drive that has only been, and shall continue to only be, available to myself. Since there exists the potential for participants' concern regarding the revealing of personal (and possibly sensitive) discussions, as well as identifying information, confidentiality has been secured by omitting all identifying information from the transcripts and final research report, where pseudonyms have been used instead. This has been clearly

communicated to participants via the participant information email. Participation was entirely voluntary and there have been no (and it is not anticipated that there might be) other direct risks or benefits in participating in the study and the research subject matter is not of a particularly sensitive nature, since participants were simply be encouraged to proceed as they ordinarily would during a social braai.

Participants were not provided with detailed information regarding the aims or rationale of the study prior to the data collection (event), as this might have led to the kind of imposition of a social science agenda and the consequent 'contriving' of the data that (Speer, 2002) describes. Instead, participants were simply given information regarding the organisational details of the event, and of the fact that the event would be recorded for research purposes. I did address some questions and concerns in this regard (mostly regarding concerns about confidentiality), before the event commenced (via the WhatsApp chat group), and I also assured participants at the start of the event on the day, once again, that any reproductions of the data would be anonymised throughout the research process, via the use of pseudonyms. Once participants agreed to take part in this study, informed consent (Appendix B) was secured regarding their participation in, as well as regarding the audio-visual recording of, the event, and the subsequent use of the recording for transcription and analysis purposes. As with the recordings, these signed consent forms (containing identifying information), have been, and will continue to be safeguarded, in a secure place that is only accessible to myself, until such time arrives that they are no longer needed, upon which they will be destroyed.

Analysis

This first section of the analysis, investigates how participants establish and manage their food-related identities, throughout the course of interaction at the braai in attendance. I examine the specific strategies that participants employ toward orienting to, and disavowing 'extreme' or 'judgmental' versions of their food-related identities, to position themselves in a 'positive'; 'non-extreme'; and 'reasonable' light, as a defensive attempt toward evading potential identity-related critique in immediate interactions. As I will illustrate throughout, this ultimately serves to accomplish the creation of a social environment where all members' food-related identities may be respected, and thus remain unchallenged. Whilst the first section focuses largely on identity management, it will also show how conflicts and disagreements (via potential judgment or critique) are a potential feature of such identity management processes, in that normative conceptions of 'extreme' food-related identities are treated as a systematic potential basis for conflict.

The second section focuses more centrally on the interactional strategies that are employed, as a recurrent outcome of identity management, toward the management, or resolution, of incipient identity-related interactional conflict. Notably, it will become apparent throughout this section, that the (micro-interactional) defensive strategies participants employ toward incipient conflict management, have wider-ranging political consequences. I.e. the resistance of counter-hegemonic discourse (thus the reproduction of hegemonic discourse) occurs in such everyday micro-interactions, which, in accumulation, result in macro-level hegemonic discursive reproduction.

Finally, in the third section of analysis, I examine how the kinds of performative work toward food-related identity management (in the first section) and conflict management (in the second section), intersects with gender identity negotiation. I.e.. how food-related identities are treated as intersecting with gender in fairly systematic ways, essentially amounting to the dominant ideological perspective that *meat consumption signifies masculinity* and *a vegetarian diet signifies femininity.*

Managing Food-Related Identities

The following excerpt (1) shows part of a discussion that took place between Steven, Levi, and David, whilst they were gathered around the braai. It follows from a discussion regarding what each of them were going to eat at the braai, which led to Levi providing an account about a work function that he had recently attended, at which he (as a vegetarian) was faced with limited meal options. This excerpt (1), picks up from the topic of Levi's work function and the "they" Levi is referring to in line 1, are thus the people at the work function. What we see being accomplished throughout this excerpt, is the performative work that participants engage in (particularly Levi here), toward establishing and managing their food-related identities in a 'positive' manner that avoids any potential negative judgment in their immediate interactional environment.

Excerpt 1; Braai 05-08-2017; Device 1 at 29:42-30:25

((Participants are socialising around the fireside and discussing the events from a work function that Levi recently attended))

1	LEV:	But ya: dude they were like (ah so) you don't eat? me:at?
2		so=like What like are you one of those people that like
3		gets grossed out if like (.)meat touches your foo::d o:r,
4		(0.4) I'm=like no? du:de, >like (.) I-like when there's a
5		braa:i (.) like I ↓like the smell of meat.
6	DAV:	Ya:, nice
7	STE:	Hhm
8	LEV:	Ya (0.2) like I ↑Li:ke it you know like I-I (.) it's:
9		jus:t, (0.2) >and I don't care if other=people eat it=
10		I'm not gonna sit here and be like ahh you shouldn't eat
11		meat because of x y and z reasons.
12	DAV:	[Hh[m
13	STE:	[Hh[m
14	LEV:	[Uh::m,(.) it doesn't (0.3) it doesn't bother me that
15		other people eat meat it's like a personal, (0.2) choice.
16		>but they were like ah-bu-ah-b-so you don't like othe-like
17		when meat touches your foo::d (.) or like can you look-even
18		look at it and you get grossed ou:::t °I'm just like these
19		people.° (.) Ignorant fucks [((laughing))
20	STE:	[Hhm ya: it's hard that hey

In lines 1-3 we see Levi performing the structuring of an account of questioning that he encountered at his work function.[3] We can see in line 4, that his structuring of this account of questioning is designed to indicate the ludicrous nature of such questions, as he provides a lengthy pause, followed by: "I'm like no dude". The expression of this line, especially the rising intonation of the "no" here, communicates a sense of exasperation at the series of questioning Levi is describing, and thus appears to be designed to show the unfairness, inconvenience, or frustration that vegetarians have to deal with in such situations. What we can observe from such a narrative production in this interaction, is an understanding of the way in which he is orienting to, and constructing, his vegetarian identity, and how he is orienting to, and constructing a meat-eater identity. In this sense, what we see being produced here is an orientation to the people (meat-eaters) who questioned him, as being 'obnoxious', 'judgemental', or more specifically: "ignorant fucks" (line 19). And thus Levi's vegetarian identity here is being oriented to, in opposition to the 'obnoxious' people doing the questioning, as 'non-obnoxious' or 'non-judgmental'. This is illustrated in that Levi claims not to "care if other people eat [it] I'm not gonna sit here and be like ahh you shouldn't eat meat because of x y and z reasons" (lines 9-11), and that it "doesn't bother" him (line 14). I.e. by orienting to the possibility of being seen as the type of vegetarian who *would* do the types of things he is disclaiming here, he positions his identity as in opposition *that* type of vegetarian.

Next, Levi states: "I like the smell of meat" (line 5), "like I like it you know" (line 8), which accomplishes a positioning of his identity to express that he is not 'extreme' or 'strange'. It also accomplishes a sense of him being 'no different to meat eaters' (and thus no different to Steven and David), to which David and Steven both provide aligning support or solidarity in lines 6 and 7 with "Ya nice" and "Hhm", respectively. So the only factor being produced here, that separates Levi's food-related identity from the meat-eater identity/ies he is orienting to

[3] Considering the context of the discussion in this excerpt, the questioning being accounted for here, occurred after Levi's colleagues noticed that he was not eating the fish that he had ordered, but rather only ate the vegetables on his plate. More detailed evidence for this account can be seen in excerpt 3, where Levi yet again, returns to this account during the discussion that took place around the dinner table.

here, is that "it's like a personal choice" (line 15)[4]. Subsequently, if it is not understood as such, people are "ignorant fucks" (line 19). That is, if Levi's vegetarian identity is subjected to judgement based on perceived emotionality, or being "grossed out" (lines 3 and 18), those doing the judging are ignorant or obnoxious. This allows Levi to claim a position (as the product of his defensive interactional work here) of 'rationality,' 'liberalism', and of 'being informed' – in opposition to 'judgmental', 'ignorant', and 'obnoxious' meat-eaters. This, of course, serves in *this* immediate interaction to: a) circumvent any potential judgment from others present (in this case Steven and David), based on normative conceptions of food-related identities; and b) to assure them that he will not be judgmental or obnoxious toward them. This work done by Levi, to avoid judgement from Steven and David, and to display to them that he does not or will not judge them, can be seen here to have been effective, as they do not do the type of thing that 'obnoxious meat-eaters' might do, but rather offer their support and alignment to Levi's frustration, as we can see in their "Hhm"'s (lines 12 and 13), as well as in line 20 where Steven provides explicit acknowledgement, perhaps even empathy, for how difficult the position might be that Levi finds himself in at such events, in "Hhm ya it's hard that hey".

Thus, here we have seen an example of performative work in immediate interaction regarding food-related identities, where there is an orientation to the potential type of negative judgement, and thus potential incipient conflict, that might be launched in such a situational context, to avoid such judgement (and conflict). This is accomplished by establishing the 'types of identities' that might exercise such negative judgement, in opposition to the 'types of identities' that would not do this, but rather perform their identities in a 'positive' manner – displaying values of tolerance, liberalism, fairness, rationality, and being educated in such matters. In doing so, this creates an environment where all present can adopt a position of liberalism and individual agency, or choice, relating to their food consumption decisions, and thus have their identities tolerated without negative judgement, regardless of what their particular stance on the issue at hand is. I.e. whatever their beliefs are regarding food-related matters, as long as they do not impose their opinions upon others, group solidarity may be maintained and everybody's choices are respected. Finally, in applying a feminist lens here, we can see that this type of identity management, on the micro-interactional level, ultimately creates an

[4] Section two of the analysis will focus in more detail on this aspect of identity positioning, as it relates to, or acts as a mechanism toward, food-related identity conflict management in interaction.

environment in which *personal* choices can, or *should*, be ascertained and tolerated, whilst any wider-ranging *political* consequences of such personal choices, remain unquestioned, but more on this to follow later.

Excerpt 2 shows the discussion that commenced, in the dining room, once participants had reached the end of their mealtime. What we see being accomplished in this interaction, is firstly, a (customary) sequence toward praising the food and thanking the participants or hosts who prepared the food. Followed by a sequence of inquiry (or mocking, as we shall see) between Luna and Levi (both vegetarian) regarding Levi's post-meal satisfaction, considering the absence of meat (kebabs in this instance) from his meal.

Excerpt 2; Braai 05-08-2017; Device 1 at 02:50:46-02:51:29
((Post-mealtime conversation at the dinner table))

1	LUN:	Those veggies were ama:zing.
2	LEV:	They we:re good=hey.
3	DAI:	>Everything was awe[some
4	LEV:	[and [just (.) salt and pepper and a
5	STA:	[That was a delicious braa::i
6	LEV:	little bit of olive oil (.) like,
7	STA:	Thank you Steven for braa[ing.
8	LEV:	[just fresh veggies.
9	STE:	↑Hhm.
10	LUN:	Did you have=enough?
11	LEV:	Plen:ty=ya >I'm actually< really ↓full.
12	STA:	>I'm=also su:[per full
13	LUN:	[(Do/don't you miss/want) those ke:babs.
14		((laughs))
15	LEV:	I do::? But=I (don't think about ea:ting=↓them)
16		(0.2)
17	STE:	Hhm?
18	LEV:	↓Hhm.
19	STE:	I'm telling you after=I=saw that ↓documentary: (0.8)
20		yoh.
21		(0.2)
22	LEV:	>That's=the=thing I was saying-saying w-c-w-Steven
23		brought=up the whole documentary thin[g .hh ↑like,
24	DAI:	[Hhm.
25	LEV:	>When=I s[e e:: m e a t.] I'm not necessarily gro:ssed

```
26   STE:            [What the health]
27   LEV:   ou:t by it, I don't loo:k at=it and=go euhh (0.2) o:r
28          uh::m (0.2) it's not like touc[h:: things that are cooking
29   STE:                                  [Hhm.
30   DAI:                                  [Ya,
31   LEV:   Like. (0.8) It's just for me I'm ↑like. (.) I=know: (0.2)
32          ho:w that got the:re. (0.5) s-and=I don't like? tha[t.
```

Luna initiates a sequence of praise in line 1 with her assessment that "those veggies were amazing". Notably, this assessment explicitly praises the vegetables, rather than the food more generally, which (regardless of her intention), provides a place where the vegetables are foregrounded and thus, a discussion regarding the merits of vegetables versus other food could potentially emerge. Further, Luna's initial praise of *only* the veggies, in a context (of a braai) where there is ordinarily a large focus on meat consumption, could also be heard as potentially accomplishing an implicit political commentary. That is, that we might speculate here that Luna's assessment is alluding to a claim that not only meat, but veggies too, can be enjoyed at a braai. Next, we see Levi simply aligning with her assessment whilst Daisy provides a broadening of the referent from "veggies" to "everything" (line 3). Hence, there is a subtle but nonetheless observable potential incipient conflict, or basis for disagreement, in play here. We can see that other participants generally respond to the praising that has been made relevant following Luna's assessment in line 1, throughout lines 2; 3; 5; and 7, as Levi; Daisy; and Stacy each, in turn, respond in accordance and provide their praise regarding the food, as well as their (well, Stacy at least) thanks to Steven for 'braaiing' (cooking the food). However, the broadening to food more generally that Daisy provides, presents as a means toward subtly resisting the sole emphasis on the veggies for particular praise, and thereby presents a place that might be heard as resistance to the potential political commentary that Luna might be making.

Although this analytic claim might be rooted in speculation, it does seem to be supported by Levi's uptake in firstly, aligning with Luna (line 2), and secondly, via his description of how the veggies were prepared in lines 4; 6; and 8. Particularly, his description seems to communicate the simplicity in preparing the veggies via "*just* salt and pepper" (line 4), "*little bit* of olive oil" (line 6), and "*just* fresh veggies" (line 8) (emphasis added in all cases). We could read this as an attempt to 'prove' that it does not require much effort to enjoy *just* veggies

(sans meat, considering the context of the braai), and by implication, that it is not effortful, nor complicated, to consume a vegetarian diet.

This is further supported by the following sequence between Luna and Levi. We see Luna asking Levi (presumably, based on his response): "Did you have enough?" (line 10), to which Levi responds: "Plenty ya I'm actually really full" (line 11). We might interpret what Levi's answer accomplishes (in the same vein as the above analysis of lines 4; 6; and 8), as a means of orienting to a possible or anticipated assessment that he may *not* have had enough, or more critically, that a meatless diet is somehow inadequate. His response is not simply a "yes, thank you" (which would have been an adequate response to Luna's question), but rather, he provides an exaggerated response with "plenty" and "really full". The continuation of this exchange/ sequence of inquiry regarding Levi's post-meal satisfaction, between Levi and Luna, provides further support for the above reading. We see Luna questioning: "do/don't you miss/want those kebabs" to which Levi responds: "I do but I don't think about eating them". [5] The question of whether or not he "[have] enough? (line 10), and the addition of her laughter (line 14), [6](coupled with both their identities as vegetarians) seems to colour this exchange toward representing a kind of self-mocking sequence. To elaborate, her laughter here, indicates that she is likely not seriously concerned whether or not Levi has had enough to eat, nor is she seriously questioning whether or not he misses or wants the (meat) kebabs[7]. Rather, we could interpret that she is performing a kind of mocking of the typical questions that vegetarians get asked by meat-eaters in this type of situational context. Thus, she might be pre-empting the kind of questions that the meat-eaters at the table may raise to the vegetarians (Levi and Luna), and thus she is performing a defensive sequence to not only answer them, but subtly mock them as being 'ridiculous questions to ask'. Here of course, she is not only *self*- mocking, but also includes another vegetarian to be part of the mocking enactment. Thus, she extends the defensive mocking of the self (as an 'extreme vegetarian', whose diet is inadequate) toward

[5] Although the recording is somewhat unclear here, either of the alternate hearings transcribed could apply equally in the analysis. Levi's response also indicates that either reading could be valid.

[6] Although this is not explicitly oriented to here, we do see both participants orienting to and/or explicitly mentioning this (vegetarian) identity in other places throughout the excerpts chosen for analysis.

[7] We can assume that she is referring to meat kebabs here, and not vegetable kebabs, due to the subsequent exchange about meat consumption.

the defensive mocking of her and Levi's group identity, as vegetarians. This serves to perform a 'non-extreme', or 'non-obnoxious', vegetarian identity (or identities) as a contrast to the 'extreme', or 'obnoxious' alternative. As we shall see below, this becomes even more explicit as the exchange unfolds through line 25, as Levi introduces and discounts a type of position that he thereby associates with an extreme type of vegetarianism. This hearing would align with Adam's (2010) assertion that after vegetarians have been noticed to be vegetarians, due to the absence of meat on their plates, they are inevitably questioned about their vegetarianism – a process which often involves ludicrous questions. Thus, through this sequence (lines 10-15), both Levi, through his exaggerated response, and Luna, through her defensive action, are performing their vegetarian identities as potentially vulnerable to critique, mocking, or evaluation as inadequate, (in comparison to a meat-inclusive diet), within the particular situational context of this social event – a braai – which typically involves a lot of interaction pertaining to the consumption of meat.

Next, a brief pause at line 16 may simply represent a marker of a potential end to the sequence of interaction that has occurred thus far. However, it can also be heard to foreshadow potential upcoming disagreement (Heritage, 1984; Schegloff, 2007). In accordance to this, Steven's "hhm" in line 17, marked by an upward intonation, could thus be heard to indicate a repair initiator, or request for confirmation, which serves as a weak challenge to (pre-disagreement with) the claim that Levi has presented in line 15. Levi's following "hhm" (line 18), marked by a downward intonation, presents as a confirmation of his (previously stated) claim, and thus he is standing his ground in the face of Steven's challenge. What Steven says next, in lines 19-20, thus emerges from this context, and seems to indicate a willingness to reconsider his food choices (both in light of a documentary film that he has seen, and in light of Levi's claim at line 15), by alluding to the possibility that, after watching a certain documentary film (which is in line 26 revealed as "What the Health"), eating meat might (in whichever sense) disturb him. Thus, Steven is orienting here, to the potential rationality (upon being exposed to information relating to such matters) of adopting a vegetarian identity (to the extent that he – currently a meat-eater – is now claiming to be re-thinking his choices, or identity). It is in response to this, as we shall see over the next few lines, that Levi presents to Steven an option that could be an outcome of such reconsideration: a 'non-extreme' vegetarian identity that is characterised not by missing eating meat, but also not by being 'grossed out' by meat either. I.e., rather, this identity is the result of making a rational choice to not eat meat, and having no regrets in doing so, nor any longing for it.

Levi's uptake in line 22 that "that's the thing I was saying", represents his referencing a conversation that he had engaged in previously (during the course of the braai), with Steven and David, relating to the documentary film that Steven has raised here. What he continues with throughout lines 25-28 in his description of his reaction to meat: that he is "not necessarily grossed out" (line 25); and that he does not "look at it and go euhh" (line 27), for example, indicates that he is structuring an account toward discounting what he treats as the kind of thing commonly attributed to vegetarians. What his response accomplishes, is to position his vegetarianism *against* normative conceptions that vegetarians might be 'extreme', or 'strangely emotionally grossed out' by meat. Hence, Levi explains in contrast: "I know how that got there and I don't like that" (lines 31-32). Thus, he positions his vegetarianism as a rational and educated choice, not an emotional reaction.[8] This performance of positioned 'rationality' versus 'emotionality' is further supported, in retrospect, by his interaction with Luna about the absence of the kebabs, since there too, the vegetarian identity was being defended against 'ludicrous questions' (Adams, 2010a), or assumptions. Finally, the construction of this accomplished positioning of Levi's (and Luna's) vegetarian identity/ies, implicitly contrasts vegetarians as informed about the processes involved in meat production and supply: "I know how that got there" (lines 31-32), with meat eaters, as simply following normative practises. Thus, the two vegetarians in this extract have done a lot of work in accomplishing a defence against any critique that they are (drawing on common sense narratives) 'extreme', or 'over-emotional', or that their diet is somehow inadequate, by positioning their food-related identities as 'rational', and stemming from informed decision-making.

The following excerpt (3) shows part of the post-mealtime discussion that continued on from excerpt 2 above. Throughout this excerpt, we see a kind of disagreement unfolding between two vegetarians (Levi and Luna) and two meat-eaters (Stacy and Steven), regarding whether or not certain questions are reasonable questions to direct toward vegetarians. Throughout this process, we see the same kind of identity management being accomplished, as in excerpts 1 and 2, as participants orient to, and disavow the 'extreme' types of food-related identities that may face ridicule, or judgment. This results in an understanding of sorts that only the

[8] Having said this though, in line 25-26 he says that it's not "necessarily" that he is "grossed out" (by meat). Thus, his vegetarianism might not *necessarily* involve an emotional response, but it is likely to be one of the contributing factors to his (rationally positioned) choice.

‘reasonable’ versions of such food-related identities at play may endure unharmed, or without ridicule.

Excerpt 3; Braai 05-08-2017; Device 1 at 02:51:29-02:52:57

((Post-mealtime conversation at the dinner table))

LEV: Uh-like .hhh >I was also saying< like there=was
people at ↑work (.) the other day, they didn-they don’t
kno:w I’m vegetarian >it’s not like I’m< telling-I
tell people [I’m vegetarian
STE: [Ya you don’t advertise it [like
LEV: [th-first thing
was. [like. (.) on the foo::d, thing. (.) There was no
DAI: [Ya,
LEV: ↑option for vegetarian >it=was=like< fish: or ↓chicken.
LUN: ↓Ya. (.) which is [already ( )
LEV: [So I jus-I-I thought then, I have
to choo:se one of >those=otherwise< I’m not gonna ↑eat
so I choo:se (.) >I think I chose?< fish? .hh I=didn’t
eat the fish: I just ate. (.) all the veggies an-I-‘cause
I left it on my ↑plate >everyone was like< (0.8)
>why=aren’t=you=eating your f[oo:d?< I’m=like I don’t
STE: [ah:
LEV: =eat meat. .hh (0.2) >and the-they like< (0.4) hhhh
>and the-they like< ↑d-do you? feel ↑healthier? Like
when you don’t e:at meat. .hh o::r u::hm .hh >and
the one guy< asked? me? he’s like oh=are=you=one of those
gu:ys that gets like freaked=out like when. .hh
when meat touches your plate? or touches your
foo:d I’m=like (0.4) .hh my=god.
LUN: >Ya [because I’m vegetarian I’m a fucki[ng (.)
LEV: [ignorant fuck. [like.
LUN: mo[:ron like. (.) craz[y, you must be crazy ((laughing))
LEV: [y-ya? [and like=do you get grossed out
when you look at meat >I’m like< NO:: like none
=of=th[at
STE: [>but Jared<,
LEV: it just [doesn’t (.) I just choo:]se not eat-it
LUN: [Yeah: you just choo:se not to do it]
LEV: doesn’t gross me ou:t?

35 STA: Well Jared (0.5) ya? I-I suppose so: (.) I mean (0.2)
36 he was vegetarian for a long time=and then he decided
37 to go ↓ve:gan (.) but not just any ki[n-like like
38 STE: [Hhm::
39 STA: hardcore vegan (0.2) like he threw=away all his leather
40 shoe:::s, h[e-he
41 STE: [↑hair products: (.) >everything<.
42 STA: Like. Ful[l:: hundre:d and ten perce::nt (.) vegan.
43 STE: [full. full.
44 LEV: Hhm,
45 STA: >Except when he's< drunk and he eats Lindor balls.
46 [((laughter))
47 STE: [He eats Lindor balls when he's dru:nk
48 LEV: That's such a funny thing to do when you're drunk?
49 ((laughter))
50 STA: He's=like=gimme=that=Li:::ndo:::r
51 ((laughter))

Since this excerpt follows from the discussion in excerpt 2, we can consider the discussion that was initiated by Steven's comment about the documentary film in excerpt 2 (lines 19 - 20), and Levi's response: "that's the thing…." (excerpt 2 , lines 22), as the starting point for the discussion in this excerpt (3). Thus, Levi's "I was also saying" (line 1) points to an additional issue (to what he had said in excerpt 2) that he starts to discuss here. His: "It's not like I'm telling I tell people I'm vegetarian" (lines 3 - 4) can be understood as an orientation to interactional sensitivity, due to the politicised nature of food-related identities, and thus the potential source of interactional conflict they represent. By saying "It's not like I'm telling people…", he is orienting to some variety of the following: *I do not throw my vegetarianism in other people's faces*. Steven's: "Ya you don't advertise it" (line 5), is then designed as a supportive action toward Levi, in the sense that it notes – and perhaps even implicitly credits - that Levi does not perform his vegetarian identity in an obnoxious manner. In doing this, Steven reinforces the idea that "advertising" your dietary choices would be considered obnoxious.

Next, we see Levi starting a list of sorts in "th-first thing was" (lines 6-7). Much of what follows from here onward, presents as a series of complaints (i.e. the list that he is presenting) in the form of a story narrative (Stokoe & Edwards, 2006) about a recent work function he had attended ("people at work" in line 2). By saying "th-first thing was" (lines 6-7), he is showing that there was more than one thing (that he will be listing), which alerts people to the multiple

and sustained nature of what he is about to describe, i.e. a pattern of complainable treatment. Firstly, he complains that the menu: "the food thing" (line 7) did not have any vegetarian options: there was only "fish or chicken" (line 9). At this point Luna provides a supportive: "Ya which is already" (line 10). She is indicating that she understands that the limited menu options Levi was faced with, is already 'the first thing' to show the unfairness or inconvenience that vegetarians deal with at such events. Levi continues his narrative (lines 11-16) to explain that he chose to 'make due' with the limited options available to him, otherwise he was "not gonna eat" (line 12). Lines 11-13 reads as Levi explaining his very pragmatic, rational approach to dealing with the situation: he "thought" (line 11) about his options; chose one of the available options; ate only the vegetables that accompanied the fish; and left the fish on his plate. Then, he describes the reactions he faced, due to his leaving the fish on his plate, from others (or rather, "everyone" as in line 15) at the event, in lines 16; and 19-24 (in a similar structuring of an account of questioning as we have encountered in excerpt 1).

First, Levi describes being questioned about why he did not eat his food (line 16), although we could read this generalisation of "food" as 'meat', since he explained that he did eat the vegetables, and since Levi treats it as such in "I don't eat meat" (lines 16- 18). Interestingly, nobody present responds to this, despite Levi's multiple pauses and hesitations (line 18), as well as his repetition (lines 18 and 19) in formulating what he is about to say next. Thus, whilst he is complaining, nobody else is aligning with the complainability of what he reports. Hence, he formulates a second, more 'extreme' or questionable reported question, toward pursuing alignment. And this is exactly what he accomplishes when Luna responds in alignment in lines 25 and 27 (although only after he has explicitly assessed the question in line 24). He continues to describe being questioned regarding his reasons for not eating meat: "do you feel healthier" (line 19); and "are you one of those guys that gets like freaked out like when…meat touches your plate or touches your food" (lines 21-24). Importantly, his structuring of this account of questioning is designed to indicate the ludicrous[9] nature of such questions, in that he introduces the second question (whether he gets freaked out if meat touches his plate) in lines 20-21 with a sense of exasperation (similar to excerpt 1, line 4), indicated by his inhalation, and delays in

[9] As I have discussed previously throughout this section, and in congruence with Adams's (2010) assertion that after vegetarians have been noticed to be vegetarians, due to the absence of meat on their plates, they are inevitably questioned about their vegetarianism – a process which often involves ludicrous questions.

expressing “or uhm”, another inhalation, and his “and the one guy asked me he’s like”, with an added “he’s like” – which adds emphasis to what he will say next.

This performance of exasperation continues, and becomes more explicitly oriented to, when he provides his response to the questioning in “I’m like”, followed by a lengthy pause, inhalation and “my god” (line 24), expressing his negative assessment of the situation he was faced with. Interestingly, it is Luna (another vegetarian) whom aligns to Levi first. Thus, she is performing a shared sense of Levi’s exasperation and, in doing so, aligns as a fellow vegetarian. To interject, notably, nobody else aligns with them here, and when Steven finally responds (line 31), he builds his response as a contrast, or disagreement to what Levi and Luna are producing, as he starts with “but” and introduces a counter-example of just the kind of extreme vegetarian that Levi and Luna have disavowed. To continue, Luna explicitly orients to the potential judgement that anyone who has an emotional response to meat might receive, and thus the potential judgement that Levi might have received if he had answered “yes” to such a question, i.e. that he would be a “fucking moron” (lines 25-27) or “crazy” (line 27). Her response here is also designed to support Levi, by a show of understanding for the frustration he dealt with in the scenario he is describing. The scenario Levi is describing, of course, cannot be taken as fact here, but what we do gain from such a narrative production in this interaction, is an understanding of the way in which he (and Luna) are orienting to, and constructing, their vegetarian identities, and how they are orienting to, and constructing a ‘judgmental’ or ‘ignorant’ meat-eater identity. Thus, what we see being produced here is an orientation to being rational, pragmatic, non-obnoxious, non-burdensome vegetarians who are faced with judgmental, annoying, and “ignorant” (line 26) meat – eaters. We can see a continuation of this performance between Levi and Luna across lines 28 – 33, with aligning turns, or solidarity indicators such as “y-ya?” (line 28); and “yeah you just choose not to do it” (line 33).

Then Steven interjects (line 31) with “but Jared”, in response to Levi’s insistence that he does not get ‘grossed out’ by meat. As mentioned above, this interjection is constructed as a contrast to what Levi and Luna have been constructing. Although Steven’s interjection here remains incomplete, Stacy seems to have taken it as a cue to introduce a contrasting case, as she continues from what Steven alluded to, in line 35 with “Well Jared” (Jared is seemingly someone she and Steven know, but who is not present at the braai). Thus, she is responding to, and somewhat aligning to what Levi and Luna have said in lines 32-33, in the sense of rejecting extreme forms of the identities at play, and that not eating meat simply comes down to a choice,

as she provides: “ya I suppose so” (line 34) and “he decided” (line 36). Although, she is simultaneously disaligning to Levi and Luna’s implication that meat-eaters routinely and unfairly assume that vegetarians are typically ‘extreme’. This is what unfolds in her elaboration of her extreme case formulation (Edwards, 2010; Pomerantz, 1986) regarding Jared’s food-related identity: Stacy describes Jared’s choice as one not only to abstain from meat consumption, but to abstain from consuming all animal products in that he “decided to go vegan” (lines 36-37). She elaborated on this definition of his food-related identity as “not just any kin[d of vegan]”, but “like hardcore vegan” (line 37-39).

Her description of what this extreme (hardcore) identity entails, is provided in “he threw away all his leather shoes, [his] hair products everything” (lines 39-41). She emphasises the extreme nature of this type of *hardcore vegan* identity once again in her exaggerated assessment: “like full hundred and ten percent vegan” (line 42), to which Steven provides alignment in: “full full” (line 43). We see Levi responding with ““Hhm” (line 44), indicating a mere registering of what Steven and Stacy are saying, which shows his orientation to what they have done as contrasting or disagreeing with him, rather than supporting or aligning with what he was saying – perhaps because, even though they are aligning to the sense that Jared’s consumer choices are a result of rational decision-making, their description (read judgement) of Jared’s vegan identity is very similar to the kind of orientation that Levi and Luna earlier were describing as ludicrous. I.e. Stacy’s exaggerated description of Jared as a “hardcore vegan” (line 39) and as a “full hundred and ten percent vegan” (line 42) is rather indicative of Luna’s “ya because I’m a vegetarian I’m a fucking moron” (line 27) and her “crazy, you must be crazy”, coupled with Levi’s more implicit orientation (via his preformed sense of exasperation) to the kind of judgement he did, or could, receive for being a vegetarian. Thus, although Stacy and Steven are producing an account that initially seems to provide understanding for Levi and Luna’s complaints, what they actually achieve is to reinforce a normative idea of non-meat-eaters as *extreme* – but only if they fall into the “hardcore vegan” category, and thus not into the same category as Levi and Luna.

So here there is a kind of disagreement about whether or not it is reasonable for people to ask questions such as the ones Levi claimed to be faced with at his work function. Whilst we have seen Luna and Levi treating it as ludicrous, Stacy and Steven’s counter-example is designed to show that *some* vegetarians *are* like that - like the “fucking moron[s]” (lines 25-27) or the “crazy” (line 27) vegetarians that Luna and Levi have been orienting to (and disavowing). In

Steven and Stacy's production of this example, they also follow on to ridicule this particular vegetarian as someone who gets drunk and abandons his principles, via Stacy's (teasing) account that, despite Jared's (rational) decision-making process regarding his consumer choices, he eats Lindor[10] balls when he is drunk (lines 45), thus his choices are treated as extreme, rather than rational. In this sense, Stacy accomplishes a sense that Jared's choices are *not so rational after all*, since his decisions do not hold up when he is intoxicated. Thus, people (implicitly, meat-eaters) whom assume that *all* vegetarians are extreme, are ridiculed. However, extreme vegetarians are also ridiculed, and the outcome of this mild disagreement is that only the "reasonable" versions of the identities at play emerge unscathed.

In conclusion, I have illustrated in this first section of analysis: firstly, the interactional orientation to an awareness of normative conceptions regarding vegetarian and vegan identities as 'extreme' or 'irrational'. This is coupled with defensive work such as self-mocking; positioned rationality; laying complaints regarding experienced judgement and inconvenience, or prejudiced treatment, that participants perform in their efforts to manage potential judgement in immediate interactions, based on such normative conceptions. We have also seen how 'obnoxious' or 'judgmental' meat-eater identities are oriented to, and disavowed by the meat - eaters in the interactions, similar to management of vegetarian identities. Thus, participants establish, and manage their food-related identities in a 'positive' manner, toward creating a social environment where all present can adopt 'reasonable' versions of their food - identities, that do not present the types of characteristics of the 'extreme' or 'obnoxious' alternatives. Thereby, everybody's identities may be maintained and respected as *personal* (and *reasonable*) matters that emerge unscathed. One of the mechanisms, of this type of identity management that has emerged throughout this section, is that participants often orient to their food-related identities from a *liberal,* or *individual-choice* perspective, which assumes that individual food-related practices (thus identities) are the result of rational decision-making, stemming from matters of personal preferences (tastes), in combination with informed thinking, which is not deserving of judgment.

[10] Lindor balls refers to a chocolate produced by Lindt. It contains dairy, and thus does not qualify as a vegan product.

Managing Conflicts Relating to Food-Identities.

Whilst the first section of analysis has largely focused on identity – management strategies, to evade potential interactional judgement or ridicule, it has also shown how conflicts and disagreements are a potential feature of identity management processes. The following section, focuses more centrally on the interactional strategies that are employed, as a recurrent outcome of identity management, toward the management, or resolution, of incipient identity-related interactional conflict. Most notably, such strategies include a willingness toward *positional shifts*; a (collective) orientation to a *liberal*, or *individual-choice* perspective; and performed *interactional sensitivity*, or delicacy.

Excerpt 4 shows part of a discussion, about the documentary film (as discussed in excerpt 2) that emerged during the course of interaction around the braai. Specifically, Steven and David gathered to check on the fire, whilst Levi was sitting close by, conversing with other[11] participants. Here, we see Steven, Levi, and David performing interactional toward the return to group solidarity, in the face of an emerging conflict (sparked by the discussion of the documentary film) concerning the food - identity of each participant. Specifically, we see David's position shifting, as he moves from a position of strong disagreement about the health-related claims regarding meat consumption that the other two participants have raised, toward a position of openness to the information that they are providing, and finally, toward a position of (partial) alignment with their claims regarding meat consumption and its related (production) practices.

Throughout this process, decisions relating to food consumption become reduced to a matter of personal choice, in that David opts to align with certain claims or arguments and not others, whilst the claim(s) that he does not align to, become an abandoned topic of discussion, and thus is left unresolved, and unchallenged. These shifts in position, and the adoption of a (albeit

[11] During the course of this excerpt, Luna, Daisy, and Stacy exited this space and moved their interaction indoors, whilst Levi, David, and Steven remained at the fireside. Thus, although there was another parallel conversation occurring (between Stacy, Levi, Luna and Daisy) during the start of this selected excerpt, it was excluded for this particular analysis, since the two parallel conversations were unrelated, and both were clearly audible in isolation in the recordings.

more implicit than what we will see throughout excerpt 5, for example) *liberal*, or *individual-choice* perspective, make it possible for participants to avoid conflict; maintain group solidarity via finding *something* to agree on despite facing disagreement in other areas – which, as we shall see, is left unresolved and thus, ultimately keep their *a priori* established food-related identities unchanged.

Excerpt 4; Braai 05-08-2017; Device 1 at 0:25:56-0:27:30

((Participants check on the fire and start discussing a documentary film about food))

1	STE:	You need to watch that Netflix thing.
2	DAV:	Which one.
3	STE:	It's called u:hm [(1.2)
4	DAV:	[About ( )
5	STE:	>No it's about< foo:d. it's ca:l[led u:hm
6	DAV:	[Who makes it though (1.1)
7		Do you remember the ↑name of it. (0.2)
8	STE:	What's? it called, the food one. (3.1)uhm. (0.2)( ) ah
9		which one was it,
10		(0.2)
11	DAV:	( )
12	STE:	>No it's about< fo:od. it's about, (0.2) how meat is
13		actually >terrible< for yo[u,
14		[hhm?
15		(2.1)
16		((David giggles))
17	DAV:	Fuck that man [((laughs))
18	STE:	>[No I promise< you, (0.2) Did you watch that
19		documentary on Netflix, (.)
20	LEV:	Which one?
21	STE:	About foo:d. (0.2) where meat is very ba:d for you.
22	LEV:	>↑Yayaya< well I've seen lo:ts of them but I've se- I know
23		which one you're talking [about
24	STE:	>[you know which=one=I'm=talkin
25		=about< (.) the latest one. with that bu::rger
26	LEV:	Yaya, it's a- it's a secon- second instalment of a previous
27		one,if [I remember correctly
28	STE:	[>Is it?<
29	LEV:	↓Ya:,
30	STE:	Ah hect[ic.

31 LEV: [It was after the ↑fi::rst one I watched that I
32 stopped e[ating meat
33 STE: [↑really?
34 LEV: Ya
35 STE: That's hectic hey (.)
36 LEV: Du:de it's a fuckin, (.) factory.
37 STE: Ya, (0.1) it's poisonous=meat is poi:son,
38 DAV: ↓Is it.
39 (0.1)
40 STE: All the chicken:, and all [th-
41 LEV: [Du:de and like, it shows you
42 [like things like] eggs dude.(.)
43 STE: [( )] ↑Eg[gs,
44 LEV: Even things like eggs=[how they're produ:ced.
45 STE: [eggs bru
46 DAV: Hhmm,
47 LEV: Like. (.) You think a:h=e:gg=it doesn't hurt the chicken.
48 (0.2)↓na:h dude. (0.2) You must ↑see:,
49 (.)it like=it's: ↓gross.
50 DAV: >'Cuz of the way< they ↓treat? them.
51 LEV: The way they treat them:, where they keep them:,
52 DAV: Hhmm
53 LEV: They live in: (.) black boxes: (.) basically::
54 DAV: Hhmm.
55 LEV: Ya.(1.8)they're [just there] to chu:rn shit out.
56 DAV: [Savage hey]
57 LEV: So it's not so much about like? (0.2) >the meat< itself:
58 (.) it's:[: h]ow they get it.
59 DAV: [The process of]
60 Ya,
61 LEV: Which is:: (0.2) ↓disturbing.
62 DAV: >It's fucked< up.
63 LEV: Ppsshh it is hey.
64 DAV: ((laughs))
65 LEV: ((laughs))

First, Steven introduces the topic of food, in terms of raising a documentary film about food (lines 1- 5). Then, since he struggles to recall the name of the film, we see a series of turns between Steven and David, aimed at recall and clarification (throughout lines 1-9). Although the title of the film does not surface here, Steven repeatedly provides an alternative toward

moving the conversation forward, in terms of a description of the content, or central thesis if you will, of the film: "No it's about food" (line 5); "the food one" (line 8); "No it's about food it's about how meat is actually terrible for you" (lines 12-13). David responds with: "hhm" (line 14), a long silence and giggling throughout lines 15- 17, which indicates minimal acknowledgement or incipient disalignment (Glen, 2003; Heritage 1984) of what Steven has said. This is followed by David's explicit rejection: "fuck that man" (line 17), at the point where it is apparent that the film has an 'anti-meat' narrative; and that Steven's claim sets up a recognition that the type of narrative about food that may follow (and which does follow), i.e. discomforting or disturbing information about food, that David does not want to hear about, much less watch a documentary film about. Thus, David displays a shift in orientation from being interested and seeking clarification, toward disinterest or disalignment, and ultimately (shortly after, in line 17), toward explicit rejection - of the central thesis of the film, and thus of Steven's suggestion that he should watch it, in line 1.

Further, David's rejection, to a claim that "meat is actually terrible for you", provides a performative marker of his identity as a meat-eater[12]. Through this rejection, we can interpret that he is, by implication, rejecting the critique of the identity implicit in the claim. I.e., if the claim asserts the premise that *meat is bad for you*, it implies the conclusion that *meat- eaters are engaging in self-harming behaviour*. This lies in stark contrast to the normative everyday narrative that *meat is healthy*. We can also see Steven orienting to an understanding of this, as he says: "meat is *actually* terrible for you" (emphasis added). The "actually" here formulates this claim as particularly responsive, or opposed to some other prevalent viewpoint, thus implying that his claim counters what one would 'ordinarily' assume about meat. Considering the situational context (where meat will be consumed), such a claim implicates potential critique of anyone in alignment with this normative viewpoint, and therefore engaging in the *self-harming behaviour* that this claim opposes.

Thus, David's rejection of the claim that meat is unhealthy, serves to perform alignment with the normative view that Steven's claim was designed to oppose. Such an individual act of resistance in the immediate micro-interactional sphere: where it is evident that David is treating Steven's claim as a critique or attack, and subsequently responds to it with strong resistance,

[12] Although David does not provide an explicit orientation in this extract that he is definitely a meat-eater, he does do so in other parts of the interaction within the dataset.

provides an example of the management of food - identities where *the personal is political* (Hanisch, 1970). Thus, we can see that such individual-level, micro-sociological situated interactions, that implicate personal identities, represent the stage where we can see the performative unfolding of (divisive) hegemonic and counter-hegemonic acts (Kitzinger, 2005). Thus, to the extent that this type if interactional process resembles other situational reproductions thereof, such micro-interactional phenomena may, collectively, construct the wider political discourse surrounding such matters. And considering a possibility that this particular example of individual political resistance might be idiosyncratic, it nevertheless illustrates that such micro-level interactions can have wider macro-level implications, thus indicating that we can find *order at all points* (Sacks, 1984).

David's rejecting response creates a state of direct disagreement (division) between these two participants, which ultimately presents a threat to group solidarity (Heritage, 1984). In such a scenario, Steven is faced with a choice between revising his claim to repair the division and thus move toward a state of agreement (or at least closer to agreement, and thus a less threatening space than the possible impasse they have found themselves in), or, to stand his ground and continue or escalate the disagreement. Alternatively, he could abandon the issue and steer the conversation in another direction, but this would ultimately leave the two participants in a state of disagreement regarding this particular discussion.[13] What Steven does, is not only to stand his ground, but to strengthen his prior claim (or his alignment with the film's claim, at least), evidenced via his immediate response[14] and his upgrade from a claim to a "promise" (line 18). Secondly, Steven treats David's turn as amounting to a rejection of the factual nature of his claim, by employing actions toward recruiting another participant to support it. This is seen in his enquiry: "Did you watch that documentary on Netflix" (lines 18-19), which is evidently addressed to Levi, based on Levi's subsequent response seeking clarification: "which one?" (line 20). After Steven provides clarification (line 21), Levi

[13] See for example, Heritage (1984) and Schegloff (2007a) for a discussion regarding the CA features of preference organization that this type of analysis draws from.

[14] See Schegloff (2007a) and Lerner (1996) for a description of the typical features involved in strengthening one's prior position in response to disalignment.

responds in alignment with "yayaya" (line 22)[15]. In confirming his knowledge of the film here, Levi becomes positioned as a potential source of corroborating evidence for Steven's position regarding the film's claim. Thus, Steven has successfully recruited Levi as a potential ally to support his side of the dispute that has developed here. Levi's response, not only supports Steven's position, but offers an upgrade from the one specific film being discussed, to "I've seen lots of them" (line 22). Thus, Levi is showing his availability to support the disputed claim based not only on this film, but on "lots of them".

Levi's statement that "it was after the first one [he] watched that [he] stopped eating meat" (lines 31 – 32), not only indicates his orientation toward membership of a vegetarian identity category, but also indicates that the film which spurred his abstinence from meat consumption, contains the kind of content that may occasion this type of identity shift (and the kind of content/narrative that David rejected in line 17). Thus, at this point, not only are Levi and Steven in clear alignment, but due to Levi's assertion that he has stopped eating meat as a result of having seen the film, (in comparison to Steven merely saying that he has learned from the film that meat is "terrible for you"), Levi can be seen as taking a stronger position than Steven's. So the initial threat posed to David's identity, by Steven's claim, becomes amplified by Levi's claim, and thus bears an even stronger implication of possible critique: that if David continues to eat meat after having learned about the content of the film, he could be labelled as 'ignorant' or 'irrational'. In addition, he faces the potential to be positioned as 'inferior' to Levi, based on Levi having made the opposite choice, which is being positioned as an 'informed'; 'educated'; 'rational' choice. Thus, at this point David faces pressure – he is now faced with the decision we saw Steven having to navigate earlier: to revise his position, stand his ground, or disengage from the topic at hand. As we will see below, his response to this decision is finally provided in line 38.

Lines 33-37 provide another instance of Levi and Steven performing a sequence of aligning action (similar to lines 22-29), in revising the previously held assessment of meat as being "very bad for you" (line 21) toward the upgraded assessment that "meat is poison" (line 37). Interestingly, at this point (after being absent from the discussion since line 17, and thus

[15] …and in typical accordance with the features of a preferred turn shape, i.e. directly and without delay (Heritage, 1984; Schegloff, 2007a).

temporarily opting for the option of disengaging from the discussion), David provides what could initially be seen as a request for confirmation in the form of "is it" (line 38). However, considering his previously provided explicit rejecting response – and strong challenge- ("fuck than man" in line 17) to the (weaker) assessment that "meat is actually terrible for you" (lines 12-13), his "is it" here seems to present a weakened challenge to the upgraded, and collaboratively produced (between Levi and Steven) assessment that "meat is poison". Thus, David moves from a position of strong resistance, to one of sceptical openness to new information via explicitly requesting clarification, or challenging the others to provide more information, which is exactly what they do next. David's position here is further supported by the way he simply listens and provides a series of "hhmm"'s (lines 46; 52; 54), indicating a neutral position (in contrast to the strong oppositional position he has taken before) toward the unfolding of a collaboratively produced discussion resembling the type of (counter-hegemonic) discomforting narrative about food, as mentioned earlier, that he might have been pre-empting by his earlier explicit resistance in "fuck that man" (line 17).

Beyond David's positional shifts, that we have seen unfolding throughout this interaction, we now arrive at a point (line 50) where he responds with "'cuz of the way they treat them", to Levi's description throughout lines 47- 49 that egg production processes are "gross" (line 49). This not only presents as another attempt at clarification (compared to "is it" in line 38), but it also displays his understanding regarding the subject matter being discussed. It indicates that he can infer the substance of the argument, from what the others are saying, even though it is in a way that ultimately defers to Steven and Levi's authority to confirm what he is proposing (as they are in a position to do so, since they have seen the film(s)). In response to this attempt at clarification, Levi provides the confirmation, via the repetition of what David has said. At this stage we also see the initiation of, what progressively becomes David's increasing convergence, with Levi and Steven, in lines 56; 59; and 62. His assessments that "the way they treat them" (line 50) is "savage hey" (line 56); and "the process of [meat production]" (line 59) is "fucked up" (line 62), achieves another shift in the progressive development of David's position from *resistant meat-eater* to *curious, but sceptical listener,* to *critical assessor of the production process.*

Importantly, this shift in position occurs at a place in the unfolding interaction where the focus of the discussion has shifted from the argument that *meat is unhealthy* toward the argument that *meat production processes are cruel.* Thus, David's shift here, occurs within a context of

a shift from health-related discourse (that he rejects) toward moral discourse (which he is more inclined to align with). Although participants now seem to have accomplished a point of convergence, solidified by their collaborative laughter (lines 64-65), it is not evident that David has adopted the exact same stance as the others, as he never quite matches Steven's assessment of meat being 'poison', nor Levi's commitment to abstain from meat consumption. Rather, David adopts a negative assessment only in relation to the processes involved in producing animal products (eggs, specifically). Hence, after facing disalignment regarding one set of claims, Levi and Steven collaborate in offering a somewhat different set of claims that David then collaborates and ultimately aligns with. These shifts in (dis)alignment are fundamentally intersecting with shifts in the substance of what is being (dis)aligned with, which is consequential for the relevant critique that may be directed at meat-eaters here as: *potentially enabling cruelty* versus *potentially self-harming* (which would have been relevant during the discussion of the health-related argument, i.e. that "meat is poison"). This interpretation stems from the evidence in this interaction that David shows no willingness to engage with (via his explicit rejection thereof) the claim about the health-related impacts of meat consumption, but far more willingness to agree with moral claims about meat consumption, or the meat production industry. Thus, although David might be morally compromised due to his continuing to do something that he agrees is cruel, this is apparently (to him – as evidenced throughout the interaction) less of an issue (and reason to change his behaviour) than being compromised in the ways the health-related claim would implicate.

Regardless of the specifics of the argument that David is willing to align to, what we see being produced here, is a willingness toward positional shifts. This is also evident in the way that what could have been a potential point of conflict, or more likely - an impasse, between David and Steven (with David's blatant rejection in line 17) serves as a catalyst for Steven to recruit another member to the project of arguing against David and in support of the claim that he had disagreed with. Steven and Levi's subsequent interactional work serves as a 'list of factors' that would be more difficult for David to disagree with (which he indeed does not disagree with). Thus, the unfolding of this interaction produces a move away from disagreement or conflict, toward agreement, as participants abandon their discussion about the claim that *meat is unhealthy* (and thus the related implications regarding David's meat-eater identity) toward discussing other factors related to meat consumption that they all can agree upon. In doing so, the claim that *meat is unhealthy* is never actually settled, enabling David to avoid the potential threat to his meat - eater identity (that he could be seen as unhealthy or irrational) and emerge

with his identity, or food choices, intact, without having to concede that he is making an unhealthy choice. Thus, we see an (albeit quite implicit) orientation to a type of *individual-choice* perspective as participants are essentially provided the freedom throughout this interaction to *choose* which claims or arguments they align to, and which they reject, without facing subsequent conflict about the claims that they have rejected. Instead, all three participants perform interactional work, not toward directly attempting to change anyone's identity - related choices, but towards finding common ground in relation to the topic at hand.

Thus, the counter-hegemonic narrative about meat-eating is still not fully being accepted, but space is being made for considering certain aspects thereof, whilst leaving others unresolved. This move away from something extremely threatening, toward something less threatening to David's meat-eater identity – to avoid or de-escalate conflict - indicates the kind of micro-interactional phenomenon which, in aggregate, serves to allow the macro-level politics of food consumption practices to continue unchanged. Thus, the personal *is* political. And even if (however unlikely) this kind of phenomenon happens infrequently, the fact that it *can* happen indicates that such a mechanism toward resolving conflict that implicates matters of identity in everyday interaction, is something that is worth paying attention to: to understand and address the potential wide-ranging political consequences it may have, in relation to the resistance of counter-hegemonic discourse.

Excerpt 5 shows part of the post-mealtime discussion, which followed a few minutes after the interaction in excerpt 3. Here, we see a return to the topic of the documentary film, once again. Throughout the course of events on the day, Steven had initially raised this topic whilst tending to the fire (as seen in excerpt 4), then during the post-mealtime discussion (excerpt 2), and here we see Stacy making this film relevant to the situated context once again.

Excerpt 5; Braai 05-08-2017; Device 1 at 02:55:37-02:56:41

((Post-mealtime discussion at the dinner table))

1	STA:	Well like- like=uh:m (.) <the guy in that> documentary
2		↓said is: (.) you=know,
3	STE:	What the health ya,
4	STA:	The question you should be [asking >is actually< where do
5	STE:	[yiss tha- was hectic yoh.
6	STA:	you >get your< ↓fi:bre,
7	LUN:	Ya exactly: most people >don't get enough[h< ↑fibre.

STA: [>Most people don't get enough< fibre=hardly anybody:: (.) doesn't get enough ↓prote[i:n.
STE: [Nuts: grai:n:,
STE: (ya::)
STA: >Like having said that< (.) I- I:::::: ca:n't give=up ↓meat. (.) I >love=it< too ↓much:.
(0.2)
LUN: And you don't [↑have to give it ↓up.
LEV: [<some people:? some people?> just li:ke=it
STA: [I=↓wo:n't ((laughs))
((laughing))
LEV: >there's no:thing< wro:ng? with tha[t
LUN: [↑no::? There's nothing ↓w[rong ∘with ↓it.
DAV: [((laughter))
STA: [.hh .hh ((simulating hyperventilation))
LEV: >Like when I see< like I said when [I see ( )
STA: [But I RE<u>spe:ct-I RES</u>pect=when people >go vegetarian or whatever< like I <u>re</u>spect their reasons >I'm not=gonna=like< hh .hh <u>b</u>era:te you guys [for being ↑vegetarian=or like
LEV: [↑Ya:
STA: Question your [mo:tives, like (.) it's you-it's
LEV: [w-when ↑I s e e:: p e o p l e
STA: [=↑your choice? I]t's=your ↑body,
LEV: [e a ting <u>me</u>:at]
LUN: [e x a c t l y] it like a:ll comes down to your <u>o</u>:wn personal cho[ice you know, it's for <u>y</u>ou:
STA: [<u>Ex</u>actly.
LEV: ∘Exactly∘, and the same thing when I: see people eating=meat I'm not like ↓oh go:d [they're a terrible person for <u>e</u>a:ting meat.
STA: [<fuck=you:::> >for eating< me:at.
LUN: ↑<u>No</u>:: it's jus-it doesn't wo:rk for me:: like=I
LEV: >It doesn't even< cross my ↓mi::nd.
LUN: can <u>w</u>atch you=guys eat meat and I don't have <u>any</u>:=emotion towa:rds that[but if ↑<u>I</u>: had=to=eat=it
STE: [Ya?
LUN: >I'd be like< I ca::n't.
LEV: >Doesn't bother< me at a:ll to see other people doing it

```
49          because it's-no: it's not. (0.8) What ↑I do it=doesn't
50          affect [them=and what they do it doesn't affect me? °so,
51   LUN:          [Ya? °exactly
52   LEV:   °it's ↓coo:l°
```

First (lines 1 – 2), Stacy and Steven introduce the topic of the documentary film, which is here (and previously in excerpt 2) titled as "What the Health" (line 3). Stacy performs hesitation here with her "uhm", pause, and slower speech in line 1, as well as the pause and the "you know" in line 2. This seems likely due to her struggling to recall the specifics of what she is referring to, thus she provides whatever vague information she can, to express herself. This is confirmed in that Steven treats her hesitation as such a failure in recall, and provides the name of the film: "What the health ya" (line 3). Over the next few turns (lines 4-12), we see Stacy, Steven, and Luna collaboratively producing a narrative that is set up against some normative understanding about nutrition and health.

Stacy's assessment that "the question you *should* be asking is *actually*" (line 4), implies that this is not a question that is ordinarily asked, yet an important one that we *should actually* ask instead of the one(s) we do ask. This is similar to what Levi produces in excerpt 2 (line 11) with his "I'm actually really full", and what Steven produces in excerpt 4 (lines 12-13) with his "meat is actually terrible for you". Thus, we see another example here of a claim being formulated as particularly responsive or opposed to some other prevalent viewpoint, and thus that this claim opposes normative ideology about the topic at hand. In excerpt 2, the normative ideology being opposed could be described as *veggies alone (thus a vegetarian diet) are not an adequate meal*, in excerpt 4 it might be that *meat is good for you*, and in this excerpt (5) it seems to represent a combination of the above, whilst including more specific claims, such as: *vegetarians do not get enough protein* (as we shall see participants orienting to below) and *meat eaters get all the fibre they need*. The kind of formulation that Stacy does here is also understood (and reinforced) by Steven, in his response: "yiss ya that was hectic yoh" (line 5). His response overlaps with Stacy's turn, indicating (in combination with the content thereof) that he a) knows what she is referring to, before she has made her point, and b) that the assessment in the film that Stacy is raising here, contains something that is shocking: "hectic yoh" – again, reinforcing the idea that the claim being produced is not part of everyday discourse regarding health (otherwise it would not be shocking). The counter-hegemonic ideology about health that participants are suggesting here, is evident in Luna's "most people

don't get enough fibre" (line 7) and Stacy's "most people don't get enough fibre hardly anybody doesn't get enough protein" (lines 8-10). Thus, it is explicitly evident here that the participants are speaking against the discourse of meat-eaters as healthy, and thus more implicitly against the discourse of vegetarians as unhealthy.

Next, Steven produces a list: "nuts grain" (line 11), which seems to represent a list of good sources of dietary fibre, in response to what Stacy has said in lines 4 and 6: "…where do you get your fibre". Steven's list does not contain any animal products, but only plant-based sources of fibre, and thus, again, reinforces that which he, Stacy, and Luna have been producing: That *actually* a vegetarian diet is healthier than a diet largely based on meat products, based on the assessment in this case that plant-based sources of fibre are *actually* better sources thereof than animal products. All this is done a) via reference to a documentary film as an authoritative source on the matter (line 1 and 3), and b) by using (albeit unstructured and loosely connected) logical reasoning to illustrate certain ideas *against* others, to the effect that the counter-hegemonic ideology being presented, is specifically being presented as an evidence-based position related to the matter of dietary choices (similar to the oppositional positioning of David and Levi's food-identities in excerpt 4). It is evident that Stacy treats it as such here, as her turn in lines 13-14: "I can't give up meat" (lines 13-14), claims her personal choice, whilst simultaneously orienting to the implication that a choice to abstain from meat consumption is one that *could* follow from the evidence base that they have been discussing, albeit not a choice that she could live with.

Further, Stacy's choice is performed as based on personal taste or preference: "I love it too much" (line 14), regardless of what she rationally knows: "having said that" (line 13). Following some hesitation, indicated by the pause (line 15), Luna and Levi both (lines 16 - 22) display an orientation to being 'non-judgmental vegetarians'. Firstly, in that both are vegetarians and they are not only passing on an opportunity to encourage others not to eat meat, significantly, in a context where a meat - eater has explicitly provided an opportunity for them to do so, as a logical consequence of what she has been saying, but secondly, they are actively claiming that it is not necessary to do so: e.g. "you don't have to give it up" (line 16) - where perhaps to do anything short of this might be seen as adopting an 'obnoxious' or 'judgmental vegetarian' identity (as shown throughout the previous section). This positioning is further reinforced as Levi and Luna orient to 'moralising', as something associated with the identity ('obnoxious or judgmental vegetarian') that they are distancing themselves from, in saying

"there's nothing wrong with that" (line 20); "no there's nothing wrong with it" (lines 21-22). Thus, they are disclaiming the moral issues regarding meat consumption at a place where an 'obnoxious' or 'judgmental' vegetarian might have exercised judgment against meat consumption. In so doing, they are performing a *choice-based position* regarding the matter, in that Stacy's individual choices are respected, even though it might differ from their own – and even though it might be judged as 'irrational' or 'wrong' by *other*, 'obnoxious' or 'judgmental' vegetarians.

Following Levi and Luna's collaborative identity – management work, we see Stacy providing the meat-eater equivalent throughout lines 26-29. Here, Stacy distances herself from the types of 'obnoxious meat-eaters' who would "berate" vegetarians for their choices: "I'm not gonna like berate you guys for being vegetarian" (lines 28-29). Thus, we see a collaborate effort here (and throughout most of the remainder of this excerpt) to produce a kind of liberalism, whereby everyone's choices are respected, and everyone is able to claim a 'non-judgemental' identity regarding their food-related choices. And this is ultimately a position (pre-existing and collaboratively produced here) that participants can evidently agree on, regardless of their individual food-related choices or identities: "exactly" (line 35; 37; and 38). Furthermore, such choices are explicitly individualised: "it all comes down to your own personal choice you know, it's for you" (lines 35-36), not only in relation to personal preferences or tastes, but also based on the separation and individuation that is perceived to belong to all persons with a body: "it's your choice it's your body" (line 31 and 33) and "I can watch you guys eat meat and I don't have any emotion towards it" (lines 42; 44; 45), as well as in: "what I do it doesn't affect them and what they do it doesn't affect me so" (lines 49-50). In this sense, the *liberal* or *individual-choice-based position* is oriented to, in opposition to, the alternative: the 'obnoxious' or 'judgemental' type of food-related identities. Thus, the sense that *what I do is none of your business,* and vice versa, is produced in opposition to the type of 'judgmental' food-related identity that assumes authority on the matter of what one should and should not eat, and which is treated here as involving a kind of illegitimate claim to authority over other people's bodies and health-related concerns. Thus, to impose such an illegitimate claim, is treated here as representing a potential source of conflict, and one that participants carefully distance themselves from, if and when it arises, or seems to be about to arise.

This presents as the *personal* means by which the taken-for-granted ideology that food-related identities are simply a matter of *individual choice,* is reproduced. It should be noted here, that

animals are not afforded the privilege of choice, but are merely subjugated to human individual choices, and this type of liberalism is therefore a partial liberalism that rests upon only some (human) individual choices being afforded respect and legitimation, whilst other (animal) individual choices are disregarded and subjugated to human preference. This is the *political* outcome of such aforementioned *personal* matters that contributes to the (social) organisation of food-related production and consumption practices – each with wide-ranging political, ecological, and socio-economic consequences. And, as we have seen, this *liberal-choice model* being produced here, is all about the rights of individuals, and thus eludes any consideration for these aforementioned collective (and cross-species) consequences related to the individual human choices being referred to.

Excerpt 6 shows part of a discussion that took place in the kitchen, whilst two participants: Luna and Daisy were preparing some of the dishes. This excerpt exemplifies the performative management of interactional delicacy relating to food-identities, as it arises in the immediate interaction, to avoid conflict. Whilst Luna utilises a self-mocking response (similar to what we have seen in excerpt 2), Daisy instead, employs avoidance, or omission, as a means toward managing potential identity- related conflict. Ultimately, the interaction leads to a kind of performed understanding of Luna's dietary choices, by Daisy, whilst maintaining an orientation to the misalignment between their respective food-related identities. Thus, we see yet another means toward the management of incipient interactional conflict, without either participant shifting their dietary positions, or choices - which are maintained as *personal* – displaying (albeit more subtly than in excerpt 5, for example) the same kind of *liberal - choice position* that we have encountered throughout previous excerpts.

Excerpt 6; Braai 05-08-2017; Device 2 at 1:53:09-01:53:33

((Participants are preparing salad in the kitchen))

1	DAI:	So >what=are=you=gonna< eat (.) Luna?
2		(0.2)
3	LUN:	Uhm: <we've go:t?> Well I've got the salad=obviously and
4		then Levi u:hm >did the< roa:st? veggies? on the braai:
5		and (the/do) mea:lies=and ya so I'm just [gonna have that.
6	DAI:	[>So you not
7		gonna< have (.) like, (0.8) >you just gonna have< that.
8	LUN:	Ya[::hhh
9	DAI:	[>Salad and ↓veg<
10	LUN:	Ya. (.) basically veg ((laughing))

```
11          (0.8)
12   DAI:   It's a >lot of stuff< to cut ou:t?=hey=whea:t? (.)
13          dai:r[y:?
14   LUN:         [wheat and dai:ry and >obviously I< just don't
15          eat ↓meat. [∘be]cause I ju[s:t (you know) I'm a vegetarian∘
16   DAI:              [ya ]          [y a (I  h e a r  y o u )
```

First, Daisy initiates a sequence of inquiry in raising the question: "So what are you gonna eat Luna?" (line 1). Due to the context (a 'bring and braai') it is to be expected that everyone has brought their own dishes to the occasion, thus Daisy is leveraging the situated context to enquire as to what Luna has brought along to the braai, toward producing a 'conversation starter', or initiating a sequence of conversation. Luna's response indicates hesitation, as marked by a pause (line 2) an "Uhm", and an incomplete, or self-interrupted, "we've got", followed by a "well" (line 3) to restart, as well as a repair from "we've got" to "I've got" (line 3). The formulation of Luna's response here, marked by hesitation[16] and revision, indicates some difficulty, or delicacy, in responding to Daisy's question. Hence, she is treating her response as presenting potentially problematic or sensitive subject matter, which might lead to interactional conflict (Lerner, 2013). Adams (2010a) asserts that vegetarians are perpetually aware of the potential critique they may face in social interactions with meat - eaters, due to their beliefs or choices – thus their hesitant approach to discussing such matters. Beyond what we have seen in previous excerpts, we can also clearly assert here that Luna is a vegetarian, as her response through lines 3-5 observably displays a vegetarian identity through the absence of mentioning any animal products, and the word "just" (line 5), indicating that she is *just* going to eat vegetables. Thus, Adams's theoretical assertion aids us in understanding that Luna's observable interactional difficulty here, regarding the formulation of her response in line 3, represents such a place where we can observe the management of food-related identity politics that may lead to interactional conflict.

Next, we see Daisy's response starting with a negative formulation in "So you not gonna have" (lines 6-7), which implicates that something is absent from what Luna will eat. Then, she repairs toward a positive formulation - albeit one that, with the word "just", in line 7, still

[16] See Heritage (1984), and Schegloff (2007a) for a discussion about preference organisation that explains the uses and consequences of these types of conversational features.

orients to something being absent. This formulation is also marked by hesitation via the two pauses and a "like" (line 7), indicating that she is avoiding directly naming the absent item, thereby treating doing so as a delicate and potentially problematic matter, such that she would perform this repair, or reformulation, to steer away from it. Hence, considering Luna's 'perpetual awareness' of the potential critique they she may face, and does face here, in a social interaction with a meat-eater, it is also observable here that Daisy (a meat eater) is performing the same awareness, and thus treating the topic sensitively and with hesitation.

This display of interactional sensitivity continues, in Luna's response to Daisy's clarification, or summary, of Luna's meal as "salad and veg" (line 9), as Luna provides a declarative reformulation: "Ya basically veg" (line 10), indicating that she is self-characterising her dietary choices as an extreme case formulation (Edwards, 2010; Pomerantz,1986), and therefore performing something akin to self-mocking. This is further strengthened by her following laughter, indicating her awareness that others might interpret her choices to be laughable, so she anticipates this response, by self-mocking. Instead of providing Luna's anticipated mocking response, or laughter however, Daisy (following hesitation), provides another inquiry in lines 12-13. Of course, for Daisy to have responded by joining in on the mocking here, would represent a hostile action (akin to agreeing with self-deprecation), thus, whilst Luna is working to avert conflict by self-mocking, Daisy is also working to build solidarity by not joining in the laughter and/or mocking. Instead, she responds with something that shows concern for Luna, that takes the potential challenges of her food-related identity seriously, and thereby de-escalates potential conflict. So Daisy's inquiry in "it's a lot of stuff to cut out hey wheat dairy" (lines 12-13), simultaneously presents an attempt at building solidarity via an assessment that warrants concern, whilst also presenting a potential challenge to Luna to defend her food-related identity, by virtue of pointing out how extreme her choices are. Interestingly, this assessment provides wheat and dairy as a restriction in Luna's diet that Daisy is already aware of, and thus, in retrospect, the interaction from line 1 onward now becomes clarified to represent the start of a sequence of inquiry regarding what Luna, with her previously established restricted diet that Daisy is aware of, will be willing or able to eat at this particular event.

Luna responds throughout lines 14-15, not via defence of her food - identity, but rather by joining in on the listing of everything that she has cut out of her diet. This leads to Luna's account of her vegetarianism as a defence of her choices: "because I just you know I'm a

vegetarian" (line 15). Interestingly, unlike with wheat and dairy, Luna's restriction regarding meat consumption is oriented to as the thing that Daisy "obviously" knows (line 14), yet does not mention, indicating Daisy's avoidance of the topic as a potential cause of interactional trouble, and thus another means toward managing group solidarity via the management of potential conflict. Further, Luna's orientation to her vegetarian identity displays some features indicating an awareness of potential conflict or sensitive subject matter, such as a decrease in volume; a slight delay in prolonging the pronunciation of the "just", and another delay in the "you know", before finally providing an explicit orientation to her vegetarian identity in "I'm a vegetarian". Thus, Luna is approaching the production of this utterance with care, indicating her management of interactional sensitivity. Further, her "because I just" (line 15) indicates that what will follow is her account regarding why she does not eat meat. Here, a range of accounts might be relevant, such as *I think meat-eating is unethical* or *meat is unhealthy*, for example. However, what Luna provides, after some hesitation in formulating her account, presents simply as an identity categorisation: "I'm a vegetarian" (line 15). This self-identification thus emerges through the unfolding of this interaction, as an explanation regarding the reason(s) she has eliminated all the items listed from her diet, and she treats any other, more substantive, accounts she may have produced here, as potentially delicate, or as a potential source of conflict, and thus merely settles on the identity categorisation. Thereby, she treats the matter at hand as something simply relating to personal identity, rather than as a morally, or empirically based choice, for example, and thus that personal identity is less likely something that might catalyse interactional conflict, or disagreement, as compared to some other, more substantive account regarding the basis of the identity in question. Consequently, such an account is never produced, and thus does not need to be confronted, which results in the politics relating to vegetarianism (and by implication meat consumption), remaining unspoken – and thus unchanged. Thus, both participants in this excerpt seem to be managing what could become a delicate, or potentially troublesome interaction, regarding Luna's vegetarian identity, by focusing for the most part on the other (perhaps less politicised) restrictions in her diet.

Next, Daisy's "ya I hear you" (line 16) response to Luna's orientation to her vegetarian identity, represents a kind of 'pro-forma affiliation' (Weatherall & Keevallik, 2016), which essentially amounts to Daisy's performance to show support for Luna, without aligning with the identity of vegetarianism that Luna has just used as an account for her dietary restrictions. In other words, Daisy is claiming and demonstrably performing her understanding of Luna's food-

related identity, and the subsequent possible difficulties that may result from such an orientation, whilst maintaining an orientation to the misalignment between their respective food-related identities. Thus, this indicates yet another subtle means toward the management, or avoidance, of potential interactional conflict, without either participant shifting their dietary positions, or choices - which are thus maintained as *personal*, rather than being up for debate with all the broader political consequences that this might involve. Thus, in applying a feminist lens here, we can see that the *personal* is *political*, in that what constitutes personal choices and actions in relation to food consumption practices, has, in aggregate, wider-ranging political, ecological, and socio-economic consequences. And thus the interactional mechanisms that are employed toward this type of maintenance of personal action, in relation to politically relevant concerns, is something worth unpacking toward mobilising strategies for social reform.

In conclusion, this second section of analysis has shown: firstly, the interactional work being performed between Steven, David, and Levi, in excerpt 4, toward returning to group solidarity in the face of emerging conflict. This included a willingness by David toward positional shifts regarding matters relating to meat consumption; and the adoption of a *liberal - choice position* regarding food consumption decisions and practices. Secondly, in excerpt 5, we have seen another (much more explicit) instance of the adoption of a *liberal - choice position* toward the avoidance of incipient interactional conflict. Finally, in excerpt 6, we have seen the performance of interactional sensitivity, as well as another instance (albeit more implicitly) of an orientation to a *liberal - choice position*. Thus, throughout this section, it has become apparent- through uncovering the employment of the particular interactional mechanisms, toward potential food-related identity conflict management- that *the personal is political*. This is to say that such conflict management strategies result in the maintenance and reproduction of personal action, which has, in aggregate, wider-ranging political, ecological, and socio-economic consequences. In the following section, I focus on unpacking this further via a focus on the same kind of interactional work we have seen thus far, but as it relates to the intersectional production and negotiation of gender and food-identities.

The Intersectional Orientation to Gender and Food-Related Identities.

The following excerpt (7) shows part of a discussion that followed a few minutes after the discussion in excerpt 1, between Steven, David, and Levi. After what transpired in excerpt 1, Levi exited the conversation to collect something from the kitchen. In this excerpt (7), Levi re-enters the space around the braai, where Steven and David have been conversing, to check on the vegetables that he is braaing. Here we see a sequence of teasing in which participants explicitly invoke the hegemony of meat-eating as an interactional resource toward witty banter. This presents as a significant example of an explicit orientation to gender in relation to meat, as well as to the dominant position of meat, essentially providing explicit evidence for the type of hegemonic discourse that *meat signifies masculinity*.

Excerpt 7; Braai 05-08-2017; Device 1 at 01:05:13-01:05:32

((Participants are socialising around the fireside))

1	STE:	Another forty=five: minutes
2	DAV:	((giggling))
3	LEV:	Tss:: hhh
4		(1.5)
5	DAV:	Taking up the whole braa::i there with your ↓veggies
6		((soft giggle)) (0.2) ↑hey? ((loud laughter))
7		(1.5)
8	LEV:	Fuck ↓you:: du[de.
9	DAV:	[((loud laughter)) The braai is for
10		mea:t Levi.
11		((collective laughter))
12	STE:	Meat is ↑ki::ng.

Considering the context of this excerpt, that Levi re-enters the space to check on the vegetables, we can see that what Steven says in line 1 represents an assessment regarding the amount of time that Levi's vegetables will still need to be on the braai before they are cooked. To this, David responds with giggling, which we can assume is directed to Levi based on his subsequent response in line 3. This giggling sets the tone of the interaction across the following lines as a sequence of teasing, although this is not yet clear at this point. Levi's response in line 3, which presents something akin to 'joking exasperation', indicates that he has received David's laughter as a jeer, although Levi does not engage with it any further. After a long pause, David proceeds to initiate his tease (line 5) – for which the tone has been set up in the previous lines – which is directed at the owner of the veggies (i.e. Levi), as he says: "Taking up the whole

braai there with your veggies". The giggling that follows (line 6), again indicates that David is teasing Levi here, and when he does not gain a response during the giggling or the subsequent pause, he questions "hey?" (line 6) with a rise in pitch. This may indicate that he was checking to gauge Levi's stance on what he had just said about Levi's veggies – i.e. to gauge whether or not Levi would respond with an uptake of the teasing. David's giggle then turns into loud laughter – possibly to diffuse the situation and to make it clear that he had intended his comment as a tease (by amplifying the giggle to loud laughter). At this point, albeit after another long pause, Levi responds with an uptake of the tease in "fuck you dude" (line 8), expressed light-heartedly (and followed by further laughter in line 11), suggesting his treatment of David's turn as non-serious, and funny.

This is followed by more loud laughter from David, in line 9, after which he continues the sequence of teasing in saying "the braai is for meat Levi" (lines 9-10). This is taken up by all three participants as teasing, as they all respond with laughter (line 11). Finally, Steven provides what can be interpreted as a progression from David's tease in line 5, toward an exaggerated parody of a pro-meat position: "meat is king" (line 12). This presents explicit evidence of the gendering of meat here, in equating meat to the masculine reference: "king". And not only to any masculine reference, but to one with absolute power and dominance, such as a king. Thus, although the overall thrust of the exchange is non-serious, the dominant position of meat, and its link to gender, are both evident here. This whole sequence under analysis, presents as the (non-serious) teasing of Levi's vegetarian identity, which relies on, or invokes, an understanding of the hegemony of meat-eating toward what is ultimately akin to a caricature performance of an 'obnoxious' meat-eater identity, by David and Steven. Notably, this occurs in the context of the braai ("the braai is for meat"), which (as discussed throughout the literature review), is characterised by a specific discursive tradition concerning the dominance of meat. Thus participants *could* seriously behave in the manner that they are teasing about (and thus disavowing) here. Further, Levi is being treated as not only violating the hegemony of meat-eating, but also as violating the 'appropriate' use of the braai (as a cooking vessel and/or as an occasion), which in itself is understood to signify masculinity (see literature review). This sequence thus exemplifies the same kind of food-related identity negotiation that we have seen throughout previous sections, as to employ the performance of such an exaggerated version of a meat-eater identity here, in a joking manner, serves to achieve the implication that Steven and David are *not* like this, i.e., they are not *really* 'obnoxious meat-eaters' that would *really* make such comments. Thus they are positioned as 'non-judgmental

meat-eaters' whom would only say such things if they are teasing, but not if they are being serious. Simultaneously, whilst their actions here indicate that they are not *really* 'obnoxious meat-eaters', it also (jokingly) treats Levi as an 'obnoxious vegetarian' as his vegetables are "taking up the whole braai" (line 5), but thereby implicitly claiming that he does not *really* represent such an identity either.

It is ultimately the awareness, and active use of the (dominant) discourse regarding the gendered politics of meat consumption, which allows for such teasing to be made possible in a context where it is to be expected that it might be relevant. And ultimately, Levi becomes the butt of the joke here, as he is the one that does not conform to the hegemonic discourse related to the intersection of both food-related- and – gender identities, in that, as Adams (2010, p. 17) notes: "Men who become vegetarians and vegans challenge an essential part of the masculine role. They are opting for women's food. How dare they". Thus, it is to be expected that the types of commentary Steven and David are making throughout this excerpt, are relevant in the context of the braai and that other people might direct such comments seriously at vegetarians. In presenting a teasing sequence, or parody of such comments, the participants in this interaction achieve group solidarity, despite their differences regarding such matters relating to the gendered politics of meat consumption.

The following excerpt (8) shows part of a fireside discussion that occurred between Steven and David (whilst Levi was in the kitchen), a few minutes before the discussion in excerpt 7 (where Levi returns from the kitchen to the fireside). In this excerpt, we see a similar exchange between Steven and David- regarding David's (initial) position on the consumption of meat- to what we have seen in excerpt 4. However, whereas in excerpt 4, David's (initial) position on the matter shifts throughout the course of the interaction, in this excerpt (8) we see David's position remaining consistent, whilst Steven revises his position. Thus, the interactional phenomena under analysis here do not vastly differ from the types of identity positioning and negotiation that we have uncovered thus far, but here we also see an (albeit largely implicit) orientation to gender that intersects with participants food-related identity positioning. Thus, although not always as explicitly oriented to as in excerpt 7, we can once again see how food-related identities are produced in gendered ways, as an embedded and performative feature of social interaction.

Excerpt 8; Braai 05-08-2017; Device 1 at 50:38-51:06

((Participants are socialising around the fireside))

1	STE:	Ya:: since I watched that documentary (I must say) (0.2)
2		I've been quite put off of ↓meat.
3	DAV:	>is=it<,
4	STE:	↑Not off mea:t but (I think like) I=dunno, (0.5) like it
5		does put you a little bit. (.) ↓like you know,
6	DAV:	Hhm::
7		(0.2)
8	STE:	The ↑thing is: (.) >I don't know< if I could ↑live without
9		meat.
10	DAV:	°Nah fuck that bro.°
11		(0.2)
12	STE:	You=know=what=I=mean like I would [probably get like,
13	DAV:	[not a cha::nce
14		(0.2)
15	STE:	get too thi:n and fucking: (2.2) >°You=know=what=I=mean°<
16	DAV:	Ya:: (0.2) sickly:
17	STE:	Sick- look ↓sickly,

Once again, Steven raises the topic of the documentary film (line 1) (that has been under discussion throughout previous excerpts). Considering the context of this excerpt (that it occurred after the discussion in excerpt 1), Steven is referring to the film here, as a device toward bridging the divide between meat-eaters and vegetarians (i.e. David and Levi) by claiming to have, after watching the film, shifted his own position regarding meat consumption: "I've been quite put off meat" (line 2). This serves to claim that Levi's choices are understandable, considering the information they are based on (which Steven has recently learned about), thus that meat-eaters like himself (and possibly David) might be inclined to make similar choices once they have learned the same information that Levi has. The construction of Steven's turn here (lines 1 and 2): firstly, by referring to the film as a legitimate reason for his positional shift, the hesitation indicated by the pause, and the subsequent revealing of his position regarding meat consumption, indicates that he is delivering information that might represent a basis for disagreement, thus he is showing sensitivity in how he delivers it.

What we see unfolding next, throughout lines 3 to 13, displays the same kind of unfolding action toward identity-related conflict resolution that we have encountered between Steven and David in excerpt 4. First, David provides an acknowledgement, and weak challenge in "is it" (line 3), to which Steven responds with a revision, or backpedalling, of his original claim, from "put off of meat" (line 2) to "not off meat" (line 4), which is marked by his performance of uncertainty: the "I dunno" and the pause (line 4), toward minimising his previous stance to "a little bit" (line 5). Thus, Steven sensitively negotiates a space between two opposing ideas, or identities (meat-eater versus vegetarian), to occupy a kind of 'middle ground'. That is, where he still eats meat, but he claims to not only understand the reasoning that would prompt one not to do so (based on the information in the film), but he also claims to have experienced being "quite put off of meat" (line 2), after watching the film, himself. Next, Steven provides an opportunity for David to display a similar kind of understanding in: "like you know" (line 5), toward reaching agreement in the 'middle ground' he is trying to establish. David's "hhm" (line 6), acknowledges what Steven is saying, but does not provide Steven with agreement (that he *knows*), nor disagreement (that he does not *know*). This could be interpreted as the same type of weak challenge, as we have seen with "is it" (line 3), in that (eventually – in lines 8 and 9) Steven responds with a revision of his previous turn. The pause (hesitation), in line 7, further indicates that the two participants have found themselves in a place of 'unsteady ground' here, instead of the 'middle ground' that Steven has been trying to establish. Hence, although Steven has been providing opportunities for David to align to an understanding regarding the potential abstinence from meat consumption, David has not done so. Rather, David maintains his position, via not agreeing with what Steven is saying (at a place where doing so had been made relevant), and via challenging Steven to revise his position.

Next, Steven's response (to David's weak challenge), indicates another revision of his initial position, as he states: "The thing is I don't know if I could live without meat" (lines 8-9). Here, saying "the thing is" indicates that what he is about to say can be heard as a "thing", i.e. a problem, or issue, regarding what they have been talking about. Thus, Steven is designing this turn as a change of direction in the context of another incipient conflict, or disagreement. This serves as a means to reason his way (back) toward a meat-eater identity – and thus toward a place where he and David will potentially be in alignment. David responds in kind, with (strong) alignment, in "nah fuck that bro" (line 10), and thus (strongly) aligns with the meat-eater identity that Steven's claim invokes. In doing so, David is also indicating that he is not going to align with the 'middle ground' that Steven had introduced. This is further evidenced

in his "not a chance" (line 13), which displays a strengthening of his rejection toward the potential abstinence from meat consumption in that there is simply no way that he will do such. Thus, via his alignment – to not being able to live without meat – David produces his meat-eater identity as constructed by an unwavering position that rejects the alternative (a vegetarian identity).

Further, here we see David referring to Steven as "bro" (line 10), which firstly, indicates an alignment (or being 'bro's) with Steven regarding not giving up meat. Secondly, considering what they are discussing, and the context within which the discussion occurs, this represents a place where there may be an implicit orientation to gender (via an incidental gender reference term), which may present implicit evidence for a rather telling link between meat consumption and masculinity. This possibility becomes more pronounced as the next few lines unfolds, in that a reason is produced toward the inability to live without meat: that Steven will "get too thin" (line 15), which David describes as "sickly" (line 16), and to which Steven aligns in line 17: "look sickly". Although this could be heard as orienting merely to health concerns, one cannot ignore the gendered discourse surrounding men and women's bodies, as being "thin" (line 15) presents a normative ideal for women, whilst masculinity is characterized (amongst other things) by strength and muscularity. Thus, looking "sickly" (or thin) is being treated here as undesirable for these two (male) participants (or 'bro's'), which might be seen to represent an implicit orientation toward not wanting to fail in achieving a discursive masculine ideal (strength). By implication, normative femininity becomes rejected toward achieving normative masculinity. Thus, through navigating the potential conflict that might have arisen between Steven and David in this interaction: i.e. between Steven being "put off meat" (thus resulting in a potential shift toward a vegetarian identity) and David's unwavering meat-eater identity, the two participants find alignment and resolution at the intersection between gender ideology and food-related identity politics.

The following excerpt (9) shows part of a discussion, around the fireside, that followed a few minutes after the discussion in excerpt 1, and just before the discussion in excerpt 7 (and 8). After what is shown in excerpt 1, Steven, Levi, and David, continued the discussion about Levi's work function, followed by a discussion regarding some of the content, or arguments against meat consumption, from the documentary film they have been referring to throughout their interactions. This excerpt (9) shows Levi introducing one such argument from the documentary film: that one does not need to eat meat to get enough dietary protein. As we shall

see, the focus on dietary protein here represents a matter of gendered discourse (relating to ideals about masculine strength), as it intersects with matters of food-related identities, which necessitates incipient interactional conflict management.

Excerpt 9; Braai 05-08-2017; Device 1 at 32:59-33:36

((Participants are socialising around the fireside and raise the topic of dietary protein))

1	LEV:	U::hm, (0.3) a::n:d, (.)↑ya dude it-i-a >and then it's< the
2		whole thing abo:ut like, (0.5) .hh you get-a-you could
3		get=a, (.) >you know< there's this who:le thing abou-around
4		like you can only get protein from dairy and mea[ts and
5	STE:	[Hhm
6	LEV:	>that's not really< tru:e, like you can get a lot of you-
7		Mo::st of your proteins from plants and things like that.
8	DAV:	Hhm
9	LEV:	Because that's: na[tural to the earth (.) that's ho:w-how
10	STE:	[yah:
11	LEV:	do you think a rhino:ceros is so friggin big=or an elephant
12		is so fr[iggin bi:g, (.) they don't eat meat?]
13	STE:	[Oh=yes=they don't=they don't hhmhhm](.) Ya they
14		=eat like. ya? grass:=nd= [( )
15	LEV:	[you know: so:
16	DAV:	Ya but they (.) don't (.)↑sto:p. ((laughing))
17	LEV:	Ya exa::ctly exa:ctly (.)[they eat to:ns, literally to:ns,
18	DAV:	[they have to eat like
19		((laughing)Ya
20	STE:	Ya

In lines 1-3 we see Levi raising a topic with much hesitation, revision, and thus, uncertainty or delicacy regarding possible critique he might face. We see this in the multiple pauses (lines 1 and 2); the "uhm" (line 1); and the multiple self-interruptions (lines 1,2, and 3) toward the careful structuring of what he is saying. Further, he refers to the matter he is raising as: "the whole thing about like" (lines 1-2) and "there's this whole thing abou - around" (line 3), indicating that what he is about to topicalise represents a common understanding on the matter – a common, and thus largely accepted and unquestioned understanding, that he is about to bring into question. Finally, he does present this matter, or argument: "you can only get protein

from dairy and meats" (line 4). This argument of course, is one that is commonly used to justify, and promote, the consumption of meat and dairy, and thus one that can be questioned as part of a defence of vegetarianism. Steven's overlapping "hhm" (line 5) indicates his acknowledgement regarding this (generally uncontroversial) claim, or debate, that Levi is raising, without providing his stance.

Next, Levi provides an evaluation to the common, or normative, understanding that one needs to consume meat and dairy to secure sufficient dietary protein: that "that's not really true" (line 6). Secondly, he provides a counter-argument: "you can get a lot of you- most of your proteins from plants" (lines 6-7), which includes a self-interruption toward a revision from "a lot" to "most", indicating an attempt at strengthening his counter-argument in the face of possible (and common) critique that *a vegetarian diet is inadequate* (as we have seen to have been made relevant in other discussions, such as throughout excerpts 2 and 5). David's response, to Levi's counter-argument (and thus introduction of controversy to a normative claim), presents an "hhm" (line 8), which, as with Steven's "hhm" (line 5), indicates his acknowledgement regarding this matter that Levi is raising, without providing his stance. However, here we might interpret that his "hhm" also presents as a weak challenge (similar to excerpts 2 and 8), in the face of a controversial claim.

Levi responds to David as such, in that he provides additional information to support his argument (thus rising to the weak challenge). We see this unfolding throughout lines 9-15, as Levi provides the argument that plants are "natural to the earth" (line 9); and that animals such as rhinoceroses, or elephants (line 11) "don't eat meat" (line 12). Specifically, that these "friggin big" (lines 11 and 12) (thus, emphasising their muscularity) animals do not eat meat (and thus do not need meat to become muscular, but more on this below). We see throughout Levi's presentation of this argument, that Steven provides supportive engagement to Levi through an aligning response in "yah" (line 10) and through an elaboration to Levi's argument: "they eat like ya grass" (lines 13-14), thus aiding and collaborating in Levi's (counter) argument. Further, Levi provides the argument that it is due to plant protein that such (herbivore) animals get "so friggin big" (line 11) and thus what he is alluding to in "you know so" (line 15), is that meat is not a necessary source of protein toward building muscle mass and that plant-based sources of protein are sufficient – thus *a vegetarian diet is not inadequate*, at least not regarding protein intake.

Thus, as we have seen in the previous excerpt (8), in considering the topic of discussion, as well as the context within which it takes place, this represents another occasion where there is an implicit orientation to gender (via an invocation of gendered discourse about muscularity implicitly signifying masculinity), which may present implicit evidence for a link between meat consumption and masculinity. And, as with excerpt 8 (regarding looking 'sickly'), although the discussion about protein may raise an orientation to health-related concerns, there is also ample evidence here for the treatment of appearance ('friggin big') as being an important factor relating to dietary choices. Thus, once again, there is an invocation here, concerning an idealized masculine body (being 'big' or muscular), as driven by normative masculine discourse, that stands in opposition to the discourse around 'thinness' (femininity). So whereas in excerpt 8, Steven and David reached alignment in their discussion that a meatless diet would leave them looking sickly and thin, here we see Levi providing an alternative (counter-hegemonic) argument, that *if other herbivores can achieve muscularity and strength on a vegetarian diet, then so can humans, including men whom aspire to muscular physiques.*

Since Levi has now provided his counter-argument, and Steven has, to an extent, collaborated in the production thereof, this leaves David in a position to provide his response, since he is the only one in this context that has not yet provided a stance on the matter. This is exactly what happens next, as David provides what could be considered to represent a means to invalidate, or subvert the comparative assessment that Steven and Levi have drawn between the diet of other species of herbivores, and what constitutes an adequate, or ideal, diet for humans (men, as implicated in this case). This can be seen in his response that "ya but they don't stop" (line 16), which is accompanied by laughter. The laughter here (and subsequently in line 19) can be interpreted as David's turning the collaboratively produced (by Steven and Levi) argument into a laughing matter and thus something that is being mocked by David here. What is being mocked, is the analogy that a vegetarian diet provides adequate protein to humans in the same way that it does for other herbivores, since the amount of vegetable matter humans would have to eat to allow for the type of protein intake being proposed, would be completely unreasonable (literally laughable). David's mocking, or disaligning response here produces a context in which the three participants are not in agreement on a matter, and thus face potential emerging conflict. Thus, Levi's response in line 17 provides a means toward agreement on a specific aspect of the issue being discussed: that animals consuming a plant-based diet "eat tons, literally tons". David then mirrors this sentiment once again in "they eat like ya" (lines 18-19), alluding to what he and Levi have already said throughout the previous

two lines – that, unlike humans, other species of herbivores eat a very large amount of plants to ingest enough protein. Finally, this particular matter is concluded in agreement in lines 19 and 20, with David and Steven both producing a "ya", which is of course subsequent to Levi's aligning "exactly exactly" (line 17).

Although the three parties have reached a place of agreement, or solidarity here, in the face of potential interactional conflict, once again (as we have seen in excerpt 4), it is not evident that David has adopted the same stance as the others in relation to the arguments presented. What they have reached alignment on is in fact rather inconsequential to the debate regarding whether or not a plant-based diet contains adequate protein in relation to human dietary needs, and thus whether or not the consumption of meat is necessary. Further, David's "ya but they don't stop" (line 16), presents a claim that might have been challenged by the others here, as one could argue that the sheer amount that an animal like an elephant needs to eat is of course relative to their body composition (i.e. size), and thus does not serve as a valid reference point to argue something to the effect that *because humans cannot ingest as much as an elephant, we cannot get enough protein from plants.* However, David's claim has been left unopposed, resulting in a similar unfolding to what we have seen in excerpt 4. Again, the three participants have managed potential identity-related conflict that might have resulted from the presentation of a counter-hegemonic narrative about meat consumption, and in this case the counter-hegemonic gendered discourse relating to meat consumption, via creating space to agree on certain aspects of the content of the discussion, without resolving the pressing ideological divergence that they are faced with. As such, this represents another example that indicates the kind of micro-interactional phenomenon which, in aggregate, serves to allow the macro-level politics of the *gendered* food (particularly meat) consumption practices to continue unchanged. More specifically, this again exemplifies the use of a particular mechanism toward resolving identity conflict in immediate interaction, where the *personal is political,* in that this analysis uncovers the immediate ways in which the resistance of counter-hegemonic discourse, and thus the reproduction of hegemonic discourse, unfolds.

In conclusion, throughout this section, we have once again seen the same kinds of identity management, and identity-related conflict management strategies that we have encountered throughout the previous two sections of analysis. However, in this section it has also become apparent that such strategies may involve the invocation of gendered discourse, as it relates to food-related identities, and thus that there is an intersection on the micro-interactional level,

between gender and food-related identity positioning, resulting in food-related identities to be produced in gendered ways. Ultimately, this intersectional production of gendered food-related identities result from, and reproduce, the ideology that *meat consumption signifies masculinity* and *a meatless diet signifies femininity*, as substantiated by such claims that *meat is king* (excerpt 7); *a meatless diet may result in bodily thinness (read femininity)* (excerpt 8); and *men need animal protein to get 'friggin big'* (excerpt 9). Hence, this section presents another example of a particular mechanism toward the food-related identity management, and identity-related conflict management strategies on the micro-interactional (*personal*) sphere, that, cumulatively, impacts the macro-level (*political*) sphere of the (particularly) *gendered* food consumption practices, as they relate to wider-ranging ecological; political; and socio-economic concerns.

Discussion and Conclusions

The analysis presented throughout the previous sections demonstrates the ways in which participants, establish and manage their food-related identities, as intersecting with gender, in interaction. As we have seen, various interactional strategies are employed, toward managing potential incipient identity-related interactional conflict. This systematically results in the achievement of group solidarity, whilst steering the interaction away from confronting the wider-ranging ideological concerns that underpin this potential conflict in the first place. This results in the wider political; environmental; and socio-economic matters related to individual choices regarding food consumption, effectively being abandoned in interaction, and thus being left uncontested.

For example, throughout the first section of analysis, we see a lot of interactional work being performed, toward establishing individual food-related identities in a 'positive', 'non-extreme' manner, and as resulting from rational decision-making. These identities are established in opposition to (the pre-empted normative type of) critique that they may be 'extreme' or 'emotional', due to their food consumption related choices. Similarly, we see participants establishing and disavowing the 'types' of food-related identities that might exercise such negative judgement. This is also done in opposition to the 'types' that would not do so, thus displaying what is oriented to, as positive values of tolerance and liberalism. In doing so, whilst participants treat their food-related identities as a systematic potential basis for conflict, they simultaneously achieve an (interactionally negotiated) environment where, regardless of individual differences in their dietary choices, their individual actions may be maintained and respected; conflict may be avoided; and group solidarity may be achieved. Of course, as I have discussed throughout the literature review, making such individual dietary choices presents an everyday personal (and social) practice that is laden with discursive and ideological motivations (Adams, 2010a; Izmirli & Phillips, 2011). Thus, in avoiding conflict regarding seemingly 'personal' (and thus not political) matters, in effect, what is being avoided, more pertinently, is the possibility of ideological conflict, relating to the underlying assumptions or arguments that inform such 'personal' dietary decisions.

In such an (interactionally achieved) environment, it is thus clear to all present that to direct critique toward others with divergent practices (or ideological orientations) related to food consumption, is to be classified as 'judgmental'; 'obnoxious'; or 'extreme'. In an effort to avoid

interactional conflict, this results in the maintenance and reproduction of *a priori* established positions on such (ideological) matters. This is to say that the *personal* identity-related management activities that unfold in the micro-interactional sphere, produce interactional mechanisms that, cumulatively, result in the collective tolerance and legitimation of possibly questionable *personal* activities (Widdicombe, 1998; Edwards, 1991). This in turn, presents highly problematic macro-level *political* consequences, which thus remain without judgement or questioning, and thus unchallenged.

Further, we have seen throughout the analysis that, to attain, or maintain group solidarity (regardless of individual ideological differences, or any wider-reaching implications of such differences), is produced as a central feature of the interactional work being done. Toward this end, individuals employ multiple, systematic strategies to avoid any potential incipient interactional conflict, and to redirect the interaction away from escalating conflict as it arises, and back toward alignment. As we have seen throughout excerpts 4 and 8, for example, one such strategy includes the unfolding of shifts in position regarding ideological matters related to food consumption, toward finding a space where *something* can collectively be agreed upon. This identity-related conflict management strategy may be successful in its endeavour to reach alignment (albeit partial) with fellow participants, although the original matter that could not be agreed upon, and thus presented a potential catalyst for interactional conflict, is left abandoned, and thus remains uncontested. Further, beyond the invocation of a position of *liberalism* or *individual-choice* regarding food-related identity matters, toward identity management (as discussed above), we have also seen how such a position is leveraged toward the management of potential incipient interactional conflict. For example, throughout section 2, we have seen how participants sensitively, or delicately, work to actively distance themselves from sources of potential conflict, via (amongst other strategies, but with the most pertinent and recurring strategy being) invoking this *liberal* position toward food consumption practices. This may result in creating a social environment where any and all such choices are reduced to a matter of *personal tastes* or *preferences*. And to question or critique such *personal* matters (as is oriented to in the interaction), would result in interactional conflict. Thus, whenever a challenge arises, to avoid such conflict, a *liberal* position (regarding matters that are treated as a systematic basis for potential conflict) is adopted as a position of consensus, that results in the challenge dissipating and group alignment being achieved. Hence, via such identity-related conflict management strategies, a kind of relativism is created where 'anything goes' on the *personal* level, whilst the *political*, or ecological; socio-economic; moral; etcetera

consequences of *personal* actions, are effectively erased from the discussion. In this sense, avoiding, or escaping, immediate interpersonal conflict is prioritized above pursuing broader political goals, and in this way the *personal* choices made in the process, potentially result in problematic macro-level consequences. Thus, no broader political accountability is taken for *personal* choices or behaviours, as relating to anything beyond the individual. Since, when personal choices are challenged, interactional conflict may arise and (considering all the performative work we have seen being done toward avoiding, or escaping such conflict) this presents an interactional barrier toward pursuing such challenging, or questioning. Thus, the interactional mechanisms that are employed toward this type of maintenance of personal action (and thus political inaction), in relation to politically relevant concerns, is something worth attending to, toward mobilising strategies for social reform.

Further, as we have seen throughout the analysis (in section 3), gender has been found to be *relevant* and *procedurally consequential* (Schegloff, 1992), within the context of the targeted social setting of this study, and to intersect with food-related identity management in fairly systematic ways. As discussed throughout the literature review, gender is a powerful ideological force that operates on the micro-sociological level to constantly construct and legitimate specific social arrangements on the macro-sociological level (Speer, 2005; 2012; Weatherall, 2012; 2015; and West & Zimmerman, 1987). And as we have seen throughout excerpts 7 to 9, this ideological force is oriented to, as an embedded and performative feature of social interaction, in the production and negotiation of food-related identities, as an intersecting social category in interaction. More specifically, I have illustrated that (in addition to the same interactional processes that we have seen throughout sections 1 and 2) gendered ideologies are apparently invoked as resources, at moments when food-related identities are challenged. This invocation of gendered ideologies, serves as a barrier against such challenges, and thus food-related identities are negotiated and reproduced in gendered ways. This may result in the reproduction of the type of hegemonic masculine ideology that Adams (2010a) outlines, i.e. that *meat signifies masculinity* and *vegetables signify femininity*.

Thus, there is ultimately an awareness, and active use of the discourse regarding the gendered politics of meat consumption here, as a participant resource in interaction. And beyond the interactional mechanisms that I have discussed above, the invocation of gendered discourse (toward food-related identity management and identity-related conflict management) presents as another micro-interactional (*personal*) practice that may cumulatively, have macro-level

(*political*) consequences. Particularly as it relates to *gendered* food consumption practices that present wider-ranging ecological; political; and socio-economic concerns. More specifically, we can see that (in excerpt 9), vegetarianism, particularly here – male vegetarianism- represents a political act of resistance, in that the dominant (gendered) position of meat is explicitly oriented to ("meat is king"), and the (male) vegetarian present is treated as 'non-conforming', as he becomes the target of teasing throughout the interaction. As Adams (2010, p. 11) notes: "The male prerogative to eat meat is an external, observable activity implicitly reflecting a recurring fact: meat is a symbol of male dominance". Thus, for a man to abstain from meat is to "challenge an essential part of the masculine role" (p. 17). Thus, such seemingly natural aspects of social life – such as men engaging in witty banter around the fireside at a braai - attain, legitimate, and maintain, their consistent influence in structuring the (asymmetrical) social organisation (as relating to gendered food-related identities here, in particular) that result in larger scale concerns regarding the promotion and practices of meat consumption.

In conclusion, in uncovering the ways in which the intersectional production, negotiation, and management of gender and food-related identities unfold in interaction, this study has gained insight into a problematic aspect of social organisation, which I hope will potentially provide an entry point toward understanding the larger scale concerns regarding the discursive production of meat consumption practices. Globally, we face urgent concerns related to the negative impacts of meat consumption on human health (Clonan, Roberts, & Holdsworth, 2016); animal rights and biodiversity conservation (Machovina, Feeley, & Ripple, 2015; Adams, 2010a; 2010b); and climate change (Goodland, 2009; Eshel & Martin, 2005), amongst other relevant issues. Thus, I hope that this study may be considered to present a contribution to the dearth of literature spanning the interdisciplinary concerns related to ecological; psychological, and social justice imperatives, specifically in relation to the cultural characteristics (gendered politics of meat consumption) and the resistance movements (vegetarianism/veganism) that influence problematic patterns of consumption. As the findings from this study indicate, to resist dominant cultural discourse (via presenting challenges, or disagreements in interaction), is to face the kind of interactional predisposition toward alignment, or group solidarity, that Heritage (1984), Schegloff (2007), and Lerner (1996) discuss. This pervasive and enduring feature of social interaction implicates that to present challenges, or disagreements in everyday social interaction may entail great cost regarding the interactant's social relationships – a cost that, in many cases (as we have seen in this study),

individuals may not be willing to risk. Thus, to quote the popular adage, in alignment with what has been consistently found in the literature (as referred to above), it seems that "some battles are not worth fighting".

This of course does not imply that (counter-hegemonic) challenges are impossible, since as we have seen, they do occur. But, for such micro-level challenges to succeed, and potentially have aggregate, macro-level influence, it is hoped that the findings from this present study may provide important insights regarding what such *personal* acts of resistance might face. Hence, insights toward understanding how such challenges may be conducted to maximise their chances of success. Thus, since this study has provided empirical insights from the micro-environment, in everyday interaction, effectively grounding the kind of macro-environmental theorising about the gendered politics of meat consumption, I hope that it might serve to aid in making explicit the connections between two intersecting social categories, as they, more widely, relate to problematic aspects of social organisation. Further, that it aids in confronting the deeply problematic inconsistencies and disconnects within social justice movements (particularly feminism and vegetarianism/veganism, in this case), which is imperative to the contemporary interdisciplinary concerns related to urgent ecological, psychological, and social justice priorities.

References

Adams, C. J. (1993). The feminist traffic in animals. In G. Gaard (Eds.), *Ecofeminism: women, animals, nature* (pp. 195-219). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Adams, C. J. (1994). *Neither Man Nor Beast: Feminism and the defense of animals*. New York: Continuum.

Adams, C. J. (1995). Woman-battering and harm to animals. In C. Adams and J. Donavan (Eds.), *Animals and women: Feminist theoretical explorations* (pp. 55–84). Durham: Duke University Press.

Adams, C. J. (2003). *The Pornography of Meat.* New York: Continuum.

Adams, C. J. (2006). An animal manifesto: Gender, identity and vegan-feminism in the twenty-first century. *Parallax, 12*(1), 120–28.

Adams, C. J. (2009). Post-meat-eating. In T. Tyler and M. Rossini (Eds.), *Animal encounters* (pp. 47–73). Leiden: Brill.

Adams, C. J. (2010). *The sexual politics of meat (20th Anniversary Edition)* (1st ed.). New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Adams, C. J. (2010). Why feminist vegan now? *Feminism & Psychology, 20*(3), 302–317.

Adams, C. J. (2012). What came before The Sexual Politics of Meat: The activist roots of a critical theory. In M. DeKoven and M. Lundblad (Eds.), *Humane advocacy and cultural theory* (pp. 103–138). New York: Columbia University Press.

Adams, C. J. (2014) [2007]. The war on compassion. In P. MacCormack (Eds.), *The animal catalyst: Towards a human theory* (pp. 15–25). London: Bloomsbury.

Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (1998). Identity as an achievement and as a tool. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk*, 3rd ed. (pp. 1-14). London: Sage.

Bailey, C. (2007). We are what we eat: Feminist vegetarianism and the reproduction of racial identity. *Hypatia, 22*(2), 39–59.

Bastian, B., & Loughnan, S. (2016). Resolving the meat-paradox: A motivational account of morally troublesome behavior and its maintenance. *Personality And Social Psychology Review, 3,* 278-299.

Baxter, J. (2003). Positioning gender in discourse: A feminist methodology. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Beardsworth, A. D., & Keil, E. T. (1992). The vegetarian option: Varieties, conversions, motives and careers. *The Sociological Review, 40*, 253-93.

Bell, D., & Valentine, G. (1997). *Consuming geographies: We are what we eat.* London: Routedge.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Routledge, London.

Chaiken, S., & Pliner, P. (1987). Women, but not men, are what they eat: The effect of meal size and gender on perceived femininity and masculinity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *13*(2), 166-176.

Chan, M. (2008). The global nutrition challenge: Getting a healthy start. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/dg/speeches/2008/20080618/en/

Charles, N., & Kerr, M. (1988). *Women, food, and families.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Chuck, C., Fernandes S. A., & Hyers, L. L. (2016). Awakening to the politics of food: Politicized diet as social identity. *Appetite, 107,* 425-436.

Clonan, A., Roberts, K. E., & Holdsworth, M. (2016). Socioeconomic and demographic drivers of red and processed meat consumption: Implications for health and environmental sustainability. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society, 75*, 367-373.

Deckha, M. (2006). The salience of species difference for feminist theory. *Hastings Women's Law Journal, 17*(1), 1–38.

Deckha, M. (2007). Animal justice, cultural justice: A posthumanist response to cultural rights in animals. *Journal of Animal Law & Ethics, 2*, 183–229.

Deckha, M. (2012). Toward a postcolonial, posthumanist feminist theory: Centralizing race and culture in feminist work on nonhuman animals. *Hypatia, 27*(3), 527–545.

Edwards, D. (1991). Categories are for talking: On the cognitive and discursive bases of categorization. *Theory and Psychology*, *1*, 515–542.

Edwards, D. (2010). Extreme case formulations: Softeners, investment, and doing nonliteral. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *33*(4), 347-373.

Egbert, M. M. (1997). Schisming: The collaborative transformation from a single conversation to multiple conversations. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 30*, 1–51.

Eshel, G., & Martin, P. (2005). Diet, energy, and global warming. *Earth Interactions, 10*(9), 1-17.

Fox, N., & Ward, K. (2008). You are what you eat? Vegetarianism, health and identity.

Social Science & Medicine, 66, 2585-2595.

Fraiman, S. (2012). Pussy panic versus animal liking: Tracking gender in animal studies. *Critical Inquiry, 39*(1), 89–115.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Glen, P. (2003). *Laughter in interaction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gomes Costa Filho, R. (2014). Meat masculinity. *Contexts, 13*(3), 56-58.

Goodland, R., & Anhang, J. (2009). Livestock and climate change: What if the key actors in climate change are...cows, pigs, and chickens? *World Watch Magazine, 22*(6), 10-19. Retrieved from http://www.worldwatch.org/ww/livestock.

Gramsci, A. (1971). Selections from the prison notebooks. In Q. Hoare, & G. N. Smith (Eds.), *State and civil society: What is the state?* New York: International Publishers.

Hamilton, C. (2016). Sex, work, meat: The feminist politics of veganism. *Feminist Review, 114*, 112-129.

Hanisch, C. (1970). The personal is political. In S. Firestone, & A. Koedt (Eds.), *Notes from the second year: Women's liberation: major writings of the radical feminists* (pp. 76 - 78).

Harper, A.B. (2010). *Sistah vegan: Black female vegans speak on food, identity, health, and society*. New York: Lantern Books.

Heritage Day (Public Holiday): Celebrate South African cultural diversity. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.capetownmagazine.com/public-holiday-heritage-day

Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Heritage, J. (1997). Conversation analysis and institutional talk: Analyzing data. In D. Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative research: theory, method and practice* (2nd ed., pp 223-245). London: SAGE Publications.

Holmes, J. (2006). *Gendered talk at work.* Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Holstein, J., & Gubrium, J. (2004). The active interview. In D. Silverman, *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 140-159). London: Sage.

Izmirli, S., & Phillips, C. (2011). The relationship between student consumption of animal products and attitudes to animals in Europe and Asia. *British Food Journal, 113*, 436-450.

Kitzinger, C. (2000). Doing feminist conversation analysis. *Feminism & Psychology*, *10*(2),

163-193.

Kitzinger, C. (2005). Heteronormativity in action: Reproducing the heterosexual nuclear family in after-hours medical calls. *Social Problems, 52*(4), 477-498.

Kitzinger, C. (2008). Developing feminist conversation analysis: A response to Wowk. *Human Studies, 31*, 179-208.

Konig, H. (2017). *Cater for your guests with these easy vegetarian braai ideas.* Retrieved March 13, 2018, from https://southcoastsun.co.za/106214/cater-guests-easy-vegetarian-braai-ideas/

Larsson, C. L., Rönnlund, U., Johansson, G. and Dahlgren, L., (2003). Veganism as a status passage: The process of becoming a vegan among youths in Sweden. *Appetite, 41,* 61-67.

Lerner, G. H. (1996). Finding "face" in the preference structures of talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 59*, 303-321.

Lerner, G. H. (2013). On the place of hesitating in delicate formulations: A turn-constructional infrastructure for collaborative indiscretion. In J. Sidnell, M. Hayashi, & G. Raymond (Eds.), *Conversational repair and human understanding.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Lindeman, M., & Stark, K. (1999). Pleasure, pursuit of health or negotiation of identity? Personality correlates of food choice motives among young and middle-aged women. *Appetite, 33*, 141–161.

Lindeman, M., & Stark, K. (2000). Loss of pleasure, ideological food choice reasons and eating pathology. *Appetite, 35*, 263-268.

Lockie, S. (2001). Food, place and identity: Consuming Australia's 'beef capital'. *Journal of Sociology 37*(3), 239-255.

Machovina, B., Feeley, K.J., & Ripple, W.J. (2015). Biodiversity conservation: The key is reducing meat consumption. *Science of the Total Environment, 536,* 419-431.

Midgley, M. (2007). *Animals and why they matter* (1st ed.). Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Mondada, L. (2006). Video recording as the reflexive preservation-configuration of phenomenal features for analysis. In H. Knoblauch, J. Raab, H.G. Soeffner, & B. Schnettler (Eds.), *Video analysis* (pp. 51–68). Bern: Lang.

Mooney, K., DeTore, J., & Malloy, K.A. (1994). Perceptions of women related food choice. *Sex Roles, 31*(7-8), 433-442.

Mooney, K.M., & Lorenz, E. (1997). The effects of food and gender on interpersonal perceptions. *Sex Roles, 36*(9/10), 639-653.

Parry, J. (2010). Gender and slaughter in popular gastronomy. *Feminism & Psychology, 20*(3), 381–96.

Pomerantz, A. (1986). Extreme case formulations: A way of legitimating claims. *Human Studies, 9*, 219-229.

Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social* construction . London: Sage.

Potter, J. (2002). Two kinds of natural. *Discourse Studies*, *4*(4), 539-542.

Potter, J. (2004). Discourse analysis as a way of analyzing naturally occurring talk. In D. Silverman (ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*. London: Sage.

Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2005). Qualitative interviews in psychology: Problems and possibilities. *Qualitative Research In Psychology, 2*(4), 281-307.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1995). Natural Order: Why social psychologists should study (a constructed version of) natural language, and why they have not done so. *Journal Of Language And Social Psychology*, *14*(1-2), 216-222.

Prevignano, C. L., & Thibault, P. J. (2003). *Discussing conversation analysis: The work of Emanuel A. Schegloff.* John Benjamins Publishing.

Rogers, R. (2008). Beasts, burgers, and hummers: Meat and the crisis of masculinity in contemporary television advertisements. *Environmental Communication*, *2*, 281-301.

Romaniuk, T. (2015). Talking about sexism: Meta-sexist talk in presidential politics. *Journal Of Language And Social Psychology*, *34*(4), 446-463.

Rothgerber, H. (2012). Real men don't eat (vegetable) quiche: Masculinity and the justification of meat consumption. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity.* Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/a0030379.

Sacks, H. (1984a). Notes on methodology. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (1st ed., pp. 21-27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1984b). On doing "being ordinary". In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (1st ed., pp. 413-429). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation* (Vol. I). Cambridge MA: Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking in conversation. *Language, 50*, 696-735.

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica, 8*, 289-327.

Schegloff, E. A. (1980). What Type of Interaction Is It to Be*?* In *The Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics.*

Schegloff, E.A. (1987). Between micro and macro: Contexts and other connections. In J. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Munch, & N. Smelser (Eds.), *The Micro-Marcro Link* (pp. 207-234). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schegloff, E.A. (1992). On talk and its institutional occasions. In P. Drew, & J. Heritage. (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 101-134). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1995). Parties and talking together: Two ways in which numbers are significant for talk-in-interaction. In P. T. Have & G. Psathas (Eds.), *Situated order: Studies in social organisation and embodied activities* (pp. 31–42). Washington: University Press of America.

Schegloff, E.A. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse & Society, 8*(2), 165-187.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007a). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis* (Vol. 1). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007b). A tutorial on membership categorisation. *Journal of Pragmatics. 39*, 462-482.

Sheriff, M., & Weatherall, A. (2009). "Empty nest" or "guilty little secret": Discourses of motherhood at postmaternity. *Feminism & Psychology, 19*, 89-108.

Sneijder, P.W.J., & Temolder, H. (2005). Disputing taste: Foods pleasure as an achievement in interaction. *Appetite, 45*, 51-61.

Sneijder, P., & Molder, H. T. (2009). Normalizing ideological food choice and eating practices: Identity work in online discussions on veganism. *Appetite*, *52*(3), 621-630.

Stapleton, S. R. (2015). Food, identity, and environmental education. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 20*, 12-24.

Stokoe, E. (2009a). Moving forward with membership categorisation analysis: Methods for systematic analysis. *Discourse Studies*, *14*(3), 277-303.

Stokoe, E. (2009b). Doing actions with identity categories. *Text and Talk, 29*(1), 75-97.

Stokoe, E., & Edwards, D. (2006). Story formulations in talk-in-interaction. *Narrative Inquiry, 16*(1), 56-65.

Smithson, J. (2000). Using and analysing focus groups: Limitations and possibilities. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *3*(2), 103-119.

Speer, S. (2002). 'Natural' and 'contrived' data: A sustainable distinction? *Discourse*

Studies, *4*(4), 511-525.

Speer, S. A. (2005). *Gender talk: Feminism, discourse and conversational analysis*. London, England: Routledge.

Speer, S. A. (2012). "Feminist" conversation analysis: Who needs it? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *9*, 292-297.

Speer, S. (2015). Responding to -isms. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *34*(4), 464-470.

Surviving the Braai. (2010). Retrieved March 13, 2018, from http://veggiebunch.co.za/surviving-the-braai/

The American Psychological Association task force on the interface between psychology and global climate change. (2017). *Psychology & global climate change: Addressing a multifaceted phenomenon and set of challenges* (pp. 29-40). Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/science/about/publications/climate-change.aspx.

Turner, K., Ferguson, S., Craig, J., Jeffries, A., & Beaton, S. (2013) Gendered identity negotiations through food consumption. *Young Consumers*, *14*(3), 280-288.

Twigg, J. (1979). Vegetarianism and the meanings of meat. In A. Murcott (Ed.), *The sociology of food and eating* (pp. 18-30). Aldershot, U.K.: Gower.

Twine, R. (2010). Intersectional disgust? Animals and (eco)feminism. *Feminism & Psychology*, *20*(3), 397-406.

Council on Foreign Relations. (2014). *The emerging crisis: Noncommunicable diseases.* Retrieved from https://www.cfr.org/interactives/diseases-noncommunicable?utm_source=redirect&utm_medium=earned&utm_campaign=legacy_campaignotr-marketing_use-NCDs_interactive/#!/

Venter, A.D., Jaars, K., Booyens, W., Beukes, J.P., van Zyl, P.G., Josipovic, M., Hendriks, J., Vakkari, V., Hellén, H., Hakola, H., Aaltonen, H., Ruiz-Jimenez, J., Riekkola, M-L., & Laakso, L. (2015). Plume characterization of a typical South African braai. *South African Journal of Chemistry*, *68*, 181-194.

Verwey, C., & Quayle, M. (2012). Whiteness, racism, and Afrikaner identity in post-apartheid South Africa. *African Affairs*, *111*(445), 551-575.

Weatherall, A. (2012). Conversation analysis as feminist research: A response to Whelan. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *9*, 1-6.

Weatherall, A. (2015). Sexism in language and talk-in-interaction. *Journal Of Language and Social Psychology*, *34*(4), 410-426.

Weatherall, A., & Gallois, C. (2003). Gendered identity: Complexities/intersections. A social psychology perspective. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *Handbook of gender and language* (pp 487-508). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Weatherall, A., & Keevallik, L. (2016) When claims of understanding are less than affiliative. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *49*(3), 167-182.

West, C., & Fenstermaker, S. (1995). Doing difference. *Gender & Society*, *9*(1), 8-37.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, *1*(2), 125-151.

Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse and Society*, *9*, 387-412.

What is a braai? (2009, 17 June). Retrieved from http://www.braai.co.za/blog/generalbraai/what-is-a-braai/

Whitehead, K. (2009). Categorising the categoriser: The management of racial common sense in interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *72*(4), 325-342.

Whitehead, K. (2012). Racial categories as resources and constraints in everyday interactions: Implications for racialism and non-racialism in post-apartheid South Africa. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *35*(7), 1248-1265.

Whitehead, K. (2015). Everyday antiracism in action. *Journal Of Language And Social Psychology*, *34*(4), 374-389.

Whitehead, K., & Stokoe, E. (2015). Producing and responding to *-isms* in interaction. *Journal Of Language And Social Psychology*, *34*(4), 368-373.

Widdicombe, S. (1998). "But you don't class yourself": The interactional management of category membership and non-membership. In Antaki, C. and Widdicombe, S. (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 52-71). London: Sage Publications.

Wiggins, S. (2004). Talking about taste: Using a discursive psychological approach to examine challenges to food evaluations. *Appetite*, *43*, 29–38.

Wowk, M. T. (2007). Kitzinger's feminist conversation analysis: Critical observations. *Human Studies*, *30*, 131-155.

Zimmerman, L. (2012). Integral, ancillary, or incidental. *Teaching Ethics*, *12*(2), 149-155.

Appendices

Appendix A: Ethics Clearance Certificate

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, JOHANNESBURG

HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE (SCHOOL OF HUMAN & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE	**PROTOCOL NUMBER: MASPR/17/002 IH**
PROJECT TITLE:	The gendered production of food-related identities as interactional phenomena: an investigation of talk-in-interaction at the South African braai
INVESTIGATORS	Lewis Ilse
DEPARTMENT	Psychology
DATE CONSIDERED	28/06/17
DECISION OF COMMITTEE*	Approved

This ethical clearance is valid for 2 years and may be renewed upon application

DATE: 28 June 2017

CHAIRPERSON B. Finchilescu
(Prof. Gillian Finchilescu)

cc Supervisor:

Prof. Kevin Whitehead
Psychology

DECLARATION OF INVESTIGATOR (S)

To be completed in duplicate and **one copy** returned to the Secretary, Room 100015, 10th floor, Senate House, University.

I/we fully understand the conditions under which I am/we are authorized to carry out the abovementioned research and I/we guarantee to ensure compliance with these conditions. Should any departure be contemplated from the research procedure, as approved, I/we undertake to submit a revised protocol to the Committee.

This ethical clearance will expire on 31 December 2019

PLEASE QUOTE THE PROTOCOL NUMBER IN ALL ENQUIRIES

Appendix B: Participant Information Sheet & Informed Consent Forms

PSYCHOLOGY
THE SCHOOL OF HUMAN AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (SHCD)

Private Bag 3, Wits, 2050 • Tel: 011 717 4541 • Fax: 011 717 4559 • E-mail: psych.SHCD@wits.ac.za

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH AND PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

We would like to invite you to participate in a research study conducted by Ilse Lewis in the Wits Department of Psychology, under the supervision of Prof. Kevin Whitehead.

What is the purpose of this study?
We are interested in investigating how people interact with each other in naturally occurring, everyday settings. This study will be conducted at a braai amongst friends, as a common South African social event.

What will I be asked to do?
If you volunteer to participate in the study, your ordinary interactions at the braai will be recorded with audio-visual equipment, which will be placed as unobtrusively as possible to limit any discomfort you may experience. Nothing further will be required of you beyond allowing your interaction to be recorded. You will not be asked to discuss any topic in particular, or to change your behaviour in any other way. You should simply go about the braai as you normally would, at any other braai that is not part of a research project.

Will participating put me at any risk or cause me any inconvenience?
As part of this study, we are asking that you allow us to audio- and/or video-record an interaction in which you participate. The recording equipment will be set up so that it will not distract you during the course of the interaction. The recordings from this study will be used for research purposes only (for example as a written final research report, and possible conference presentations and publications). Participating in this study is completely voluntary. If you choose to be in the study, and feel any discomfort as a result of participating, you can change your mind and withdraw from the study at any time, up to the point that data analysis has commenced. If you want the video data in which you appear to be withdrawn from the study, even after the video-recording has been completed, you can request this at any time (up to the point that data analysis has commenced) by contacting myself or my supervisor.

Will the information I give be confidential?
You may be concerned that the things you say or do during your interaction might be made public, and used against you in some way. We want to reassure you that your identity will be kept private, and you will not be personally identified in any research reports or presentations that are made available to public audiences. The recordings will be transcribed by the researcher, and all personal names and identifying details will be excluded from the transcript. You will not be identifiable from the transcriptions.

There is a small risk that you might be recognized from video recordings shown for academic purposes, at professional conferences, or in "screen shots" used in written reports, but you are permitted to

PSYCHOLOGY
THE SCHOOL OF HUMAN AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (SHCD)

Private Bag 3, Wits, 2050 • Tel: 011 717 4541 • Fax: 011 717 4559 • E-mail: psych.SHCD@wits.ac.za

request that data in which you appear not be used in these contexts (see the signature portion at the bottom of this form).

The recordings will be kept indefinitely in a locked storage area and on a password-protected computer. Only myself and my supervisor will have access to them, and only for research purposes.

What are the potential benefits to me and to society?
It is unlikely that you will personally benefit from your participation. However, there will be benefits for me with regards to the completion of my Masters degree. These recordings may also contribute to the development of knowledge about social interactions activities, that may be used as the basis for future interventions designed to bring about positive changes in people's lives.

Will I be paid to participate?
You will not receive any payment for participating in this study and the braai will be organised the same way it ordinarily would – as a 'bring & braai'.

How can I get in contact with the researchers?
The contact details for the supervisor of the research are shown below:

Prof. Kevin Whitehead
E-mail: kevin.whitehead@wits.ac.za
Phone: 011 717 4530

Please feel free to contact him should you have any concerns or enquiries about your participation in the research, alternatively you can feel free to contact me:

Ilse Lewis
E-mail: ilse.lewis.10@gmail.com
Phone: 0824080636

Rights of Research Participants
You may withdraw your consent at any time (up to the point of data analysis commencing) and discontinue participation without any negative consequences. You are not waiving any legal claims or rights because of your participation in this research study. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, you may contact Professor Brett Bowman (brett.bowman@wits.ac.za).

PSYCHOLOGY
THE SCHOOL OF HUMAN AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (SHCD)

Private Bag 3, Wits, 2050 • Tel: 011 717 4541 • Fax: 011 717 4559 • E-mail: psych.SHCD@wits.ac.za

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

If any questions you have about this research have been answered to your satisfaction, and you would like to participate in the research, please print your name and sign below. In addition, please indicate that you consent to being audio and video filmed (check box):

☐ I agree to be audio and video filmed.

Finally, please choose how you will allow recordings in which you appear to be used, by indicating below in which contexts you are willing to have such be played/used (check all boxes that apply). Please remember that you may be identifiable to people who know you and who may be in the audience when the recordings are played.

☐ Presentations delivered at scientific research conferences.

☐ Classroom settings for the purposes of student presentations.

☐ "Screen shots" included in written reports

☐ Direct quotations in final report.

_____
Name of Participant

_____ _____
Signature of Participant Date