

Citation for published version:

Wendy J. Wills, Giada Danesi, Ariadne B. Kapetanaki, and Laura K. Hamilton, 'The Socio-Economic Boundaries Shaping Young People's Lunchtime Food Practices on a School Day', *Children & Society*, Vol. 32 (3): 195-206, May 2018.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.1111/chso.12261>

Document Version:

This is the Accepted Manuscript version.

The version in the University of Hertfordshire Research Archive may differ from the final published version.

Copyright and Reuse:

© 2018 John Wiley & Sons Ltd and National Children's Bureau.

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with [Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving](#).

Enquiries

If you believe this document infringes copyright, please contact Research & Scholarly Communications at rsc@herts.ac.uk

The socio-economic boundaries shaping young people's lunchtime food practices on a school day

Abstract

Little is understood about the relationship between socio-economic deprivation and places where young people purchase food at lunchtime on a school day. This paper draws on qualitative data from 600+ young people aged 13-15 years and illustrates that socio-economic factors produce boundaries that young people sense when buying food. This informs where they seek out lunch and what products, service and prices they access and find acceptable. Such insights help to understand inequalities in young people's health as boundaries confine what is possible in terms of eating on a school day.

Keywords

Lunchtime; food and drink practices; young people; school; socio-economic boundaries

Background

Young people from socio-economically deprived backgrounds tend to have a poorer diet and higher rates of overweight and obesity (Kimbrow 2013, Beghin 2014) and yet the evidence is not yet clear about *why* this inequality exists. Attention often focuses on the role of the family since this is where socio-economic status (SES) and practices are formed (Eldridge et al. 2000, Backett-Milburn et al. 2010) but school is where young people spend the majority of their lives and young people consume a third of their food and drink during the school day (Nelson 2004) therefore this setting is significant in terms of its contribution to overall diet.

The food and drink available to purchase during the school day is not a socio-economically neutral issue (Pollan 2006). What food and drink is sold in high schools and whether it is fully funded by a national government or subsidised for all or only some young people varies at schools within Europe (Polish Eurodyce Unit 2016). Across England and Scotland, young people at high school are only entitled to a free meal if their parental income is below a threshold or the family is in receipt of certain welfare benefits. Only families with low economic capital who have high-school aged children are eligible for FSM in Scotland and England.

Evidence regarding whether areas of high socio-economic deprivation have a greater density of outlets serving foods higher in fat, sugar and salt (such as fast food takeaways) is ambiguous (Moorhouse et al. 2016). It is possible that lower socio-economic status (SES) areas enable businesses to operate with lower costs and overheads, through charging reduced rents for example (Caraher 2016). Operation is only viable, however, if there is a market for purchasing the products on sale therefore businesses that operate near schools have an interest in ensuring that young people want to regularly buy from them and this relationship is not well understood. Conversely, the nature of the relationship between a school and its pupils is based on education as well as a duty of care (**Reference: removed for peer review**). The re-introduction of nutrition standards for food and drink served in UK schools after a gap of almost 30 years (Gillard 2003) and the focus on behaviour management during the lunch period (Daniel et al. 2010) is evidence of this. It is known, however, that young people prioritise social relationships during the school day [**Refs removed for peer review**] therefore the creation of a food and eating environment that benefits young people in terms of enabling them to consume an adequate diet but in a setting that they consider to be socially acceptable may be challenging to achieve within schools. Pupils can resist or object to the duty of care imposed on them (Moore et al. 2013), particularly if food business operators offer something altogether more socially or economically attractive. The purpose of this paper is to therefore explore how the socio-

economic backdrop to young people’s lives shapes and reflects their food and drink purchasing practices during the lunch period at schools located in areas of low, mixed and high socio-economic deprivation.

Research design and methodology

An ethnographic approach utilising multiple qualitative methods was adopted, incorporating a case study design. This approach was to ensure that young people could participate in a range of ways and to take account of nested levels of practice (practices undertaken by different people, at different times and in different settings) (Hammersley et al. 1995, Tellis 1997). Seven case study schools were purposively selected across Scotland after approval was given by regional education departments. Individual schools were contacted that differed in terms of their SES to determine their interest in taking part. Seven were chosen from those interested; four were classified as being of low SES (Schools 1, 2, 3 and 5); two had mixed SES (Schools 4 and 7); and one was selected with high SES (School 6) according to the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (<http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/SIMD>) and the proportion of pupils registered for FSM based on the 2013 dataset (<http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/School-Education/SchoolMealsDatasets/schmeals2013>) (see Table 1). Schools 4 and 7 were classified as being of mixed SES for the following reasons. School 4 was situated in a postcode area signifying low relative socio-economic deprivation but it had a higher than average percentage of pupils registered for FSM. School 7 was also classified similarly because it was in an area of moderate deprivation but with a very high proportion of pupils registered for FSM. Unlike the lower SES school catchment areas, these schools each had two noticeably different areas of housing nearby, where pupils lived. There were streets of private, detached housing but also large, dated, social housing estates within walking distance of each school. The social housing is likely to have contributed to the high FSM eligibility, despite the low/moderate deprivation ranking of the schools’ postcodes.

Table 1. Participating school’s information

	No of students on school roll	SIMD category ¹	% FSM ²	SES	Density of food outlets within 800m of school
Sch01	<600	1 (most deprived)	30-40	High	Moderate ³
Sch02	>1000	1 (most deprived)	10-20	High	Low
Sch03	<1000	1 (most deprived)	20-30	High	Moderate
Sch04	<1000	3 (least deprived)	20-30	Mixed	Moderate
Sch05	<600	1 (most deprived)	20-30	High	High
Sch06	>1000	3 (least deprived)	0-10	Low	Low
Sch07	<600	2 (moderately deprived)	30-40	Mixed	Low

¹ 1 =SIMD ranks 1-2602 (four most deprived deciles); 2 =SIMD ranks 2603-3903 (two middle deciles); 3 =SIMD ranks 3904-6505 (four least deprived deciles)

² % registered for free school meals (FSM) at the school based on the 2013 FSM dataset. The proportion of pupils registered for FSM at secondary schools across Scotland is 15.5% (this includes pupils attending local authority and grant-maintained schools). Ranges are shown rather than exact percentages to protect the identity of the participating schools.

³ 0-20 outlets classified as ‘low’; 21-99 outlets classified as ‘moderate’; 100+ outlets classified as ‘high’ number of outlets.

In terms of recruitment and consent, parents of 13-15 year olds were given opportunity to contact the school or the research team to opt their child out of the study after letters were sent out (none did so). We informed young people about the research through school assemblies and classroom visits and handed out leaflets. Written consent was then obtained from more than 600 young people who participated in one or more qualitative elements of the study (see Table 2). Within classroom-based focus groups young people informed the research team if they did not wish to participate and sat separately from those taking part, or turned their chair away from the group to ensure they were not video-recorded (this was their suggestion).

Table 2. Participants

School	Individual and group interviews	Go-along tours	Focus groups	Semi-structured written activity	Total participants
Sch01	7	7	21	41	76
Sch02	8	0	20	79	107
Sch03	7	3	22	57	89
Sch04	16	2	24	71	113
Sch05	7	0	35	58	100
Sch06	5	4	20	65	94
Sch07	0	0	13	59	72
TOTAL	50	16	155	430	651

The use of multiple methods was based on the overall ethnographic approach and case study design and reflects similar studies (Fletcher et al. 2013, Oncini 2017). The research team undertook periods of two-three weeks **ethnographic observation** in each school cafeteria/dining room and of the local food outlets, to observe the ebb and flow (Hammersley et al. 1995) during the mid-morning break and lunch period. The team photographed and filmed video footage in these settings and wrote detailed fieldnotes to enable a detailed reflection to be undertaken after fieldwork had ended.

During classroom visits young people were invited to volunteer (in friendship groups) on a lunchtime **‘go-along’ tour**, whereby two members of the research team accompanied their group outside the school during the lunch period. This was designed to give participants a chance to talk through their purchasing, to provide the research team with first-hand experience of what it was like to shop for food at lunchtime (Kusenbach 2003).

A **semi-structured written exercise** was administered in the classroom, whereby young people were given maps showing food businesses within 800m; they were asked to highlight outlets they visited, additional outlets not shown on the map and known walking routes to access food businesses. They were also given written prompts and asked to write about lunchtime practices and what, if anything, they discuss with parents about food and drink purchased. Using a written exercise enabled pupils who did not want to participate in other ways to take part.

Individual and peer group **semi-structured interviews** were conducted to ask pupils about marketing practices such as sales promotions, meal deals and offers as well as their food and drink purchases more generally. Interviews occurred following a go-along tour (with individuals) or with those who completed the semi-structured written exercise early, both individually and in groups.

Two classroom-based **focus groups** were conducted at each school. Focus groups gave participants an opportunity to discuss their food and drink purchasing with their peers; the group dynamic (Barbour 2008) enabled a detailed discussion about the benefits or drawbacks of making purchases in school

versus in specific outlets nearby. Focus groups started with the research team showing young people photographs of products and local shops taken during observation as well as maps of the local area, to facilitate discussion.

All head teachers and school kitchen supervisors were invited to take part in **semi-structured interviews**: five head teachers, one wellbeing advisor and seven kitchen supervisors were interviewed individually. They were asked about school food policies and perceptions of the local area. The researchers asked local retailers where young people had been observed shopping to take part in a short interview and 25 of them did so. Retailers were asked about marketing initiatives; pricing strategies; products they sold and their experience with young people who bought food or drink from them. Verbal consent to participate was obtained from all adults who took part.

Ethics approval for the study was obtained from the Health and Human Sciences Ethics Committee with Delegated Authority at the University of [removed for peer review].

Analysis of all data involved an examination and discussion of the data for each school in line with a case study approach (Yin 2003) and thematic analysis (Braun et al. 2006) to account for the complexity and variety within the dataset. This approach is based on earlier studies involving the lead author (**Refs removed for peer review**). Audio, video and photographic data were viewed repeatedly and notes written. Interviews and focus groups were transcribed. All written data, including notes written about the photographs and videos, were coded in NVIVO according to the themes that emerged and the codes were discussed among the research team. We explored themes from the analysis for each case study site and then recombined the data and analysis into a coherent framework for all seven schools.

Findings

Food and eating in schools

There was communality regarding young people's views about food in schools, across the socio-economic spectrum, resonating with earlier research (**Reference: removed for peer review**). The data suggest that many young people disliked eating in school at lunchtime. Inadequate seating and social areas were reported, queues were universally disliked and the food and drink sold was perceived by many as “*unhealthy*” (term used by young people at Sch06), “*disgusting*” (term used by young people at Schools 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7) or “*horrible*” (term used by young people at Schools 1, 5 and 6). Some young people did not express negative perceptions and some appreciated the food and dining service offered by schools, but it was noticeable that SES was not related to negative comments being made by pupils. Findings about the landscape for food and drink practices within schools are only described further below if different to the above commonalities or if they shed light in other ways about socio-economic context. The emergent findings are presented according to the SES of the participating schools.

Low socio-economic status school catchment areas

Around schools classified as having low SES (Schools 1, 2, 3 and 5), young people said they shopped at outlets where they liked the staff, the food/drink available and where they received friendly service as well as good value for money. Food outlet staff reported that they knew and understood local teenagers, having known them and their families for several years. Young people reported visiting the same shops and takeaways with their families in the evening or at weekend thereby helping to develop ongoing relationships with local businesses. The ice cream van outside Sch03, for example, parked near to pupils' houses at weekends. Shop staff made comments that indicated that they treated young people in lower SES areas with respect, valuing their custom. Banter, humour and rapport were evident and young people as well as food outlet staff said they viewed these encounters as enjoyable.

'I sometimes think the bairns get some raw deals with some shops eh...we don't do that...the children see that and they think "well, we're not getting shoved aside in here"' (Owner of takeaway close to Sch01)

'The man who is in the [food] van is very friendly and that's a big draw for people to go there' (Young person talking about food van near Sch03)

School staff, particularly kitchen supervisors, saw local families as *"under privileged"* (Kitchen supervisor at Sch05) and believed this negatively influenced what food or drink young people were willing to purchase:

'A lot of the pupils here are, you know, like maybe broken homes or like, you know' (Kitchen Supervisor, Sch01)

'A lot of it starts from the house, I mean a lot of its to do with the way they've been brought up as well...it's fast food outlets they're going to, isn't it' (Kitchen Supervisor, Sch03)

'As I say, a lot of it stems from, a lot of these kids are under privileged and they don't know what a cooked meal is' (Kitchen Supervisor, Sch05)

Some kitchen supervisors tried to accommodate young people's preferences by, for example, serving food in a disposable, takeaway pot (*"if that's what they want...if they want to go out and eat it they can, eh"* Kitchen supervisor, Sch01) though there was no evidence that this was an effective strategy. Some Head Teachers expressed exasperation at trying to *"police"* (Sch02) or change what young people selected to purchase inside or outside of school, illustrating the scale of the perceived task of improving diet, in addition to attending to the core task of educating young people and managing their behaviour (Fletcher et al. 2013).

Staff in lower SES schools were frequently described negatively by young people, who felt rushed and misunderstood by these adults; this stood out in stark contrast to the relationships they described with businesses in the local neighbourhood. Rapport, humour or banter did not often feature in regard to relationships between young people and staff in school and pupils described wanting to escape the school environment at lunchtime. The school dining environment was often viewed as inaccessible. The cafeteria in these schools was closed during exam periods, for example, as the schools did not have sufficient space elsewhere to accommodate pupils taking exams (this was not raised as an issue at other schools) and young people did not feel able to 'hang out' with friends in the cafeteria after eating. The data clearly show that the physical and social environment of these schools was not conducive to a pleasant lunchtime experience.

'[The catering staff] kick us out early just so they can clean and go home early' (Young person, Sch01)

'The school never put the tables out anymore [in the cafeteria] so there is nowhere to sit' (Young person, Sch02)

Food and drink was often sold locally at discounted prices at lunchtime (compared to the evening) and young people felt this offered value for money; they said they could shop around to eat and drink the amount that they wanted to (portion sizes were commented on favourably) within their daily budget. Food and drink in schools was seen as expensive in comparison and was generally viewed negatively in terms of portion size, price and quality. Prices were often described as not being visible in schools, which raised anxiety in young people who wanted to be certain they had enough money to buy what they wanted before reaching the point of purchase. Some pupils said they received a small amount of money from parents despite taking FSM and therefore felt able to accompany friends outside school, to buy a drink, for example.

'[We] check prices and...go into more than one shop to save money' (Young person, Sch02)

'We do them things a bit cheaper for the school kids, I think they like that as well' (Food retailer near Sch05)

Schools within mixed socio-economic status catchment areas

Mixed SES played out in several ways in terms of food and drink purchasing, both within and outside these schools. There was considerable talk by young people about the affordability and pricing of food and drink, rather than value for money. Young people did not always have the money needed to purchase what they wanted to satiate their tastes (or stomachs) at lunchtime and this meant there was more talk about hunger and 'going without'. This issue of affordability related to eating at school as well as in the local neighbourhood.

'If I was to stay in school all the time...I'd spend like a lot more money than I do outside school, so I'm better going to the shop' (Young person, Sch07)

'It's supermarket prices', 'it's expensive compared to other shops' 'it's expensive for the sandwiches' 'it's a rip off' (Focus group, Sch04)

'What about if some people's mum or dad can't afford to give them money. Not even a pound, if they haven't got spare, they might have five kids, and they've got to give them break and lunch [money], and people say it's cheaper at school and that, it's no wonder people don't come to school' (Young person, Sch07)

Pupils discussed lack of fairness about whether their family was eligible for FSM; working parents were viewed as being penalised if earning above the threshold that related to FSM eligibility and young people voiced their anger about this, particularly at Sch07.

'I think everyone should get money on their [payment] card, not just ones whose mums don't work'. 'If they work it's not fair, it doesn't mean they can afford it' (Focus group, Sch07)

Those who took FSM at these schools did not receive additional money from parents and were therefore excluded from accompanying friends to shop outside at lunchtime. Young people receiving FSM were viewed by other pupils as unable to afford all the food and drink needed to get through the school day.

'If they do get free school meals, then they don't get any money, but then they'll be hungry by break, and then lunch and they can't get both' (Young person, Sch07)

School kitchen supervisors agreed that if young people wanted to buy food for breakfast or mid-morning break as well as at lunchtime that the FSM allowance would not cover this. Kitchen Supervisors felt that the allowance did, however, allow young people to purchase a full lunch, including unlimited bread and salad, but this type of full 'meal' was not what most young people wanted to purchase (**Reference: removed for peer review**).

The food outlets within a 10-minute walk of each school presented a contrast, both in terms of where they were physically located, on different 'sides' of the schools, but also because they were either fairly run down, selling cheaper food and drink (located close to social housing) or more specialised and 'up market', with correspondingly higher prices (and situated near to private and detached dwellings). Many young people we spoke to did not feel they could access the latter outlets either because of unaffordability or because they felt uncomfortable or "a little put off" by them (young person, Sch04).

Unlike in the lower SES areas, young people at these mixed SES schools said they were regarded with suspicion by food outlet staff and not treated equally with adult shoppers. They were required to leave

their school bags outside the shop, were not allowed to use the staffed tills in one supermarket chain and reported concern about being accused of shoplifting. A lack of respect or understanding was not always in the direction from adults towards young people, however. At Sch04 pupils and school staff described racist comments made by several young people towards the staff of a Chinese takeaway (about their ethnicity), which forced the business to close. In other instances, some pupils reported that they reacted to the way they were treated by shop staff by laughing or taunting them.

'[The manager] just screams at you,' 'she's really funny, like funny to laugh at,' 'she patrols the door' (Focus group, Sch04, taking about a small supermarket).

The young people who frequented food businesses in the poorer part of the catchment area reported much cheaper prices but these outlets were viewed by many young people, parents and teachers as being sites of conflict, unhygienic and where teenagers congregated to smoke cigarettes. These places were described as busy, dirty and offering greasy food. This reputation was alluring and off-putting in equal measure to young people and acted as a boundary around lunchtime practices, with some young people willing to step across the boundary and others afraid to do so.

'[Mum said] don't go up to R.'s because like R.'s is the place where everyone goes to smoke and stuff like that and it might get out of hand...so just don't go near it' (Young person, Sch04)

'I don't like just eating cold food for lunch. Like at the S they do have hot stuff, it's far, far too greasy....there's not a lot of choice, well obviously there's choice in a shop but it's all crap, I want like proper food, that's why I go to my grandad's' (Young person, Sch07)

School 6: An area of high SES

The findings from Sch06, situated in an area of high SES highlighted different ways that social as well as economic capital played out for young people from more affluent backgrounds. Family influence on lunchtime food and drink practices was more explicit and evident in the data. Young people and the school kitchen supervisor reported that parents were keen to know what was being purchased and consumed at lunchtime. The kitchen supervisor said that parents would phone to ask what their child was buying or eating or to express concern about a young person's diet and the head teacher saw this as helpful for parents.

'They have got like a direct line to me, they can phone me up at any time, a lot of the parents do....like you get a lot of people like 'I'm watching what they're eating', maybe 'I've put them on a diet', so I can check what the kid's been buying' (Kitchen Supervisor, Sch06)

'Parents who are probably concerned about what they are consuming around school, so it allow them to a certain extent to supervise and influence...what they are eating during the school day' (Head Teacher, Sch06)

Young people reported that parents took a keen interest in knowing what they had to eat and drink and a felt parental gaze guided young people's selections at lunchtime, with many commenting that parents would be unhappy if they knew that less than healthy choices (such as chips bought outside school) were being made on a regular basis. This contrasts with young people's reports at all the other schools studied, where parents, if they asked about lunch, were reported to be more concerned with whether food or drink had been consumed, rather than what had been eaten. Parents also shaped young people's food habits more explicitly at Sch06 through the provision of a packed lunch. This was the only high school studied where a packed lunch culture was evident; young people appeared content to eat their lunch brought from home in the cafeteria and there was little negative comment about the physical surroundings. The head teacher at Sch06 was fairly scathing about the food sold at

his school and the lengthy queues in the cafeteria but he described positively the space he wanted available to young people.

'I've always seen it as... the school is a kind of safe haven for the students and you shouldn't be afraid to come in here and eat in here' (Head teacher, Sch06)

There were five food businesses within a 10-minute walk of the school and four of these were visited by young people during the period of observation. The outlets were perceived as clean and sociable places where young people were known and respected. The school head teacher encouraged young people to bring the food and drink bought at these businesses into school, rather than to eat outside the school gate; this was not encouraged at the other schools studied.

Young people managed to access takeaway food from further afield than 800 metres at Sch06 as parents and older siblings were reported to fetch food from takeaways and drive it to school at lunchtime. Additionally, some young people reported phoning a branded pizza chain and arranging lunchtime delivery. Affordability and value for money were not raised by young people at this school and indeed some pupils talked about having money left over from their lunchtime allowance.

Discussion

The analysis suggests that socio-economic factors influence young people's lunchtime food and drink practices at several related levels, and this differentially structures what is purchased, and from where. The local neighbourhood around a high school and the school itself act as boundaries, in terms of physical, economic and social environments and this shaped the food and drink on sale. Young people's reports of parental and peer attitudes as well as the views of school staff and local businesses further form the socio-economic boundaries that affected young people's purchasing. Young people attending the schools with lower SES felt excluded from the school environment at lunchtime as it inhibited socialising with peers in this space (Daniel et al. 2010). To overcome this, young people left the school grounds so they could spend time with friends, shopping and eating at places where they were known and welcomed thereby bonding in their own defined and respectable spaces (Clavering 2010). These young people achieved parity between their home life and their lunchtime practices by going outside school at lunchtime in the same way that many young people from the more affluent school found parity in terms of social 'fit' by eating a home-packed lunch at a school that made them feel welcome. Both sets of practices illustrate social capital (Bourdieu 1986), in terms of the ways that young people draw on, and from, their social networks (whether school friends, school staff or local retailers) in ways that are comfortable to them. Young people at mixed SES schools had a more difficult time than the other pupil studied when trying to bridge a socio-economic connection at lunchtime. Young people had to select from run-down food outlets locally that had a 'bad reputation' or shop at more up-market outlets with a better range of food and drink but at prices that many could not afford. Young people were not as likely to be made to feel welcome as a valued customer or respected as a neighbour by shopkeepers if they were living in a mixed SES area. Similarly, young people sometimes felt like 'outsiders' even within the school system because many were not eligible for FSM and were aware that some families and young people could not afford to purchase the food and drink that they wanted or needed. Rather than the school lunch period representing an opportunity to develop or draw on social or economic capital young people living in this dual-landscape of affluence and relative deprivation were caught between socio-economic boundaries. This runs counter to Governments' thinking that socially mixed residential areas enhance social capital (Nast et al. 2014). The longer-term impact of living in such a landscape is worthy of future study as it was at this socio-economic nexus that class-based marginalisation and stratification seemed most noticeable (Fletcher et al. 2013).

Whilst socio-economic boundaries around food and eating practices were evident from the data analysed, there is insufficient evidence from this study that young people eat a nutritionally poorer

diet if living in a low or mixed SES area. Young people attending the school with higher SES reported parental concern about the quality of their diet and parents were more likely to provide a packed lunch, plus they had a head teacher more willing to allow young people to make the school cafeteria into a space in which they could socialise and ‘make their own’ but this does not necessarily relate to eating a healthier diet (nor does it indicate that parents with children at lower SES schools are not interested in what young people eat (Backett-Milburn et al. 2006)). Young people at Sch06 had the confidence to order pizza for delivery at lunchtime, asked their parents and siblings to fetch takeaway food and drive it to school and the Head allowed food and drink bought outside the premises into the school. Sch06 was at the centre of a different social and economic context, co-produced by parents, school staff and young people in a way not evident at other schools and this could potentially be conducive to eating a healthier diet; it would be foolhardy, however, to assume that different forms of social capital, underpinned by greater affluence, automatically results in a better dietary outcome. More research would be needed to draw firmer conclusions about SES and diet quality, to explore all food and drink consumed, including packed lunches, and throughout the whole day, not just over the lunch period. Without further comprehensive research, conclusions about differences in SES offer insight into why inequalities exist in food and drink purchasing but no further awareness about links with positive or negative outcomes. Studies of younger children have provided some insights, however (Oncini et al. 2017)

Our findings indicate that eligibility for FSM excludes some young people from food and drink purchasing during the school day and the FSM allowance does not allow young people to purchase food and drink at multiple points in the day (as the spending limit is capped for those in receipt of FSM and they cannot purchase at mid-morning break as well as the lunch period). For young people whose parents are unable to give them money to buy food and drink, they are not only socially excluded from participating in important lunchtime practices that contribute to social capital they are going through the school day on an empty stomach. One argument for introducing FSM for all young people (universal FSM) is to ensure this does not happen (Royston et al. 2012). Universal FSM also encourages commensality through sitting and eating together, regardless of family background or circumstances, providing a chance to develop bonds regardless of economic assets. Whether this benefit (and policy) is achievable in the UK would need testing however, given that proximity to people from other social groups does not necessarily mean that bonds are established or outcomes are positive and foreseen (Daly 2008).

Conclusion

Whilst the study discussed in this paper was conducted in only one part of the UK, it highlights that socio-economic status is a multi-layered phenomenon that moulds young people’s expectations about food and drink purchasing. At a time when young people become more autonomous during the school day and when faced with increased ‘choices’ (compared to when eating at primary school, when food choice is limited) SES is likely to influence where young people seek out food and drink and what products, service and prices they find acceptable. This socio-economic layering and the boundaries it creates needs to be taken account of considering interventions to improve young people’s diets.

References

- Backett-Milburn, K., W. J. Wills, S. Gregory and J. Lawton (2006). "Making sense of eating, weight and risk in the early teenage years: views and concerns of parents in poorer socio-economic circumstances." *Social Science & Medicine* **63**(3): 624-635.
- Backett-Milburn, K., W. J. Wills, M. Roberts and J. Lawton (2010). "Food and family practices: teenagers, eating and domestic life in differing socio-economic circumstances." *Children's Geographies* **8**(3): 303-313.
- Barbour, R. (2008). *Doing Focus Groups*. London, Sage.

- Beghin, L., Dauchet, L., De Vriendt, T., Cuenca-Garcia, M., Manios, Y., Toti, E. (2014). "Influence of parental socio-economic status on diet quality of European adolescents: results from the HELENA study." British Journal of Nutrition **111**: 1303-1312.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. J. G. Richardson. New York, Greenwood.
- Braun, V. and V. Clarke (2006). "Using thematic analysis in psychology " Qualitative Research in Psychology **3**(2): 83.
- Caraher, M., Lloyd, S., Mansfield, M., Alp, C., Brewster, Z. & Gresham, J. (2016). "Secondary school pupils' food choices around schools in a London borough: Fast food and walls of crisps." Appetite **103**(208-220).
- Clavering, E. (2010). *Between and betwixt. Classed Intersections: Spaces, Selves, Knowledges*. Y. Taylor. Farnham, Ashgate.
- Daly, M., Silver, H. (2008). "Social exclusion and social capital: A comparison and critique." Theory and Society **37**(6): 537-566.
- Daniel, P. and U. Gustafsson (2010). "School lunches: children's services or children's spaces?" Children's Geographies **8**(3): 265-274.
- Eldridge, J. and A. Murcott (2000). "Adolescents' dietary habits and attitudes: unpacking the 'problem of (parental) influence'." Health **4**(1): 25-49.
- Fletcher, A., F. Jamal, N. Fitzgerald-Yau and C. Bonell (2013). "'We've Got Some Underground Business Selling Junk Food': Qualitative Evidence of the Unintended Effects of English School Food Policies." Sociology **48**(3): 500-517.
- Gillard, D. (2003). "Food for Thought: child nutrition, the school dinner and the food industry." Retrieved 9th September 2017, from www.educationengland.org.uk/articles/22food.html
- Hammersley, M. and P. Atkinson (1995). Ethnography: Principles in Practice. London, Routledge.
- Kimbro, R. T., & Denney, J.T. (2013). "Neighborhood context and racial/ethnic differences in young children's obesity: structural barriers to interventions." Social Science & Medicine **95**: 97-105.
- Kusenbach, M. (2003). "Street Phenomenology: The Go-Along as an Ethnographic Research Tool. Ethnography, **4**(3), pp. 455-485."
- Moore, L., A. De Silva-Sanigorski and S. Moore (2013). "A socio-ecological perspective on behavioural interventions to influence food choice in schools: Alternative, complementary or synergistic? ." Public Health Nutrition **16**(6): 1000-1005.
- Moorhouse, J., A. B. Kapetanaki and W. J. Wills (2016). *Within Arm's Reach: School Neighbourhoods and Young People's Food Choices*. London, Food Research Collaboration Policy Brief.
- Nast, J. and B. Blokland (2014). "Social Mix Revisited: Neighbourhood Institutions as Setting for Boundary Work and Social Capital." Sociology **48**(3): 482-499.
- Nelson, M. (2004). *Schools Meals in Secondary Schools in England*. DfES Research Report 557, Food Standards Agency/Department for Education and Skills.
- Oncini, F. (2017). "The Holy Gram: Strategy and Tactics in the Primary School Canteen." Journal of Contemporary Ethnography **Online early**: 1-31.
- Oncini, F. and R. Guetto (2017). "Determinants of dietary compliance among Italian children: disentangling the effect of social origins using Bourdieu's cultural capital theory." Sociology of Health & Illness **39**(1): 47-62.
- Polish Eurodyce Unit (2016). *School Meals in Europe*. Warsaw, Polish Eurodyce Unit.
- Pollan, M. (2006). The Omnivore's Dilemma: A Natural History of Four Meals. London, Penguin Press.
- Royston, S., L. Rodrigues and D. Hounsell (2012). *Fair and Square: A policy report on the future of free school meals*. London, The Children's Society.
- Tellis, W. (1997). "Application of a case study methodology." The Qualitative Report **3**(3).
- Yin, R. K. (2003). Applications of case study research. London, Sage.