



Analysis on food and nutrition education political guidelines

Análise sobre orientações políticas de educação alimentar e nutricional

Marina Noronha Costa do Nascimento¹
Maria Cláudia da Veiga Soares Carvalho¹
Shirley Donizete Prado²

¹ Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Instituto de Nutrição Josué de Castro. Rio de Janeiro-RJ, Brasil.

² Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Centro Biomédico, Instituto de Nutrição. Rio de Janeiro-RJ, Brasil.

This paper is derived from the Master's Thesis *Orientações políticas de educação alimentar e nutricional: uma análise crítica do "Marco de referência de educação alimentar e nutricional para políticas públicas"* [Public Guidelines for Food and Nutrition Education: a critical analysis of *Reference Landmark of Food and Nutrition Education for Public Policies*], by Marina Noronha da Costa do Nascimento. (Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, 2016 / Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, 2016).

Correspondence
Marina Noronha Costa do Nascimento
E-mail: mnoronha.nutri@hotmail.com

Abstract

Viewing the government agenda from the perspective of the Humanities and Social Sciences as part of a dynamic social structure that produces political documents that work in a reflexively way, and motivate educational actions concerning food practices, the aim of the research presented in this paper is to analyze the Food and Nutrition Education (FNE) guidelines and educational policies found in the official document *Marco de referência de educação alimentar e nutricional para políticas públicas*, [Reference Landmark of Food and Nutrition Education for Public Policies], using the concept of ideology and its link with education. The methodological approach adopted consisted in information retrieval and document analysis, which enabled systematic evaluation of the document from the dimensions proposed by Cellard (2010). The document presents directives and guidelines for FNE practices in an idealized and simplified way, despite the issue's complexity. Some complex aspects and contradictions inherent to the educational process were analyzed, such as use of a supposedly transformative discourse, based on Freire's freeing education, but that does not escape some "banking model" features in its intention to moralize FNE actions, reducing them to a pattern of "right eating habits" to be followed, which are not harmonious with the socially unequal Brazilian reality.

Keywords: Food and Nutrition Education. Public Policy. 'Marco EAN 2012'

Resumo

Entendendo, na perspectiva das Ciências Humanas e Sociais, as agendas governamentais como parte de uma estrutura social dinâmica que produz documentos políticos, que, de modo reflexivo, motivam processo educativo em alimentação, o objetivo da pesquisa que inspirou este artigo foi analisar as principais diretrizes e orientações políticas de Educação Alimentar e Nutricional (EAN) presentes no *Marco de referência de educação alimentar e nutricional para políticas públicas*, utilizando o conceito de ideologia em sua relação com educação para fundamentar a discussão. O percurso metodológico adotado compreendeu a pesquisa documental e a análise documental, que possibilitaram sistematizar a avaliação do documento a partir das dimensões propostas por Cellard. O documento apresenta seus princípios e orientações para as práticas de EAN de modo idealizado, e simplificado, ainda que o tema seja denso e complexo. Foram analisados aspectos complexos de contradições inerentes ao processo educativo, como o uso de um discurso que se pretende transformador, fundamentado na educação libertadora freiriana, mas que não escapa de um aspecto “bancário”, quando reflete a intenção de moralizar práticas, regulando-as em um modelo que se quer ‘certo sobre um fazer EAN’ que tensiona com a realidade da desigualdade social perversa brasileira.

Palavras-chave: Educação Alimentar e Nutricional. Políticas Públicas. Marco de EAN 2012.

Introduction

Under the perspective of Humanities and Social Sciences, and understanding government agendas as part of a dynamic social structure, which change in accordance with the political, economic and cultural context, and which reflexively influence as much as express modes of understanding the process of food education, this paper analyzes the main Food and Nutrition Education (FNE) directives of the official document *Marco de referência de educação alimentar e nutricional para políticas públicas* [Reference Landmark of Food and Nutrition Education for Public Policies] (henceforth *Landmark*),¹ and questions its underlying notions of *good food education*; it intends to contribute to the assessment of FNE public policies, understanding them as a reflex of social and institutional relations, the intention of which set the path to be followed.

If, on the one hand, public policies on food and nutrition seek to guide such practices, on the other, they reflect them, and often come into being in order to provide answers and normalize them, despite their previous non-normalized existences, thus expressing ideological ideals of “good education” or “good eating habits” to be attained

However, rather than delimiting right and wrong, or presenting answers and solutions, this paper undertakes a critical analysis. It does not wish to propose a new text for a new policy, but to think on the conflicts and discussions on public policies, which is the function of research.

It wishes to reflect on ideologies sustaining ascriptions of “right” or “adequate” to these guidelines from a critical perspective, since by so doing it is possible to understand the formulation of policies, with their specificities, without naturalizing them, observing the complex relations between documents and their engendering context.

The understanding of how FNE policies come into being requires *understanding the economic, political and social environments in this country, in the historical moment of their implementation*.² We thus believe that the nature of FNE practice may, too, be determined, amongst other elements, by its economic, political and social environment.

In the mid 2000s, a new cycle was inaugurated in Brazilian politics, when a candidate from the *Partido dos Trabalhadores* [Worker’s Party] (PT) stepped into office as president. Fight against hunger and debate on Food Security and Nutrition (FSN) resumed position in government agenda, and the participation of civil society in the formulation and implementation of federal public policies took up a strategic role.

FNE was once again discussed in the context of public policies, and conceived as government action. Teaching and research institutions and government and civil society representatives began to share action strategies, knowledge construction, formulation and implementation of policies, in issues relating to food and nutrition; Brazil began to institute national policies by socially participative processes, such as *Política Nacional de Alimentação e Nutrição* [National Food and Nutrition Policy] (PNAN) and *Política Nacional de Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional* [National Food Security and Nutrition Policy] (PNSAN).³

Regarding the theoretical and methodological approach, it is identifiable in these policies discourse on *transformative* and *dialogical* FNE, assuming a *problematizing* perspective, with a view to overcome a purely instrumental and instructional take on education.

These policies are essentially committed to the promotion of individual autonomy, based on interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity, respect for other cultures, valuing history and regional diversity, while at the same time recognizing popular knowledge and fostering local biodiversity and environmental sustainability.⁴

The theoretical background of this research is based on the conception of ideology and its link to education. It is necessary to dwell a bit on our understanding of ideology, as this concept is often naturalized, and therefore demands authors and theories to establish how the research object is to be approached.

Ideology: one possible perspective

We here approach ideology – which concept was first tackled by Marx in the nineteenth century – with the help of Chauí,^{5,6} in order to adjust it to the analysis and discussion here proposed, inserting it in the educational context problematized by Paulo Freire.⁷

Marx's concept highlights the illusion of thinking and acting according to “our” understanding and “our” freedom, as we are unaware of an invisible power that forces us to think and act the way we do. This power, which is social, he named *ideology*.⁸

Ideology, understood as an ideal elaboration of reality, substitutes the idea of reality by reality; it stems from social practice, from the social activity of human beings when they begin to represent such activity to themselves.⁵

In order to understand ideology, it is also necessary to understand *social alienation*: a reproducing social imaginary that deviates attention from reality, and is used to conceal the truth. This social imaginary reproduces reality, enhancing it with seductive, magical and embellished features, which reinforce the present as unquestionable and unavoidable. Such imaginary is made up of ready-made and seemingly final explanations, and justifies the world as it seems to be.⁶

For example, the ideas of “a better world” or of “good education” or, still, the idea of “adequate eating habits” to be attained may, on the one hand, motivate actions for the construction of a future project of life, and, in this sense, present an active character which mobilizes individuals to create, becoming agents of transformation.

On the other hand, the idea of a better world, which is difficult to be attained, may demobilize and alienate, in the sense of preventing possible connections to be built between individuals and future projects, making them passive and showing little autonomy.

When does this system of ideas and representations on reality lead individuals closer to an understanding of reality, and, inclusively, makes them an active part thereof as transforming agents? Or, conversely, when does it sever such bonds, promoting apathy and dependency? The answer depends on the context and on the position of agents in the field in which analysis is being made, as it adapts to external elements pertaining to local culture. The intention here is to problematize and reflect on public policy assessment; it is observable that some FNE public policies in Brazil promote a logic of “adequate” or “healthy” eating habits.

PNAN's latest edition (Ministry of Health, 2013) presents, as one of its *directives*, the Promotion of Adequate and Healthy Eating [Promoção da Alimentação Adequada e Saudável] (PAAS). The document understands adequate and healthy eating as:

[A] dietary practice that is *appropriate to the biological and sociocultural* aspects of individuals as well as to a *sustainable use of the environment* [...]; referenced by food culture and by gender, race and ethnicity; *accessible* from a physical and financial standpoint; *harmonious* in quantity and quality; based on adequate and sustainable production practices; with *minimum quantities of physical, chemical and biological contaminants*. (Emphases added.)⁹

The *Guia alimentar para a população brasileira* [Nutrition Guide for the Brazilian Population] presents, in a more recent version, a set of guidelines for healthy eating. Its second chapter, on food choice, contains recommendations for the composition of a nutritionally balanced, healthy and culturally appropriate meal, which also promotes socially and environmentally sustainable food systems.¹⁰

They thus show constant concern in thinking of quality food and/or FNE in terms of adequacy to *healthy* standards. But healthy to whom? Adequate to what, or to whom?

Kuwaie,¹¹ when analyzing ideas on healthy eating in a group of senior citizens, comments that this definition intersections with cultural and nutritional categories, and that these realms are not always converging, nor do they always share standards on what is and is not healthy.

Eating is a complex theme to be analyzed and understood, precisely because it is a biological, psychological and social phenomenon, in which these three dimensions of human life are expressed (and enmeshed).

Thus, thinking about the “better world” or “better eating” that some policies seek means thinking about to what extent eating habits are likely to change, or to what extent these policies prompt action, including individuals as agents or, conversely, have them subservient to an unfeasible text.

In a country of continental like Brazil – with all the ensuing cultural (and nutritional) implications –, which is still one of the most socially unequal countries of Latin America,¹² is it possible to speak of a single proper way of eating?

It is necessary to analyze the political text – that is, what is politically recommended –, which, as any other text, has interests, motivations, ideologies; it is necessary to problematize its guidelines for FNE practices, founded on the concept of ideology, seeking to identify how it acts: Does it dissimulate? Hide? Silence? Intervene? Naturalize reality?

The education that invades our lives...

Among the possible conceptions and theories of education, the line affiliated to the thought of Paulo Freire was chosen as reference in this work. The intention here is not to state what Freire claims to be education, but to show a path for the education here under discussion, and use the relevant concepts as analytical tools for FNE discussion.

Paulo Freire's take on education⁷ is based on a pedagogy of humans beings in a permanent freeing process, in a philosophical view of a future project of social transformation by *freedom* and *awareness*, one of the most important aspects of his ideology. Under this perspective, awareness means to develop a problematizing concept of reality; it is composed of two fundamental moments: *knowing* in order to *transform*. It is here possible to see an ideological link with the FNE context that was developed.

The main characteristics of the *freeing education* announced by Freire is its problematizing essence, part of action and reflection on the world so as to transform it,⁷ which affirms dialogicity and is made dialogical. Freeing education does not foster certainty and truth conceived as final, nor should it harbor safety; instead, it should raise problems and provoke transforming conflicts.¹³

Freeing education is opposed to what Freire calls *domesticating, banking or alienating education*. According to Freire,¹³ such education comes from a dominant and oppressive social structure.

The banking model of education is narrative; it speaks of reality as something stable, pigeonholed and well behaved. The educator is its undisputed agent, whose task is to fill students with contents, bit of reality completely disconnected from the narrative as a whole. Education thus becomes a domination practice.

However, Freire^{7,13} states that this model is characterized not only by "content deposits", but by an attitude which annuls or creates obstacles to the development of critical thinking, inhibiting human being's disposition to "the reflection on being".

Brandão¹⁴ discusses education as a "network of exchanges of universal knowledge", which may exist as a broad inventory of direct interpersonal relations: family, social equipment, health, school, etc. In this sense, a broader conception of education is possible, an education which is part of life, which happens anytime, anywhere, beyond school walls, and under various forms and practices in very different situations.

It is from this perspective on education that FNE was here looked at and thought upon. Founded on *reflection on reality* as one of its starting points in order to understand the *social context* with its agents, interests and struggles, it *guides education practice*, since each human being is spatially, temporally, socially and contextually situated.

Thus, education occupies life, is intermingled with life and is impregnated by life. Freire⁷ perceives education as living practice itself in its entirety; it is to pronounce the world, change it, with “critical and planetary” consciousness from within a historical standing point.

Therefore, problematizing FNE is to face the challenges on education action in life. Thus, the analytical process undertaken by this article presupposes symbolic exchanges, in so far as it is made in accordance with what culture and local context considers as good or as having quality.

In this context, it looks at the *Landmark* as its object, questioning its conceptions on education and their presentation. What is the current educational context?

Method

Interest in analyzing FNE’s directives and public policies within the Brazilian political agenda led to seeking a type of research that would enable the systematization of documentary assessment.

The approach here chosen was qualitative, giving emphasis not to quantification or data description, but to the relevance of the information to be generated from a careful and critical look at documentary sources.¹⁵ In the case of the present research, the main document under analysis is the *Landmark*.

Our methodology is based on Cellard,¹⁶ who proposes a model of critical assessment of documents, to be analyzed in five dimensions: (1) the document’s context of production; (2) the author’s identity, interest and motivations; (3) textual authenticity and reliability; (4) the nature of the text; (5) the text’s key concepts and internal logic.

Corsetti¹⁷ analyzes the use of documents in the area of History of Education, and criticizes the fact that, for a long time, it was related to the construction of what is termed Official History. Currently, the idea is not to “fetishize” documents, believing that they may “tell” all truths, but to “problematize” them as sources, question them so as to confirm, invalidate and enrich hypotheses, rather than limit them to an inductive framework.¹⁶

It is a deconstructive – cutting, organizing, identifying elements, describing relations – and reconstructive process by several readings and rereadings.

Results and analysis

The results of the analysis here presented, in association with the aforementioned theoretical perspective, have provided foundation for a critical and constructive view of a demand in the field of food education, by the relevance of this theme in the FNE field.

Context

By examining the current context of FNE practices, it is possible to state, agreeing with Santos,¹⁸ that FNE reflects a political conjecture. It was this transforming universe –a universe in demand of other needs and basic rights such as health, housing, education, etc. –, which the present research aimed at understanding.

The current moment in Brazil is deemed relevant by the Brazilian government for FNE public policies. The *Plano Nacional de Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional* [National Plan for Food Security and Nutrition] (PLANSAN) proposes explicit goals for FNE actions, and predicts the publication of a Conceptual Framework for public policies. By means of a political trend in the field, it was possible to formalize it, recognizing the importance of FNE as a strategy for the promotion of healthy eating.

Santos¹⁹ views the Landmark as a document providing concepts, principles and directives which intend to contribute to the construction of guided practices, to be converted into more qualified FNE axes, guides and programs. Another aspect of the document which Santos approaches was its construction process, which involved different sectors of Brazilian society, and exemplifies the attempt to be faithful to one of the documents' composing principles, active and informed participation of the subjects.

Intersectionality and integration among government sectors around the actions proposed, as well as partnerships with other private and non-governmental organizations are also worthy of note.

From a theoretical and methodological point of view, it is considered that FNE, in these documents, is geared towards a perspective of popular education based on Freire, with emphasis on dialogicity and individual autonomy.

The *Landmark*¹ was created within the *Ministério do Desenvolvimento Social e Combate à Fome* [Ministry of Social Development and Fight against Hunger] (MDS), and is inserted in this context, and marked by public policies founded on the ideas of right, adequacy, FSN, and on the Human Right to Proper Food (HRPF), which may be identified in various parts of the document: “Today, FNE is inserted in the *field of public policies in the context of health and FSN promotion*”;¹ “FNE is one of FSN's *fields of action and health promotion*”.¹

The concept of FNE itself, as well as the structuring principles for its actions expressed in the document, present it as a field of knowledge inserted in the context of the realization of the HRPF and of ensuring FSN.¹ Thus, FSN and HRPF are incorporated into FNE, renewing it.

The documents expects to qualify the food and nutrition agenda; one of the ways of doing so, according to the *Landmark*, is the institutionalization of FNE actions as public policies. Given this emphasis, FNE is considered in these political texts as a strategic action for the promotion and insurance of FSN, and for the realization of the HRPF.

It is thus evident the tendency to the adequacy to a model (the *Landmark*) as goal for FSN program, which is in accordance with the investments made by PT administrations in programs such as *Fome Zero* [Zero Hunger] and *Bolsa Família* [Family Allowance].

Author's identity, interests and motivations

FNE Landmark is an official document which expresses various proposals, manifests ideas belonging to certain sectors – professionals, universities, political groups and organizations, etc. – of Brazilian society.

The description of its historical construction begins with the first stage of its composition: the creation of a work-group made up by representatives of various sectors: Affiliated to the MDS: *Secretaria Nacional de Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional* [National Secretary of Food Security and Nutrition] (SESAN), *Departamento de Estruturação e Integração dos Sistemas Públicos Agroalimentares* [Department of Structuring and Integration of Public Food Systems] (DEISP), and *Coordenação Geral de Educação Alimentar e Nutricional* [General Coordination of Food and Nutrition Education] (CGEAN); Affiliated to the *Ministério da Saúde* [Ministry of Health] (MS): *Coordenação Geral de Alimentação e Nutrição* [General Coordination of Food and Nutrition] (CGAN); Affiliated to the *Ministério da Educação* [Ministry of Education] (MEC): *Fundo Nacional de Desenvolvimento da Educação* [National Fund for Educational Development] (FNDE); *Conselho Nacional de Segurança Alimentar* [National Council of Food Security] (CONSEA); Non-governmental institutions: *Associação Brasileira de Nutrição* [Brazilian Association of Nutrition] (ASBRAN); *Conselho Federal de Nutricionistas* [Federal Council of Nutritionists] (CFN); *Observatório de Políticas de Segurança Alimentar e Nutrição* [Observatory of Food Security and Nutrition Policies] (OPSAN, affiliated to the University of Brasília, UnB).

We understand there are competing conceptions in this scenario. In this perspective, the construction of the *Landmark* was problematized, calling into question which tensions and conflicts there occurred during this process.

For example, the notion that something is “healthy” and the ascription of “adequacy” are used in the document without any problematization. Healthy for whom? In which context? Adequate to what? Why? What interests are behind the concealment and naturalization of these questions?

According to Villangelin et al,²⁰ dealing with the idea of healthy eating means to recognize the polyphony underlying it. Diez García²¹ highlights the strong association in the contemporary world between the idea of healthy eating and the hegemonic take on nutrition, based on scientific recommendations relative to the ingestion of the necessary *nutrients* for the physiological and

biochemical activities of the human body. It is an approach built from the biomedical paradigm – biologizing, technicist, interventionist –, which at its best merely mentions (without effectively valuing or properly dimensioning) the role of the economic, social, political, cultural and psychological aspects in the social construction of phenomena in the realm of health and food, and at its worse simply ignores them.

This scenario is also conceived as a space of consensus, in which there is some type of agreement among the interests of each sector: MS establishes its *standard of health*, of food, of correct and “healthier” eating, which, in its turn, is supported by MDS, which *adapts this correct and healthy eating standard* to fit FNS and HRPF contexts.

Therefore, there are multiple interests and motivations present in the document, given that there are different social groups therein represented, and, even though they converge, it is likewise a political context of conflicts, disputes and agreements, in which the results and pathways for public policies are established.

Authenticity and reliability

The *Landmark* is not a rare and ancient document, kept safe by restricted access; on the contrary, it is a contemporary official text, political and in public knowledge, largely promoted by socially recognized vehicles (government agencies, political programs, scientific publications, etc.) viewed as appropriate for this purpose; it is largely used in the field of Food and Nutrition, often cited in the political and academic universe, and echoes in FNE practices, having been well legitimized in the field.

The document has a printed version, which was distributed by government agents, higher education and research institutions all over the country. It also has a digital version, available on government web pages.

The construction of the document was collective, and stemmed from four activities: (a) the meeting *Educação Alimentar e Nutricional – Discutindo Diretrizes* [FNE – Discussing Directives], which took place in Brasília/DF in October 2011; 160 people were present, among whom were Nutrition professors from public and private universities, managers and professionals acting on FNE-related public policies in the fields of Health, Education, Social Service and FSN all over the country; (b) the *Atividade integradora sobre Educação Alimentar e Nutricional* [Integrating Activity on FSN], which was part of the *IV Conferência Nacional de Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional* [4th National FSN Conference], which took place in Salvador/Bahia in November 2011, and had 27 participants; (c) the *Oficina de Educação Alimentar e Nutricional nas políticas públicas* [Workshop on FSN in public policies], which was part of the World Nutrition Congress, Rio de Janeiro (2012),

and counted with 59 participants; (d) the public consultation between June 4 and July 7, 2012, which had 979 respondents, 111 of whom sent 347 suggestions. Furthermore, the generalized use of the document, which is mentioned in other official documents, implies the reliability of the text under analysis.

Nature

Under this topic, we sought to identify the nature of the *Landmark*, and the field of knowledge in which it was produced.

The *Landmark* is a political document, which proposes the promotion of a common field of *reflection and guidance* to practice,¹ with a view to support different government sectors in their FNE actions, so they may reach as many results as possible.¹

It was built within a field of knowledge that is inserted in the interface between the *fields* of Food and Nutrition and Education, in which FNE is situated.

However, it is understood that FNE conceptions were and are under influence of the cycle of public policies, and that these policies, expressed in documents, provide guidance to a path to be followed.

The concept of *field* in the realm of science is strategically defined by Bourdieu.²² According to Bourdieu, *scientific field* corresponds to a system in which agents conquer positions in a space of struggle, in which various types of homology – such as dominant and dominated, greater and lesser influence, conservator and avant-garde – are articulated, guided by interests in disputes which are more concurring than complementary. Competition in the scientific field involves monopoly of socially ascribed authority and scientific competence, considered as a form of capital. The rules determining scientific research belong to a game founded in the constitution of the field.^{23,24}

In Brazil, the field of Food and Nutrition and the field of Foods are well established, but it is important to conceptually trace their borders, so we may better situate the field in which the *Landmark* was produced.

The field of Foods is founded upon the chemical, sanitary, political and economic aspects of food; food is basically conceptualized as a mere vehicle of chemical substances or, more specifically, complex molecules.^{23,24} Food and eating are clearly pertaining to the satisfaction of physiological, bodily needs of humans beings, as they would be for any other living species.

According to Carvalho, Luz & Prado,²⁵ the Field of *Nutrition* ascribes meaning to eating, which becomes rationalized and biologizing, in the typical fashion of biomedical health. In this universe, food is abstracted as nutrients, and Nutrition is essentially seen as the Science of Nutrients. Diet is

seen according to its main function: as medicine, necessary for the prevention and cure of diseases, and to the maintenance of health, thus reduced to its biological dimension.

The concept of *Eating*, in its turn, is represented by the various senses and meanings, rites and symbols, knowledge and practices in the historical and cultural creation of societies.^{24,25} *Food* as a symbol, as the act of feeding oneself and someone else, gains space in the social, cultural, political, philosophical and psychological orders. *Eating* corresponds to human relations mediated by *food*, and *Nutrition* to its biological outcome.

Recently, the institutionalized fields of Nutrition and Collective Health have been dedicated to the understanding of *eating* as a human phenomenon, resulting in growing interchange between the biomedical fields and the Humanities. It is therefore observable that the Humanities seem to be flourishing within this field, as may be inferred from the terminology that is being recently adopted to name the field: *Alimentação e Nutrição* [Eating and Nutrition].

While Eating and Nutrition consolidate as a *scientific and professional field* in Brazil, FNE also develops as a significant practice within this *field*.

Brazil today is doubtless very different from what it was in the 1930s and 1940s, as the political, economic, social and cultural scenario has changed, and FNE and public policies are articulated to this historically changing context.

What has actually changed regarding the type of FNE practiced in the decades of 1930 and 1940 – when the *Serviço de Alimentação da Previdência Social* [Social Security Food Service] (SAPS) was created, which, in practical terms, set the beginning of a “food and nutrition policy”, understood as the *promotion of adequate nutrition standards for the population* – to today’s FNE?

Under this perspective, it was observed a re-signification of ideas, practices and principles that are being updated to fit the current context.

Key-concepts and internal logic

The analysis of the document led to a systematization of its content, which was problematized and explored with the intention to apprehend its key-concepts and assess its foundations.

The document was thus divided in two parts. This selection followed a conceptual perspective in which the first part was named (I) *Directives* and the second (II) *Guidelines*.

By *Directives*, we understand the *Landmark*’s main ideas, representative of its scope, which, in the global textual perspective operate in the analysis as an integrating element of the document’s proposal. The sixth chapter of the *Landmark*, entitled “Princípios para as ações de Educação Alimentar e Nutricional” [Principles for EFN actions], was understood as belonging to this first part.

The *Guidelines* were defined as displaying the document's future dispositions, that is, where the *Landmark* leads, the direction to which it points. The guidelines were dispersed throughout the document, since they build a network of recurring textual elements.

Directives: action-regulating principles

Some public policies are written so as to make explicit their structuring principles. In the case of the *Landmark*,¹ it views FNE as a public policy, and dedicates one chapter to speak of its principles and of FNE actions (chapter 6, p.24). The directives were briefly listed as nine elements.

1. *Sustainability*. Understood in a perspective which is not limited to the environmental dimension, but encompasses human social and economic relations established in all stages of the food system.¹
2. *Integration*. Perceived as all dimensions of the food system: from access to land, water and the means of production, the ways of processing, supplying, commercializing and distributing food, the choice and consumption of foods (including individual and collective eating habits) to the generation and destination of residues.¹
3. *Diversity*. Understood as respect and appreciation for the various different identity and cultural expressions of our population, acknowledging and spreading the immense richness of local and regional foods, recipes, combinations and eating habits.¹
4. *Linkage*. Takes place when eating variously manifests cultural, social, affective and sensory values.¹
5. *Autonomy*. Focuses on providing support to people, so they may become productive agents in their own health, and so they may adopt, change and maintain behaviors that contribute to their health.¹
6. *Permanence and continuity*. FNE needs to be present throughout people's course of life, answering to the different demands they present, from eating habit formation in early childhood to the organization of their eating habits away from home in adolescence and adult life.¹
7. *Systematicity*. Coordinated, harmonious and systemic FNE strategies must be available in the various different social spaces for different population groups.¹
8. *Intersectionality*. Understood as an articulation of the distinct government sectors, so they may be co-responsible for ensuring access to adequate and healthy food.¹

9. *Planning, Assessment and Monitoring*. An organized process of diagnose generation, priority identification, elaboration of goals and strategies to reach them, development of action instruments, prediction of costs and necessary resources, work plan outlining, definition of responsibilities and partnerships, definition of process and result indicators.¹

One of the moments of collective construction of the *Landmark* was the meeting *FNE – Discussing Directives*, which intended to share experiences, debate and find paths to be followed so FNE would become a concrete reality within the realm of Brazilian public policies.

In this context, among these principles, the foundation was identified for the argumentation scheme and internal logic of the document, a future project to “educate for good eating habits”, a logic of “good” education, of the idealization of food/eating and an attempt to institute or apply a given *ideology*.

Guidelines: the purposes of FNE actions

As was already explained, expressions or practical FNE guidance are to be found all over the *Landmark*, and resurface at various different points.

The guidelines configure to path to be trodden for FNE construction. They are related to strategies leading to the achievement of a goal. However, in our analysis, they evidence what is *desired or defined* as “good eating”/“good FNE”.

It was possible to identify in the document that the guidelines reproduce the policy’s structuring principles, and are complementary in the analysis here proposed.

This part is composed of excerpts regarding the concept of FNE, located on chapter 5 (p. 23), since this chapter was identified as presenting a convergence of elements that guide education practices, and that permeate the whole text.

Five guidelines were outlined with relation to FNE practices:

1. *Reflection on the policy’s principles*. The concept of FNE makes use of some political principles – for example, when it is said that FNE is a field of knowledge and of *continuous and permanent practice, transdisciplinary, intersectional and multi-professional*, which seeks to promote the *autonomous* and voluntary practice of healthy eating habits, taking all stages of the food system into account,¹ presupposing that FNE practices must reflect the aforementioned directives: integration, autonomy, permanence and continuity, intersectionality, etc. The concept, as it is announced, simultaneously recovers these directives, and, despite speaking

elsewhere of contextualized practices, here this guideline was observed to be neither modulated nor relativized. It is possible to have an education practice encompassing so many elements at once?

This guideline resurfaces elsewhere in the documents: the *Landmark* states that its principles must be reflected in the FNE practices;¹ that FNE requires *intra and intersectional* articulation and partnership with different segments of society.¹ FNE requires, therefore, an integrated *approach* which acknowledges eating practices as resulting from availability and access to food, besides behaviors, practices and attitudes relevant to choices, preferences, ways of preparation and consumption of foods.¹

Does the integrated approach amount to acknowledged eating practices as resulting from the *availability* and *access* to food? What about those who have no such access?

2. *Methodological landmark.* In the *Landmark*, FNE is expressed as a *field of knowledge*,¹ in which its actions and practices must be conceived from a methodological landmark. This guideline is suggested when the *Landmark* states that FNE must be conceived from a methodological landmark which predicts a process of *participatory planning, assessment and monitoring*.¹ Both methodological and instrumental aspects would need to be referenced by a *permanent process of research and knowledge management*.¹

Besides a methodological landmark, the document highlights the need to *develop and expand theoretical and methodological instruments* for FNE actions, so they may approach various concepts, such as “empowerment”, “participation”, “appraisal of popular knowledge”, “knowledge sharing”, “construction of partnership”, “association of knowledge and information”, “interest negotiation”, etc.¹

This guideline demands a multi-professional team. In which contexts can that be applied? Professional often count only with the community in order to plan education activities, so it is important to make evident that all that may not always be feasible.

3. *Problematization.* Problematization appears in the *Landmark* as an ever-present guiding principle; it must act as an autonomy-generating force; its practices must make use of problematizing education approaches and resources¹, in order to strengthen active participation, develop the individuals’ interpretative and analytical skills about themselves and the world.¹

However, what is one to do when the individual has not been trained so as to incorporate problematization into their actions? What's the guideline? Will it be but a change in words?

The *Landmark* itself points to some shortcomings of this type of discourse, which may be understood as limitations of the process – which is typical of political texts in general –: difficulty in articulating between fields of knowledge such as sociology and food anthropology, ethics and philosophy; poor use of theoretical background from pedagogy and education; the hegemonic status of biomedicine; difficulties in making FNE become transversal in the pedagogical project.¹

4. *Dialogicity*. According to the *Landmark*, FNE practice must make use of resources that favor dialog between individuals and social groups.¹

Another guideline pertaining dialogicity is found in chapter 8 (p. 35), when the issue of effective communication in the FNE context is tackled: effective *communication* in the FNE context must be based on active and close *listening*; *acknowledgment of different practices and forms of knowledge*; *shared construction* of knowledge, practices and solutions; *communication* undertaken so as to supply individual and group needs; creation of *bonds* among the various individuals integrating the process; *horizontal relations*.¹

However, if, on the one hand, dialog is treated as the essence of education – a freeing practice, in which communication and symbolic exchange, by means of retribution, change people, endowing them with autonomy –, on the other, this selfsame dialog may be masked, muffled by some voices, while consenting that only one may be heard.

This dominant voice may, in some situations, be ascribed to public policies, when they impose beforehand a single mode of thinking onto FNE.

5. *Contextualization*. According to the concept of FNE, as represented in the *Landmark*, FNE practice must consider interactions and meanings making up eating behavior.¹ This may also be observed in the principles for education actions listed in chapter 6 of the document: educational and pedagogical approaches adopted for FNE must privilege active processes, incorporating popular knowledge and practices, *contextualized according to the reality of the individuals*, their families and groups, and must enable permanent integration between theory and practice.¹

If, on the one hand, these guidelines seem docile and adaptable in the text, on the other, they are often violent in their limitations and stereotypes pertaining what good eating habits must be, but this does not go against the use of public policies in the field, or in food and nutrition practice: docile and imperative at the same time.

Discussion

The *Landmark* presents its directives and guidelines for FNE practices as clear, simple, and practical, when in fact they are complex, thick and often hard to attain.

We here sought to highlight the *possibilities* or strong points, which enable and mobilize FNE actions, as well as *challenges*, or shortcomings, which often present themselves in the document as highly idealized, hindering action, demobilizing FNE action agents/actors.

The *Landmark* is challenging, because it proposes to trace possibilities for the collective construction of a field of FNE knowledge and practice.¹⁸ It is also a document that organizes and situates FNE practices, which offers support and subsidies to other food and nutrition policies.

However, in order to advance, we must face difficulties and obstacles. In order to do so, we must point the incoherence and contradictions perceived in the document, such as the utilization of a seemingly transforming discourse, based on the freeing education proposed by Freire, that contradicts itself, and displays a “banking” and oppressive nature, as it limits the capacity for critical reflection of the subject by concealing facts, ideas, etc.

The concept of ideology, introduced by Marx and discussed by Chauí,^{5,6} was here used with the intention of understanding how it operates, and evidencing such idealizations, dissimulations, concealments, inversions, gaps and generalizations present in the *Landmark*, as well as their implications for educational practice.

Ideology is conceived as having two main functions: it is a way to *conceal* social reality, and a powerful instrument of *dissimulation* thereof.

How does ideology operate? According to Chauí,^{5,6} it initially operates by *inversion*, that is, it places effects before causes, and has the latter pass for the former. This inversion leads to the production of images and ideas that intend to represent reality: “it is necessary that eating practices be considered as a social value, and that society incorporates and fights for the FNE agenda”.¹

The impression is that the rule (the policy) comes first when, in fact, there is a set of phenomena: the rule (the policy regarding what the right form of eating is) is invented alongside with what is actually eating, and there is need of a moralizing, normative culture to set the rule in place.

The second mode of ideological operation is the *social imaginary*, by means of a *social illusion*. Collecting direct and immediate images form social experience – that is, from the way we experience social relations –, ideology reproduces them, while transforming them into a coherent, logical and systematic set of ideas that function as representations of reality and as norms and rules of behavior and conduct. These representations, norms and values form a mesh of images that explain the whole of reality and prescribe to society what its members must think, say, feel and how they must act.⁶

Ideology endows individuals with modes of understanding reality and behaving in or before it, with a view to make them accept the conditions under which they live, seeing them as natural, normal, correct, fair, without intending to transform them or knowing them truly; it shuns with doubt, anxiety, anguish and awe, and it conceals the contradictions of social life, as well as contradiction between the latter and the ideas that supposedly explain and control it.

FNE is field of action within FSN and Health Promotion, and has been considered a fundamental strategy for the prevention and control of contemporary food and nutrition problems. Among its potential results, we may identify its contribution in the prevention and control of chronic, non-transmissible diseases and nutrition deficiencies, as well the positive appraisal of food culture, the strengthening of regional habits, reduction of food waste, and promotion of sustainable consumption and healthy eating.¹

This excerpt presents the appraisal of food culture as one potential result of FNE. But what is here being deemed *food culture*? Isn't fast food also food culture? Isn't eating beans with flour, as in the "sertão", also food culture? Are these the cultures being valued as potential results of FNE actions?

At last, the third mode of ideological operation is by *silence*. Social imaginary is like a sentence in which not everything is said nor could be said, because, if it were, the sentence would lose coherence and become self-contradictory, and no one would believe it. Coherence and unity in the social imaginary or ideology result from silencing something.^{5,6}

Ideology is also characterized by generalization and naturalization of facts, relations and ideas.

Naturalization takes place when ideas state that things are as they are because it is natural that they be so. This is how ideas produce *social alienation*; society is seen as a natural force, strange and powerful, that has things being exactly as they are.

FNE reached an important point in its process of construction. It came a long way, with highs and lows, it overcame obstacles in the sense of reaching conceptual changes and significant practices [...].¹

What is being naturalized in this excerpt of the *Landmark* is that FNE is presented, today, as a renewed practice, which overcame obstacles from past decades, and reached significant changes. However, when this process is critically assessed, it is observed that there is still an education standard on “teaching how to eat”, on the promotion of “healthy and adequate” food choices: “FNE contributes to the realization of HRPF, to the construction of a healthy Brazil”.¹

Generalization and concealment seek to offer society a *single* image that allows *unification* and social identification –*one* language, *one* religion, *one* race, *one* nation, *one* humankind, *one* standard of health, same habits. Their function, therefore, is to conceal, dissimulate and deny social inequalities, and offer an illusory image of the community as generated from a social contract among the free and equal.⁶

Alternatively, it may be said that the political context on health/eating/social service etc., on the right to health/food appropriated some concepts such as FSN, HRPF, integration, intersectionality, sustainability, continuous education, autonomy, among others, transforming and incorporating them into the directives and principles of public policies.

However, what is observed in political texts is a highly repetitive and moralistic discourse, which occupies a stereotypical position, so that it becomes an empty speech, as if it were necessary to incorporate these concepts/discourses to public policies so they may become “good policies”. This is not about questioning the relevance or importance of these concepts, but to make a critical analysis and point that they are often perceived as clichés, occupying a mere platitude, as a “toll” one must pay in order to fulfill the requisites of good public policy.

According to the *Landmark*, education practice must value food culture and respect diversity in the population:

FNE must take the *legitimacy* of cultural, religious and scientific knowledge into account. It must *respect and value* the identity and cultural features of our population expressed in and by food.¹

But to what knowledge and which culture is the document referring? When we consider that there is no one single food culture, but various food cultures throughout the country, how is it possible to respect diversity while speaking of “healthy eating habits” and “adequate food”? What is healthy? Adequate to whom?

Likewise, the discourse on permanent education is called into question:

Educational and pedagogical approaches adopted for FNE must privilege active processes; in this sense, FNE must take its approach beyond knowledge transmission, and generate situations that foster reflection about everyday situations, in search of alternative practices and solutions.¹

Where are the reflections about everyday situations of our population? The scarcity of public transportation, lack of potable water, the lack of basic education, access to land, the use of pesticides, latifundia, social inequality, etc. – where is all that discussed and contemplated in public policies, in the *Landmark*?

Food system integration

The *Landmark* views the food system as a process encompassing from access to land, water and the means of production, the ways of processing, supplying, commercializing and distributing food, the choice and consumption of foods (including individual and collective eating habits) to the generation and destination of residues.¹

How to approach food system in its entirety from access to land and water to the destination of residues without discussing the social function of property and agrarian reform?

Social, environmental and economic sustainability

Sustainability, according to the *Landmark*, is not limited to the environmental dimension, but encompasses human social and economic relations established in all stages of the food system, which do not imply the sacrifice of renewable and non-renewable natural resources, and which involve economic and social relations established from parameters based on ethics, justice, equity and sovereignty.¹

How to develop environmentally, socially and economically sustainable FNE when this education must promote “healthy eating habits” according to a standard of health established by the policy, while, at the same time, supplying individual needs? Are these needs contemplated by this standard of health?

Intersectionality. Such discourses incorporated into policies and adopted by the *Landmark* encompass complex concepts, subtly presented as simple and easy to attain. However, they need to be discussed and problematized, lest they become pseudo-discourses, good on paper but unfeasible in reality. “The process of construction of intersectional actions *implies the construction and exchange of knowledge, language and practices among the various sectors conversant with the theme.*”¹

The ideological character of the document is further problematized with the help of two other categories, autonomy and normativity/moralization, by once again inquiring on what is being asked, dissimulated or silenced in the *Landmark*.

Autonomy: a matter of choice?

When it is said that all human beings are free by nature, and that they express this freedom by their capacity to choose among things or situations, it is necessary to think on what things and situations are given for human beings to choose from. Who is responsible for the conditions enabling such choices? Is it true that people may choose as they will?

As the discussions on the promotion of human rights gain strength, policies have been seeking to guarantee and broaden the scope of individual decisions, and the role of FNE is currently linked to the production of information that may allow for decision-making. However, according to Castiel & Vasconcelos-Silva,²⁶ offering information is a necessary but not a sufficient condition, if we consider the non-rational and unconscious dimensions behind human volition.

If, on the one hand, guaranteeing and broadening individual decision-making represents an advancement toward the right to food, on the other, there emerge issues in need of consideration, as we risk reinforcing personal responsibility and guilt, thus reducing health to a matter of individual decisions and choices.

As educational practices are centered on message/content transmission, there is yet another risk: that of reducing professionals to mere information vehicles, when they could act as mediators in a dialogical relation, centered on educational action conceived with individuals in their action setting.

The naturalness of the “choice for healthy eating” is present in the directives of public policies of such as PNAN, PNSAN and on the priority goals of the *Política Nacional de Promoção da Saúde* [National Policy for the Promotion of Health] (PNPS), etc. and is highlighted in the concept of FNE as expressed in the *Landmark*: “FNE [...] *intends to promote the autonomous and voluntary practice of healthy eating*”.¹

Food norms and conceptions about healthy eating habits converse with culturally acquired dispositions in time, which are reproduced without consent. Problematising such issues may denaturalize some food-related norms and presuppositions.

Furthermore, it is necessary to reflect on the status of political/scientific discourse in the contemporary world and its socially ensured legitimacy, by critically analyzing the scientific authority that produces incontestable truths.

If, on the one hand, the *Landmark* states that the characteristics of the ways of life significantly influence food behavior, and the *power and autonomy in the choice* of individuals *are influenced by various determining factors*, such as age, gender, social and economic aspect,¹ on the other, it establishes that FNE actions need to encompass themes and strategies related to these dimensions so as to contribute to *conscious decision-making* on the part of individuals, *so these choices may act upon all stages of the food system*.¹

What type of autonomy are we talking about? What is it the *Landmark* considers as “conscious choice” and “autonomous practice”? Is a given practice autonomous only insofar as it is *healthy*?

In its directives, the PNPS predicts the institution of permanent FNE processes. This directive is detailed in the PNSAN, four out of the six objectives of which are directly related to FNE. One of these directives sees the structuring, spreading and integration of “FNE actions in public service institutional networks and media, so as to stimulate individual autonomy for the production of healthy and adequate food practices.”²⁷

The individual of which the *Landmark* speaks seems an empty and concealed one, with no age, no gender, no income, belonging to no social class, who does not appear, does not think, does not speak and is not in a world so as to choose, let alone question anything.

The promotion of self-care and autonomy is one of the main structuring principles of the *Landmark*:

The exercise of this principle may favor people's endorsement of the *necessary changes in their ways of life*. Self-care and the process of behavioral change centered in the person, in their availability and needs, are fundamental to ensure individual development in FNE actions. The *main goal* of self-care support is to *generate knowledge and skills*, so people may know and identify their context of life, and *adopt, change and maintain behaviors that contribute to their health*.¹

But under Freire's perspective, how (is it possible) to build an autonomous individual? How can a FNE action promote self-care and autonomy when it is imperative about the need to change? To whom is change necessary? Change into what? Change into a standard? Why?

Normative and moralizing discourse: a strategy of legitimation?

The creation of an *eating standard* constitutes one important formative element in the field of Food and Nutrition, which has been present throughout its consolidation. Since it is said that there is such a thing as “eating right” or “the best way of eating”, there would need to be someone to point which way is right or best.

Having to say what the other has to eat is a way to authorize a professional as “possessor” of that type of knowledge. It becomes a strategy for the legitimation of the Food and Nutrition field, of both profession and professional. When this model is instituted as the sole standard by means of public policies (such as the *Nutrition Guide for the Brazilian Population*, the *National Food and Nutrition Policy*, the *Landmark*, etc), government ratifies such logic.

The “healthy” and “correct” standard appears naturalized in the document, seemingly unique and unquestionable. Nonetheless, when “healthy” is limited to a single rule, the concept is reduced to a single possibility and fixed in such a way that it becomes nearly impossible to practice it, besides the concealment of other options of being “healthy”.

This is one way of showing the norm, the “how” an individual may act, and, if they fail to do so, change their practices to follow the standard, which is the policy's goal.

With this goal, the *Landmark* intends to qualify the food and nutrition agenda: “It is important to admit that this document allows each sector to qualify its actions from what has been collected on the theme so far.”¹

The moralizing and normative discourse in the policy presents itself as educational, when its intention is to moralize individuals, regulating them in favor of what it says it is right to do. According to the *Landmark*, an adequate and healthy meal is an expression of citizenship and a protecting factor of life.¹

If the policy says one must eat fruits, vegetables and greens, the nutritionist will seek to moralize this so the individual who does not do this is erroneous, irresponsible and guilty.

For this policy, individuals today are no longer the ignorant individuals from the 1940s and 1960s; they are now irresponsible when they do not follow “good” (or, in current coinage, “adequate”) eating standards. But the process of construction of directives still converges to an imposition and repetition of a standard.

However, the strategy of the moralizing and normative discourse imposing an ideal model of health, eating or FNE is the legitimation of the norm. If professionals do not point to what is wrong, referenced by the policy document, the *Landmark* delegitimizes them. Silence and absence weaken the policy.

A challenge is made to all government sectors and to civil society to spread the word among the most diverse agents and actors promoting educational actions in the area of Food and Nutrition in the country, besides adopting it in their process of planning programs and actions and give it due continuance, so it does not end in itself.¹

In order to do so, society, professionals and managers are mobilized around the promotion of adequate and healthy eating, given the understanding that the envisaged impact needs permanent action.¹

Today, in the communication word, there's a lot of likes, a lot of clicks, a lot of talk... If something isn't talked about, isn't heard of, we think it's over, it's dead –hence the need to put the document in evidence, citing it in papers, courses, books, FNE theories, etc., with the intention of reinforcing the rule (the policy) so as not to deconstruct it, rather moralizing it in order to legitimize it.

Final remarks

The present paper sought to understand the *Landmark* from the perspective of the Humanities, as a component of government agenda, which reflexively operates as directives, but also as a product of an ideology present within the field of Food and Nutrition, which acts one-directionally when it does not place itself as object of reflection.

The exercise of critical analysis led to a reflection on the way to ascribe qualities – “adequate” or “correct” – to practices from a critical take on ideologies. We understand that flexibility regarding a model of proper eating does not exist independently from the model itself.

The methodology used allowed for the systematization of the assessment of part of the *Landmark* centered around its main directives and guidelines, which express an ideological character that seems to be present throughout the document in the form of the idea of *good FNE*.

Among the limitations of the method, we may cite the difficulty to access certain supporting documents, as it was not always possible to have access to them. Besides, depending on the kind of document, they may not contain detailed information, and may not clearly present the necessary data relative to the social and political context, or they may also have been counterfeited with alterations imposed on them by the administrations under which they were composed. However, these were not critical difficulties found in the document here under analysis. We understand that the process of construction of the *Landmark*—the workshops, meetings and activities—were fundamental, but were not included in the research, except insofar as they are described in the document. We sought to overcome this limitation by using conceptual tools on ideology in the broader sense, so as to allow certain inferences to be drawn on that process.

Right and wrong are structural in the construction of eating, and pointing to definite solutions and quick answers is operational in political clashes in the field of Food and Nutrition, despite their effacement in the text. As for the ideologies therein contained, we believe it is non-productive to naturalize them, since the most fruitful approach would have been precisely to debate various models of good eating habits, alongside a series of everyday issues pertaining to “making politics” and defending the Right to Healthy and Adequate Food in our inequality-ridden country. Refraining from describing or pointing to difficulties is equal to alienating an ideal. Even if the ideal is construed in everyday reality, it is inimical to reality, in the sense that it chains the changes and clashes necessary to the process of human creation.

So, we emphasize that political documents such as the *Landmark* represent important political gains in the field of Food and Nutrition. Notwithstanding, we call attention to the fact that it is living politics, and that it operates as a compass, guiding models which may give rise to educational processes when analyzed with a critical and sensible view in relation to the ideologies that give it support.

Contributors

Conception and design: Nascimento MNC and Carvalho MCVS. Data interpretation: Nascimento MNC. Revision and final version: Carvalho MCVS. and Prado SD.

Conflict of interests: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests.

References

1. Brasil. Ministério do Desenvolvimento Social e Combate à Fome. Marco de referência de educação alimentar e nutricional para as políticas públicas. Brasília: MDS; 2012. 67 p.
2. Prado MS. A trajetória da política de alimentação no Brasil: de 1889 a 1945. *Rev Baiana Saúde Publ.* 1993; 20(1/4):23-31.
3. Burlandy L, Mattos RA. Inter-relações entre conhecimento, política e ação nas questões de alimentação e nutrição. *Rev Nutr.* 2012; 25(1):5-8.
4. Oliveira SI, Oliveira, KS. Novas perspectivas em educação alimentar e nutricional. *Psicol USP* 2008; 19(4):495-504.
5. Chaui M. O que é ideologia? São Paulo: Brasiliense; 2001.
6. Chaui M. Convite à filosofia. São Paulo: Ática; 2004.
7. Freire P. Educação como prática da liberdade. 29ª ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra; 1999.
8. Marx K, Engels F. A ideologia alemã. São Paulo: Expressão Popular; 2009.
9. Brasil. Ministério da Saúde. Secretaria de Atenção à Saúde. Departamento de Atenção Básica. Política nacional de alimentação e nutrição. 3 ed. Brasília: Ministério da Saúde; 2013. 82 p.
10. Brasil. Ministério da Saúde. Secretaria de Atenção à Saúde. Departamento de Atenção Básica. Coordenação Geral da Política de Alimentação e Nutrição. Guia alimentar para a população brasileira: promovendo a alimentação saudável. 2 ed. Brasília: Ministério da Saúde; 2014. 152 p.
11. Kuwae CA, Carvalho MCVS, Prado SD, Ferreira FR. Concepções de alimentação saudável entre idosos na Universidade Aberta da Terceira Idade da UERJ: normas nutricionais, normas do corpo e normas do cotidiano. *Rev Bras Geriatr Gerontol.* 2015; 18(3):621-630.
12. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. Coordenação de população e indicadores sociais. Síntese de indicadores sociais: uma análise das condições de vida da população brasileira [Internet]. Rio de Janeiro: IBGE; 2015. [acesso em: 27 abr. 2016]. Disponível em: <http://biblioteca.ibge.gov.br/visualizacao/livros/liv95011.pdf>
13. Freire P. Pedagogia do oprimido. 17ª. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra; 1987.
14. Brandão CR. O que é educação. São Paulo: Brasiliense; 2007.
15. Silva LRC, Damasceno AD, Martins MCR, Sobral KM, Farias IMS. Pesquisa documental: alternativa investigativa na formação docente. In Anais do: 9º Congresso Nacional de Educação (EDUCERE). 3º Encontro Brasileiro de Psicopedagogia. Eixo Temático: Formação de Professores e Profissionalização Docente; 26-29 out. 2009; Paraná.
16. Cellard A. A análise documental. In: Poupart J, Deslauriers J-P, Groulx L-H, Laperrière A, Maye R, Pires AP. A pesquisa qualitativa: enfoques epistemológicos e metodológicos. 2. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes; 2010.

17. Corsetti B. Análise documental no contexto da metodologia qualitativa: uma abordagem a partir da experiência de pesquisa do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação da Unisinos. *UNIrevista*; 2006; 1(1):32-46.
18. Santos LAS. Educação alimentar e nutricional no contexto da promoção de práticas alimentares saudáveis. *Rev. Nutr.* 2005; 18(5):681-692.
19. Santos LAS. Avanços e desdobramentos do marco de referência da educação alimentar e nutricional para políticas públicas no âmbito da universidade e para os aspectos culturais da alimentação. *Rev. Nutr.* 2013; 26(5):595-600.
20. Villagelim ASB, Prado SD, Freitas RF, Carvalho MCVS, Cruz CO, Klotz J et al. A vida não pode ser feita só de sonhos: reflexões sobre publicidade e alimentação saudável. *Ciênc. Saúde Coletiva* 2012; 17(3):681-686.
21. Diez Garcia RW. Reflexos da globalização na cultura alimentar: considerações sobre as mudanças na alimentação urbana. *Rev Nutr.* 2003; 16(4):483-492.
22. Bourdieu P. O campo científico. In: Ortiz R, organizador. *Pierre Bourdieu*. São Paulo: Ática; 1983.
23. Klotz-Silva J, Prado SD, Carvalho MCVS, Ornelas TFS, Oliveira PF. Alimentação e cultura como campo científico no Brasil. *Physis* 2010; 20(2):413-442.
24. Prado SD. Alimentação e nutrição como campo científico no Brasil. 2009. Mimeo.
25. Carvalho MCVS, LUZ MT, Prado SD. Comer, nutrir e alimentar na perspectiva das Ciências Sociais, 2009. Mimeo.
26. Castiel D, Vasconcelos-Silva R. Internet e auto-cuidado em saúde: como juntar trapinhos? *Hist Ciênc Saúde – Manguinhos* 2002; 9(2):291-314.
27. Brasil. Ministério do Desenvolvimento Social e Combate à Fome. Câmara Interministerial de Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional. Plano Nacional de Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional: 2012/2015. Brasília: CAISAN; 2011.

Received: May 07, 2017.

Proofread: June 28, 2017.

Accepted: August 27, 2017.

