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Abstract
This paper examines how farm women represent rurality and agriculture within the context of farm tourism. We draw upon qualitative data analysis of a farm women’s agritourism network in southern France centred on sheep milk production for Roquefort cheese. Through the use of choreography, staging, performances, and their bodies, we found that women represent rurality and agriculture in multiple and seemingly contradictory ways. At times they paint portraits of rural life that reproduce human-nature and masculine-feminine binaries affiliated with tradition and cultural heritage. At other times, they choreograph, stage, and perform modernity by accentuating materials, ideals, and roles more accurately articulated as a product of contemporary society. The result is a complex amalgam of agriculture and rural life representations constructed for tourist consumption. We conclude by discussing the opportunities such representations hold for enabling farm women to access cultural influence in agriculture.
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“Juliette threw open the doors to her 125 year old barn and invited us in. She had a big smile and seemed warm. She lives on a 71 ha family farm and she was excited to show us her farm tourism operation. The barn is where she welcomes guests for the tour and ‘farm snack’. This beautiful old barn was erected with limestone harvested from the area. There was a massive fireplace opposite the entryway. Antique scythes, wagon wheels, and ox yokes were hung on the walls for art, not cultivation. It was very rustic, traditional … old world France! We admired it, asked questions about the setting, and complimented her. She is very proud of the renovations and says she wants tourists to appreciate the cultural heritage of Roquefort when they come here. Then we looked up above the fireplace and into the vaulted ceiling to see a large Harley Davidson® Motorcycle flag hanging from the rafters. Oh, no!”

(Author’s field notes, 2012)

Introduction

For many, representations of rural France easily evoke picturesque images of a simpler time where bucolic landscapes, dense familial and social bonds, and old world traditions prevail. For the French, aspects of cultural *patrimoine* and *la vieille France* (old France) (p. 280) embody even a more poignant idealisation of rural spaces and livelihoods (Bourdieu 1984; Hervieu and Viard 1996; 2008). Waters (2010) argues that rural traditions – characterised by belonging, rootedness, stability and national distinctiveness – along with peasant agriculture, are revered because they offer an antidote from the alienating forces of neo-liberal globalisation. The peasant farmer is frequently heralded as the *l’âme de la nation* (the soul of the nation), “evoking deep-rooted cultural traditions and implantation in the national territory which define France” (Rogers, 2000, p. 62). The strength of this collective admiration compels Bessière (1998, p. 23) to contend that, in France, the symbolic consumption of the landscape trumps its productive value; “stage-management comes before the productive function in the general public’s eye.”

Yet, in our first foray into the world of French rural tourism we were met with a Harley Davidson Motorcycle flag, hardly a symbol of *la vieille France*. Our initial reaction was disappointment because our personal images of the rural idyll (Bunce 1994) were shattered (Bell 2007). Little (1999, p. 440) argues that “the ‘rural idyll’ has too often “served to detract from the recognition of variety and, indeed, alongside the concept of ‘otherness’, to
simplify our understanding of power relations within rural society and of the contestation of
the reality and representation of rural culture.” For Hinrichs (1996), idealised rural images
evoke tradition in ways that omit tension, diversity, and complexity. “Rather than
acknowledge conflict, benightedness, or squalor, notions of ‘rural tradition’ dwell selectively
on its most sanitized, beneficent possible features” (1996, p. 263). In this light, Juliette’s
Harley flag is an invitation to problematise representations of agriculture and rurality within
agritourism. It is a reminder that representations of agriculture and rural life are less
homogeneous and more complex than documented, extending an opportunity to explore the
ways in which agritourism is organised to symbolically construct rurality in ways that depart
from stock idealised or mythical images.

Is it possible Juliette’s flag signals the presence of a new rurality? Could agritourism
possibly be used to animate roles and identities associated with values and lifestyles
emblematic of contemporary identities? Or perhaps farm tourism entrepreneurs interweave
tradition, custom and their contemporary multifaceted daily lives to represent to tourists an
intricate amalgam of twentieth-first century rurality. We explore these questions in the context
of a farm women’s agritourism network in southern France called, Réseau de Visites de
Ferme (RVF). Using interviews, participant observation, and document analysis, we explore
the representations embodied in agritourism as farm women choreograph, stage, and perform
agriculture and rurality for the tourist gaze.

Farm tourism packages, accentuates, and commoditises the social and cultural value in
farming activity for public consumption (Jackson 1999). The diversification of farms into
agritourism has grown considerably in recent years, rising six per cent annually in both
North America and Europe from 2002 to 2004 (Choo 2012). Advocates argue that it brings
‘fun’ to the farm (George and Rilla 2011), yet most contend that the ascendancy of
agritourism to a position of political and practical relevancy stems from the limits of the
productionist agrifood model (Brandth and Haugen 2010; 2011; Che et al. 2005; Kneafsey 2000; Marsden and Sonnino 2008; Ploeg 2008; Sonnino 2004). A growing body of research favours farm diversification into agritourism as a remedy for farm family financial stress and risk management (Benjamin 1994; McGehee et al. 2007; Nickerson et al. 2001), rural development (Butler et al. 1998; Hinrichs 1996; Marsden 2003; Neate 1987; Ploeg et al. 2000), nature conservation (Lane 1994), and cultural consumption (such as its amenity value, production of typical products, or heritage protection) (Bessière 1998; Che et al. 2005; Burton and Wilson 2006). Moreover, it is rooted in a contemporary theoretical turn that privileges rural development processes valorising local resources, such as rural people, farmers, and nature, to restore equilibrium to fragmented human and eco-systems (Ploeg et al. 2000). In short, recent literature suggests that agritourism not only fosters economic development, it can also contribute to the maintenance and reinforcement of the rural social fabric, as well as the preservation of the environment. In other words, much of the enthusiasm for agritourism has been justified on the premise that it is prescriptive for the ‘sustainable’ (economic, social and environmental) development of the countryside (Brandth and Haugen 2011; Marsden and Sonnino 2008; Ploeg and Renting 2004). Given the promise agritourism is claimed to potentially hold for sustainability, we see the nexus of symbolic representation, farm tourism, and gender as fertile terrain for embarking upon an explanatory investigation.

In this paper, we first look to the literature on representations to examine agritourism as a symbolic vehicle of agriculture and rurality (Cloke 1997; 2006; Cloke and Milbourne 1992; Falk and Pinhey 1978; Halfacree 1993; 1995; 1997; 2007; Jones 1995; Mormount 1990; Pratt 1996). Bessière (1998, p. 20) claims that representation, or “mental perception of the countryside,” is often central to rural tourism as tourists reactivate “well-established stereotypes about nature and purity” firmly embedded in their “collective consciousness.” Our concern is with the ability of farm women to instrumentally use agritourism to shape
meaning and understanding of agriculture and rural life for tourists drawn from a generation
whose knowledge of these domains is limited. Indeed, Cloke (1997, p. 372) writes that “many
people are likely to ‘know’ rural areas more through watching popular television programmes
than through personal experience.” If accurate, agritourism may be one of the few
opportunities urban dwellers have throughout their lives to engage in the rural and to
experience agriculture, beyond the realm of eating, making it a pivotal arena for
understanding how agriculture and rural life are constructed and performed for uninitiated, yet
politically salient audiences.

Secondly, a small number of scholars have studied rural representation through a
gendered lens, inquiring as to how rural representations depict gender relations, practices, the
feminine and masculine body, and the heterosexual norm in rural spaces (Little 2006; Morris
and Evans 2013). Most of these studies take media representation as the unit of analysis (Agg
also explored the gendered dimensions of farm tourism, most frequently to explore
motivations and characteristics (Babrieri and Mshenga 2008; Getz and Carlson 2000;
McGehee et al. 2007), the division of labour in farm tourism (Danes 1998; Dernoi 1991), its
ability to increase women’s power within the family farm (Bouquet and Winter 1987; Brandth
and Haugen 2010; Nilsson 2002) and its impact on women’s identity formation (Brandth and
Haugen 2011). Yet, there is little empirical research examining how agritourism is used by
women to represent rurality to others. Brandth and Haugen (2011) are one exception; they
found Norwegian farm women integrating cultural heritage through storytelling, home-
cooked local foods, personal dress, and nature-based activities. In addition, food and
foodways often play a central role in agritourism representation. Bessière (1998, p. 30) argues
that “[h]ighly cultural, culinary heritage is right at the heart of France’s rural tourist market.”
Following Murdoch and Pratt (1993, p. 411), we see farm women agritourism entrepreneurs as “actors [who] impose ‘their’ rurality on others” by choreographing, staging, and performing educational and leisure farm activities. This platform to construct rurality and commodify rural culture for tourists raises important questions that may challenge classical assessments of rural gender dynamics. Is it possible that farm tourism might permit a new form of cultural power farm women have historically been unable to access? The chance to represent agriculture and rural life to tourists gives farm women an unprecedented opportunity to emerge as agricultural authorities, challenging traditional roles held by farm women in scholarship informed by political economics which often cast them as exploited ‘farm help’ tethered to the farm and a patriarchal system. Brandth et al. (2010) argue that farm women are often able to infuse farm tourism with practical knowledge vital for success.

Our empirical investigation of RVF suggests that tradition is only one aspect of the commoditised farm tourism package. By situating this investigation in the everyday (Harding 1991), we find farm women in southern France activating representations of agriculture and rurality that construct a much more complex image of life on the farm. “Their rurality” is one which selectively punctuates tradition interweaving it with social practices and relations endemic of contemporary gender and family roles, while negotiating political-economic realities/uncertainties. In this regard, this paper accentuates the “messiness of rural space” and the inability of farm tourism to map smoothly onto idealised imagery (Cloke 1997, p. 371).

**Theoretical Overview**

Theories of social representation of the rural have become a growth industry over the past two decades (Cloke 1997). The deconstructive turn advanced by post-modernism sparked renewed interest in the rural through attention to the socially constructed process which makes it possible (Halfacree 1993; Mormont 1990). The intellectual turn to culture and agency via
phenomenology and the sociology of knowledge (Cloke 1997; Woods 2005), extended to the rural, accentuates the process by which people creatively shape reality through everyday interaction and imaginaries (Bell 2007; Cloke and Milbourne 1992; Falk and Pinhey 1978; Halfacree 1993; 1995; 1997; 2007; Jones, 1995; Pratt, 1996). From this intellectual tradition, rurality arises from “the social production of a set of meanings” attributed to rural spaces, peoples, and practices (Mormont 1990, p. 36).

Foregrounding rural social interaction over spatial or materialist dimensions sets the stage for understanding rurality as a dynamic “social construct and ‘rural’ becomes a world of social, moral, and cultural values in which rural dwellers participate” (Cloke and Milbourne 1992, p. 360). This approach to the study of rurality has allowed scholars to probe “how practice, behaviour, decision-making and performance are contextualized and influenced by the social and cultural meanings attached to rural places” (Cloke 2006, p. 21), thereby, expanding our capacity to understand the realities of rural people.

Such work foregrounds the micro elements of social life, such as language and social norms, the rural as imaginary or an ‘idyll’ (Bunce 1994), and the situatedness of everyday experience (Cloke 2006; Frouws 1998; Murdoch and Pratt 1993). Everyday words, symbols and actions become tools in a socialised arsenal to make meaning and represent rural selves to others. Halfacree (1993, p. 29), for example, argues that the rural is best represented through discourse - through the “words and concepts understood and used by people in everyday talk.” Through discourse it becomes evident that meanings of rurality do not inhere in the material, but are socio-psychological constructs (Cloke and Milbourne 1992; Frouws 1998; Jones 1995; Pratt 1996; Zografos 2007).

Edensor (2001; 2006) centralises the role of action in rural representation with the performance metaphor. He argues that rural dwellers ‘perform’ rurality – or behaviourally manage an impression of themselves as rural people - with their bodies, discursive practices,
material artefacts, and social environments. In short, rural spaces become a theatre where actors don costumes, stage the setting, and enact performances with culturally appropriate props and scripts. In the tourism context, the goal is to “produce affective, sensual and mediatized experience – within a format of ‘edutainment’” (Edensor 2006, p. 488). Success depends upon boundary maintenance in which the tourist gaze is directed to discourse and symbolic imagery aligned with the desired representation while being detracted from elements which might undermine this vision. Such was our experience as we stood in Juliette’s 125 year old barn perplexed by the contradiction represented by the Harley Davidson flag in the midst of what otherwise appeared as la vieille France.

**Gender and Agritourism**

The material and symbolic representations of rural women are less well understood. Investigations into gender and rural representation have typically taken women to be the object of representation, not empowered to represent (Little 2006; Morris and Evans 2013), yet a growing body of scholarship has found that farm women often figure prominently in agritourism initiatives (Barbieri and Mshenga 2008; Brandth and Haugen 2010; Jennings and Stehlik 1999; O’Connor 1995; Oppermann 1995). Studies show that French farm women make a sizeable contribution to farm work, carry a disproportionate share of the household and child care burden, and are more likely than men to manage farm tourism activities (Darque 1988; Giraud and Rémy 2013). For many, women are perceived to be particularly well suited to agritourism given the importance of skills and competencies associated with work women have traditionally performed. Cleaning, cooking, and care work are frequently viewed as an extension of gendered norms into the commercial realm (Brandth and Haugen 2010; 2011; Jennings and Stehlik 1999; McGehee et al. 2007).
More recently, work has begun to explore the emancipatory potential within agritourism. Brandth and Haugen (2010, p. 425) argue that “engaging in farm tourism implies a change that not only demands new skills and competencies but may also influence the conditions under which gender relationships, power, and identities are enacted.” Studies reveal a range of consequences, from relatively static or no change in women’s position to significant improvements (Brandth and Haugen 2010; Evans and Ilbery 1996; Cánoves et al. 2004). These studies have been primarily concerned with individual, household, or farm-level changes such as those which increase women’s status, decision-making, or income within the household or farm or studies that posit a change to individual identity (Brandth and Haugen 2010). Work is needed which considers the macro implications of women as cultural authorities.

We see women’s entrepreneurship in agritourism as potentially empowering in its ability to provide women with a platform for exercising cultural authority – for transgressing normative gender boundaries and constructing a professional and contemporary identity imbued with contradictions and complexities. Rather than confine women to the backstage of cooking, cleaning, and caretaking, some forms of agritourism move women to the front stage of the farm unit. Educational or pedagogical farm tourism, for example, may provide a venue for recoding farm women as knowledgeable and authoritative. Farm tourism allows women the chance to model professional expertise and transmit practical knowledge historically associated with men. Farm women may disseminate complex biological, economic, political and social processes and practices essential for daily agricultural functioning; demonstrate the workings of sophisticated technology, unpack convoluted international agricultural policy and economic formulas, explain conservation strategies and environmental policy, animate cultural and geographic histories, and showcase technical exhibits. All this, while answering an array of questions from “what do sheep eat?” to ‘why do farmers receive government
subsidies?’. Lest we forget, they demonstrate this knowledge and skill all the while cooking for and feeding tourists.

We explore the ways farm tourism affords women visibility and how they use this role to represent agriculture and rural life. Our focus is on the content of these representations, with particular attention to the ways in which rural traditions and contemporary livelihoods are symbolically constructed for tourists.

Background

Réseau de Visites de Ferme (RVF) is an agritourism network of farm women located in Aveyron, France devoted to disseminating knowledge of sheep farming. Aveyron is one of the 96 political departments of France and belongs to the southern Midi-Pyrenees region. It is a landscape of breath-taking scenery and geological diversity composed of massive and craggy mountains, deep gorges, serene meadows, and numerous waterways. The high limestone plateau known as the Grands Causses is made up of a series of underground caves. Part of the region is located in the Massif Central. Rural character has lingered much longer in this area than in other regions of the country. It is commonly described as la France profonde - the heartland – a region of unspoiled rural France. Some add the adjective “backward” to depict the area and its people. Saugeres (2002, p. 376) contends that “the inhabitants of the region have developed a strong sense of a distinct identity, a sense of nostalgia for the traditional ways of life of the peasantry, alongside an inferiority complex of being ‘backward’, and the desire to be as modern and developed as in most areas of France.”

Agriculture remains central to the economic portfolio of Aveyron, employing 15-20 per cent of the labour force (Frayssignes, 2011). Its origins lie in the small scale agro-pastoral system where peasants largely produced cereals and herded sheep, but industrialisation and concentration began to take hold in the early twentieth century. Modern transportation, along
with the development of a cash economy, made possible highly specialised sheep farming for
the purpose of supplying milk to the Roquefort cheese market. “Between 1960 and 1980, the
production system became much more intensive with the amalgamation and modernisation of
farms, intensive forage crop growing, animal breeding programmes and an increase in the
volume of milk produced” (Quétier et al. 2005, p. 173). By 2000, 95 per cent of all
agricultural income in the region was derived from sheep farming (Frayssignes 2011), with
sheep producers numbering 2,458.

Roquefort is a blue cheese made of raw sheep milk derived primarily from the
Lacaune breed of sheep which are fed a diet of 75 per cent pasture and regional fodder.
Roquefort production is an intensive and industrial process. Milk is stored on farm in bulk
tanks and trucks arrive daily to retrieve it and deliver it to a local cheese dairy for processing.
In 1960, there were 460 small cheese dairies across the region, but today there are seven. One
firm (Société) represents 70 per cent of the market.

Once the milk arrives at the dairy, the milk will be heated and rennet and *penicillium
roqueforti* will be added to ignite lactic fermentation. It is then cut to separate the curds and
whey, moulded into “loaves” or large wheels, and allowed to drain for two days. Next, the
cheese is salted and pricked to “enable the carbon dioxide generated during the fermentation
process to escape and thereby encourage the development of the *penicillium roqueforti*”
during the ripening process (Confédération Générale de Roquefort N.d. p. 47). Finally, the
cheese wheel is marked with information regarding herd origins and manufacturing date to
facilitate traceability and then sent for ripening to the limestone caves located beneath its
namesake village - Roquefort-sur-Soulzon. Natural ventilation in the cellars produces
constant humidity and temperature providing a conducive microclimate for activating the
*penicillium roqueforti* which creates the blue-green veins. Once ripe, women “cabin workers”
fold each wheel in tinfoil and prepare it for the market. In 2001, 3,000 tons of Roquefort was exported to more than 90 countries (Frayssignes 2011).

The symbolic imagery evoked by the industry in advertising and branding is one of bucolic landscapes and the preservation of longstanding cultural traditions, yet this brief overview affirms that the production of Roquefort is a highly industrialised process. Cheese is manufactured via a regulated process informed by “the strictest scientific conditions” (Confédération Générale de Roquefort N.d., p. 49) and marketed to an international consumer base who demand a standardised product. For many, quality cheese production conjures up images of small scale artisanal production, but in the case of Roquefort the more accurate representation is an industrial laboratory setting where white lab-coat-wearing workers inject microscopic fungi into uniform cheese wheels to ignite a biological process.

It is hard to overstate the role of Roquefort cheese to the local economy. An old saying holds, that “[i]f Roquefort sneezes, all the region catches a cold” (Frayssignes 2011, p. 5). Today, it is protected by French legislation which endorses the use of a geographical name for products originating from a distinctive provenance and produced with specific cultural knowledge. Labelled products with a geographic indication, or Appellation d’Origine Contrôlée (AOC),² are granted legal protection as a form of collective intellectual property. Roquefort was the first cheese in France to receive this official status in 1925 and received similar protective status from the European Union in 1996 when it was registered as a Protected Designation of Origin (PDO). Since 1930, the red ewe label that graces each wheel of cheese has guaranteed to the consumer authenticity and quality, but for producers, AOC standards “strongly affect the way farms are managed” (Quetier et al. 2005, p. 172). AOC standards can also influence the ways farm women represent rural life and agriculture through agritourism.
Frayssignes (2011) argues that the link to rural development, although significant, is not a priority of Roquefort supply chain actors, especially, the cheese processors. Although the caves draw in approximately 200,000 visitors a year for tours, the only other tourism presence is the RVF which was launched in 1993 by two of its current members. Its origins are rooted in a request from the Confédération Générale de Roquefort – the regulatory association made up of milk producers and processors - that milk producers open up their farms to tourists to share the milk production process and its rich cultural heritage.

Members of the RVF welcome tourists to their family farms to provide a goûters à la ferme, or ‘farm snack’. The farm snack is a popular form of farmstead hospitality in France (Bessière 1998), and, in this case, is accompanied by a guided educational tour where the host disseminates knowledge of milk production as well as sharing the cultural heritage of sheep farming and the natural amenities of the area that make Roquefort distinctive and globally recognized. Overall, each member of the RVF offers the same type of services: first the guided educational tour, then the ‘farm snack’. Likewise, three types of farm snacks are offered by all members, from a basic option including Roquefort cheese and local wine to a more elaborate one including Roquefort cheese, local wine, and traditional deserts. In addition, the general outline of the guided tour is similar from one member to another (they share the same educational material). Offering a homogeneous package is essential to the members of RVF—especially to the founding members, in order to be clearly identified. However, some differences exist depending on the characteristics of each farm and on each member’s personal interest and desire to develop one particular aspect of the business. The RVF functions in some ways like a woman’s auxiliary that serves to support and bolster - often via the realm of culture - the cheese industry. At the end of the farm tour, guests are often directed to visit the caves in Roquefort-sur-Soulzon.
The leadership of RVF prefer to keep the Network small; at its largest there were six members, but currently only four participate, ranging in ages from 45 to 62. Three of the four members are also full-time farmers working with either their husband or son, while the fourth member identified herself as a farm employee. Regardless of official status, their primary role on the farm is to milk the sheep twice daily. Three are also responsible for the management of the farm records, and some also engage in other farm activities, such as poultry and gardening.

Methods

The research design consisted of three components: 1) semi-structured interviews; 2) participant observation; and, 3) document analysis. We interviewed each of the four members of the Network as well as one former member. Each of the five interviews were conducted at their farm and ranged in length from 1 ½ - 4 hours. Interviews were conducted in French, tape-recorded, and later partially transcribed and translated. Both authors were present for the interviews as was a language interpreter. Interviews consisted of approximately 40 open and closed-ended questions covering subjects such as farm history, farm and agritourism organisation and interaction, motivations, gender dynamics, and future visions. In each case, researchers were also given a guided tour of the farm and facilities.

Next, we proceeded to make participatory observations of the Network. Each author assumed the role of tourist on two separate occasions and took part in an actual farm visit along with other guests. The visit allowed us to observe first-hand the interaction of the host with the guest, to hear the script, and to experience the visit as a tourist. Perhaps most importantly, it allowed us to engage with other tourists, to watch their reactions and learn what information appeared to resonate with them.
Lastly, we analysed a number of documents. These documents include the RVF advertising brochure and their website. Network members were also able to provide us with a number of newspaper articles profiling their work which turned out to be useful for understanding the evolution of the group.

We have given each member a pseudonym in an effort to disassociate her comments from her identity. Given the small sample size it is not possible to determine if these findings represent all farm women agritourism entrepreneurs. We offer these data to ignite further scrutiny of this phenomenon, providing evidence for theorising about the ways rural and agriculture are represented by women as rural restructuring is performed in ways which blur conventional production and consumption boundaries.

Representing Rurality

In this section, we analyse how Network members use their role as agritourism entrepreneurs to represent agriculture and rural life. We examine women’s agritourism work in regards to the organisation of the initiative, its staging, performance, and the discourse they use to animate rural life and agriculture. In this section we will show how RVF Network members reproduce nostalgic imagery associated with an agrarian past along with traditional social relations. Yet, tradition is not the only commodity on offer. Farm women also represent agriculture and rural life in ways that animate modernity. First, we turn to a discussion of traditional representation where we find women activating custom and convention in three ways, through: 1) marketing, organising, and narrating the farm tour around AOC sanctioned production practices; 2) designing and staging the farm tour; and, 3) their bodies via performances as food provider and caretaker.
Understanding agriculture and rural representation by RVF members begins with the process of organising the farm tour and delimiting the numerous possibilities farm tourism could take. In this regard, the organisation of the tourism experience is prescribed, in part, by Roquefort itself and the AOC certification process. Bowen and DeMaster (2011) argue that the setting of quality assurance standards is an inherently political project whereby some practices are included, and others omitted, from protection, thereby shaping and constraining what is protected or permitted. In essence, such standards are an attempt to bound (Edensor 2001) history, place, and culture.

For agritourism, this means that the codification of quality assurance standards in the AOC legal framework not only establishes the parameters of production practices, but it also establishes the parameters of any activity which seeks to communicate the nature of production processes, such as farm tourism. Any effort to transmit the production practices of sheep farming will indirectly follow the production guidelines set by Roquefort AOC. This enhances the likelihood of homogeneity of tourist experience among members in the Network, but distinguishes it from other non-Roquefort agritourism initiatives.

The AOC quality assurance standards prescribe the basic protocol for the production process, foregrounding tradition, cultural heritage, and the distinctive properties of the natural landscape. We can see women reproduce these guidelines in the way they market the Network, organise the farm tour, and narrate the milk production process. The advertising brochure, for example, may be the first encounter guests have that begins the work of representing tradition.

At the origin of Roquefort cheese, before the maturing of the cheese in the caves, there is country, farms, sheep farmers, ewes and their milk… There is an entire world which
is quite often unknown. Animated by the desire to share their passion for their job, four ‘agricultrices’ [farm women] invite you to discover their job in all its richness/intensity. They welcome you to their place, in Roquefort country, in the heart of the typical landscapes and the traditional architectural heritage of the Parc Naturel Regional of the Grands Causses. They introduce you to the world of their farm, they tell you its story and they speak about their lives shaped by the seasons (*author transcription*, RVF brochure, 2012).

This representation constructs sheep producers as both traditional and distinctive. Tradition is framed through the unassuming personal invitation which lowers the boundaries of formality by evoking a down-home character associated with the hospitality and charm ascribed to rural people. It accentuates social solidarity and the expressive forms of rationality associated with “passion”, not the instrumentality of science and industrial food production methods. It also calls on the rural idyll by situating farms within the natural landscape, furthered by a nod to seasonality. Imagery such as “cheese”, “caves”, “Roquefort country”, “traditional architectural heritage” and the “Grands Causses” also help to brand them as unique. An aura of mystique is punctuated throughout when referencing the “unknown” “world” of their region and work. Such framing segregates farm women and their “world” of sheep farming from tourists, and, in this way, perpetuates their image as different or “other” (Hall 1997; Little 1999). Weightman (1987, p. 230) contends that “the tour brochure directs expectations, influences perceptions, and thereby provides a preconceived landscape for the tourist to discover.” This suggests that what tourists may be primed to witness is a cultural reproduction of the rural/urban binary at work. Hosts may foreground that which differentiates rural and urban dwellers (nature, culture, heritage, *patrimoine*) instead of that which bonds them (modernity, capitalism, etc.). Therefore, as suggested by Holloway in examining the British context (2004), by emphasizing differences between rural
and urban dwellers, hosts may be underlining tourists’ preconceived ideas of rural life and reinforcing rural/urban cleavages where common values, identities, and aspirations are otherwise masked.

The advertising brochure and the website illuminate tradition and distinctiveness and when guests arrive they enter a scene designed and staged to reinforce this imagery. From the script that farm women use to narrate the farm tour, to the architecture tourists observe, to the final snack they consume, tradition and cultural heritage are enrolled to represent life on a working sheep farm. Juliette describes how she begins to orient guests upon first arrival.

I tell people we are different. Our region is really rural, really agricultural, with people with strong characters. They are proud people of their roots and their heritage.

Juliette’s orientation is to follow the lead of the brochure and position her region and people as distinctive, or “other”, and, at the same time, illuminate the importance of cultural heritage. Apolline uses her farm tour to achieve similar distinctive objectives.

When people arrive, first I speak about the region, its specificities. From there, we speak about the park of the Grands Causses, then of the production area in which we need to be located to produce milk to be used in the making of Roquefort. Next, I focus on the farm with its specificities, how it works, how it’s organised, where it’s located, its natural environment, its buildings, its architectural heritage.

Apolline’s narrative punctuates the symbolic imagery associated with the unique features of cultural heritage and tradition by enrolling AOC standards, the farm, nature, and architecture as props to authenticate the representation. Perhaps the most significant prop is the barn.

One of the criteria for RVF membership is that each woman must have a suitable ‘old’ barn in which to welcome tourists and provide the snack. Perhaps no image resurrects rurality
in the same way as agricultural barns constructed of materials typical of the nineteenth century, such as honey-colored stone harvested from the local terrain, with massive hand-cut tongue and groove wooden beams. These buildings began their life housing Lacaune sheep around 150-200 years ago, but became obsolete in the 1960s-1970s when farmers adopted mechanical milking machines. Today, preservation of these barns is perceived by the French as part of their patrimoine, or cultural heritage.

Each of the women in the RVF reclaimed the stone barn on their property and renovated it for their agritourism business. From a former place of production, the old sheep barns are now repurposed spaces for urban consumption (Hinrichs 1996; Potter and Tilzey 2005). In reclaiming this traditional architecture and enrolling them as props in agritourism staging, the women participate in cultural heritage protection and the transmission of patrimoine. As Agathe said, “[b]arns like ours give authenticity, terroir, a sense of history, everything. If cheese tasting takes place in a regular room, it’s not the same thing.”

The barn may be the clearest material nod to tradition, but, once inside, the interior fortifies the image of la vieille France. Each barn is staged with several long roughly hewn farm tables and benches or mismatched chairs. Old features were preserved where possible, such as a fireplace or sheep milking stanchions. Antique farm implements line the stone walls not to celebrate progress as Holloway (2004) found in his study of British agricultural shows. The rustic motif transports tourists to an agrarian past, all be it, one sanitised of the animals, with attendant smells and sounds emblematic of authentic animal housing.

Lastly, we found women constructing an image of rurality as tradition with their bodies. The performances they play as food providers and caretakers are an extension of typical roles associated with women in the home, into the realm of farm tourism (Pini 2004). The women take it upon themselves to welcome the guests, guide the tour, write and deliver
the script, as well as cook and serve the snack. The wine and cheese are purchased locally, but
the desserts are prepared by each woman in her home kitchen. Foods are presented on
artisinal stoneware, both prepared and presented to further the yesteryear image through
home cooking and craft production. By assuming the role as cook, and presenting foods in a
traditional manner, the farm woman perform a traditional gendered division of labour - for
the purpose of commodification (Brandth and Haugen 2010), while at the same time
representing notions of food purity and wholesomeness (Ilbery and Kneafsey 2000).

This part of the paper has shown that tradition, cultural heritage, and distinctiveness
play key roles in the farm women’s representations of rurality. They accomplish this in their
marketing, organisation, and narration of the farm tour, the designing and staging of the farm
tour, and through their bodies as they perform customary roles ascribed to rural women. This
supports previous research that has found farm tourism to be “inextricably intertwined with
historical, political, and cultural processes” (Pritchard and Morgan 2001, p. 168). Whether it
is the AOC certification standards that politically prescribe production parameters, or the
cultural artefacts that confer resource availability, farm women’s representations reproduce a
binary division that may portray them and their livelihood as yesterday’s people. This
“marking of difference” (Hall 1997, p. 232), or “othering”, may, indeed, be the commodity
that tourist’s demand, yet today’s image, may be tomorrow’s obstacle. Such images run the
risk of fostering stereotypes of complex sub-cultures and places as simple, hardy and self-
sufficient and not in need of responsive rural development policies. It may also further the
gulf between rural and urban populations if it is not replaced or buttressed with social and
cultural imagery that communicates authenticity of experience and contemporary realities.

Indeed, we discovered that traditional representations of rural life are not immutable.

Just as often as tradition was constructed, so too was the diversity and complexity of
contemporary life. We now turn to a discussion of how farm women use agritourism in ways that confound tradition, heritage and distinctiveness.

Recoding Roquefort

Representations of agriculture and rurality by farm women accentuate classic imagery associated with agrarian traditions, however, such representations were also buttressed by a dynamism indicative of modernity. Beck (1992) tells us that under reflexive modernity, individuals have more agency to construct their lives in a multiplicity of ways. Just as we saw women instrumentally exploiting tradition for commodification, we also observed hosts resisting convention, and infusing diversity and the prosaic elements of everyday farm and family life into their agritourism operation to recode agriculture and rurality with a modern orientation. In this section, we discuss how RVF members turn the tables on tradition in three ways, through: 1) marketing, organising, and narrating the farm tour to accentuate knowledge and professionalism; 2) performing everyday, lived experiences; and 3) with their bodies, via identity management.

First, the very visibility of farm women is far from a minor addition to the rural story. Women’s place on the farm has historically been read as largely exploited and invisible (Alston 1995; Brandth 1998; Sachs 1983; Shortall 1999), assigned to the backstage of family farming where they play a secondary role as farm helper, but rarely viewed as a farmer in their own right. Saugeres (2002) has argued in the case of France that women are rarely viewed as ‘farmers’ because the occupation is constructed as a masculine endeavour. The role as agritourism entrepreneur not only makes them visible, (Barbieri and Mshenga 2008; Brandth and Haugen 2010; Jennings and Stehlik 1999; O’Connor 1995; Oppermann 1995), but allows them to craft a professional image and demonstrate specialised knowledge and authority. Farm tourism also permits women to cultivate both an interest and income
generating activity of their own and diversify their range of activities atypical of traditional farm women’s lives.

The representation of farm women as professionals begins once again in the marketing domain as the brochure emphasizes farm tourism as not a way of life or hobby, but a “job”.

“Animated by the desire to share their passion for their job, four agricultrices’ [farm women] invite you to discover their job in all its richness/intensity.” Historically, farm women were referred to as paysan or fermière. Around the mid-century – during rapid adoption of industrial farming methods, the modern label of agriculteur began to be applied to farmers who embraced production for commercial markets with intensive and scientific methods. At the same time, a woman similarly engaged in commercial agriculture began to be referred to as an agricultrice. By invoking the label agricultrices, members of the Network align themselves with this professional status.

In the early days of the Network, members worked closely with the Grands Causses Regional Park which trained them to host farm tourism activities. Jocelyne recalls being excited by their insistence on professionalism. They warned, “be careful, your job is being a farmer, people don’t want to come to a museum. People want to come to your workplace.” She took this advice to heart and structured a well-organised tour along with a narrative that recounted for guests the highly technical aspects of the production process along with economic and political realities of modern day sheep farming.

The importance of professionalism was reinforced by each member, but more noticeable among the younger members. Some made significant investments to construct a professional agritourism business. Juliette left her husband, two sons, and the family farm for four months to attend cheese school in the north of France. This was very unpopular with her husband and in-laws, who feared neighbours might gossip about her absence from the home
for such a period. She insisted that proper training was crucial, in part, because her dream is to expand the operation one day to produce her own cheese.

Professionalism is also accompanied by the assertion of independence and autonomy. Women resisted traditional farm roles where they were ascribed to the role of ‘farm help’, and advocated for having their own “activity.” “A little something of my own on the farm” was the primary driver for entrepreneurialism among each woman. As Apolline put it, “when you arrive on your in-laws farm, you need to create your own space.” For Jocelyne, once newly married, her husband preferred she assume traditional mothering and homemaking roles.

When I arrived here we were three generations under one roof and my mother-in-law was doing my husband’s wash…He would tell me, ‘for God’s sake, why can’t you stay home?’ I told him no, I would be bored…It is important for me to have relationships. I thought that starting this activity, welcoming people, would help me recreate these relationships and give me something of my own.

Perhaps the most forceful in her demand for autonomy was Apolline who agreed to “work on the farm and in agritourism only if [she] was in charge to the same degree as [her] husband and brother-in-law…[They] took the decision to go into agritourism together.” In this way, their desire for their own individual income-generating farm activity, is in line with other research that has found autonomy to be a driving motivational factor in the decision to farm more generally (see Mooney, 1986).

Each of the members saw themselves as the primary agritourism entrepreneur and the husband as secondary. This relocates women in positions of authority and demotes men to the role of helper. Even though Apolline claimed her husband was an equal partner and regularly involved, she described his role as being primarily confined to the backstage where he was responsible for maintenance and infrastructure. His regularly occurring visible role was to
provide entertainment for the guests; when she slips out to get the snack he performs a short
sheepdog demonstration. Such a division of labour situates women in positions of authority
and furthers the separation with tradition, and at the same time, it also recasts men in
agriculture.

According to Charlotte, she and her husband also embarked upon agritourism
primarily as a joint venture. They share in leading the tours even though there are strong rural
norms that go against such activity for men.

My husband likes leading the tours but he says that most farmers around here would
not, rural areas are patriarchal where men drive tractors and women milk. Other
farmers would make fun of him if they knew he hosted visitors on the farm…I don’t
consider welcoming guests as feminine, my husband prepares flowers and jam, but
some do.

These cases suggest that women’s professionalism in agritourism casts men in secondary
roles. Now men play the part of ‘helper’ and assist in uncompensated work that resides in the
sphere of cultural reproduction.

The dependence on science and technology is also seen to challenge the dominance of
tradition. Farm women choreograph and narrate the tour in ways that demonstrate a broad
knowledge base in a range of complicated social, biological, and technological processes. Just
as the barns can be enrolled to mimic tradition, tours are also choreographed to highlight
state-of-the-art buildings equipped with the latest technology, such as modern milking
machines and hay driers. Charlotte de-emphasizes tradition when she explains why the old
stone barn can no longer serve the needs of a modern sheep farm. Jocelyne incorporates
modernity when she recounts the long programme of selective breeding that has doubled milk
production over the last 20 years.
Women commonly reported that the guests were unprepared to see such ‘modern’ technology and production practices. Agathe said, “when they arrive they are surprised to see the way we work, the buildings, the milking room. They see the milking room tiled and they say ‘it’s a real lab that you have.’” Apolline’s overview shows how she disseminates modern production practices.

I start it in the area where we dry hay where there is enough space and were I set up explanatory posters. There, I explain how to manage a sheep herd. Everyone can ask questions. I explain everything, births, lambs’ sales, why milk control, old ewe’s sales - the entire production cycle. Then, I tell them about the principle of in-door hay drying which takes place right behind them, the feeding of the sheep. Then we walk across the sheep barn itself, I tell them why there are different areas, how it works. I start the automatic feeder to show them how it works. After, I go into the milking room where I start the milking machines so that they can see how it works and we take advantage of this moment to speak about what happens with the milk and its process into Roquefort cheese. We speak about the milk, its components, all the sanitary controls, traceability, the arrival of the milk into the cheese factory then the Roquefort caves. Then, we go the water treatment area planted with reeds. Then we reach the last hour when my husband gives them the sheepdog show so that I can prepare the snacks.

Each of the women reported showcasing production practices designed to impress the tourist with state-of-the-art methods and the upmost regard for adherence to quality assurance standards. As guests are led through the barns they are exposed to stainless steel bulk tanks that store milk at precise temperatures, equipment used to test daily for pathogens in the milk, and machines that can milk 500-600 sheep in an hour. They walk by posters that detail complicated nutritional formulas that vary by the season; they are instructed on the importance of lactation cycles, genetic improvements, and artificial insemination. Apolline
incorporates a PowerPoint presentation that explains the origins of AOC regulations and how production standards assure cheese quality in partnership with numerous actors across the Roquefort supply chain. Agathe adds fluency in international agricultural policy when she informs tourists about the role of farm subsidies. “People ask about the subsidies a lot...so I explain that subsidies are here to compensate farmers because consumer prices have not gone up for many years. They think it is charity; they have no idea what a farmer earns and they have a lot of misconceptions. I tell them the truth.”

The litany of skills necessary to make this performance credible is not insignificant. Their comfort with chemistry, biology, and technology animates the know-how that gives AOC products their distinctive shared practices, yet with a modern veneer. Quality assurance standards may be time and space bound, but the traditional know-how required to produce Roquefort is accomplished with contemporary skills, competencies, and science and technology applications. Such fluency with cutting-edge knowledge and techniques helps to recode women from disposable farm helpers to authorities with a wide range of skills and professional acumen.

Some are disillusioned with this representation of modern sheep farming, according to Charlotte. “All these people have a romantic vision of farm life. Their image of the farmer is from the media and is old fashioned and not realistic. Some are disappointed to see it is not rural enough. Some feel cheated when they see modern hygiene equipment.” The introduction of the modern, through “hygiene equipment” or other technologies or practices suggests a shattering of the rural idyll and reinforces the gulf that segregates rural producers from urban tourists.

Network members also root their tourist activity in the present, making sure the tourist leaves with an accurate understanding of life on a modern sheep farm. Women frequently
find, intentionally or unintentionally, that the exigencies of life are often on stage for tourists
view. Charlotte makes an effort to ensure guests have a “direct experience with everything. I
want them to touch, see, smell everything. I try to have them understand that we work
here…We clean up but it should not be too perfect…it is a working farm.” Jocelyne
punctuates the multiple demands modern women have on their shoulders by communicating
the multi-tasking she does. When they call for an appointment I tell them “that they cannot
come 30 minutes late because otherwise I would be late to complete my other chores like the
milking.”

Each of the women also reported having their tours interrupted by family members
from time to time. Children barge in with a question, husbands stop by to greet the guests,
neighbours pop in unexpected, phones ring, and oven timers buzz forcing women to briefly
excuse themselves to tend to lunch preparations. Such disruptions bring to light the numerous
activities that require women’s attention and, at the same time, communicate a blurring of
productive and reproductive spheres. An awareness of the difficulties women face in
balancing farm, tourism and household obligations begins to shatter images of traditional
divisions of labour where women and men are confined to prescribed roles.

Lastly, we found contemporary traces represented in the routine staging of women’s
bodies as they dress to look the part of a *real* farmer. Some agritourism operators find it
useful to wear culturally specific attire to evoke some desired sentiment (Brandth and Haugen
2010), but the women in the Network eschew traditional dress in favour of modelling a
twentieth-first century representation. Apolline is often told by guests that they did not expect
to “meet a farm woman looking like [her]. Maybe they were expecting someone older.
Usually they are also surprised to see a house with a lawn, a farm house well-ordered. They
tell me that they were not expecting a modern, dynamic woman like me.” For some members,
dress can be an important way to defensively manage an impression of themselves. Looking
the part of a modern farm woman can also be a tool to combat the negative stereotypes often
directed toward rural people. Juliette’s fashion choices seem to be aimed at both these ends.

Sometimes the kids tell me they want to see the fermière [farmwoman]. I tell them I
am the fermière. It is true that in kid’s books the fermière is more likely to appear with
a scarf holding a basket. I think there is a difference for some people between what
they expect and what they see…I am into traditional dancing, but I never dress up in a
traditional outfit to welcome guests. I don’t wear a dress and clogs. I wear a pair of
jeans and a t-shirt. If some people try to keep these traditions alive, why not? It’s our
roots, but personally I think we should show people that they are not arriving where
bouseux [nednecks] live.

In a similar defensive vein, Agathe adds that she wants them to know that she is not
“bagnard,” or a convict, that she is not chained to the farm toiling endlessly, but enjoys the
same activities as urban residents, including family vacations. “Before coming, they have a lot
of clichés in their mind…Parisians still see us with clogs and boots.”

Saugeres (2002) argues that Aveyron residents are typically believed to suffer from a
sense of inferiority in comparison with other French citizens and often strive to prove that
they are just as modern as others. Whether such forms of identity management described
above are enacted to counter the stereotype of themselves as ‘backward farmers’ specifically,
or the more general ‘Aveyron resident’, may be impossible to disentangle. They are,
however, evidence for how women use their bodies to transgress traditional symbolic
boundaries and plant the seeds for a new rural and agricultural imagery.

Conclusion

French agritourism entrepreneurs represent farm tourism in ways that interweave
tradition, cultural heritage, and distinctiveness with contemporary knowledge, expertise,
economic and political realities, and symbols. Imagery of an agrarian past is commonplace, but an asymmetrical interpretation of the representations farm women create within agritourism is also present. Performances, staging, and organisation, intentionally and unintentionally, also construct agriculture and rural life as modern, dynamic, and multifaceted. Custom and tradition collide with rationality and individuality creating a paradox. The result is a representation for tourists that complicates the *la vieille France* imagery of agriculture and rural life. As Juliet affirms, “[w]e show them that agriculture is evolving, that it’s modern, but that at the same time, there is *patrimoine*, a gastronomical heritage as well as an architectural one.”

Whereas Bowen and DeMaster (2011) see similar heritage-based initiatives which become institutionalised through policy as freezing culture in time and place, we found in agritourism - also prescribed by heritage-based regulations - a degree of dynamism. We found the Network members showing and telling a story that aims to strike some semblance of a balance to convey the complexity and totality of the rural experience, both intentionally and unintentionally. Edensor (2006, p. 485) argues that rural performances are both self-conscious or deliberate action and habitual at the same time, “an interweaving of conscious and unaware modalities, part of the flow of ongoing existence.”

Representing this totality begins with an organisational frame somewhat prescribed by AOC guidelines that accentuates tradition, cultural heritage and distinctiveness, yet regulations have not frozen production practices in place. They may have been set by custom, but they are increasingly accomplished with modern, industrial implements and techniques in an effort to respond to changing local and global economies (Frayssignes 2011). This orientation allows Network members to blur the boundaries of tradition and modernity as they demonstrate their recasting of cultural heritage with contemporary tools, such as milking equipment, industrial processors, EU subsidies, and international trade laws. As women are
the embodiment of authority in the tourist experience, they are also able to challenge
conventional imagery of the farmer (the embodied male farmer) and make a feminised imprint
on agriculture. In this way, AOC regulations become malleable, contouring agriculture or
rural representation, without concretising it.

In addition to animating AOC standards accomplished with modern means, Network
members also infuse the complexities of everyday life in the performance as they enact daily
life in view of tourists. Because their home is the setting, the lived experience of sheep
producers is often on view, allowing guests a front seat to the backstage of contemporary rural
life. Hard working, unassuming rural people bound together in dense kinships ties, so the
stock idealised image goes, become demanding, over-programmed, busy professionals with a
wide range of skills, knowledge, and responsibilities - a heterogeneous mix whose lifestyles
reverberate diversity. Bodies are used to further manage an impression of themselves as
modern, both to show how they adapt to socio-economic or political realities, as well as
creatively infusing a sense of self into the encounter. This desire of the farm women to
imprint on the tourist experience stands in stark contrast to the invisibility of their mothers
and grandmothers.

Through their participation in RVF, women challenge classical assessments of rural
gender dynamics by moving from a position of ‘farm help’ to one of ‘agricultural authority’.
Literature suggests that for decades farm women had been confined to the backstage,
exploited and invisible, in charge of the household and required to contribute to male-defined
farm activities (Sachs, 1983; Saugeres, 2002). Agritourism may provide women an
opportunity to move to the front stage of the farm. In fact, hosting visitors on the farm might
afford women the opportunity to move from a position of societal invisibility (Sachs, 1983) to
assume roles that hold promise for significant influence.
Our study suggests that, through their participation in the Network, farm women challenge dominant representations of women as “incomplete farmers” (Saugeres, 2002) by preforming the role of ‘agricultural authority.’ This role might permit a new form of cultural power farm women have historically been unable to access. In the context of this activity, they are able to demonstrate to the public their agricultural knowledge and skills. Their power to represent, stage and perform rurality allows them to build a bridge between rural and urban populations that seem increasingly polarised. However, future research is needed to explore how tourists interpret such imagery, as well as the long term implications of such representations on urban values and political sensitivity to rural issues. In short, it is questionable to what extent representations that fragment social relations and enlarge gulfs between rural and urban populations enhance shared meaning and understanding.

Lastly, agritourism may also be fertile ground for women’s empowerment within the context of the family farm. However, as previously suggested by the literature (Brandth and Haugen, 2010), whether these new opportunities empower women or change on-farm power relations remains unsettled. If our research participants appear as agricultural authorities in the eyes of the public, the extent to which this role challenges a traditional distribution of power between men and women requires further exploration. Further research should explore how agritourism initiatives can empower farm women on the farm and within the household.
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Endnotes

1. In this paper, we use farm tourism and agritourism interchangeably.

2. The officially defined AOC Roquefort region is not synonymous with Aveyron. Today milk is sourced from two regions, the Midi-Pyrenees and Languedoc-Roussillon and six departments: Aude, Aveyron, Gard, Hérault, Lozère, and Tarn.

3. In 1962, the Groupement Agricole d’Exploitation en Commun (GAEC) agricultural framework was created to allow two individuals to legally enter into a business partnership, sharing the work and the benefits. The two contractees were considered as co-operators. GAEC contracts were seen as a path toward agricultural modernisation, a mechanism for improving productivity by increasing farm size. The earliest GAEC contracts could be entered only by parents and children (typically, father/sons). Modifications allowed spouses (husband/wives) to enter a GAEC contract in 2004.
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