Farm Women and Agritourism: Representing a New Rurality

Wynne Wright* and Alexis Annes**

* Associate Professor

Depts. of Community Sustainability and Sociology
330 B Natural Resources Building
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824, USA
Tel: (517) 884-1372
Email: wrightwy@anr.msu.edu

**Enseignant Chercheur

UMR LISST-Dynamiques Rurales—Ecole d'Ingénieurs de Purpan
75 voie du TOEC
BP 57611
31076 Toulouse Cedex 3, France
Tel: (33) 5 61 15 30 86
Email: alexis.annes@purpan.fr

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.

Keywords: Agritourism, Cultural heritage, Farm women, France, Representation, Roquefort, Rural, Tradition

“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.¹ 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 and Phillips 1998; Brandth 1995; Liepins 1996; Walter and Wilson 1996). Scholarship has also explored the gendered dimensions of farm tourism, most frequently to explore motivations and characteristics (Babriero and Mshenga 2008; Getz and Carlson 2000; McGehee *et al.* 2007), the division of labour in farm tourism (Danes 1998; Dernois 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. Bessire (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 (Clope 1997, p. 371).

Theoretical Overview

Theories of social representation of the rural have become a growth industry over the past two decades (Clope 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

271 with the development of a cash economy, made possible highly specialised sheep farming for
272 the purpose of supplying milk to the Roquefort cheese market. “Between 1960 and 1980, the
273 production system became much more intensive with the amalgamation and modernisation of
274 farms, intensive forage crop growing, animal breeding programmes and an increase in the
275 volume of milk produced” (Quétier *et al.* 2005, p. 173). By 2000, 95 per cent of all
276 agricultural income in the region was derived from sheep farming (Frayssignes 2011), with
277 sheep producers numbering 2,458.

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

284   Once the milk arrives at the dairy, the milk will be heated and rennet and *penicillium*
285 *roqueforti* will be added to ignite lactic fermentation. It is then cut to separate the curds and
286 whey, moulded into “loaves” or large wheels, and allowed to drain for two days. Next, the
287 cheese is salted and pricked to “enable the carbon dioxide generated during the fermentation
288 process to escape and thereby encourage the development of the *penicillium roqueforti*”
289 during the ripening process (*Confédération Générale de Roquefort* N.d. p. 47). Finally, the
290 cheese wheel is marked with information regarding herd origins and manufacturing date to
291 facilitate traceability and then sent for ripening to the limestone caves located beneath its
292 namesake village - Roquefort-sur-Soulzon. Natural ventilation in the cellars produces
293 constant humidity and temperature providing a conducive microclimate for activating the
294 *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 farmers³ 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.

367   Lastly, we analysed a number of documents. These documents include the RVF
368   advertising brochure and their website. Network members were also able to provide us with a
369   number of newspaper articles profiling their work which turned out to be useful for
370   understanding the evolution of the group.

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

378   **Representing Rurality**

379   In this section, we analyse how Network members use their role as agritourism
380   entrepreneurs to represent agriculture and rural life. We examine women's agritourism work
381   in regards to the organisation of the initiative, its staging, performance, and the discourse they
382   use to animate rural life and agriculture. In this section we will show how RVF Network
383   members reproduce nostalgic imagery associated with an agrarian past along with traditional
384   social relations. Yet, tradition is not the only commodity on offer. Farm women also represent
385   agriculture and rural life in ways that animate modernity. First, we turn to a discussion of
386   traditional representation where we find women activating custom and convention in three
387   ways, through: 1) marketing, organising, and narrating the farm tour around AOC sanctioned
388   production practices; 2) designing and staging the farm tour; and, 3) their bodies via
389   performances as food provider and caretaker.

391 *Rurality as Tradition*

392   Understanding agriculture and rural representation by RVF members begins with the
393 process of organising the farm tour and delimiting the numerous possibilities farm tourism
394 could take. In this regard, the organisation of the tourism experience is prescribed, in part, by
395 Roquefort itself and the AOC certification process. Bowen and DeMaster (2011) argue that
396 the setting of quality assurance standards is an inherently political project whereby some
397 practices are included, and others omitted, from protection, thereby shaping and constraining
398 what is protected or permitted. In essence, such standards are an attempt to bound (Edensor
399 2001) history, place, and culture.

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

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

413   At the origin of Roquefort cheese, before the maturing of the cheese in the caves, there
414 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

440 and urban dwellers, hosts may be underlining tourists' preconceived ideas of rural life and
441 reinforcing rural/urban cleavages where common values, identities, and aspirations are
442 otherwise masked.

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

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

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

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

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

461   One of the criteria for RVF membership is that each woman must have a suitable 'old'
462 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 artisanal 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 preform 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

535 generating activity of their own and diversify their range of activities atypical of traditional
536 farm women's lives.

537   The representation of farm women as professionals begins once again in the marketing
538 domain as the brochure emphasizes farm tourism as not a way of life or hobby, but a "job".
539 "Animated by the desire to share their passion for their job, four *agricultrices*' [farm women]
540 invite you to discover their job in all its richness/intensity." Historically, farm women were
541 referred to as *paysan or fermière*. Around the mid-century – during rapid adoption of
542 industrial farming methods, the modern label of *agriculteur* began to be applied to farmers
543 who embraced production for commercial markets with intensive and scientific methods. At
544 the same time, a woman similarly engaged in commercial agriculture began to be referred to
545 as an *agricultrice*. By invoking the label *agricultrices*, members of the Network align
546 themselves with this professional status.

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

554   The importance of professionalism was reinforced by each member, but more
555 noticeable among the younger members. Some made significant investments to construct a
556 professional agritourism business. Juliette left her husband, two sons, and the family farm for
557 four months to attend cheese school in the north of France. This was very unpopular with her
558 husband and in-laws, who feared neighbours might gossip about her absence from the home

559 for such a period. She insisted that proper training was crucial, in part, because her dream is to
560 expand the operation one day to produce her own cheese.

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

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

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

578 Each of the members saw themselves as the primary agritourism entrepreneur and the
579 husband as secondary. This relocates women in positions of authority and demotes men to the
580 role of helper. Even though Apolline claimed her husband was an equal partner and regularly
581 involved, she described his role as being primarily confined to the backstage where he was
582 responsible for maintenance and infrastructure. His regularly occurring visible role was to

583 provide entertainment for the guests; when she slips out to get the snack he performs a short
584 sheepdog demonstration. Such a division of labour situates women in positions of authority
585 and furthers the separation with tradition, and at the same time, it also recasts men in
586 agriculture.

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

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

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

598 The dependence on science and technology is also seen to challenge the dominance of
599 tradition. Farm women choreograph and narrate the tour in ways that demonstrate a broad
600 knowledge base in a range of complicated social, biological, and technological processes. Just
601 as the barns can be enrolled to mimic tradition, tours are also choreographed to highlight
602 state-of-the-art buildings equipped with the latest technology, such as modern milking
603 machines and hay driers. Charlotte de-emphasizes tradition when she explains why the old
604 stone barn can no longer serve the needs of a modern sheep farm. Jocelyne incorporates
605 modernity when she recounts the long programme of selective breeding that has doubled milk
606 production over the last 20 years.

607 Women commonly reported that the guests were unprepared to see such ‘modern’
608 technology and production practices. Agathe said, “when they arrive they are surprised to see
609 the way we work, the buildings, the milking room. They see the milking room tiled and they
610 say ‘it’s a real lab that you have.’” Apolline’s overview shows how she disseminates modern
611 production practices.

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

625 Each of the women reported showcasing production practices designed to impress the tourist
626 with state-of-the-art methods and the upmost regard for adherence to quality assurance
627 standards. As guests are led through the barns they are exposed to stainless steel bulk tanks
628 that store milk at precise temperatures, equipment used to test daily for pathogens in the milk,
629 and machines that can milk 500-600 sheep in an hour. They walk by posters that detail
630 complicated nutritional formulas that vary by the season; they are instructed on the
631 importance of lactation cycles, genetic improvements, and artificial insemination. Apolline

632 incorporates a PowerPoint presentation that explains the origins of AOC regulations and how
633 production standards assure cheese quality in partnership with numerous actors across the
634 Roquefort supply chain. Agathe adds fluency in international agricultural policy when she
635 informs tourists about the role of farm subsidies. “People ask about the subsidies a lot...so I
636 explain that subsidies are here to compensate farmers because consumer prices have not gone
637 up for many years. They think it is charity; they have no idea what a farmer earns and they
638 have a lot of misconceptions. I tell them the truth.”

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

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

654   Network members also root their tourist activity in the present, making sure the tourist
655 leaves with an accurate understanding of life on a modern sheep farm. Women frequently

656 find, intentionally or unintentionally, that the exigencies of life are often on stage for tourists
657 view. Charlotte makes an effort to ensure guests have a “direct experience with everything. I
658 want them to touch, see, smell everything. I try to have them understand that we work
659 here...We clean up but it should not be too perfect...it is a working farm.” Jocelyne
660 punctuates the multiple demands modern women have on their shoulders by communicating
661 the multi-tasking she does. When they call for an appointment I tell them “that they cannot
662 come 30 minutes late because otherwise I would be late to complete my other chores like the
663 milking.”

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

672   Lastly, we found contemporary traces represented in the routine staging of women’s
673 bodies as they dress to look the part of a *real* farmer. Some agritourism operators find it
674 useful to wear culturally specific attire to evoke some desired sentiment (Brandth and Haugen
675 2010), but the women in the Network eschew traditional dress in **favour** of modelling a
676 twentieth-first century representation. Apolline is often told by guests that they did not expect
677 to “meet a farm woman looking like [her]. Maybe they were expecting someone older.
678 Usually they are also surprised to see a house with a lawn, a farm house well-ordered. They
679 tell me that they were not expecting a modern, dynamic woman like me.” For some members,
680 dress can be an important way to defensively manage an impression of themselves. Looking

681 the part of a modern farm woman can also be a tool to combat the negative stereotypes often
682 directed toward rural people. Juliette's fashion choices seem to be aimed at both these ends.

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

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

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

702 **Conclusion**

703 French agritourism entrepreneurs represent farm tourism in ways that interweave
704 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.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Meredith Redlin for insightful comments on this manuscript. Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the *Centre International d’Études Supérieures en Sciences Agronomiques* (SupAgro), Montpellier, the 2013 INRA conference “New Forms of Agricultures: Ordinary practices, public debate and social critique” (Dijon, France), South

Dakota State University, Dept. of Sociology and Rural Studies, and the 2013 Rural Sociological Society annual meeting. We are indebted to the feedback of the audience members which helped us fine tune our analysis. Funding for this research was supported by the *Institut National Polytechnique* of Toulouse, France, through a *Soutien Mobilité Internationale* grant and Michigan AgBioResearch.

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.

References

- Agg, J. and M. Phillips (1998) Neglected gender dimensions of rural social restructuring, Pp. 252-279 in P. Boyle and K. Halfacree, eds., *Migration issues in rural areas* (London: Wiley)
- Alston, M. (1995) *Women on the land: the hidden heart of rural Australia*. (Kensington: University of New South Wales Press)
- Barberi, C., and P.M. Mshenga (2008) The role of the firm and owner characteristics on the performance of agritourism farms. *Sociologia Ruralis* 48 (2) pp. 166-183
- Beck, U. (1992) *Risk society: towards a new modernity*. (London: Sage)
- Bell, M.M. (2007) The two-ness of rural life and the ends of rural scholarship. *Journal of Rural Studies* 23 (4) pp. 402-415
- Bell, M.M., S.E. Loyd and C. Vatovec (2010) Activating the countryside: rural power, the power of the rural and the making of rural politics. *Sociologia Ruralis* 50 (3) pp. 205-224
- Benjamin, C. (1994) The growing importance of diversification activities for French farm households. *Journal of Rural Studies* 10 (4) pp. 331-342

- Bessière, J. (1998) Local development and heritage: traditional food and cuisine as tourist attractions in rural areas. *Sociologia Ruralis* 38 (1) pp. 19-34
- Bouquet, M. and M. Winter (1987) *Who from their labour rest?* (Aldershot: Avebury)
- Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction*. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)
- Bowen S., and K. DeMaster (2011) New rural livelihoods or museums of production? Quality food initiatives in practice. *Journal of Rural Studies* 27 (1) pp. 73-82
- Brandth, B. (1995) Rural masculinity in transition: gender images in tractor advertisements. *Journal of Rural Studies* 11 (2) pp. 123-133
- Brandth, B. (2002) Gender identity in European family farming: a literature review. *Sociologia Ruralis* 42 (3) pp.181-200
- Brandth, B. and M. S. Haugen (2011) Farm diversification into tourism – implications for social identity? *Journal of Rural Studies* 27 pp. 35-44
- Brandth, D. and M.S. Haugen (2010) Doing farm tourism: The intertwining practices of gender and work. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 35 (2) pp. 426-446
- Brandth, B., M.S. Haugen, A. Kroken (2010) Farm tourism: a question of gender and competence? Paper presented at the Nordic rural futures: pressures and possibilities, Uppsala, Norway. 3-5 May
- Brunori, G. and A. Rossi (2007) Differentiating countryside: social representations and governance patterns in rural areas with high social density: the case of Chianti, Italy. *Journal of Rural Studies* 23 pp. 183-205
- Bunce, M. (1994) *The countryside ideal*. (London: Routledge)
- Buller, H. (2000) Re-creating rural territories: LEADER in France. *Sociologia Ruralis* 40 (2) pp. 190–199
- Burton, R.J.F. and G.A. Wilson (2006) Injecting social psychology theory into conceptualization of agricultural agency: Towards a post-productivist farmer self-identity? *Journal of Rural Studies* 22 (1) pp. 95-115
- Butler, R., C.M. Hall and J. M. Jenkins (1998) *Tourism and recreation in rural areas*. (Chichester: Wiley)
- Cánoves, G., M. Villarino, G. K. Priestley, and A. Blanco (2004) Rural tourism in Spain: an analysis of recent evolution. *Geoforum* 35 (6) pp. 755-69
- Che, D., G. Veeck, and A. Veeck (2005) Agriculture and the selling of local food products, farming, and rural America tradition to maintain family farming heritage. Pp 109-121 in S. Essex, A.W. Gilg, R.B. Yarwood, eds., *Rural Change and Sustainability: Agriculture and Environment and Community*. (Wallingford: CAB International)

- Choo, H. (2012) Agritourism: development and research. *Journal of Tourism Research and Hospitality* 1 (2) pp. 1-2
- Cloke, P. (1997) 'Country backwater to virtual village': rural studies and 'the cultural turn.' *Journal of Rural Studies* 13 pp. 367-75
- Cloke, P. (2006) Conceptualizing rurality. Pp 18-28 in P. Cloke, T. Marsden, and P.H. Mooney, eds., *The Handbook of Rural Studies*. (London: Sage)
- Cloke, P. and P. Milbourne (1992) Deprivation and lifestyle in rural Wales: rurality and the cultural dimension. *Journal of Rural Studies* 8 (4) pp. 71-76
- Confédération Générale des Producteurs De Lait Brebis Industriels De Roquefort. N.d. Roquefort: Garanti D'Origine et de Qualité. (Millau: Graphi Imprimeur)
- Danes, S. (1998) *Farm Family Business*. (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Extension Service)
- Darque, M. B. (1988) The division of labor and decision-making in farming couples: power and negotiation. *Sociologia Ruralis* 28 (4) pp. 272-292
- Dernoi, L. (1991) About rural and farm tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research* 16 (1) pp. 3-6
- Edensor, T. (2006) Performing rurality. Pp. 355-364 in P. Cloke, T. Marsden and P.H. Mooney eds., *The handbook of rural studies*. (London: Sage)
- Edensor, T. (2001) Performing tourism, staging tourism: (re)producing tourist space and practice. *Tourist Studies* 1 (1) pp. 59-81
- Evans, N. and B. Ilbery (1996) Exploring the influence of farm-based pluriactivity on gender relations in capitalist agriculture. *Sociologia Ruralis* 36 (1) pp. 74-92
- Falk, W. and T. Pinhey (1978) Making sense of the concept rural and doing rural sociology: an interpretive perspective. *Rural Sociology* 43 (4) pp. 547-558
- Frayssignes, J. (2011) System IV: Roquefort Cheese (France). Pp.177-183 in E. Barham and B. Sylvander, eds., *Labels of origin for food: local development, global recognition*. (Wallingford: CAB International)
- Frouws, J. (1998) The contested redefinition of the countryside: an analysis of rural discourses in the Netherlands. *Sociologia Ruralis* 38 (1) pp. 54-68
- George, H. and E. Rilla (2011) *Agritourism and nature tourism in California*. (Davis: University of California Press)
- Getz, D. and J. Carlson (2000) Characteristics and goals of family and owner-operated business in the rural tourism industry and hospitality sectors. *Tourism Management* 21 (6) pp. 547-560

- 920 Giraud, C. and J. Rémy (2013) Division conjugale du travail et légitimité
921 professionnelle : le cas des activités de diversification en France. Travail,
922 Genre et Société 30 pp. 157-174.
- 923 Halfacree, K.H. (1993) Locality and social representation: space, discourse and
924 alternative definitions of the rural. *Journal of Rural Studies* 9 (1) pp. 23–37
925
- 926 Halfacree, K.H. (1995) Talking about rurality: social representations of the rural as
927 expressed by research in six English parishes. *Journal of Rural Studies* 11 (1) pp. 1–
928 20.
929
- 930 Halfacree, K.H. (1997) Contrasting roles for the post-productionist countryside: a
931 postmodern perspective on counterurbanisation. Pp –in P. Cloke, J. Little eds.
932 *Contested countryside cultures: otherness, marginalization and rurality.* (London:
933 Routledge)
934
- 935 Halfacree, K.H. (2007) Trial by space for a ‘radical rural’: introducing alternative
936 localities, representations and lives. *Journal of Rural Studies* 23 pp. 125-141
937
- 938 Hall, S. (1997) The spectacle of the “other”. Pp 223-290 in S. Hall ed., *Representation:*
939 *cultural representation and signifying practice.* (London: Sage)
940
- 941 Harding, S. (1991) *Whose science, whose knowledge: thinking from women’s lives.*
942 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press)
- 943 Haugen, M.S. (1998) The gendering of farming: the case of Norway. *European*
944 *Journal of Women’s Studies* 5 (2) pp. 133-153
945
- 946 Hervieu, B. and J. Viard (2008) *L’archipel paysan, la fin de la République agricole.*
947 Editions de l’Aube, La Tour d’Aigues.
- 948 Hervieu, B. and J. Vivard (1996) *Au bonheur des campagnes (et des provinces).*
949 (Marseille: Editions de l’Aube)
950
- 951 Hinrichs, C.C. (1996) Consuming images: making and marketing Vermont as
952 distinctive rural place. Pp. 259-278 in P. Vandergeest and E.M. DuPuis eds.,
953 *Creating the countryside: the politics of rural and environmental discourse.*
954 (Philadelphia: Temple University Press)
955
- 956 Holloway, L. (2004) Showing and telling farming: agricultural shows and re-imaging
957 British agriculture. *Journal of Rural Studies* 20 (3) pp. 319-330
958
- 959 Ilbery, B. and M. Kneafsey (2000) Producer constructions of quality in regional
960 specialty food production: a case study from south west England. *Journal of Rural*
961 *Studies* 16 (2) pp. 217-230
962
- 963 Jackson, P. (1999) Commodity cultures: the traffic in things. *Transactions of the*
964 *Institute of British Geographers* NS 24 (1) pp. 95-108
965
- 966 Jennings, G. and D. Stehlik. (1999) The innovators are women: the development of
967 farm tourism in Central Queensland, Australia. Pp. 84-98 in Conference

- proceedings of the 1999 annual ISTTE conference. One world, one community,
one mission. (Vancouver, Canada)
- Jonasson, M. (2012) Co-producing and co-performing attractive rural living in
popular media. *Rural Society* 22 (1) pp. 17-30
- Jones, O. (1995) Lay discourses of the rural: developments and implications for rural
studies. *Journal of Rural Studies* 11 (1) pp. 35-50
- Kneafsey, M. (2000) Tourism, place identities and social relations in the European rural
periphery. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 7 (1) pp. 35-50
- Lane, B. (1994) Sustainable rural tourism strategies: a tool for development and
conservation. Pp 102-111 in W. Bramwell and B. Lane eds., *Rural tourism and
sustainable development: proceedings of the second international school on rural
development* (Clevedon: Channel View)
- Leipins, R. (1996) Reading agricultural power: media as sites and processes in the
construction of meaning. *New Zealand Geographer* 32 pp. 3-10
- Little, J.K. (2006) Gender and sexuality in rural communities. Pp. 365-378 in P. Cloke, T.
Marsden, and P.H. Mooney eds., *Handbook of Rural Studies*. (London: Sage)
- Little, J. (1999) Otherness, representation and the cultural construction of rurality.
Progress in Human Geography 22 (3) pp. 437-442
- Marsden, T. (2003) *The condition of rural sustainability*. (Assen: Van Gorcum)
- Marsden, T. and R. Sonnino. (2008). Rural development and the regional state: denying
multifunctional agriculture in the UK. *Journal of Rural Studies* 24 (4) pp. 422-431
- McGehee, N.G., Kim, K and G.R. Jennings (2007) Gender and motivation for agri-
tourism entrepreneurship. *Tourism Management* 28 (1) pp. 280-289
- Mooney, P.H. (1986) *My own boss: class, rationality and the family farm*. (Boulder, CO:
Westview)
- Mormont, M. (1990) 'Who is rural?' or, how to be rural: towards a sociology of the
rural. Pp. 21-44 in T. Marsden, P. Lowe, and S. Whatmore eds., *Rural
restructuring*. (London: Fulton)
- Morris, C and N. Evans (2001) 'Cheese makers are always women': gendered
representations of farm life in the agricultural press. *Gender, Place & Culture: A
Journal of Feminist Geography* 8(4) pp. 375-390
- Murdoch, J. and A. C. Pratt (1993) Rural studies: modernism, post-modernism and the
'post-rural'. *Journal of Rural Studies* 9 (4) pp. 411-427
- Neate, S. (1987) The role of tourism in sustaining farm structure and communities on
the Isles of Scilly. Pp. 9-12 in M. Bouquet and M. Winter eds, *Who from their
labors rest? Conflict and practice in rural tourism*. (Avebury: Aldershot)

- 1018 Nilsson, P. Å. (2002) Staying on farms: an ideological background. *Annals of*
1019 *Tourism Research* 29 (1) pp. 7-24
1020
- 1021 Nickerson, N.P., R. Black, and S.F. McCool (2001) Agritourism motivations behind
1022 farm/ranch business diversification. *Journal of Travel Research* 40 (1) pp. 19-26
1023
- 1024 O'Connor, P. (1995) Tourism and development in Ballyhoura: women's business?
1025 *Economic and Social Review* 26 (4) pp. 369-401
1026
- 1027 Oppermann, M. (1995) Holidays on the farm: a case study of German hosts and guests.
1028 *Journal of Travel Research* 34 (1) pp. 63-67
1029
- 1030 Pini, B. (2004) Gender and farming in the information economy. *Australian Journal of*
1031 *Communication* 31 (2) pp. 135-48
1032
- 1033 Ploeg, J.D.v.d. (2008) The new peasantries: struggles for autonomy and sustainability in
1034 an era of empire and globalization. (London: Earthscan)
1035
- 1036 Ploeg, J.D.v.d. and H. Renting (2004) Behind the redux: a rejoinder to David
1037 Goodman. *Sociologia Ruralis* 44 (2) pp. 233-242
1038
- 1039 Ploeg, J.D.v.d, H. Renting, G. Brunori, K. Knickel, J. Mannion, et al. (2000) Rural
1040 development: from practices and policies towards theory. *Sociologia Ruralis* 40
1041 (4) pp. 391-408
1042
- 1043 Potter, C. and M. Tilzey. (2005) Agricultural policy discourse in the European post-
1044 fordist transition: neoliberalism, neomercantilism and multifunctionality.
1045 *Progress in Human Geography* 29 (3) pp. 1-20
1046
- 1047 Pratt, A. C. (1996) Discourses of rurality: loose talk or social struggle? *Journal*
1048 *of Rural Studies* 12 (1) pp. 69-78
1049
- 1050 Pritchard, A. and N. J. Morgan. (2001) Culture, identity, and tourism representation:
1051 marketing Cymru or Wales? *Tourism Management* 22 pp. 167-179
1052
- 1053 Pritchard, A. and N. J. Morgan (2000) Constructing tourism landscapes: gender,
1054 sexuality, and space. *Tourism Geographies* 2 (2) pp. 115-139
1055
- 1056 Quetier, F., P. Marty, J.Lepart (2005) Farmers management strategies and land use in
1057 an agropastoral landscape: roquefort cheese production rules as a driver of
1058 change. *Agricultural Systems* 84 pp. 171-193
1059
- 1060 Rogers, S.C. (2000) Farming visions: agriculture in French culture. *French Politics,*
1061 *Culture and Society* 18 (1) pp. 50-70
1062
- 1063 Sachs, C. (1983) The invisible farmers: women in agricultural production. (Totowa,
1064 NJ: Rowman and Allanheld)
1065
- 1066 Saugeres, L. (2002) The cultural representation of the farming landscape: masculinity,
1067 power and nature. *Journal of Rural Studies* 18 (4) pp. 373-384

1068
1069 Shortall, A. (1992) Power analysis and farm wives: an empirical study of the power
1070 relationships affecting women on Irish farms. *Sociologia Ruralis* 32 (4) pp. 431-
1071 451
1072
1073 Shortall, S. (1999) *Women and farming: property and power*. (London: Macmillan)
1074
1075 Sonnino, R. (2004) 'For a 'piece of bread'?: interpreting sustainable development
1076 through agritourism in southern Tuscany. *Sociologia Ruralis* 44 (3) pp. 285-300

1077 Walter, G. and S. Wilson (1996) Silent partners: women in farm magazines success
1078 stories, 1934-1991. *Rural Sociology* 61 (2) pp. 227-248

1079 Waters, S. (2010) Globalization, the Confederation Paysanne, and symbolic power.
1080 *French Politics, Culture & Society* 28(2) pp. 96-117

1081 Weightman, B.A. (1987) Third world tour landscapes. *Annals of Tourism Research* 14
1082 (2) pp. 227-239

1083 Wilson, G. (2001) From productivism to post-productivism ... and back again?:
1084 exploring the (un)changed natural and mental landscapes of European agriculture.
1085 *Transactions, Institutes of British Geographers* 26 (1) pp. 77-102

1086 Woods, M. (2008) Social movements and rural politics. *Journal of Rural Studies* 24 (2)
1087 pp. 129-137
1088
1089 Woods, M. (2005) *Rural geography: processes, responses and experiences in rural*
1090 *restructuring* (London: Sage)
1091
1092 Zografos, C. (2007) Rurality discourses and the role of the social enterprise in
1093 regenerating rural Scotland. *Journal of Rural Studies* 23 (1) pp. 38-51
1094