



universität
wien

MASTERARBEIT

Titel der Masterarbeit

„*Stølsdrift* in Valdres: an analysis of Norwegian transhumance
in the context of agrarian structural change“

verfasst von

Alexandra Meyer, BA

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, 2015

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt: A 066 810

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt: Masterstudium Kultur-und Sozialanthropologie

Betreuer: Univ.-Prof. Dr. Peter Schweitzer

Thank you

Kathrin and Thomas at Olestølen for your kindness and hospitality and for sharing your knowledge.

Anne and Gudrun, Ida and Sigmund, Ole Jakob and Yvonne, Vigdis and Magne, Katharina, Lise, Ingrid, Guri, Kristin and Tor for your openness, interesting conversations and tasty *kvikako*.

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Peter Schweitzer for competent supervision.

Alberto for moral support, intellectual input and proofreading.

Rosi, Ida and Vicki for proofreading.

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Subject	1
1.2. Research questions, aims and outline of the thesis	3
1.3. Theoretical framework	6
1.3.1. <i>The economic role of agriculture: political economy conceptualizations of agrarian structural change</i>	6
1.3.2. <i>Landscapes of production and landscapes of consumption</i>	12
1.3.3. <i>Farmers' attitudes and values under agrarian restructuring</i>	14
1.4. State of the art: literature on agrarian restructuring and transhumance	16
1.4.1. <i>Anthropological research on agriculture in European advanced economies</i>	16
1.4.2. <i>Farmers' attitudes and values in regard to farming</i>	18
1.4.3. <i>Transhumance in Norway and beyond</i>	19
1.5. Methodology	21
1.5.1. <i>Sampling and constructing the field</i>	22
1.5.2. <i>Ethnographic fieldwork</i>	23
1.5.3. <i>Participant observation</i>	24
1.5.4. <i>Interviews</i>	25
1.5.5. <i>Textual material and secondary data</i>	27
1.5.6. <i>Data analysis</i>	28
1.6. Contextualizing the field: Valdres	28
2. The structural conditions of summer farming in Valdres	30
2.1. Agrarian structural change in Norway	30
2.1.1. <i>General characteristics of Norwegian agriculture</i>	30
2.1.2. <i>Norwegian agricultural restructuring: productivism</i>	31
2.1.3. <i>Norwegian agricultural restructuring: multifunctionality</i>	33
2.1.4. <i>Coexistence of productivism and multifunctionalism</i>	35
2.2. Summer farming in Valdres in the context of agricultural restructuring	36
2.2.1. <i>Agrarian restructuring and summer farm decline</i>	37
2.2.2. <i>State support for summer farming</i>	39
2.2.3. <i>Added value</i>	42
2.2.4. <i>Changing market demands</i>	45
2.2.5. <i>Summer farming as a resource for rural development</i>	46
2.2.6. <i>Business development based on agriculture's multiple outcomes</i>	50
2.2.7. <i>The widening and changing role of farmers</i>	55

2.3. Concluding remarks	56
3. Summer farming as an economic practice	58
3.1. Production	59
3.1.1. <i>Mountain pasture grazing</i>	59
3.1.2. <i>Milk production</i>	63
3.1.3. <i>Summer farm milk refinement</i>	66
3.1.4. <i>Harvest of the summer farm pastures</i>	69
3.1.5. <i>Meat production at the summer farm</i>	70
3.1.6. <i>Sharing the workload: budeier and volunteers</i>	70
3.1.7. <i>The summer farm landscape: a landscape of production?</i>	71
3.1.8. <i>Concluding remarks</i>	72
3.2. Distribution	72
3.2.1. <i>Distribution of summer farm milk</i>	72
3.2.2. <i>Distribution of farmstead products</i>	74
3.3. Consumption	76
3.3.1. <i>Consumers</i>	77
3.3.2. <i>„Å komme opp på stølen”</i>	77
3.3.3. <i>The purchase of summer farm products</i>	78
3.3.4. <i>Tourism at the summer farm</i>	79
3.3.5. <i>Concluding remarks</i>	82
3.4. Summer farming: economic and ecological adaptation	82
3.5. From production to post-production and from landscapes of production to landscapes of consumption?	84
4. The values of summer farming and of the summer farming landscape	89
4.1. The values of summer farming	90
4.2. The perception of the summer farming landscape	96
4.3. The conveyance of summer farming's multiple values	100
4.4. Concluding remarks	103
5. Summary and outlook	105
6. Bibliography	115
7. Appendix	123
7.1. Abstract	123
7.2. German abstract	124

1. Introduction

1.1. Subject

The subject of this thesis is an analysis of summer farming in Valdres, Norway, in the context of agrarian restructuring. The agricultural sector in advanced economies in Europe is undergoing great changes. In this process, the economic role of farming is being reconfigured. The neoliberalization and globalization of the world food market has led to intensification and rationalization of agricultural primary production, which is being increasingly outsourced from Europe. This has resulted in a substantial decline in farm units throughout the continent. Scholars have argued that the main reason for farm decline is economic: farmers who cannot keep up with the rationalization and industrialization, typically small-scale farmers belonging to the Less Favored Area classification of the European Union (Stewart & Strathern, 2010, p. 5), are squeezed out of the industry (Almås, 1994; Gray & Lawrence, 2001).

Simultaneously, this category of farming is experiencing a revaluation in society. Small-scale farming is “central to many issues of heritage and conservation” (Stewart & Strathern, 2010, p. 5). Policy makers, the agricultural sector as well as the general public increasingly argue and acknowledge that agriculture not only produces food and fibers, but also sustains a range of environmental, social and cultural values and services, such as the conservation of biodiversity and cultural heritage (Heatherington, 2011; Stewart & Strathern, 2010). Moreover, “agriculture has become much more than a sector of primary production” (Heatherington, 2011, p. 3). It constitutes the basis of a tertiary sector providing a range of green goods and services (ibid.). In the face of economic pressures, farmers are increasingly diversifying into farm-related businesses to supplement their incomes (Bryden, 2010). This development is accompanied by a growing market for commodities such as ecotourism, agrotourism and specialty foods that farmers increasingly provide (ibid.; Heatherington, 2011). Agriculture is thus included in ideas of integrated rural development aimed at biodiversity and heritage conservation combined with food production and rural entrepreneurship (Heatherington, 2011; Refsgaard, 2010; Stewart & Strathern, 2010).

These developments have led to theoretical debates in the social sciences about the changing economic role of farming and agricultural landscape. Theses and concepts from these

discussions constitute the theoretical basis on which summer farming will be analyzed throughout this thesis. Focus will be on political economic conceptualizations of agrarian change. The concept of the “post-productivist transition” (Ilbery & Bowler, 1998) implies that agriculture has changed from being a primary sector producing food and fibers to become a tertiary sector providing non-food goods and services (Heatherington, 2011, p. 3). The term “multifunctionality” refers to the notion that the agricultural sector produces a set of valuable externalities in addition to food and fibers (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008; Refsgaard, 2010; Rønningen & Burton, 2013). These theses of agrarian structural change indicate a transformation in the economic role of the agricultural landscape conceptualized as a transition from “landscapes of production” to “landscapes of consumption” (Rettie, 2010; Stacul, 2010; Stewart & Strathern, 2010). This macro-perspective will be complemented by related actor-oriented approaches that focus on the views and experiences of farmers in the face of these changes (Stewart & Strathern, 2010, p. 3).

This thesis offers an analysis of summer farming in Valdres, Norway in the context of the structural transformations in the agrarian sector and on the basis of the outlined theoretical perspectives. It aims to explain why summer farming is practiced today by analyzing, on the one hand, the structural conditions of Norwegian agriculture, and, on the other hand, exploring the farmers’ perspectives on summer farming. The starting point of the analysis is hence a detailed case study (specific summer farms in Valdres), which will be analyzed in its broader political and economic contexts.

Summer farming is a transhumance system of agricultural production, which is a form of pastoralism involving the seasonal vertical movement of livestock. The rationale behind this system is thought to be economic as it aims to exploit the resources located in the mountains. Summer farming in Norway is thus customarily explained in terms of ecological adaptation to a mountainous environment (Daugstad, 1999; Norbye, 2010). However, the assumption that farming is increasingly defined by external political and economic forces (Stewart & Strathern, 2010) and the argument that agrarian restructuring has “particularly significant effects in the mountain areas of Europe, which are characterized by small and extensive farming systems, remoteness and challenging natural conditions” (Daugstad, Fernández Mier, & Peña-Chocarro, 2014, p. 248) give reasons to believe that the explanation of summer farming today might be slightly more complex. Summer farms are part of regular farm-based economic systems, and these are almost exclusively small-scale in Valdres. Summer farming

in Valdres thus belongs to the category of farming referred to as economically “marginal” by Stewart and Strathern (2010, p. 6). It is an agricultural practice vulnerable to structural changes and largely dependent on subsidies. The precarious economic situation in small-scale dairy farming in Norway has resulted in a substantial decline of summer farms across the country, including Valdres. Simultaneously, based on the concept of the multifunctionality of agriculture, summer farming is increasingly perceived as being a source for added value and hence as a resource for rural development. National and regional governments as well as the agrarian and tourist sectors perceive summer farming as a multifunctional agricultural practice producing a range of valuable externalities. It is seen as a cultural heritage that maintains the specific biodiversity of mountain pastures (Riksantikvaren, 2011; Statens Landbruksforvaltning, 2014). Moreover, summer farms in Valdres are increasingly promoted as tourist destinations (Valdres, 2014) and becoming providers of locally processed dairy products.

1.2. Research questions, aims and outline of the thesis

Based on these considerations, this thesis explores the question of why farmers in Valdres engage in summer farming today. The guiding research question thus reads as follows:

Why is summer farming practiced in Valdres today?

This general question is divided into three sub-questions, which form the guiding questions of the three empirical chapters of this thesis:

What are the structural conditions of summer farming in Norway today and how do these influence summer farming in Valdres?

What is the economic role of summer farming in Valdres today and which economic processes constitute this practice?

Which attitudes and values of the farmers accompany these practices?

These research questions indicate a qualitative methodology, which will be outlined in this chapter.

The aim of this thesis is twofold. On the one hand, it tries to explain in terms of political economic macro processes why summer farming is practiced in Norway today and to what extent it is a rational economic practice. On the other hand, it aims to understand the farmers’ practices and views related to summer farming. Both perspectives are analyzed and discussed in the light of theoretical concepts related to agriculture’s changing economic role. Hence, the

thesis adds the specific case of summer farming in Norway to the discussion and theorizing about the ongoing socio-economic transition in rural Europe. This field of inquiry is of “vital relevance” (Heatherington, 2011, p. 7) as “only a handful of anthropologists are engaged in the anthropology of [European] rural and farming communities” (Demoissier, 2011, p. 115) today. There is a need for ethnographic studies on this topic that, while attending to processes of agrarian structural change, could bring the local level as well as the farmers’ perspectives to the fore, which is what this thesis sets out to do. Moreover, this thesis contributes to the ethnography of Norway, where research on rural areas and issues is sparse (Norbye, 2011).

After a short review of existing anthropological literature on agriculture in advanced European societies as well as on summer farming, in Chapter One the theoretical perspectives from which summer farming will be approached throughout this thesis are presented and discussed. Political economy conceptualizations of agrarian structural change are reviewed and critically assessed, as well as more actor-based theoretical approaches to agricultural restructuring. Moreover, Chapter One contains a detailed outline of the research methodology.

Chapter Two sets out to explain why summer farming is practiced in Norway today by exploring the structural conditions of Norwegian agriculture. Summer farming is viewed from an outside perspective, focusing on political and macro-economic processes. The analysis is based on the theoretical discussion on agrarian restructuring and the changing economic role of farming. Chapter Two thus analyzes Norwegian agriculture and summer farming by means of the concepts of productivism, post-productivism and multifunctionality. In the first step, the trends in national agricultural policies and practices are traced and examined in the light of theories on agrarian structural change. In the second step, summer farming in Valdres is explored in the context of these general trends and policies. The decline of this agricultural practice will be outlined and explained in terms of the political economy conceptualizations of agrarian restructuring. This is followed by an exploration of how summer farming is perceived and supported by the Norwegian agrarian and environmental sectors, the tourist sector as well as by national and regional governments and rural developers. Subsequently, the changing market demand for summer farm products and services will be considered. Finally, summer farming will be discussed with regard to farm-based business development and the resulting change in the role of farmers. Chapter Two thus provides an etic perspective on why summer farming is practiced in Valdres today.

Anthropologists have called for an inquiry into local experiences with regard to larger structural trends in agriculture (Demoissier, 2011; Heatherington, 2011; Stewart & Strathern, 2010). Following this spirit, the analytical vista will move from the macro- to the micro-level in Chapter Three. The analysis will focus on the economic processes of Valdresian summer farms, which are approached ethnographically. Scholars of agriculture in advanced economies have argued that the economic role of farming is reconfigured in the process of agrarian restructuring. A central thesis in this context is that agriculture in advanced industrial economies has moved away from primary production towards the post-productive provision of services (Almstedt, 2013; Heatherington, 2011; Ilbery & Bowler, 1998; Slee, 2005). This implies a shift in emphasis from production to consumption in the agrarian sector (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008; Rettie, 2010; Stacul, 2010). Considering these theses, Chapter Three aims to explore the economic role of summer farming in Valdres. Drawing on the data of ethnographic fieldwork in Valdres, summer farming will be described by means of the basic categories of economic practice: production, distribution and consumption. This descriptive part is followed by an analysis of summer farming as an economic practice with regard to the theoretical discussion on the changing economic role of farming.

Next, Chapter Four explores the emic perspective of the farmers regarding summer farming. Chapter Two argues that the agrarian and the environmental sectors, as well as the tourist sector and rural developers frame summer farming as a multifunctional agricultural practice, valuable because of its cultural, environmental and social aspects rather than due to its productive outputs in terms of milk. The aim of Chapter Four is to explore the values that the farmers themselves associate with summer farming as well as their perceptions of the summer farming landscape. Data from fieldwork will be analyzed in light of theories on farmers' attitudes and values towards farming as well as theories on the changing economic role of agriculture.

The thesis is concluded in Chapter Five with a summary of the findings presented. The findings regarding the economic processes at Valdresian summer farms (Chapter Three) as well as the farmers' perspectives (Chapter Four) are related to the political and economic explanations of summer farming presented in Chapter Two. All findings are related to the theoretical debates regarding agrarian structural change. The emic perspective of the farmers, accessed through ethnographic fieldwork, is emphasized and compared with the etic perspective presented in Chapter Two. Moreover, shortcomings of the thesis as well as topics

that emerged during fieldwork but did not find their way into this paper are pointed out. Finally, questions that arose in the course of this analysis and call for further research are presented.

1.3. Theoretical framework

In this thesis, summer farming in Valdres will be analyzed on the basis of theories and conceptualizations of agrarian structural change. On the one hand, the theoretical perspective of this thesis consists of concepts that aim to grasp macro-processes of agrarian change. This structural approach will on the other hand be complemented by an actor-oriented perspective (Bjørkhaug, 2012), focusing on the farmers' perspectives on and reactions to agrarian changes (Stewart & Strathern, 2010).

1.3.1. The economic role of agriculture: political economy conceptualizations of agrarian structural change

The theoretical discourse in the social sciences on agriculture in advanced societies has over the last years been dominated by political economy conceptualizations (Wilson, 2001). European rural restructuring and changes in the agricultural sector are frequently conceptualized in terms of the post-productivist transition, post-productivism and multifunctionality. These conceptualizations relate to agriculture as an economic activity and point to changes in agriculture's economic role. These concepts, originally stemming from geography, are to a large extent structuralist, trying to capture processes on the macro-level (Marsden, Munton, Ward, & Whatmore, 1996). However, in anthropological works on European agriculture, these concepts are widely applied, and it has been argued that they are apt for explaining processes on a local scale (Bryden, 2010; Demoissier, 2011). This claim will be tested throughout this thesis.

The first phase of agricultural change in post-war agriculture in industrialized countries has been termed as "productivist" (Bowler, 1985; Ilbery & Bowler, 1998; Langthaler, 2010; Lowe, Murdoch, Marsden, Munton, & Flynn, 1993). In Europe, this phase spanned from the early 1950s to the mid-1980s (Ilbery & Bowler, 1998), a period characterized by "industrial state-regulated globalization" (Langthaler, 2010). The productivist mode of agricultural policy and practice is referred to by the theoretical term productivism (Refsgaard, 2010). According to a review article on productivism and post-productivism (Evans, Morris, &

Winter, 2002), scholars agree on the main characteristics of productivism: intensification, concentration and specialization. The term labels both a specific style of agricultural practice and the level to which governments support agricultural production through subsidization, price guarantees and protectionist policies (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008, p. 99). Productivist agricultural practice refers to the intensification and specialization of agriculture driven primarily by increased output and productivity and ultimately profit (Bowler, 1985; Ilbery & Bowler, 1998). It thus includes the increased exploitation of natural resources through the application of inputs such as chemicals and machinery. Policies within this Fordist agricultural regime (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008) are aimed at increased levels of production and characterized by a strong cooperation between agricultural actors and strong governmental support for production, property rights and protectionism (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008; Bowler, 1985).

The concept of “post-productivism” emerged in the 1990s to theorize contemporary changes in agriculture (Almstedt, 2013; Evans et al., 2002; Ilbery & Bowler, 1998; Wilson, 2001). The post indicates that productivism with its focus on increased production output is abandoned in favor of a new agricultural regime where the focus increasingly shifts towards agriculture’s provision of environmental, social and cultural services (ibid.). Reviewing the extensive literature on the topic, Evans et al. (2002) sum up the characteristics of post-productivism as a shift from quantity to quality in food production; the growth of on-farm diversification and off-farm employment (pluriactivity); extensification and the promotion of sustainable farming through agri-environmental policy; dispersion of production patterns; and environmental regulation and restructuring of government support for agriculture. As noted by Almstedt (2013), it is crucial to distinguish between post-productivism as a descriptor of actual empirical processes and post-productivism as an ideology inherent in policies and discourses.

Post-productivism is to a large extent an inversion of productivism. This is expressed in the concept of a “post-productivist transition” (Ilbery & Bowler, 1998), meaning a transition from productivism to post-productivism. As a descriptor of empirical changes in the agrarian sector, the concept refers to the transition from a primary sector producing food and fibers to a tertiary sector providing non-food goods and services (Heatherington, 2011, p. 3). Rural communities cease agricultural production and increasingly turn to businesses such as tourism or the provision of leisure activities. On a policy level, the term post-productivist transition refers to a change in focus from a productivist agriculture producing food and fibers to post-

productivist activities (Almstedt, 2013, p. 10). Post-productivism is thus a reaction to productivism and about reversing the negative effects of the previous agricultural regime such as agricultural overproduction and environmental degradation (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008). It can be framed as “a critique of the intensification of primary production and its detrimental effects on rural society and the environment” (ibid., p. 100). Moreover, it implies an emphasis on issues of rural development in agricultural policies. In this process, agriculture is to a large extent integrated with broader rural economic and environmental objectives (Almstedt, 2013; Refsgaard, 2010; Rønningen, Flø, & Fjeldavli, 2004).

It has been pointed out that the post-productivist restructuring of agriculture is informed by post-material values (Langthaler, 2010; Vaccaro, 2006), expressed in aestheticism, heritage conservation, environmentalism, leisure and tourism. Placing the concept in its wider social, political, economic and historical context, the historian Ernst Langthaler (2010) emphasizes that the post-productivistic agricultural system emerged in the market-regulated or neoliberal globalization, and thus corresponds to contemporary neoliberal-capitalistic society.

Although widely deployed in scholarly discussions on agricultural restructuring, the conceptual dualism productivism / post-productivism and the concept of the post-productivist transition have been criticized as potentially misleading (Evans et al., 2002; Wilson, 2001). Authors have pointed out that these conceptualizations imply a “historical scheme” (Vaccaro, 2006, p. 361) of agrarian development from one agricultural regime (productivism) to another (post-productivism). The main critique is that these political economy conceptualizations are too structuralist and “unidimensional” (Wilson, 2001, pp. 78, 85-86) and thus fail to capture heterogeneous and contradictory empirical realities at the meso and micro-level of agriculture in developed economies today where both productivist and post-productivist attitudes and practices coexist (Evans et al., 2002; Wilson, 2001). Post-productivism has thus been criticized for being applied “too widely and too loosely” (Mather, Hill, & Nijnik, 2006, p. 441), for being too static and failing to capture processes of change (Evans et al., 2002, p. 325). A common argument in this regard is that agrarian systems are heterogeneous (Langthaler, 2010) and hence hard to label with one concept. Evans et al. (2002, p. 3), in their critique of the “orthodoxy” of post-productivism, for example argue that whilst the term is fruitful for describing major changes in agricultural and rural policies, it fails to capture the reality of agricultural production and is hence “misleading if applied uncritically to agriculture as an economic activity” (ibid.). Putting the characteristics of post-productivity up

against empirical evidence, the authors argue that there is no hold for the notion that productivism is abandoned in favor of post-productivism, and thus refute the legitimacy of post-productivism as a term to capture recent agrarian change: “There is little to support the assumption that agriculture has passed from one state of coherence to another set of bounded circumstances” (ibid., p. 332). Rather, the authors argue that productivist attitudes and practices are still the defining features of agriculture in advanced Western economies. Hence, rather than speaking of a post-productivist transition, a number of authors argue that productivist and post-productivist farming systems coexist.

Based on these considerations, the term “neo-productivism” was introduced (Burton & Wilson, 2012; Rønningen & Burton, 2013). It is used as an umbrella term for the multiple and diverse forms of new productivisms in contemporary agriculture (ibid.). It points to the continued emphasis of agricultural policies on increased agricultural production and is used to summarize the “extension of productivist principles in agriculture” (Evans et al., 2002, p. 14). This continuation of productivist principles has to be seen in relation to wider socio-economic processes: “The popularity of (neo) liberal policies in Western countries, with their emphasis on global trade in a de-regulated market has unintentionally contributed to a further intensification and concentration of the food chain. [...] It is within this contradictory manifestation that productivism and what has been referred to as post-productivism are occurring at the same time” (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008, p. 100). Potter and Tilzey (2005, p. 581) even argue that “the dominant framing is in favor of a neoliberal regime of market productivism”. In conclusion, farming as an economic activity, including agricultural practices and farmers’ attitudes, exhibits post-productivist elements but is still dominated, some would argue (Evans et al., 2002, p. 24), by production. However, “the market and the policy context have changed dramatically” (ibid.). The conceptualizations post-productivism or the post-productivist transition are thus apt for describing major changes in agricultural policies and the “political culture of agriculture” (Evans et al., 2002, p. 3), but farming as an economic activity is best captured by the coexistence of productivist and post-productivist attitudes and practices. The continuation of productivist discourses and practices at the empirical level has thus led to a critique of the binary opposition between productivism and post-productivism on the conceptual level.

In an attempt to overcome the dichotomy of productivism and post-productivism, the concept of “multifunctionality” has been proposed to describe ongoing contradictory changes in

agriculture and rural areas (Almstedt, 2013; Burton & Wilson, 2012). Whereas the primary role of agriculture has been mainly understood as the production of food and fibers, multifunctionality expresses the idea that agriculture has “multiple outcomes”, including “not only the production of food and other resources, but also social and environmental benefits” (Woods, 2011, p. 80). These additional social and environmental outputs or functions of agricultural production include environmental benefits (cultural landscapes, biodiversity, flood control), cultural heritage, recreational opportunities, viable rural areas and food security. In economic terms, these outputs are externalities of agricultural production of food and fibers, which means outputs that were not intended at the outset (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008). They are, however, increasingly perceived as public goods or values by governmental authorities, the public, private actors and by farmers (Rønningen et al., 2004). This is reflected in the theoretical body of literature on agriculture in industrialized countries where the externalities of agriculture are frequently referred to as public goods or values. The term multifunctionality thus emphasizes that agricultural production produces a range of environmental, social and cultural values in addition to economic value.

On an analytical level, the term multifunctionality implies that the externalities of agricultural production have to be recognized as a potential part of the farm economy. The concept makes the entire range of values produced and sustained through agricultural production subject to scientific inquiry of farming as an economic practice, which is why the term is fruitful for the analysis of summer farming in Valdres. Viewing agriculture through the conceptual lens of multifunctionality opens up the analytical perspective to agricultural economic practices beyond the production of food and fibers, such as diversification into farm-related businesses or the production of value-added craft goods (Woods, 2011).

As multifunctionality acknowledges that agriculture includes productivist elements – the production of commodities such as food and fibers – and post-productivist elements – the provision of environmental, social and cultural services, speaking of a “multifunctional agricultural regime” (Wilson, 2001) allegedly “allows for multidimensional coexistence of productivist and post-productivist action and thought” and “may, therefore, be a more accurate depiction of the multi-layered nature of rural and agricultural change” (Wilson, 2001, p. 95). In recognizing agriculture’s production of amenities in addition to food and fibers, the term thus overcomes the conceptual binary opposition between productivism and post-productivism (Almstedt, 2013).

Theoretical discussions of these terms suggest that they must be handled with care. As pointed out by Almstedt (2013), the scholarly discourse on post-productivism exhibits a “confusion of concepts” (ibid., p. 18). Productivism and post-productivism are “-isms” (ibid.), that is, ideologies inherent in discourses and policies. The concepts productivism and post-productivism thus represent sets of ideas. However, they are often used as descriptors of actual processes. Multifunctionality, on the other hand, is mostly used as a term to describe ongoing processes, reflecting reality. This makes it difficult to compare the concepts of post-productivism and multifunctionality, “since they reflect different things (i.e. ideology versus reflection of reality)” (ibid., p. 19). For a more constructive debate, Almstedt proposes to compare multifunctionality with “post-production” (reflections of reality) (ibid., p. 20). Post-production thus implies the empirical circumstance where the agricultural sector moves away from primary production to service production. Similarly, post-productivism would be comparable with “multifunctionalism” (ideologies inherent in policies and discourses) (ibid.). Hence, when applying these terms it is crucial to distinguish – on the analytical level – between farming as a practice or an economic activity, on the one hand, and the “political culture of agriculture” (Evans et al., 2002, p. 4), including discourses and policies, on the other.

Multifunctionality points to the diverse valuable outputs of agriculture. As a policy discourse, multifunctionality thus legitimizes the continued existence of farming largely independent of its economic output through commodity production. As a discourse, then, multifunctionality argues that “farms that cannot be viably sustained through the free market for agricultural produce [...] have value to the countryside over and above their production of goods for the mass market, and seeks to enable these wider functions to be valorized in order to achieve economic sustainability” (Woods, 2011, pp. 81-82). Besides recognizing the multiple functions or outcomes of agriculture, multifunctionality as a discourse thus further emphasizes that these externalities can be sources for added value (Daugstad, Rønningen, & Skar, 2006). As a descriptor of reality, multifunctionality indicates that farmers increasingly receive economic support for the externalities of agricultural production, especially for environmental services. Furthermore, the term acknowledges that the commodity outputs of agriculture exceed conventional agricultural products as the amenity values of agriculture or farmland might be used in tourism or recreational activities (ibid.). Finally, multifunctionality indicates that non-commodity externalities of agricultural production might contribute to the

added value of agricultural products (Daugstad et al., 2006; Woods, 2011). Some scholars therefore argue that commodification lies at the heart of the concept of multifunctionality: “We assume that at its core a major part of the multifunctionality debate is about commodifying agricultural collective goods for purposes of rural development” (Daugstad et al., 2006, p. 70), a topic I will return to below. Correspondingly, it has been argued that diversification into businesses based on agricultural amenities is the main indicator of a multifunctional agricultural regime: Marsden and Sonnino (2008), for instance, argue that an agricultural activity is multifunctional if it adds income to agriculture, reconfigures rural resources to contribute to wider rural development and contributes to the needs of wider society.

1.3.2. Landscapes of production and landscapes of consumption

A central thesis related to the political economic conceptualizations of agrarian change is the transition from “landscapes of production” to “landscapes of consumption” (Rettie, 2010; Stacul, 2010; Stewart & Strathern, 2010). It corresponds with the thesis of the post-productivist transition. The landscape of production or the “productivist landscape” refers to the “agriculturally productive landscape that has been formed through generations of labor and the technological development of farming” (Vergunst, 2012, p. 173). It has been supported through a subsidy system aimed at a productivist agriculture and the “cultural norms of farming communities” (ibid.). The cultural norms of farmers regarding landscape have been identified as being production-oriented, meaning that farmers see landscape primarily as a site of agricultural production (Emery, 2014), a subject I will elaborate on more in detail below. The productivist landscape thus implies a landscape constituted through active agricultural production. Scholars argue that in the course of agrarian restructuring, the economic role of the countryside has changed from primary production to the provision of non-food goods and services. This has been conceptualized as the transition from landscapes of production to landscapes of consumption, which marks a “change from the consumption of agricultural products to the consumption and preservation of the countryside and the biodiversity held within it” (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008, p. 100).

In rural geography and sociology, the argument has been brought forward that the countryside in general has turned into a place of consumption (Burton & Wilson, 2012; Slee, 2005). As primary production is increasingly outsourced or concentrated, it no longer constitutes the main livelihood for rural communities who, in response, turn to the sale of non-food rural

commodities, services, lifestyle products and experiences (Slee, 2005). Correspondingly, rural landscapes change from being land for agricultural production to becoming landscapes of consumption (Rettie, 2010; Slee, 2005; Stacul, 2010). As part of post-productivist and multifunctional agricultural regimes, farmers are encouraged to provide “non-food landscapes and services, ranging from nature conservation and flood control to public access to land” (Vergunst, 2012, p. 173). Agriculture is increasingly expected to provide non-food goods and services that are consumed by visitors, tourists and amenity migrants. This development has to be seen in relation to a growing market for “green” products and services (Heatherington, 2011). Furthermore, agricultural landscapes and farming not only provide goods and services for consumption, but are increasingly being consumed as cultural and natural heritage (Heatherington, 2011). In this process, “farmers are expected not only to produce crops, but also to perform heritage as the living embodiments of collective natural and cultural histories” (ibid., p. 3). This consumption has to be seen in relation to the diversification into on-farm businesses such as tourism. As argued by Vaccaro (2006), in the face of economic pressures, farmers increasingly turn to the provision of services and the ‘production’ of amenities (Rettie, 2010) for consumption. In the political economy terminology discussed above, such landscapes where primary agricultural production no longer constitutes the defining economic process can be termed “post-productivist landscapes” (Vergunst, 2012).

It has been argued that “commodification is the central process driving rural change and the development of new rural economies” (Mackay, Perkins, & Espiner, 2009, p. 8). This argument indicates that the commodity form is extended to goods and services that were not previously commodified, such as cultural heritage. In this process, rural culture, including farming and agricultural landscapes, is consumed through tourism, leisure and recreation (ibid.). The consumers of these goods and services are typically affluent city dwellers who come to the countryside as tourists, amenity migrants or simply visitors (Heatherington, 2011; Vaccaro, 2006). Pointing to this notion, the term “postmodern landscape” (Vaccaro, 2006, p. 371) is suggested for grasping rural landscapes after an alleged post-productivist transition: “A postmodern landscape is a territory characterized by an urban appropriation of land and resources directed at covering postmaterialistic needs. These needs and uses are mostly related to leisure and tourism” (ibid.).

A related argument is that the notions of landscapes of production and landscapes of consumption are relative and that farmers tend to perceive the landscape different than

outsiders or consumers of the landscape (Okeley, 2001; Stacul, 2010; Vergunst, 2012). This argument is based on the assumption that the perception of the landscape is rooted in the (economic and cultural) relations between the perceiver and the landscape. Okeley (2001), for instance, argues that farmers, through working the landscape in processes of agricultural production, view the landscape differently than tourists, who relate to the landscape through recreation and relaxation. This is reflected on a conceptual level in the distinction between “seeing” and “looking” (ibid.). Whereas seeing refers to the engaged and embodied understanding of the landscape and a view from within the landscape, looking represents the distanced, optical gaze of the outsider. Based in their occupation and identity as farmers, farmers see the landscape as a landscape of production, whereas outsiders who consume the landscape through tourism or recreation look at it primarily as a landscape of consumption (Okeley, 2001; Stacul, 2010; Whitehouse, 2012). Moreover, whereas the landscape in landscapes of production is dynamically constituted through agricultural production, landscapes of consumption often include a sense of “nature” that is thought of as static and available for consumption (Vergunst, 2012).

The concepts of productivism, post-productivism and multifunctionality provide conceptual tools with which the economic role of summer farming in Valdres will be analyzed throughout this thesis.

1.3.3. Farmers’ attitudes and values under agrarian restructuring

The theoretical debate regarding the changing economic role of the agricultural sector raises questions about the farmers’ perspectives on this matter. What do the farmers perceive as the role of agriculture, and how do they envision their position in the context of agrarian change? This actor-centered approach to agrarian structural change can be seen as an expansion and a complementation of the structuralist political economic conceptualizations outlined above (Bjørkhaug, 2012; Wilson, 2001). Critics have claimed that theories on agrarian change tend to be “farmer-free” (Duesberg, O’Connor, & Dhubháin, 2013) and to neglect the farmers’ own ideas and attitudes towards farming (Bjørkhaug, 2012). They thus call for an increased “farmer focus” (Battershill & Gilg, 1997) in studies on agrarian structural change.

Farmers’ attitudes towards farming have been found to be influenced by both structural and attitudinal factors (ibid.) Structural factors include governmental policies and financial pressures. Attitudinal factors point to the farmers’ values, dispositions and personalities,

which are also referred to as “intentional” elsewhere (Jones, 1988). Jones (ibid.) added functional factors to the list, referring to economic and practical factors related to the individual farm. Attending to both structural and attitudinal factors, a dominant thesis in the literature on agriculture’s changing economic role is that farmers’ value systems with regard to farming are informed by the principles of productivism (Emery, 2014). This thesis implies that farmers primarily focus on productivity and profit based on the production of food and fibers (Lowe et al., 1993; Siebert, Toogood, & Knierim, 2006). In this regard, it has been argued that the main motivation behind farming is economic (Daugstad et al., 2014; Lowe et al., 1993). A central question in the discussion on agrarian structural change is thus whether farmers continue to exhibit productivist values and attitudes when the rationale of agricultural policies change towards post-productivism and multifunctionalism, a topic I will turn to below.

However, the notion of an ethos of productivism has been criticized for being too uni-dimensional, and the argument has been brought forward that farmers hold different values in regard to farming and exhibit “multiple farming identities” or “farming styles” (Burton & Wilson, 2012; Duesberg et al., 2013). Conceptualizations of farmers’ multiple value systems in relation to farming tend to come in list form. Gasson (1973), for instance, identified four sets of values in relation to farming: instrumental values (i.e. making the maximum income or making a satisfactory income); intrinsic values (i.e. enjoyment of work tasks, of a specific lifestyle, purposeful activity); social values (i.e. continuing the family tradition, maintaining farming as a socio-economic system) and expressive values (i.e. self-expression, pride).

The notion of an “ethos of farming” (Stewart & Strathern, 2010, p. 5) attempts to grasp farmers’ attitudes towards farming while attending to multiple value systems (Duesberg et al., 2013; Emery, 2014; Vergunst, 2012; Whitehouse, 2012). In the terminology used above, this notion implies that farmers in general value production over post-production, farming over “post-farming” (Vergunst, 2012). This thesis thus holds that “farming identity and rootedness are often situated in traditional conceptions of the role of agriculture” (Wilson, 2001, p. 87), which is to produce food and fibers.

These theoretical discussion and questions provide the basis on which the farmers’ attitudes and values towards summer farming and the summer farming landscape will be analyzed throughout this thesis.

1.4. State of the art: literature on agrarian restructuring and transhumance

1.4.1. Anthropological research on agriculture in European advanced economies

When anthropologists first began to turn their interest to Europe in the 1960s, rural communities and agriculture moved into the focus of anthropological attention (Demoissier, 2011, pp. 112-113). From the 1970s, local communities were studied in the context of globalization and Europeanization. With the restructuration of agriculture the “end of peasantry” (Mendras, 1967) was predicated. This pessimistic account of rural change was soon to be modified, and farming as an occupation and the changing role of agriculture became subjects of anthropological inquiry. Today, however, European rural anthropology is “deeply marginalized” (Demoissier, 2011, p. 115), and there is “no collective research agenda” (ibid.) on this field. In this context, scholars have called for increased anthropological attention to farming issues in Europe (Demoissier, 2011; Heatherington, 2011; Stewart & Strathern, 2010). The edited volume *Landscape, Heritage and Conservation* (Stewart & Strathern, 2010) and the special issue of the *Anthropological Journal of European Culture* on ‘Politicking the Farm: Transitions and Transformations in European Agriculture’ (2011) can be seen as steps in this direction.

In this burgeoning anthropological research agenda on European agriculture, agrarian structural change and the changing economic role of agriculture have been identified as major trends calling for scientific inquiry. In this regard, anthropologists appropriate the political economy vocabulary of agrarian restructuring and discuss the observed changes in terms of post-productivism, post-productivist transition and multifunctionality. The predominant way of approaching these changes is essentially anthropological as it includes the wider political and economic contexts in which agriculture is embedded while at the same time examining what these structural processes imply on a local scale and how they are perceived by farmers (Demoissier, 2011; Stewart & Strathern, 2010). The focus of anthropological studies in this field lies less on agri-businesses; “we are concerned, rather, with a category of farming that is in a sense marginal” (Stewart & Strathern, 2010, p. 5), meaning small-scale agriculture belonging to the Less Favoured Area classification of the European Union.

Two related characteristics of marginal and small-scale farming have been identified and received anthropological attention. Firstly, with earlier visions of agricultural modernization being replaced with ideas of integrated rural development and multifunctional agriculture

(Heatherington, 2011), anthropologists acknowledge that “agriculture has become much more than a sector of primary production” (Demoissier, 2011). As “cultural landscapes and agricultural practices across Europe are now enfolded by a dominant vision of ‘sustainable development’” (Heatherington, 2011, p. 3), agriculture is increasingly expected to carry out cultural and environmental functions, i.e. (environmental) conservation and (cultural) heritage (Heatherington, 2011; Stewart & Strathern, 2010), and this change demands anthropological inquiry. In this regard, anthropologists have focused on the farmers’ views of these changing policies and their ability to adapt to changing structural conditions and economic pressures. Bryden (2010), for example, shows how Scottish small-scale farmers diversify and take on a number of functions in order to supplement their income from farming. In a similar vein and drawing on data from Andalusia, Spain, Maddox (2010) argues that diversification and commoditization of agriculture and its outcomes can be seen as neoliberal economic strategies in the face of rural restructuring. Welch-Devine and Murray (2011) see diversification amongst herders in the Northern Basque region as an adaptation to changing agricultural policies. Drawing from data from the Pyrenees, Vaccaro (2006) argues that for some farmers changing market demands and the changing role of the agricultural sector constitute (economic) opportunities, and that farmers’ responses to agrarian restructuring have to be framed in terms of economic rationality. These studies all have in common that they do not constitute the farmers as passive recipients of economic and policy changes, but rather emphasize their agency and ability to adjust to changing political economic contexts (Bryden, 2010; Maddox, 2010; Welch-Devine & Murray, 2011).

A second and related phenomenon that concerns European marginal agriculture and that has received anthropological attention is the increasing “consumption of the countryside” (Slee, 2005). A feature of agrarian restructuring is that agricultural landscapes are expected to provide amenities for consumption, with tourism and the commodification of natural and cultural heritage (Daugstad et al., 2006) being common strategies for diversification. This trend is conceptualized in terms of a change of rural landscapes from landscapes of agricultural production to landscapes of consumption, discussed above (Rettie, 2010; Stacul, 2010; Stewart & Strathern, 2010). The agricultural landscape has been explored by scholars of the anthropology of European agriculture, as well as in anthropological landscape studies (Árnason, Ellison, Vergunst, & Whitehouse, 2012). Drawing on a case study from Scotland, Rettie (2010) shows how land is consumed as it is turned into a national park, and examines adjacent farmers’ divergent responses to this development. In a similar vein, Stacul (2010)

shows how former agricultural land is transformed into a nature park and hence into a landscape of consumption. He argues that the farmers' view on the landscape differs substantially from that of the visitors to the park. Whereas the former emphasize the landscape as a locus of production, outsiders view it primarily as a place of consumption. Also focusing on consumption, Vaccaro (2006) argues that the emergence of post-materialistic values among urban consumers has led to the "commodification of nature" (ibid., p. 366) which ultimately constitutes "postmodern landscapes" (ibid.) in the Pyrenees.

Stewart and Strathern (2010) point to the political aspects of these agrarian structural changes. They argue that the relation between farming, heritage and conservation is contested, and that the "immigrant values" (ibid., p. 10) of policy makers and urban consumers not always correspond with the aims and perceptions of the farmers affected by structural change. This notion is also put forward by Chaia Heller (2010), who outlines how representatives of French marginalized small-scale farmers articulate a "radical critique" of industrial farming and of policy initiatives that "seek to transform small farmers into a new service class" (Heatherington, 2011, p. 7). In this regard, Heatherington (ibid.) argues that: "We need to understand where such initiatives revitalize the social fabric of community and support the life projects of farmers themselves, and where they instead seem to (re)produce marginality and exploitation".

1.4.2. Farmers' attitudes and values in regard to farming

The debate regarding agriculture's changing economic role and the post-productivist transition raised the question whether these structural changes have led to a shift in the farmers' cultural orientations towards farming. In the European context, scholars have argued that a large part of the farming community was skeptical to or even rejected post-productivity and the new green policies (Wilson, 2001, pp. 88-92). Farmers were found to retain a productivist view of farming (Burton, Kuczera, & Schwarz, 2008), emphasizing the production of food and fibers and production maximization as well as economic output (Wilson, 2001, p. 92). This argument was brought forward as a critique to the dualism productivism/post-productivism (Evans et al., 2002). Also in Norway it has been found that farmers, despite agri-environmental measures, continue to exhibit productivist attitudes (Rønningen et al., 2004). Others have argued that some farmers do believe that agriculture's function includes more than the production of food and fibers and appreciate that their

multifunctional role in society is acknowledged (Rønningen & Burton, 2013). The multifunctionality of agriculture, then, is a contested topic amongst farmers.

What scholars seem to agree on, though, is that most farmers express a “farming ethos” (Wilson, 2001). This term points to a cultural valuation of “standard farming practices” (Vergunst, 2012, p. 175): the agricultural production of food and fibers. This argument has been brought forward inter alia by Vergunst (ibid.). Drawing on data from Orkney, Scotland and exploring farmers’ responses to the rise of the environmental movement and agri-environmental schemes, he found a tension between the “two landscapes of farming and post-farming” (ibid., p. 175), and argues that the cultural norms of farmers include an appreciation for the agricultural productive landscape. A similar argument has been brought forward by Whitehouse (2012), who also conducted fieldwork in Scotland. Through narratives about the landscape in which the productive land is emphasized as aesthetically appealing, farmers of Islay express ‘productive values’ and an ‘ethic of productivity’ (ibid.).

1.4.3. Transhumance in Norway and beyond

Transhumance is practiced in Europe, the Middle East, Central Asia and South America. It is primarily explained in terms of ecological adaptation to a mountainous environment (Daugstad, 1999; Daugstad et al., 2014; Norbye, 2010). Recent anthropological studies of European transhumance have focused on the farmers’ ability to adapt to structural changes, for example through diversifying into tourism (Funnel & Ramola, 2001; Kirchengast, 2005). Drawing on data from throughout the Alps, Minnich (Minnich, 1989) argues that farmers tend to accentuate the cultural heritage aspect of summer farming only when this practice is threatened by farm closure. In Slovenia, summer farming is thriving and therefore, according to the author, not emphasized as a cultural heritage.

The major part of written and visual material on summer farming in Norway is descriptive in nature and has to be treated today as historical sources. Historical studies of summer farming describe the social life at summer farms and the development of the summer farm mode of agricultural production. Several of these studies were carried out with the aim of documenting a distinctive part of Norwegian rural culture that was believed to be vanishing. Examples include the classical three-volume *Sæterbruket i Noreg* (Summer farming in Norway) by Lars Reinton published respectively in 1955, 1957 and 1961; the studies carried out by The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture in the 1920s and 1930s (Arkivverket

Digitalarkivet, 2014), and *Norsk saetertradisjon* by the folklorist Svale Solheim (1952). The ethnologist Ragnar Pedersen studied summer farming in Hedmark, Norway (Pedersen, 1974). This historical and descriptive study depicts how summer farming as an integrated part of the farm economic system gradually lost its function in the course of agrarian structural rationalization.

There is little contemporary social science research on summer farming in Norway, not to speak of anthropological research on the topic. An exception is the anthropologist Brun Norbye's study *En fornemmelse av støl. Om meningsdannelse av sted og moderne stølsliv i Hallingdal, Norge* (2010) (A taste of summer mountain dairy farm. Place-making and contemporary life at summer farms in Hallingdal, Norway). In addition to providing a thick description of summer farming, Norbye applies a phenomenological approach to illuminate the processes of place-making and identity construction at contemporary summer farms. From the perspective of social and cultural geography, Karoline Daugstad (1999) explores how the summer farming landscape is presented in Norwegian literature and art from the end of the 18th century to date. In a comparative study of Norwegian and Spanish transhumance, Daugstad et al. (2014) argue that even though the main motivation behind farming is economic, Norwegian summer farmers place emphasis on the cultural aspect of summer farming and express the aim to uphold the traditions connected to this practice. The authors further argue that agrarian restructuring has "particularly significant effects in the mountain areas of Europe, which are characterized by small and extensive farming systems, remoteness and challenging natural conditions." (ibid., p. 248). Summer farming in Valdres is the subject of two recent reports from the Norwegian interdisciplinary Bioforsk Institute (Daugstad & Lunnan, 2009; Skarstad, Daugstad, Lunnan, & Sickel, 2008). These reports give a descriptive account of summer farming in Valdres, combining a historical perspective with contemporary empirical data. The focus is on landscape use and the economic aspects of summer farming.

Finally, summer farming in Norway has been treated widely in the natural sciences. Studies have focused on outfield pasture grazing and on the summer farming cultural landscape. Emphasis has been placed on the advantages of summer farming and outfield pasture grazing in terms of milk quality and biodiversity (Bele et al., 2011, 2013; Bele, Tunón, & Røe, 2014; Norderhaug & Sickel, 2002, 2007; Hanne Sickel & Svalheim, 2010). The ongoing interdisciplinary project *Utmarksbeite - en biologisk kulturarv som ressurs for ei bærekraftig framtid* (Outfield pasture grazing – a biological cultural heritage for a sustainable future)

provides a comparative study of summer farming in Norway and Sweden. It views summer farming as a “biological cultural heritage” (Tunón et al., 2014, p. 58) and documents the traditional ecological knowledge connected to this practice with the aim of stimulating to continued active summer farming and outfield pasture grazing. In an article based upon the findings of the projects, the values of the summer farming landscape are explored from a policy perspective as well as from the perspectives of summer farmers.

1.5. Methodology

In this thesis, I ask why farmers in Valdres engage in summer farming today. The aim is to analyze the economic processes at Valdresian summer farms, relate these to larger political economic structures and explore the farmers’ views on summer farming. This calls for an empirical study of the topic and indicates a qualitative methodology, which is why ethnography was chosen as the main research strategy.

The research design contains both inductive and deductive elements. As the research consists of an analysis of a case study in the light of an already existing body of theoretical literature on agrarian structural change, the research is guided by theoretical assumptions (see chapters 1.1 and 1.2). However, the research was conducted using open research questions, and I remained open to issues that were not indicated by the existing literature on the topic during both fieldwork and analysis. The research process was of a circular nature, meaning that the different stages of research were not clearly differentiated from each other. During fieldwork, I began coding and interpreting the data and allowed my findings to influence the further data collection. Through telecommunication, I was able to collect further data after having returned from fieldwork in Valdres, allowing me to fill in gaps or answer questions that emerged during data analysis.

Furthermore, my research contains both idiographic and nomothetic elements. It aims at understanding a specific case – summer farming in Valdres, while also explaining this case in relation to broader processes and theories. Ethnographic fieldwork was therefore chosen as the most suitable strategy for data collection, and various methods were applied in order to grasp different dimensions of this complex field of study (Beer, 2008). The two central research methods were participant observation and qualitative interviews.

1.5.1. Sampling and constructing the field

The topic of this research is summer farming in the Norwegian region of Valdres. The field of study is thus various summer farms in this region. Valdres has Norway's highest amount of active summer farms, and it promotes itself as the region in Northern Europe with the most summer farms (Valdres Natur- og Kulturpark, 2014). Summer farming in Valdres is considered an important natural and cultural heritage by the national environmental and agricultural authorities as well as by the regional government and tourist sector. Simultaneously, summer farms are decreasing substantially in Norway and in Valdres. These factors make summer farming in Valdres an interesting case for exploring questions linked to agrarian structural change. The sampling of the case is therefore purposive (Silverman, 2007, p. 129), as a setting was chosen in which "the processes being studied are most likely to occur" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 370). The field of study was furthermore chosen out of pragmatic reasons; through earlier stays in Valdres in 2012 and 2013 during which I worked as a volunteer at a summer farm, I knew several summer farmers and was familiar with this agricultural practice.

Traditionally, anthropologists studied small rural societies, which made the anthropological fields bounded and rooted in localities. Thus, the classical anthropological concepts and research strategies were tailored to grasp such supposedly delineated and small units. As the contemporary world is a world of connections and relations, anthropologists increasingly face difficulties in applying these methods and strategies (Amit, 2000; Gupta & Ferguson, 1997). Even though the actors of summer farming in Valdres are embedded in larger networks and contexts, the fact that Valdres is a quite small rural society I did not face great difficulties in constructing a field of research and conducting fieldwork and participant observation. Many farmers in Valdres are acquaintances, which facilitated my access to summer farmers. Moreover, during summer, the summer farmers mostly live at their summer farms, which further contributed to their accessibility.

The starting point of this research was the Olestølen summer farm belonging to the Nørrestogo farm run by the Aslaksby family in the municipality of Øystre Slidre in Valdres. In order to obtain a polyphone perspective on summer farming in Valdres, additional summer farms were included in the sample – in total I visited seven different summer farms. As I am interested in agrarian structural change, I included several farmers who diversify into summer

farm related businesses. The summer farmers I met in Valdres can be divided into two categories. The “alternative” farmers farm ecologically and typically with simpler technological infrastructure. All professional cheese makers I met in Valdres belong to this category. The “conventional” farmers do not farm ecologically, and deliver their milk to the dairy cooperation Tine. The farmers use this categorization and these terms to denominate themselves and other farmers. Kathrin and Thomas at Olestølen, my main informants, identify themselves as alternative farmers. They practice ecological farming and have about twenty-five milking goats and ten additional goats for meat and fur production. Kathrin is a professional cheese maker. During summer they sell their dairy products directly from the farm and offer summer farm tourism. The other summer farmers I met belong to both categories. At four of the seven summer farms I visited, ecological farming is practiced. The same summer farms produce cheese. At two of these summer farms, tourist activities are offered during summer. The remaining three summer farms can be labeled as conventional. One of these farms is open to tourists once a week during summer.

The sampling of interviewees for the expert interviews was theoretically informed as I specifically contacted people to whom I attribute a certain expertise and knowledge about summer farming (Halbmayer & Salat, 2011, p. 44). During fieldwork I moreover engaged in numerous conversations with different people such as tourists, visitors or an employee of the Beitostølen tourist office. Such conversations occurred spontaneously in the field and the sampling was random.

1.5.2. Ethnographic fieldwork

The methodological cornerstone of this research is the strategy of ethnography, in the course of which various procedures of data gathering were applied, mainly participant observation and different forms of interviewing (Flick, 1998, p. 148; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). I understand ethnographic fieldwork as a research strategy that potentially includes a wide spectrum of different methods and techniques and that is characterized by the personal involvement of the researcher in the field. The research design was oriented towards the classical model of ethnographic fieldwork in the sense that I was living among and sharing the life of the summer farmers that I was studying (ibid.). I consider ethnography as a most apt method for collecting qualitative data on summer farming. Through the immersion of the researcher in the field, the researcher can gain access to lived experiences (Amit, 2000) and emic perspectives as well as generate “thick descriptions” (Geertz, 1973) of the topic under

study. The strength of ethnography further lies in the possibility of applying various forms of data gathering side by side (Flick, 1998; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). Moreover, doing fieldwork with participant observation allowed me to give something back to the farmers I wanted to study in terms of helping out at the summer farm. This again strengthened the mutual trust between the farmers and me and facilitated the process of data gathering.

Ethnographic fieldwork was conducted in Valdres for almost six weeks in July and August in 2014. During these weeks, I lived and worked at the Olestølen summer farm as a *budeie* (a summer farmer) and visited other summer farms. Because of my previous involvement in the field of summer farming at Olestølen, the access to the field was unproblematic and went very smoothly. Through my earlier stays in Valdres, I knew Thomas and Kathrin Aslaksby at Olestølen, my main research partners, quite well. A mutual trust and understanding was there from the onset of my fieldwork. Thomas and Kathrin played crucial roles as gatekeepers and facilitated my access to other farmers and actors in the field of summer farming (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 2007, p. 378). They helped me get in touch with possible interview partners and influenced my conception of the field under study. In general, I was surprised over how willingly people engaged in conversations and interviews with me and am grateful for the hospitality with which I was met.

The time frame of six weeks obviously put restraints on my data collection. However, this methodological handicap was compensated by the fact that I was already familiar with summer farming through earlier stays at the Olestølen summer farm. Moreover, as I am Norwegian, I have a basic cultural understanding of the field and speak the native language, factors that facilitated my access to the field.

1.5.3. Participant observation

Participant observation with a high degree of participation constituted the main tool for data collection during fieldwork in Valdres. As goes for ethnographic fieldwork in general, I understand participant observation as a strategy for data gathering that is characterized by a personal involvement of the researcher in the field who oscillates between closeness and distance to the people he or she studies (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2002). I used this method to gather first-hand data on summer farming in Valdres and to access the emic perspective of the farmers (ibid., 103). This presupposed a high degree of personal engagement in the process of

data collection and the consequent recording of all steps of the research process in a field diary (Emerson et al., 2007).

Thomas and Kathrin were extremely welcoming and included me in all parts of life at the farm and summer farm. This arrangement was convenient for me on a methodological level as it provided me with good working conditions, allowing me to stay at the farm and summer farm, and to live among the people that I studied in the environment that I studied. I could do in-depth participant observation in combination with other methods of data gathering. Hence, at the Olestølen summer farm, I became very much part of the setting that I was researching. I see this as a methodological advantage in the sense that it granted me with valuable insider knowledge about summer farming in Valdres.

During my stay, I further got the chance to observe and take part in several specific events that were of great interest to me concerning my research, such as joining the *Gards- og Stølsnettverket*, the Valdres farm and summer farm tourist network, on a networking meeting and an excursion to several summer farms or helping out at a photo shoot at the Olestølen for the homepage of the rural development organization Valdres Natur- og Kulturpark.

The data gathered through participant observation provides me with important descriptions of everyday life at summer farms in Valdres. These data contain events, attitudes, atmospheres, conversations and other facets of summer farming that do not appear in the interviews. The participant observation generated data in the form of written and audio field notes and a written field diary.

1.5.4. Interviews

A strength of participant observation is that it works as a starting point and context for applying other methods of data gathering (De Walt & DeWalt, 2011). During fieldwork in Valdres this method functioned as a foundation for creating interview guidelines and it created situations for informal interviews.

Formal interviews were conducted with several summer farmers and different agents in the field of summer farming in Valdres. The aim of the interviews with the summer farmers was to gain insight into their summer farming practice and their attitudes towards summer farming. Depending on the context, atmosphere and time frame, these interviews were either

narrative (Halbmayer & Salat, 2011; Lamnek, 2005) or problem-centered (Halbmayer & Salat, 2011; Witzel, 2000). The interviews with the summer farmers were mainly problem-centered, even if some of them in the end turned out more like narrative interviews. Based on my empirically and theoretically informed knowledge on summer farming, I created an interview guideline with questions that were focused around certain topics. Throughout my fieldwork, I modified the interview guideline as new topics emerged or some questions turned out to be irrelevant. I tried to handle concepts, such as cultural landscape or multifunctionality, with care to avoid pushing the interview in a certain direction. The formal interviews lasted for between 1,5 and 3 hours. On three occasions I conducted explicitly narrative interviews with summer farmers. In these interviews I tried to encourage biographic narratives from the farmers and merely asked questions related to what my interview partner talked about (Halbmayer & Salat, 2011; Lamnek, 2005). The expert interviews were problem-centered and semi-structured (Halbmayer & Salat, 2011; Witzel, 2000, p. 44).

In all, I conducted thirteen formal semi-structured interviews, whereof eight were conducted with summer farmers, four with other experts (an employee at the Valdres Folk Museum; researchers at Bioforsk Løken; the Senior Counsellor of the agricultural department at the County Governor of Oppland; and a cheese technologist, cheese maker and consultant for small scale agricultural producers) and one with a *budeie*, a temporary summer farmer at Olestølen.

Even though the interviews provided me with important data, methodologically they were more useful for creating situations for participant observations and informal talks. After the voice recorder was turned off and I joined my interview partners as they showed me around the summer farm or we sat down for another coffee, I obtained the most valuable information. This proves the importance of participant observation in ethnographic fieldwork.

As participant observation was my methodological starting point for data gathering, informal interviews (Spradley, 1979) constitute an important part of my collected data. Countless unstructured and informal talks occurred spontaneously in the field, at the Olestølen summer farm, at other summer farms and at locations such as the tourist information in Beitostølen or the Bitibua kiosk. These talks were adapted to the respective situations and I mostly did not explicitly assume the role of an interviewer. However, also in these conversations I often kept a certain focus on my research topic, posing specific questions and making use of repetitions

in the style of an ethnographic interview (ibid.). In general, I was open about my own role as a researcher and mentioned that I was doing a research on summer farming whenever I met new people. Often this led to interesting conversations about summer farming. At the farms I visited, I always stayed for longer than just the scheduled formal interview. This allowed for making use of informal and ethnographic interviews additionally. In such situations, the farmers knew what my research interest was and why I was there. Thus, the conversations often naturally revolved around summer farming. Given the explorative and inductive nature of such unstructured informal interviews, they were a necessary complementation to the more formal semi-structured interviews and often contained valuable information that could not be obtained through the interviews. In these conversations, many unexpected topics popped up along the way, and these informal talks thus worked as a foundation for adapting my interview guidelines.

The research topic I chose seemed to be of great interest for the summer farmers I met in Valdres. It is a quite uncomplicated and easy topic to talk about as it does not involve sensitive personal information, which helped building rapport with summer farmers. The topic is very straightforward and precise – it was easy to explain my research interest to people. The fact that I was living on a summer farm and actually was taking part in the work there granted me with an insider-status which made my access to people and their stories easier. These factors all contributed to the quality of the data gained from my fieldwork and interviews.

The informal and ethnographic interviews generated qualitative data that are available as notes in my field diary and as written texts. Since using a recorder would disturb the informal nature of conversations in everyday settings, I jotted down the main content of such informal talks in my notebook, sometimes during the talk but mostly afterwards.

1.5.5. Textual material and secondary data

The data collected through participant observation and interviews were complemented by diverse textual material. I searched for national and local newspaper articles that concern summer farming in Norway. This provided me with some insight into the public discourse on summer farming and helped me identify important topics related to summer farming. Furthermore, I used the Internet to look up different websites concerning summer farming in Valdres. These included the facebook pages of some of the summer farms I visited, the

website of the Norwegian summer farming association (Norsk Seterkultur) and the websites of the Valdres tourist office and of the rural development organization Valdres Natur- og Kulturpark. These websites offered important insights into how the summer farmers represent themselves and their summer farming practice, how summer farming is promoted by the Valdresian tourist industry and how it is viewed in terms of rural development, inter alia. I further drew on different pamphlets, information sheets, etc., published by different organizations such as the Norwegian summer farming association or the Directorate for Cultural Heritage whenever these seemed to suit my research interest.

Furthermore, I gathered various types of secondary data before, during and after fieldwork. To grasp the topic quantitatively and to map out the structural conditions of summer farming in Norway today, I collected various statistics covering different aspects of summer farming in Norway and in Valdres. I obtained these data mostly from different governmental institutions (Statistisk Sentralbyrå, Skog og Landskap, Fylkesmannen i Oppland, etc.).

1.5.6. Data analysis

Reviewing and analyzing the gathered data was a continuous part of the research process. In Valdres, I started to develop a system of categorization by which I coded the material in the field and after fieldwork. The gathered data were systemized by inductively and deductively constructed codes. To systematize the process of analysis, I used the software NVivo.

1.6. Contextualizing the field: Valdres

Valdres is a region consisting of six municipalities, located in in Southern Central Norway. The region has a population of 18,000 inhabitants. Except for Fagernes, the region's urban center, Valdres has a low population density. Historically constituting the main pillar of the regions' economy, forestry and agriculture have decreased substantially during the last decades. Today, about ten percent of the region's population are employed in these sectors. Simultaneously, the service sector has increased. There is a strong growth in sectors such as gastronomy, commerce and hospitality, which is an effect of the growth in tourism in the region. The region accommodates an impressive amount of cabins: 17,516 in total in 2013. Valdres is promoted as a destination for experience-based tourism, often in relation to agriculture and nature (Valdres, 2013). Located at the Riksvei 51, a popular and highly frequented route, Beitostølen (historically a cluster of summer farms) has developed into the

regions' most important tourist center. The region is characterized by extensive valleys with large lakes and covered by boreal forest and mountains with alpine tundra.

2. The structural conditions of summer farming in Valdres

Departing from the assumption that summer farming is affected by agrarian structural changes (Daugstad et al., 2014, p. 256), this chapter outlines the general characteristics of Norwegian agriculture today and explores their influence on summer farming in Valdres. The political economy conceptualizations outlined in Chapter One serve as the analytical tools in this regard. In this chapter, I draw on secondary data such as scientific literature, policy documents and statistical data from different governmental institutions. Websites of rural development institutions, tourist bureaus, etc., have also been considered. Furthermore, I draw on my empirical data, based mainly on interviews and conversations with representatives of a rural development organization in Valdres and the County Governor in Oppland.

2.1. Agrarian structural change in Norway

Two related features characterize Norwegian agriculture. On the one hand, it is defined by the continuation of productivism, or by a neo-productivist turn (Rønningen & Burton, 2013). On the other hand, Norwegian agriculture increasingly exhibits post-productivist features and multifunctionality is embraced in agrarian discourse and policies (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008; Rønningen et al., 2004). To fully understand these developments, one has to first consider the general characteristics of Norwegian agriculture.

2.1.1. General characteristics of Norwegian agriculture

Norway is an advanced capitalist industrialized nation with a strong social democratic tradition. The country has about five million inhabitants who live mainly on the country's many natural resources: oil, natural gas, hydropower, fishery and aquaculture. Norway's climate is varied: the Southern coast is characterized by a temperate climate with mild winters and cold summers due to the Gulf Stream, and the Northern coast and the interior are characterized by a boreal climate with cold winters and warmer summers. These climatic conditions make for relatively fair conditions for agricultural production. Due to climatic and topographic heterogeneity, the Norwegian farmland and thus the conditions for farming vary throughout the country. In general, land suited for agricultural production is scarce: only three percent of the total land area is cultivated and/or harvested (Daugstad et al., 2014). Norwegian

agriculture is generally family based (Bjørkhaug, 2012) and small-scale in international comparison with an average farm size of about fourteen hectare (ibid.). Correspondingly, the country imports about 50 percent of its agrarian produced calories (Daugstad et al., 2014).

Norwegian agriculture is a politically strongly protected sector. Export of agricultural produce is low and import is regulated, and the country has one of the world's most comprehensive systems of agricultural subsidies (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008). Thus, the conditions for agriculture and hence the farmers' economic situations are to a large extent decided by political priorities (ibid.). Here it is important to note that through organizations, unions, cooperatives and political parties Norwegian farmers have exerted great influence on the country's agricultural policies since the 1930s (Almås, 2002). In annual negotiations, the agricultural budget is elaborated in collaboration between the Ministry of Agriculture and the two farmers' associations, the Norwegian Farmers' Union and the Norwegian Farmers and Smallholders Union. This strong and protectionist agricultural policy is only possible because the country is not a member of the European Union; as a matter of fact, one of the key arguments for Norway's rejection of joining the Union was agricultural concerns. An important goal of Norwegian agricultural and rural policies is the maintenance of agricultural production throughout the country. This aim forms part of broader rural development objectives of maintaining dispersed settlement and preventing centralization and efforts to maintain farming have substantially contributed to reach these objectives (Refsgaard, 2010, p. 288). Besides rural employment and settlement, other important aims of Norwegian agricultural policies include self-sufficiency and food security (ibid.). During the last three decades environmental objectives have moved up on the agenda of Norwegian agricultural policies (Refsgaard, 2010; Rønningen et al., 2004). Norway does, however, cooperate with the EU through the Agreement on the European Economic Areas and collaborates with international actors such as the World Trade Organization, which involves free trade with limitations on agricultural and fishery products. As power is increasingly moved to the market, the WTO and the EU, the Norwegian protectionist agricultural model seems to be under pressure (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008).

2.1.2. Norwegian agricultural restructuring: productivism

Scholars of Norwegian agriculture argue that one major defining feature of this sector is productivism, discussed in Chapter One. Technological improvements, such as the application of chemical fertilizers and pesticides, as well as the access to better-performing crops have

kept the domestic food production on a steady level; parts of it have even increased significantly (Rønningen & Burton, 2013). These developments are brought about by the globalization of the food market and the corresponding Norwegian agricultural policies. To ensure competitiveness in an increasingly globalized food market, Norwegian agricultural policies encourage effectiveness and rationalization (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008; Rønningen & Burton, 2013), a trend which is further reinforced by the Norwegian consumer demands for cheaper food (*ibid.*). Comparable to agriculture in other developed economies, the pressure for rationalization and industrialization combined with low profitability for agricultural products and a favorable job market outside agriculture has forced a high number of less efficient farmers to leave the sector (Daugstad et al., 2014). These indications of a “neo-productivist turn” (Rønningen & Burton, 2013) in agricultural policies mirror developments found in many parts of the world today. The political promotion of rationalization and intensification augmented in 2013 when the conservative and right-wing government came to power in Norway. Suggestions such as removing the milk quota, doubling the limited amount of chicken on chicken farms and the agricultural budgets proposed by the government at the annual agricultural agreements of the past two years give reasons to believe that structural rationalization for agriculture will be reinforced under the government currently in power. Further effectiveness and rationalization are stressed by the government as means of keeping Norwegian agriculture competitive in a future of increased international trade and as a response to Norwegian consumer demand for cheaper food (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008; Rønningen & Burton, 2013). These trends support the thesis that Norwegian agriculture is still characterized by the continuity of productivist policies and practices.

However, agricultural structural rationalization and intensification are more moderate in Norway than in other comparable countries. The increase in farm size is moderate and average farms are still very small compared to other Western countries (the average Norwegian dairy farm in 2014 had 24 milking cows) (Almaås & Brobak, 2012; Ekern, 2014). In this regard, Bjørkhaug concludes: “Even though the number of farms has decreased dramatically, they are not replaced by large capitalist companies that own a lot of farms” (Bjørkhaug, 2012, p. 300). The reasons for this are to be found partly in the protectionist Norwegian agricultural policies and their emphasis on the multifunctionality of agriculture.

2.1.3. Norwegian agricultural restructuring: multifunctionality

Sociologists argue that in Norway the conditions of agriculture and hence the farmers' economic situation are to a large extent decided by political priorities (Almås, 2002; Refsgaard, 2010). Following Tilzey (2001), multifunctionality is an important discourse in contemporary Norwegian agricultural policies as well as a useful concept to describe agricultural practice in Norway today (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008; Daugstad et al., 2006; Refsgaard, 2010; Rønningen & Burton, 2013; Rønningen et al., 2004). This emphasis on the multifunctional role of Norwegian agriculture resonates with the international discourse on agriculture's multifunctionality (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008). Two institutions are of special importance in this regard. Agricultural multifunctionality has emerged as a key concept in WTO policy negotiations (ibid.), and holds a strong paradigmatic position in EU policies and practices (ibid.). Within the Common Agricultural Policy of the EU, the multifunctionality of agriculture has since the late 1980s been stressed and promoted through various agri-environmental schemes (Rønningen et al., 2004). Since the end of the 1990s, the notion of a multifunctional agriculture became important in agricultural discourses and policies (Almås, 2002; Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008; Daugstad, Rønningen, & Skar, 2006; Rønningen & Burton, 2013). The general acknowledgement that agriculture produces externalities such as biodiversity, cultural heritage and cultural landscapes in addition to food and fibers, and that these externalities of agricultural production are of value to society, is of great significance for understanding the structural conditions of summer farming in Valdres.

Different factors have brought about a "multifunctionalist agricultural policy" (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008) in Norway. As a response to the negative environmental effects of agricultural production and in some cases agricultural overproduction, Norwegian agricultural policies have since the 1970s oriented towards environmental objectives (ibid.). Furthermore, even though Norwegian agriculture in the past and present can be characterized as protectionist, Norway has since the 1970s been involved in international trade agreements and thus been increasingly influenced by international agricultural policies and regulations (Almås, 2002; Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008). Being tied to international developments of liberalization and the general embeddedness of Norwegian agriculture in a capitalist economy has led to international pressure on Norway to reduce production subsidies and import tariffs (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008). The response of Norwegian agricultural authorities and actors to this situation has been to emphasize the multifunctionality of agriculture (Bjørkhaug &

Richards, 2008; Daugstad et al., 2006; Rønningen, Flø, & Fjeldavli, 2004). In emphasizing agriculture's multifunctionality, Norwegian agricultural policies stress that the agricultural sector, besides producing commodities such as food and fibers, produces certain externalities that are defined as values or public goods (Rønningen & Burton, 2013). The argument that agriculture is valuable beyond the production of food and fibers is thus an attempt to legitimize continued state support for and protection of small-scale agriculture through measures such as high subsidies and import tariffs (Rønningen et al., 2004). As this argument resonates with an international and European multifunctionality discourse, it has enabled Norway to somehow gain acceptance for its protectionist agricultural policies from the EU and the WTO (ibid.). Also internally in Norway, the emphasis on agriculture's multifunctional role has been used as a legitimization for continued strong and protectionist agricultural policies (ibid.). Agriculture's multifunctional role, then, is generally acknowledged, accepted and incorporated into Norwegian agricultural, rural and environmental policies.

In the Norwegian discourse on agriculture's multifunctionality, emphasis has been placed on agriculture's contribution to viable rural areas, production and conservation of cultural landscape, cultural heritage, food security and biodiversity (ibid.). Whereas multifunctionality in other countries has often been integrated in agricultural policies as part of a post-productivist agricultural regime characterized by de-regulation, in Norway multifunctionalism has "thrived within a protectionist setting with the support of the public, the state and agricultural actors" (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008). Since the late 1980s, Norwegian farmers have received financial support directly aimed at the protection of biodiversity and the maintenance of cultural landscapes, buildings and physical structures. Studies have shown that the public supports these policies: for instance, a study carried out by The Federation of Norwegian Agricultural Co-operatives (Norsk Landbrukssamvirke, 2005) found that 80 percent of the Norwegian population wants to keep Norwegian agriculture at the present level. The main argument put forward is that Norwegian agriculture is important in order to preserve rural communities, Norwegian food production and cultural landscapes. Hence, agriculture is appreciated by the Norwegian public because of its multifunctional role.

Besides being a powerful discourse and characterizing a large part of Norwegian agricultural policies, multifunctionality is an apt descriptor of agricultural practice in Norway. Political measures and governmental support have played important roles in bringing about the

discourse on multifunctionality and enhancing multifunctional agricultural practices. As I will elaborate below, Norwegian farmers increasingly diversify into farm-related businesses such as the processing of farm products or agro-tourism - a development that, according to Marsden and Sonnino (Marsden & Sonnino, 2008), qualifies Norwegian agriculture to fall under the category of multifunctional agriculture.

A topic of discussion in relation to the multifunctionality of agriculture has been whether or not the production of these public goods could be decoupled from agricultural primary production (Daugstad et al., 2006; Rønningen et al., 2004). In this context, active agriculture, living agriculture or active farming refers to “a production system based on economic outcomes from producing food and fibre” (Daugstad et al., 2006). Throughout the EU, subsidies aimed at the multiple outcomes of agriculture are mainly decoupled from agricultural primary production (ibid.), hence supporting a post-productive agriculture. In Norway, on the contrary, the support and promotion of an active agriculture is “seen as the most sustainable strategy in order to secure cultural heritage and other environmental values” (ibid., p. 68). Even though some of the goods associated with a multifunctional agriculture could be provided cheaper without active farming, studies conclude that the whole range of goods included in the multifunctionality of agriculture are most efficiently produced by the agricultural sector (Daugstad et al., 2006; Rønningen & Burton, 2013). Apart from the scientific community, this view is held by the tourism sector and the environmental and cultural heritage sector, and is particularly stressed by the agricultural sector and the farmers’ associations (Daugstad et al., 2006). The agricultural sector clearly emphasizes that it is part of the farmer’s role to provide public goods such as cultural heritage, cultural landscapes and biodiversity, but that the farmer’s main function is to produce food and fibers (ibid.). Hence, Norwegian agricultural policies aimed at agriculture’s additional outputs simultaneously support active agricultural production. They thus support a multifunctional agriculture.

The multifunctionality discourse is crucial for understanding summer farming in Valdres today. Throughout this thesis, I argue that through various policies and projects summer farming in Valdres is promoted and conceptualized as a multifunctional agricultural practice.

2.1.4. Coexistence of productivism and multifunctionalism

Norwegian agriculture, then, can be characterized as multifunctional in the sense of a coexistence productivist and post-productivist practices. Correspondingly, in emphasizing the

multifunctionality of agriculture, Norwegian agricultural policies and discourses hold an ideology of multifunctionalism, while at the same time productivism as an ideology inherent in these policies and discourses endures (see chapter 1.3.1). Whether structural rationalization and multifunctionality are compatible, is a matter of ongoing debate (Rønningen et al., 2004). Pointing to the coexistence of productivism and multifunctionalism, Rønningen et al. (2004) speak of a “polarization” of Norwegian agricultural policies since the 1990s. On the one hand, the pressure on the farmers for increased farm effectiveness and rationalization is rising. On the other hand, agriculture’s provision of environmental and cultural services is emphasized. Moreover, business development based on agriculture’s multiple resources and outcomes is encouraged, a topic I will return to below (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008; Rønningen et al., 2004). These ambivalent policies lead to a “spatial polarization” of Norwegian agriculture (Rønningen et al., 2004). Areas with good conditions for production experience further intensification and industrialization and are, to a high degree, integrated into the neoliberal market economy. In areas less suitable for large-scale intensive agriculture, farmland is abandoned and threatened by regrowth and afforestation. At the same time, the economic potential of such areas is being discovered as they allegedly can develop into areas for conservation, tourism and recreation (ibid.).

2.2. Summer farming in Valdres in the context of agricultural restructuring

The described structural changes taking place in Norwegian agriculture – the coexistence of productivism and post-productivism, and the emphasis on the multifunctionality of agriculture in agrarian policies and practices – have a great impact on the practice of summer farming in Valdres. In the following, I will describe and discuss specific policy measures, discourses, projects and other developments that condition summer farming in Valdres. On the one hand, I argue that, in the context of neo-productivism, summer farming is particularly vulnerable and is declining due to difficult economic conditions for small-scale dairy farming. On the other hand, summer farming is affected by multifunctionalism as it is believed to produce a set of values in addition to commodities for the market. It is therefore substantially supported and promoted by national and regional authorities. Furthermore, as a multifunctional agricultural practice, summer farming is being discovered as a site for farm-related business development. Multifunctionalism, then, I argue, is an important reason for the continued existence of summer farming in Valdres.

2.2.1. Agrarian restructuring and summer farm decline

Summer farms throughout Europe have been identified as vulnerable in the context of agrarian structural change. Mountainous areas in Europe are “characterized by small and extensive farming systems, remoteness and challenging natural conditions” (Daugstad et al., 2014, p. 250). Hence, “agrarian restructuring has particularly significant effects in the mountain areas of Europe” (ibid.). Adjustments such as enlargements are limited, which often leads to marginalization and abandonment (ibid.) which, again, results in a decline of transhumance practices in these areas. In Norway, the continuation of productivism or the neo-productivist turn has led to a substantial decline of summer farming. Despite protectionist agricultural policies, the number of farm units in Norway decreased from 213,000 in 1949 to 43,500 in 2013 (Daugstad et al., 2014). Simultaneously, the average farm size increased from 4,9 to 21,3 hectare between 1949 and 2010 (Almaås & Muirhead, 2013). Moreover, Norwegian farmers with small or medium-sized farm units are increasingly dependent on off-farm income in order to stay in farming (Bjørkhaug, 2012). There are different reasons for farm closure in Norway; economic, social or environmental. Scholars have especially emphasized the “cost-price squeeze” (ibid., p. 288) as a factor forcing farmers to exit farming. From a structuralist viewpoint, as it is brought forward in theories of agrarian political economy, the integration of agriculture into a neo-liberal and globalized market results in the continuance of productivist principles described above. To be able to compete in a neo-liberal and globalized food market, farmers are forced to rationalize and industrialize their farms in order to become more efficient. In relation to large-scale and highly industrialized farm units, small-scale farms and family farms are inefficient and non-profitable and thus more likely to be squeezed out of the agricultural sector (Bjørkhaug, 2012). This thesis has been backed up by the empirical evidence of a decline in farm units in most developed economies, while the remaining farms become bigger and more efficient (ibid.; Langthaler, 2010). The argument that the integration of agriculture into capitalism and ultimately into a neo-liberal and globalized economy will lead to the decline of smaller less efficient farm units is crucial for understanding summer farming in Norway in general and in Valdres especially. Due to economic pressures and challenges, small-scale dairy farms cease production, which again leads to summer farm closure.

Summer farming in Norway was at its peak in the mid-19th century. The estimates of the number of active summer farms at that point vary. Drawing on the classic work on summer

farming in Norway by Lars Reinton, Daugstad & Lunnan (2009) state that there were around 52,000 active summer farms in Norway at that time. Kristin Daugstad (1999) and the Norwegian Agriculture Agency (Statens Landbruksforvaltning, 2014) estimate the number to be around 100,000. All authors agree that there has been a substantial decline in active summer farm in Norway. In 2013, only 975 active¹ summer farms remained (ibid.); 831 of them are *enkeltseter*, which means they are being operated by one farm unit, and 144 of them are *fellesseter*, which means that they are operated by several cooperating farm units (ibid.). According to the County Governor of Oppland, Guri Grønolen, twenty percent of all Norwegian summer farms are located in the six municipalities constituting the region of Valdres (192 *enkeltseter* and seven *fellesseter*). Summer farms are always part of a regular farm, and in Valdres these farms are exclusively small-scale. The average number of livestock on Valdresian farms is fifteen (Hillestad, 2012), and on farms with summer farms the average lies between ten and twelve animals. The average Norwegian dairy farm in 2011 had 21 cows (Almaås & Brobak, 2012). Due to its topography characterized by mountains, valleys and forests, Valdres is a region not suited for large-scale farming and can thus be described as marginal in the sense of Rønningen et al. (2004). As argued above, small-scale farms and hence summer farms in Valdres are especially vulnerable in the context of agrarian structural change, even in Norway.

The literature on summer farming in Norway and Valdres suggests that the main reason for the decline of active summer farm units in the region are the unfavorable economic conditions for farming in general and small-scale farming in particular (Daugstad et al., 2014; Daugstad & Lunnan, 2009; Skarstad et al., 2008). Summer farms in Valdres close when the dairy farms they belong to cease agricultural production, which mostly is a result of the difficult economic situation in the dairy farming sector (ibid.). This point was particularly stressed by Kristine Daugstad and Tor Lunnan from the Bioforsk research institute in Valdres in an expert interview, but also by the summer farmers I met in Valdres. They are all aware and worried about the difficult economic situation in dairy farming, but emphasize that they will continue to practice summer farming for as long as they continue with dairy production.

In sum, summer farm closure in Valdres is a consequence of dairy farm closure, which again is a result of the difficult economic situation in the Norwegian small-scale dairy sector. In the

¹ Norwegian agricultural authorities define summer farms as “active” when milk is produced at the summer farm for a minimum of four weeks during summer. As I will elaborate in Chapter Three, this definition accords with the summer farmers’ definition of summer farming and active summer farms.

context of continued structural rationalization of agriculture small-scale dairy farms and thus summer farms are increasingly squeezed out of the market. Hence, the thesis regarding farm closure and the integration of agriculture in a neo-liberal globalized economic system outlined above seems to explain the decline of active summer farm units in Valdres. However, as outlined above, contemporary Norwegian agriculture is not just characterized by the continuity of productivism. It is accompanied by an increased emphasis on the multifunctionality of agriculture in agricultural policies and discourses. In this context, summer farming in Valdres is rediscovered as a valuable agricultural practice.

2.2.2. State support for summer farming

Summer farming in Valdres today is very much affected by Norwegian agricultural policies, and particularly by the economic support for summer farming they generate. Summer farming is believed to provide a range of values in addition to food and fibers. As a multifunctional agricultural practice, it is supported economically by the state. The support and promotion of agriculture's non-food goods and services have been identified as a major feature of post-productivism. As elaborated in Chapter One, agricultural regimes always have to be seen in a wider societal context (Langthaler, 2010). Post-productivism as a "flexible" (ibid.) agrarian system is usually situated in the context of neoliberal globalization and corresponds with a neoliberal-capitalist society (ibid.). Whereas productivism is associated with strong state support through subsidies, price guarantees and protectionist policies aimed at increased productivity (Wilson, 2001), post-productivism is associated with a de-regulation of the agrarian system (Langthaler, 2010): "In policy terms, the PPAR [post-productivist agricultural regime] is generally seen to be characterized by reduced state subsidies, indicative of a move away from state-sustained production models, and signaling a gradual loss of faith in the ability of the state to influence agricultural regeneration" (Wilson, 2001, p. 84). This retreat of the state from the regulation of the agricultural sector is accompanied by an increase of agri-environmental policies and subsidies aimed at agriculture's provision of non-food goods and services (ibid.). In Europe, these policies and subsidies are mostly decoupled from agricultural production of food and fibers (Daugstad et al., 2006). Hence, they play an important role in bringing about a "post-productivist countryside" (Slee, 2005) and post-productivist agricultural landscapes (Vergunst, 2012).

In Norway, however, the support and promotion of agriculture's provision of non-food goods and services do not form part of a post-productivist agricultural regime. State promotion of

agriculture's non-food outcomes is not associated with de-regulation, but is rather part of the country's protectionist agricultural policies (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008). As in other European countries, the argument for supporting agriculture has in Norway changed from food production towards environmental cultural heritage and rural issues (ibid.). Norwegian agriculture is relatively small-scale compared to the rest of the world, and thus in danger of being squeezed out of a neoliberal and globalized food market (Bjørkhaug, 2012). Emphasizing the multiple values generated by agricultural production legitimizes the economic support for Norwegian agriculture even if its profitability is contested (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008; Daugstad et al., 2006; Rønningen, Flø, & Fjeldavli, 2004). Norway has one of the world's most comprehensive systems of agricultural subsidies (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008). Especially for small-scale farmers, the governmental support is crucial for farm viability (Refsgaard, 2010). Comparable with the rest of Europe, Norwegian state support aimed at agriculture's outcomes besides food and fibers mostly spring from environmental schemes such as the General Acreage and Cultural Landscape Payments or the summer farming subsidies. They are legitimized by the argument that landholders should be assisted financially for producing and maintaining the externalities of agricultural production as these are considered to be valuable (Refsgaard, 2010). Rønningen (2001) found that these subsidies and the schemes they are part of have contributed to a general awareness and interest amongst farmers regarding agriculture's role in producing environmental, social and cultural values. Norwegian farmers perceive especially cultural landscapes as a value and a public good produced by agricultural practice (ibid.).

Norwegian subsidies aimed at agriculture's non-food or non-productive aspects and values furthermore differ from those in other European countries as they are accompanied by a strong protection and support of "traditional" agricultural production, meaning the production of food and fibers (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008). As elaborated above, the main goal of Norwegian agricultural policies has been to maintain active agricultural production throughout the country. An important implementation to reach this aim has been to subsidize the *combined* agricultural production of food, fibers and non-food values, goods and services. Compared to other European countries, then, Norway has not pursued a post-productivist model but a multifunctional model where agriculture's additional outcomes are produced alongside food and fibers. In this regard Bjørkhaug and Richards (2008) conclude: "Whilst subsidies have often been used to encourage productivism, the Norwegian experience has also shown that they can be used to bring about multifunctional landscapes" (ibid., p. 108).

Summer farming in Norway is supported economically by national and regional governments for its environmental and cultural functions. This reflects Norwegian authorities' view of summer farming as a multifunctional agricultural practice (Tunón et al., 2014). The summer farming payments spring from the Norwegian Agriculture Agency's national environmental scheme – the *Nasjonalt Miljøprogram* – an agri-environmental scheme which consists of juridical and economic means for the promotion of an environmentally friendly and culturally valuable agriculture (Statens Landbruksforvaltning, 2015). Active summer farming is subsidized through the *Regionalt Miljøprogram* (Regional Environmental Scheme), which is part of the national environmental scheme. Established in 2005, this program allocates economic means aimed at pollution reduction and the maintenance of cultural landscapes (ibid.). The summer farming support is part of the latter target area and aims at the conservation of the cultural landscape, cultural heritage sites and biodiversity. In their 2013 report on the status of environmental issues in agriculture, the agency states that the role of summer farming has changed. According to the Agricultural Agency, summer farming used to be an important economic practice and a system of resource use, but today's focus lies increasingly on the cultural historical aspect of summer farming (Statens Landbruksforvaltning, 2014). The counties and municipalities manage and allocate the environmental scheme and can decide which measures they want to prioritize, based on the situation and challenges of agriculture in each region. Twelve out of twenty Norwegian counties subsidize summer farming through RMP. In ten of these counties, Oppland and thus Valdres included, the prerequisite for receiving these subsidies is milk production on the summer farm for a minimum of four weeks per year. Interesting exceptions are the counties of Nord-Trøndelag and Sør-Trøndelag. Here, the summer farm subsidies are to a large extent decoupled from active milk production at the summer farm. In Nord-Trøndelag, the highest payments are given to summer farms where at least two cows or four goats are milked for four weeks during summer and the milk is processed at the summer farm, which is open to visitors. Hence, in this county, diversification into summer farm-related businesses is being economically rewarded. Summer farming is thus supported not as an agricultural productive practice but rather as a provider of experiences and services to be consumed (Norbye, 2010).

In Oppland in 2013, more than 55 out of nearly 70 million NOK (approx. US\$7m) were aimed at the preservation of cultural landscapes and biodiversity, and a major part of these means was directed at summer farming (Statens Landbruksforvaltning, 2014). The summer

farms in Oppland receive yearly 26,000 NOK for four weeks and 33,000 NOK for eight weeks of dairy production on the summer farm (respectively approx. US\$3,700 and US\$4,400) (Norsk Seterkultur, 2013). In addition, each summer farm receives 4,000 NOK for outfield pasture grazing.

Summer farming is further subsidized through *Spesielle Miljøtiltak i Landbruket*, Special Environmental Measures in Agriculture. These are one-time subsidies that are aimed at investments in specific natural and cultural heritage values in agricultural cultural landscapes (Statens Landbruksforvaltning, 2014). Summer farmers can receive such subsidies for investments in summer farm buildings or for the tending and preservation of the summer farming landscape. Active milk production at the summer farm is no prerequisite for receiving these payments.

In sum, summer farming in Valdres is supported for its environmental and cultural functions. However, as the economic support is linked to milk production at the summer farm, the subsidies furthermore aim at the maintenance of summer farming as a practice of active agricultural production. In this lies the acknowledgement of the importance of an active agriculture for the maintenance and production of collective goods and the recognition that these goods are most efficiently produced by the agricultural sector (Rønningen et al., 2004). Summer farming is thus perceived and supported by national and regional governments as a multifunctional agricultural practice. In the context of agricultural restructuring and farm decline, the summer farm subsidies appear as a measure to combat the decrease in active summer farm units. The economic support for this agricultural practice, which in economic terms is not very profitable due to its extensive and small-scale nature, is legitimized by pointing to its multifunctional role (Tunón et al., 2014).

2.2.3. *Added value*

Another important reason why summer farming is practiced in Valdres today is its potential for added value. In Norway, this term is closely linked to the concept of a multifunctional agriculture (Daugstad, Rønningen, & Skar, 2006). Agricultural restructuring has brought about a change in the agricultural resource base where, on the one hand, farms are getting fewer, bigger and more productive and, on the other hand, the externalities of agricultural production are considered as resources, in both an economic and non-economic sense (Refsgaard, 2010). The discourse on the multifunctionality of agriculture thus not only

acknowledges that agriculture produces values or public goods, such as cultural landscape and cultural heritage, but also emphasizes that these values are resources and constitute a basis for business development (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008; Daugstad, Rønningen, & Skar, 2006; Refsgaard, 2010; Rønningen et al., 2004). The Norwegian government thus seeks legitimation for its protectionist agricultural policies not just by pointing to the agrarian sector's multiple functions, but also by emphasizing that they have potential for economic development (Daugstad et al., 2006).

Added value in this context can be understood in different ways. Within economic terminology, added value refers to the realization of a resource's economic potential (Daugstad et al., 2006). It is the difference between input and output in a process of production: the difference between what has been invested in the process of production and what comes out of this process. In this sense of the term, agricultural value added refers to the realization of agriculture's economic potential. The Norwegian multifunctionality discourse stresses that agriculture's cultural and environmental functions are resources for economic value added (ibid.). In their analysis of the Norwegian agrarian, environmental and tourist sectors' uses of the term in relation to agriculture's cultural heritage, Daugstad et al. (ibid.) found that added value furthermore is used in non-economic terms. In this regard, it points to agriculture's multiple functions in society: the environmental, cultural and social values produced and maintained by agriculture and their public availability (ibid., 71). Especially the environmental sector stresses the non-economic externalities of agricultural production such as biodiversity as valuable per se and thus valuable beyond their potential for economic value added (ibid.). In both senses of the term, agricultural value added takes into account the agrarian sector's multiple outputs.

In the context of a multifunctional agriculture, non-economic and economic value added intersect. Economic value can, for instance, contribute to non-economic value added when a farm is economically viable and remains productive, thus maintaining the agricultural cultural landscape. As elaborated above, this argument is invoked when countries such as Norway seek legitimation for continued support and protection of their agricultural sectors. In other cases, agriculture's non-commodity outputs can contribute to economic value added. A typical example is the economic potential of agriculture's cultural heritage related to tourism.

A value is not absolute: it is generated when something is assessed as valuable by somebody. The multifunctionality discourse assesses agriculture's externalities as valuable, and seeks these non-economic functions to be valorized by a wider public so that they can contribute to the sector's economic value added (Woods, 2011). These externalities, for instance cultural landscape, cultural heritage, or biodiversity, are not necessarily commodities at the outset as they are not produced in the conventional sense. However, they can be appropriated and used for commercial gain (Carrier, 2012) and thus contribute to agriculture's economic value added. Hence, the multifunctionality discourse is to a great extent about commodifying agricultural externalities (Daugstad et al., 2006). This economic potential of agriculture's externalities is of great interest for the agricultural sector in times of agrarian restructuring. If agriculture's multiple outcomes can contribute to economic value added of agricultural production, then these outcomes appear as valuable resources, above all for farms that cannot be economically sustained through the free market for agricultural produce (Woods, 2011). Threatened by farm closure, small-scale farmers relying on a second income source thus increasingly seek to exploit the economic potential linked to agriculture's externalities. In this context, the diversification into farm-related businesses, such as tourism or the processing of primary products into agricultural craft goods, is a common strategy. Hence, the economic value added based on agriculture's multiple outcomes is not just an important aspect of the multifunctionality discourse, but also one defining aspect of a multifunctional agricultural practice (Ilbery & Bowler, 1998; Marsden & Sonnino, 2008).

Reviewing the literature on the topic and policy documents, it becomes apparent that agriculture's environmental and cultural values are the externalities that are most emphasized in the Norwegian context as resources for both economic and non-economic value added. The cultural values produced and maintained by agriculture are often referred to as agriculture's cultural heritage and include material aspects such as cultural landscapes or physical structures as well as intangible assets such as knowledge and practices. The environmental values produced by agriculture with a potential for contributing to the sector's value added include the biodiversity of cultural landscapes or animal welfare. It is important to note that Norwegian agriculture always has produced certain externalities. What has changed is how society and the farmers themselves view and make use of these multiple outcomes and whether they are perceived as resources for economic value added.

2.2.4. Changing market demands

As already stressed, the described developments in agriculture and their significance for summer farming in Valdres have to be seen in their wider societal context. The development towards a multifunctional agriculture in policy and practice has thus to be seen in relation to a changing market and changing consumer demands. Whereas productivism focused on (increased) agricultural production, in post-productivism and multifunctionalism there is an increased focus on the consumption of agriculture's multiple functions (Woods, 2011). As elaborated above, these developments have led to a conceptual shift in the academic discussion of rural regions from landscapes of production, mainly serving the purpose of producing food and fibers, to landscapes of consumption, providing goods and services for (urban) consumers (Marsden et al., 1996; Vaccaro, 2006). Also in Norwegian agriculture there is an increasing focus on consumer concerns (Refsgaard, 2010). These developments have to be seen in relation to changing demands for agricultural produce. A growing group of consumers evaluates agricultural goods and services in terms of their social, cultural, environmental and political context. In economic anthropology, purchases made on the basis of such moral valuations have been termed "ethical consumption" (Carrier & Luetchford, 2012).

A multifunctional agriculture is one that produces other values in addition to food and fibers. Ethical consumers of agricultural goods and services, then, attend to these values and make them influence their choice of product (ibid.). Hence, a multifunctional agriculture benefits from ethically motivated consumers. In regard to agriculture, the growth of ethical consumption patterns are expressed for example in the growing demand for ecotourism (Carrier, 2012), but are most notable in the food market. Langthaler (2010) points out that neoliberalism and globalization bring about a segmentation of the world food market. While agro-industrially produced mass-products feed the neo-Fordist consumer groups from countries of the global South and East, the affluent middle and upper classes of the developed economies of the global North increasingly demand ecological and regional agricultural products (ibid.). Langthaler argues that the consumption patterns of the latter group have to be seen in relation to their post-materialist lifestyle in general (ibid.). In reference to Carrier and Luetchford (2012), they are ethical consumers concerned with the wider context of the purchased products.

In Norway, there has been an increased focus on consumer demands in the process of agrarian restructuring. On the one hand, the segment of agriculture oriented by productivist principles tries to satisfy the regular Norwegian consumer's demand for cheap agricultural products by the means of more efficient production (Rønningen et al., 2004). On the other hand, the segment of Norwegian agriculture that can be characterized as multifunctional is concerned with the growing group of consumers demanding “ethically” produced agricultural goods and services. This latter trend is primarily apparent in the tourism and agricultural craft good sectors (Hillestad, 2012). When it comes to food, Norwegian consumers increasingly demand variation and diversity, quality and “safe” products (Amilien, Schjøll, & Vramo, 2008). Hence, they increasingly attend to environmental or social values when purchasing food (ibid.). In this context, food with *tilleggsverdi* (added value) is especially sought after (ibid.). In the context of the Norwegian food market, this term refers to agricultural products with non-economic value added. Such non-economic factors adding to the product's overall value can be cultural (cultural heritage, traditional food), environmental (food produced in an environmentally sustainable way), experiential (experiencing “real farming” when purchasing and consuming a product) and so forth (ibid.). As argued above, this non-economic value added can increase the product's economic value.

Furthermore, there seems to be a growing demand for rural experiences among Norwegian and visiting consumers. Tourism is a growing sector in Norway, and most of this tourism is rurally based (Daugstad, 2005). Studies show that the Norwegian population and tourists in general cherish the agriculturally influenced landscape (ibid.). Norway's cultural landscape is thus an important element of tourist attractions and, with the development of agro-tourism, there is a growing demand for experiencing “real farming” (ibid.). Moreover, Norwegian consumers increasingly demand “food experiences” (Amilien, Schjøll, & Vramo, 2008), meaning food that comes with a cultural or environmental experience. This enables the development of niche markets for small-scale agricultural producers, and constitutes a market for summer farm products and services.

2.2.5. Summer farming as a resource for rural development

The recognition that the agrarian sector produces a set of values apart from food and fibers and that these can contribute to its economic value added has made multifunctional agriculture a resource for rural development in Norway (Refsgaard, 2010). The “commodification of agricultural collective goods for purposes of rural development” has

thus been identified as an essential aspect of the multifunctionality debate (Daugstad et al., 2006). Regional development through entrepreneurship based on agriculture's multiple outcomes is not a Norwegian phenomenon, but characterizes the multifunctionality debate in general, especially in Europe and within the European Union (Bowen & De Master, 2011, p. 74). The "synergistic benefits" (ibid.) resulting from business development based on agriculture's cultural and environmental heritage are believed to have positive effects on rural development (ibid.).

Rural development has been and continues to be an important part of the Norwegian industrialization and modernization project (Refsgaard, 2010). Here, it is important to note that, as a non-EU member, Norway has its own rural development policies. Since the Norwegian independency from Sweden in 1905, there has been a strong focus on decentralization and empowerment in rural areas (ibid.). However, since the Second World War, Norway has witnessed outmigration from rural areas and subsequent tendencies of centralization. To counter this trend, Norway has since the 1980s led an active *distriktpolitikk*, a district or rural policy (Bringslid, 2012; Refsgaard, 2010). The main aims of this policy are to maintain rural settlement structures, sustain viable local communities and promote the equality of living conditions in rural and urban areas (Refsgaard, 2010). Agricultural policies are an important aspect of Norwegian rural policies. It is an explicit aim of agricultural policies to contribute to viable rural areas (ibid.). With the general recognition of agriculture's potential for value added based on its multiple functions, agriculture is seen as a contributor to viable local communities. Agriculture's externalities are valuable for the countryside as resources for non-economic and economic value added. Rural policies thus embrace the multifunctionality discourse (Refsgaard, 2010). As pointed out above, the focus on the multifunctionality of agriculture and its importance for rural development can be observed at the policy level in a shift in agricultural policies from production-linked subsidies to environmental and rural development support (ibid.). During the last decades, a multitude of rural development projects have been launched promoting a multifunctional agriculture as a resource for value added in rural regions (ibid., Bringslid, 2012). These are initiated and supported by different institutions and actors such as the county governments, the Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Innovation Norway.

Rural development based on agriculture's multifunctionality is to a large extent about what in Norwegian is called *omdømmebygging*, or reputation building. The term refers to rural

regions' efforts to present themselves in a certain way to its surroundings. Local variation and idiosyncrasy are celebrated and accentuated as tools for rural development. In the course of rural development projects, a region's features that have long been taken for granted or been perceived as marginal can suddenly turn out to be a resource (Bringslid, 2012). *Merkevarebygging*, meaning trade marking, is another important concept in the Norwegian rural development jargon. It refers to the development and staging of local identity in an attempt to attract consumers, tourists and residents. Thus, *merkevarebygging* is about identifying and processing local resources to saleable products and services (Bjelland, 2012). In processes of *omdømmebygging* and *merkevarebygging*, rural regions increasingly draw upon agricultural elements, such as cultural landscapes or craft goods, as resources for value added and rural development (Bringslid, 2012).

This integration of agriculture's multifunctionality into rural development policies very much affects summer farming in Valdres. Summer farming as a multifunctional agricultural practice producing a set of values in addition to food and fibers is identified as one of the region's typical and special traits and hence emphasized as a resource for economic development. Summer farming is moved into the center of attention and promoted as a central part of the Valdresian identity for the sake of economic and non-economic value added and rural development. This has led to the support and promotion of summer farming through different rural development projects. Of special importance in this regard are the Valdres Natur- og Kulturpark (VNK) and the added value project of the Directorate of Cultural Heritage.

The VNK was established in 2007 as the country's first "nature and culture park" (Valdres Natur- og Kulturpark 2014). The VNK defines itself as a "rural development region", aimed at rural development and added value based on the region's natural and cultural resources (ibid.). The occasion for its foundation were the challenges Valdres experienced in the past decades in terms of outmigration and farm closure. In the face of these challenges, the organization seeks to promote and emphasize certain natural and cultural traits that can be built upon in the above-described processes of *merkevarebygging* and *omdømmebygging*. In this context, summer farming is believed to constitute both a cultural and natural resource for regional value added. As an agricultural practice constituted through a set of specific practices and knowledge, summer farming in Valdres is emphasized as a tradition – a cultural heritage of the region. According to Katarina Sparstad from the VNK, the organization further holds

that summer farming conserves important natural resources, namely the open summer farming landscape with its specific biodiversity.

One central strategy chosen by the organization for bringing about rural development is branding related to natural and cultural values. In this process, Valdres as such is developed as a brand. Organized in collaboration between local businesses and politicians, the VNK aims at the cooperation between and integration of the spheres of culture, tourism, environment and food tradition. As a part of its reputation building, VNK has focused on developing *Varemerket Valdres / Valdresmerket* (The Trademark Valdres). The trademark is owned by the VNK and is built upon the core values of environment, identity, quality and idiosyncrasy (Valdresdesign, 2014). Producers can apply for labeling their product with the trademark, which is used for conveying the different values the producers believe constitute their products with the aim of economic value added. Different products and services can use the trademark provided that the producer or service provider represents the trademark's core values. The aim of the trademark is to contribute to economic value added and thus to rural development. As summer farming is believed by the VNK to represent the values environment, identity, quality and idiosyncrasy, different summer farm products and summer farm tourism are branded with the trademark. *Merkevaren Valdres* is thus an example of a *merkervarebygging* or a “quality initiative” in the sense of Boen and De Master (2011) aiming at economic value added to agricultural products through the emphasis of its cultural and environmental heritage.



The Valdresmerket. The label consists of two symbols. A heart inspired by the låveroser, a ‘traditional’ decoration on Valdresian barns, and a dragon, which dominates the ornaments on the Valdresian stave churches (Valdresdesign, 2014)

At the level of rural development policies, summer farming in Valdres has further been promoted through *Verdiskapningsprogrammet*, the value added program of the Norwegian

Directorate for Cultural Heritage (Riksantikvaren, 2011). Between 2006 and 2010, the Norwegian Directorate for Cultural Heritage launched a program with the aim of using cultural heritage as a resource for value added and thus for rural development. Value added in this context included economic, cultural, social and environmental value added (ibid.). Eleven cultural heritage sites or objects were chosen as pilot projects, among them Valdres. In Valdres, the project was implemented through the VNK as a part of the organization's integration of cultural heritage into regional development schemes. The main goal of the project was to increase the engagement and the competences regarding cultural heritage and make them more accessible for the public (ibid.). In Valdres, summer farming was, alongside with the region's medieval stave churches, chosen as a cultural heritage to be emphasized in relation to rural development. In the final report of the project, the Directorate for Cultural Heritage states that summer farming is a cultural heritage "of international value" (ibid., p. 3).

2.2.6. Business development based on agriculture's multiple outcomes

Based on the recognition of agriculture's multiple outcomes and their potential for contributing to economic value added in the agricultural sector, agrarian restructuring is to a large extent about diversification and business development based on these resources (Bryden, 2010; Daugstad et al., 2006; Woods, 2011). Recalling Evans et al. (2002), the post-productivist transition includes a shift from quantity to quality in food production and the growth of on-farm diversification and off-farm employment (pluriactivity). Multifunctionalism as a discourse recognizes the multiple outcomes of agricultural production and points to their potential for business development in the agrarian sector. Multifunctionality as a descriptor of reality describes not only an agricultural practice with multiple outputs, but also a farm-related practice that adds to the income of agricultural production (Marsden & Sonnino, 2008).

In Norway, business development based on agriculture's multiple outcomes is an important aspect of multifunctionality in discourse and practice (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008). With the aim of sustaining viable rural communities and boosting rural development, the Norwegian agricultural, environmental and tourist sectors have since the 1990s discursively and through subsidies encouraged farmers to increase the (economic) value added from their agricultural properties through activities such as rural and farm tourism, the refining of farm products, or letting out hunting rights (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008; Daugstad et al., 2006; Refsgaard, 2010). In this regard, some scholars argue that, on a policy level, the term multifunctionality

is less used after 2002 and is increasingly renamed as *Landbruk Pluss*, or agriculture plus, and transformed into a focus on entrepreneurship and value added (Rønningen et al., 2004). The term *Landbruk Pluss* was launched in 2003 by the Ministry of Agriculture and points to the diversification of agriculture into activities beyond conventional farming (Daugstad et al., 2006). As traditional primary production especially for small-scale farmers typically generates low economic output, through economic incentives, political signals and rhetoric, farmers are encouraged to take action on their farms and develop new businesses based on their farm and land resources (ibid.). Hence, farmers are increasingly perceived as independent economic actors responsible for their own business development based on their farm and land resources (ibid.). This widening of the farmer's role in Norway is observable not just on the policy level, but also in practice (Refsgaard, 2010; Rønningen et al., 2004). Since the mid-1990s, there has been an increase in business development based on agriculture's cultural landscape, cultural heritage and local food traditions (Refsgaard, 2010; Rønningen et al., 2004). More and more farmers are supplementing or even replacing the production of food and fibers with the provision of activities, services or refined goods. These developments are not only to be seen in relation to the policy measures and discourses referred to above, but also as a response to an expansion of the market for farm-related experiences and agricultural craft goods. Especially tourism and the processing of farm products are common strategies of business development in Norwegian agriculture.

Pointing to agriculture's multifunctionality, the agricultural sector increasingly turns to tourism for economic value added (Daugstad, 2005; Daugstad et al., 2006). The "synergistic benefits" (Bowen & De Master, 2011) between agriculture and tourism are particularly articulated in agrotourism or geotourism (Bowen & De Master, 2011). This kind of tourism emphasizes the cultural heritage of agriculture and local distinctiveness of a place and is supposed to benefit its local population (Carrier, 2012). In recent years, Norwegian agricultural authorities and the tourist sector have brought forward the argument that agriculture and tourism are "tied together by destiny, facing the same challenges and with a potential for mutual benefit" (Daugstad, 2005, p. 2). The tourist industry benefits from agricultural production in terms of its environmental and cultural values. Agricultural production produces cultural landscapes that are cherished by the public and is constituted through traditional knowledge and practices that are perceived of as cultural heritage (ibid.). The continuity of active farming and the maintenance of the agricultural landscape are thus of

great importance for the Norwegian tourist industry. Likewise, farm-related tourism is increasingly becoming an important second income source in the agricultural sector (ibid.).

Locally processed agricultural products and the production of “quality”, “ecological” or “traditional” foods constitute another sector in which agriculture’s externalities can contribute to economic value added. The multifunctionality discourse emphasizes the different values associated with agricultural food products. Through “quality initiatives” (Bowen & De Master, 2011), such as origin-labeled products or the notion of *terroir* (Paxson, 2010), these values are appropriated with the aim of restoring the economic viability of rural communities in areas where traditional agriculture is economically marginalized (ibid.). “Local” food alludes to the cultural heritage associated with specific foodstuffs. Cultural aspects such as “tradition”, specific knowledge or practices are believed to add to the economic value of agricultural products (ibid.). “Ecological” products draw the attention to their environmentally sustainable production. Through these labels the cultural and environmental heritage of agriculture is appropriated with the aim of adding value to the agricultural product (Daugstad et al., 2006). In Norway, the niche market for specialty foods has since the 1990s been identified as an important focal point for the Norwegian Ministry of Agriculture and Food and thus for Norway’s agricultural policies. Different policy measures and schemes have been implemented to promote business development in this sector and support small-scale producers.

Tourism and agricultural niche products are two sectors that frequently intersect in Norway. Tourism has been an important tool in the development of agricultural niche products (Vittersø, 2012, p. 114). Farmers are increasingly combining farm-related tourism with the marketing and the vending of agricultural products, and farm-related food experiences, such as on-farm consumption combined with a guided tour or a visit to the animals, are becoming a commodity (Innovasjon Norge, 2015). The development of geo-tourism and agri-tourism, local craft goods and the consumption of cultural heritage are part of a general development within Norwegian tourism where the focus lies on experiences and sensations (Rød Larsen, 2012). The trend moves away from the distanced “tourist gaze” (Urry, 1990) towards the tourist’s wish to “absorb” the place he visits (Rød Larsen, 2012).

In Valdres, these described tendencies are notable and to a large extent concern summer farming. In the context of the multifunctionality discourse, regional and local authorities view

summer farming in Valdres as a potential source of value added and is thus re-conceptualized as a site for diversification and business development based on its externalities. Summer farming's cultural and environmental values are seen as resources for economic value added, mainly through tourism and local craft food claiming to be traditional. Business development within these sectors is believed to stimulate the economic activity and contribute to overall development in the region. Valdres is increasingly focusing on geo- and agro-tourism. In this regard, the summer farms are actively promoted as tourist destinations where visitors can experience real farming life, local tradition and culture (Valdres Turistkontor, 2014). On the tourist portal *Valdres.com*, the summer farm is described in a nostalgic way as a place that, even if adapted to modern times, shows continuity over time, where the relationship between humans, animals and nature remains unchanged (ibid.). It is described as a place that can be experienced with all senses: the visitor can cook brown cheese, cuddle with the animals, taste freshly churned butter and smell the mountain plants. Furthermore, Valdres is marketed as a destination for outdoor activities such as cross-country skiing, hiking or cycling. The cultural landscape in the mountains is promoted as a place for carrying out these activities and summer farming emphasized as producing and adding value to this landscape. Finally, regional and local authorities and the tourist sector view summer farming and the summer farming landscape in Valdres as a cultural heritage (Riksantikvaren, 2011). Summer farming is promoted as a tradition to attract visitors seeking the “authentic”, “real” Norwegian life and culture (Daugstad et al., 2006).

In Valdres, summer farm-related tourism is mostly promoted in combination with summer farm products. Over the last years, private and public actors in Valdres have focused on developing locally produced craft foods as cultural heritage and tourist attractions. The focus has been on the *rakfisk*, fermented trout, and the *kurv*, a sausage, and now summer farm dairy products increasingly gain attention (Grønolen, 2014). As part of the process of *merkevarebygging*, summer farm products are marketed as distinctive local products expressing the Valdresian identity (Bringslid, 2012; Rød Larsen, 2012). The branding of such goods as high quality, traditional products of Valdres is an important aspect of this development. In the promotion of summer farm products and summer farm experiences, the Valdresian tourist sector's focus on experiences and sensations becomes apparent. As part of their marketing strategy, VNK labels Valdres as *Sanseriket Valdres*, the sensorial realm Valdres, with the slogan *Valdres skjerpar sansane*, meaning “Valdres sharpens your senses” (Valdres Natur- og Kulturpark 2014): visitors are invited to experience Valdres with all their

senses. The marketing suggests that through the consumption of local craft food, visitors experience a part of Valdres. These developments in the Valdresian tourist industry concur with a growing market for experience-based tourism and local craft goods.

Different national and regional actors, both public and private, have substantially supported and promoted summer farm-related diversification through several projects. An important actor in this regard is the Valdres Natur- og Kulturpark. This rural development organization sees in summer farming a multifunctional agricultural practice that apart from producing high-quality milk sustains the environment and is an important regional tradition. These features are perceived as valuable resources for rural development, and diversification into tourism, and local processing of milk on summer farms is thus promoted and supported through economic support, marketing and competence development. The County Governor of Oppland also emphasizes the opportunities for diversification on summer farms: *Valdres Destinasjon AS* (Valdres Destination Ltd.) is a service organization that aims at developing Valdres as a tourist destination. It carries out projects independently and in cooperation with the above-mentioned actors.

These actors in cooperation have carried out various projects to support and develop diversification into tourism and the production of small-scale craft goods on summer farms in Valdres. Launched in 2003 and spanning over two years, the *Stølsprosjektet i Øystre Slidre*, is a summer farm project in the municipality of Øystre Slidre aimed at generating knowledge about summer farming as a viable practice and at stimulating the development of summer farm-related businesses (Daugstad & Lunnan, 2009). The *Stølsprosjektet i Hedmark, Oppland og Møre og Romsdal*, the summer farm project in the counties of Hedmark, Oppland and Møre og Romsdal (2006-2010), was launched by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. It aimed at promoting summer farming as a multifunctional agricultural practice contributing to rural development and supported summer farm-related business development (ibid.). Through the *Verdiskapingsprogrammet på Kulturminneområdet*, the value added project on cultural heritage (2006-2010), the Norwegian Directorate of Cultural Heritage has been involved in mapping out summer farming's potential as a resource for rural development (Riksantikvaren, 2011). The project was commissioned by the Ministry of Climate and Environment and carried out in cooperation with Valdres Natur- og Kulturpark and the County Governor of Oppland. As part of the value added program, the project *Gards- og stølsturisme i Valdres* or Farm and summer farm tourism in Valdres, was launched in 2008. The project is based on the

concept of geo-tourism. Its aim is “to increase the value added from agriculture in Valdres through the enhancement and establishment of farm and summer farm-related tourism” (translation by the author) (ibid.). As part of the project, a network of around 40 farmers and summer farmers was established. The aim of the network is to market farm and summer farm-related tourism in Valdres, and to increase knowledge and competences through communication and cooperation between the different actors (ibid.).

2.2.7. The widening and changing role of farmers

In the course of the described restructuring of Norwegian agriculture, the role of farmers has changed and widened. The “traditional farmer’s role” conceives of farmers mainly as food producers (Rønningen et al., 2004). In this perspective, environmental, social and cultural goods such as cultural landscape or rural viability are perceived as by-products of food production (ibid.). With agricultural, environmental and rural policies increasingly stressing the multifunctionality of agriculture and turning towards payments encouraging the production of such goods, the farmer’s role is widened to include environmental, social and cultural functions (Refsgaard, 2010). With the focus on agriculture as a source of value added and thus as a basis for new business development, the farmer is furthermore assigned the role of an independent entrepreneur, encouraged to take action on the own farm and diversify into farm-related businesses (Daugstad et al., 2006). Many farmers do not accord with this dual role they are given (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008; Rønningen et al., 2004). Studies from Norway show that among farmers and within the agricultural sector the traditional farmer’s role (Rønningen et al., 2004) (still) prevails. The farmers see the production of collective goods as clearly linked to regular agricultural production, or the production of food and fibers (ibid.). According to Rønningen et al. (ibid.), “the average farmer sees his/her contribution to the production of collective goods in productive terms – that means in regard to the production of food and fibre and not of cultural heritage or environmental objectives”. To some extent, this attitude is noticeable also outside the agricultural sector. Even though the post-productivist farmer’s role is emerging in Norway, the idea prevails that the environmental, social and cultural goods produced by agriculture are most efficiently provided by regular agricultural production (ibid.). As we have seen, most agricultural payments are still production oriented. Nevertheless, some farmers appreciate that their social, environmental and cultural functions in society are recognized (Rønningen & Burton, 2013). This confirms the thesis that farmers’ work ethics are complex and diverse and thus the

farmer's role multidimensional (Emery, 2014). How summer farmers in Valdres perceive summer farming and its roles and values will be explored in Chapter Three.

2.3. Concluding remarks

This chapter set out to analyze the structural conditions of summer farming in Valdres, Norway. The aim was to explain from an outside perspective and by taking into account political and economic macro-processes why summer farmers in Valdres (still) engage in this agricultural practice.

Contemporary Norwegian agriculture is characterized by the coexistence of productivist and multifunctional policies and practices. These trends have a great impact on summer farming in Valdres. On the one hand, summer farming in Valdres and beyond is declining in the context of a neoliberal and globalized food market as well as the neo-productivist tendencies in Norwegian agriculture. The precarious economic situation of small-scale dairy farming has forced many farmers to exit the industry. On the other hand, in line with Norway's protectionist agricultural policies aimed at maintaining agricultural production throughout the country, agricultural authorities have been emphasizing the multifunctionality of agriculture for a couple of decades now. The insistence on agriculture's multiple functions and its value to society beyond the production of food and fibers legitimizes state support for farms that are otherwise economically unviable. Moreover, the multiple outcomes of agriculture are perceived as resources for value added. In this regard, farm-related business development is encouraged. This trend coincides with the growing market for green goods and services. In this context, summer farming in Valdres is perceived as a multifunctional agricultural practice, maintaining cultural and environmental values besides producing milk. Agricultural and environmental authorities, the tourist sector and rural developers view summer farming as a biological as well as cultural heritage, simultaneously maintaining traditions and conserving biodiversity in the summer farm cultural landscape. The summer farm subsidies are aimed towards summer farming's cultural and environmental functions, but are coupled with active milk production at the summer farm. As a multifunctional agricultural practice, summer farming in Valdres is perceived as a source for value added and thus a resource for rural development. This has resulted in various regional development projects that promote summer farming. Farmers are encouraged to diversify into summer farm-related businesses such as tourism or the local processing of milk products to capitalize on the growing market

demand for agrotourism and specialty foods in Valdres. In the context of agrarian restructuring, especially where small-scale farmers are becoming increasingly dependent on off-farm income, summer farming is thus promoted as an economic opportunity.

In conclusion, the described policy and market changes put restraints on summer farming in Valdres on the one hand, and, on the other hand, result in its revaluation and provide summer farmers with new economic opportunities. In this context, the next chapter explores summer farming in Valdres as an economic practice.

3. Summer farming as an economic practice

Against the theoretical backdrop presented in Chapter One and the conditions of Norwegian agriculture presented in Chapter Two, this chapter investigates summer farming in Valdres as an economic practice. It thus moves from the macro-level to the micro-level: the specific summer farms. Drawing on the data from my fieldwork, I look at summer farming as an economic activity through the three analytical categories of production, distribution and consumption. Hence, the subject of this chapter is the material aspect of the economic processes taking place at Valdresian summer farms, a perspective that will be complemented by their cultural expressions and meanings in the following chapter.

Recalling Chapter One, a central thesis in the literature on agriculture in developed economies is that agriculture's economic role has undergone great changes during the last decades. The continuity of productivism puts economic pressures on small-scale farming in marginal areas, which has led to a substantial decline in active summer farms in Valdres and beyond. In this context, typically small-scale farmers that cannot keep up with rationalized and industrialized large-scale farms are dependent on additional income sources and increasingly turn to farm-related business development. Simultaneously, agriculture's economic role has changed from the production of commodities (food and fibers) to the provision of environmental, cultural and social services that are promoted and economically supported by the state. Norwegian agricultural policies aim at the multifunctionality of small-scale agriculture: primary production coupled with the provision of values and services.

After a descriptive section about the economic processes at the summer farm, summer farming will be analyzed as an economic practice with regard to the theoretical framework of this thesis and the structural context of Norwegian agriculture elaborated in Chapter Two. First, it will be discussed whether summer farming in Valdres today can (still) be explained in terms of ecological adaptation to a mountainous environment. In the following, summer farming as an economic practice will be analyzed on the basis of the political economy conceptualizations of agrarian structural change outlined in Chapter One. Moreover, summer farming in Valdres will be discussed regarding the theoretical distinction between landscapes of production and landscapes of consumption. In this chapter, I draw mainly on the empirical data gathered during fieldwork in Valdres.

3.1. Production

“Production generally is understood to be the human transformation of matter, through work, into some useful, consumable good” (Narotzky, 2001, p. 4070). With regard to the political economy concepts presented in Chapter One and discussed in Chapter Two, production in the context of summer farming means agricultural production of food and fibers. The matter that is transformed through work into a good on Valdresian summer farms is thus first and foremost the mountain pastures complemented with craft fodder. The consumable good that is produced is above all milk. In some cases, the milk is transformed into cheese and other dairy products on the summer farm. Furthermore, fodder is produced through mowing the mountain pastures, and in some cases animals graze on summer farms before they are slaughtered. The processes of production require the use of technology and knowledge by a skilled person.

3.1.1. Mountain pasture grazing

Summer farming is usually explained in terms of ecological and economic adaptation to a mountainous environment (Daugstad, 1999; Daugstad et al., 2014). Historical sources argue that in Valdres, where pastures are scarce due to the topography, the only way to sustain the livestock was to let the animals graze the mountain pastures. Drawing on fieldwork from Forollhogne, Norway, Daugstad et al. (2014, p. 7) conclude: “Summer farmers are motivated to continue the practice of transhumance first and foremost because summer farming, as a system of access to pastures in the mountains, is of vital importance in areas where this is the only way to practice animal husbandry due to topography, altitude, and scarcity of suitable land for cultivation.” Elsewhere, Daugstad (2006) has argued that this explanation applies for summer farming in Norway in general.

In Valdres, as in most mountainous regions in Norway, each farm traditionally had at least two, but sometimes up to four summer farms (Gudheim, 2013). The summer farms closest to the farm are called *heimstøl*, *hauststøl* or *liastøl* (home summer farm, autumn farm or hillside farm), and were grazed first while the meadows close to the farm were harvested. As summer proceeded, the farmers moved their livestock to higher latitudes, and the meadows at the *heimstøl* were harvested. When summer had reached its peak and the grass at the highest summer farm, the *langstøl*, turned yellow, the livestock was brought down to graze at the *heimstøl* until the grass quality moved them down to the farm again. The mountain pastures were crucial for maintaining the farm’s livestock. While the animals were grazing the summer

farm pastures, the meadows around the farm were harvested for winter fodder. Additional fodder was harvested at the summer farm pasture. Farmers in Norway divide pastures, including mountain pastures, into two categories: *innmark* (infield pastures) and *utmark* (outfield pastures). The former is cultivated land, and refers to land inside the fence. The latter designates all land outside the fence and thus refers to outlying pastures. At summer farms in Valdres, the *innmark* was usually used for harvesting fodder while the animals were grazing the *utmark*. The grazing right on the summer farm pastures dates back centuries and has been established through custom, usucaption and law (Vestre Slidre Kommune, n.d.). The grazing right emanates from each summer farm and includes grazing right in the *statsallmenning*, the state commons (ibid.).

Due to its topography, there are plenty of mountain pastures in Valdres (Daugstad & Lunnan, 2009). These resources have played and continue to play a crucial role for animal husbandry in the region. Today, about 43,000 farm animals graze the outfield pastures in Valdres, thereof 32,000 sheep, 8,500 cows, 6,000 reindeer and 2,250 goats (Fylkesmannen i Oppland, 2014). Most animals grazing the outfield mountain pastures are not dairy animals milked at the summer farm. As the emic terms *stølsdrift* and *støling* (summer farming) imply that there is active milk production at the summer farm, mere outfield pasture grazing in mountainous areas will not be treated further in this thesis. Summer farming is by the regional authorities believed to be a crucial factor for maintaining grazing in mountainous outfield pastures (ibid.). Grazing on summer farming mountain pastures in Valdres has declined substantially since the mid-20th century (Skarstad, Daugstad, Lunnan, & Sickel, 2008). This is a result of the general decline in dairy producing farm units in the region (ibid.). The overall number of dairy cows in the region has been reduced by 60 percent between 1949 and 2007, and the number of dairy goats has been reduced by 80 percent within the same period. The number of milk-producing farms has been reduced by 79 percent since 1969. These numbers correspond to the overall picture of outfield pasture grazing in Norway. Simultaneously, the number of cattle for meat production and sheep on mountain pastures has increased. However, there is a general concern that the landscape is undergoing great changes due to the decline in harvesting the summer farm pastures and the declining grazing pressure. This leads to overgrowth and reforestation and is seen as a threat to the region's cultural landscape by the local government and the farmers themselves (see Chapter Four). Therefore, and because outfield pasture grazing is believed to increase food production based on local resources,

maintaining the grazing pressure on outfield mountain pastures is an explicit goal of regional authorities in Valdres (*ibid.*).

In 2013, 70 percent of all dairy farmers in Valdres used their summer farms during the summer months (Fylkesmannen i Oppland, 2013). This accords to around 260 summer farms in the region. When asking the farmers about why they move to the summer farm with their livestock, they all emphasized the importance of the free resources the summer farms provide in terms of pasture. These pastures are seen as indispensable resources for the farm economy. Even if there are a number of additional costs and efforts involved in summer farming (Daugstad & Lunnan, 2009), the farmers all emphasized that they cannot afford not to use the free pastures the mountain provides. Even if the general decline in farming in Valdres has left more areal vacant in the valley, most summer farmers still consider it more convenient to let the livestock graze the mountain pastures around the summer farms than to rent additional farmland in the valley. Letting the livestock graze in the mountains allows for the low-lying meadows to be harvested for winter fodder, which means that fewer additional pastures have to be rented. For farmers in Valdres today, the mountain pastures thus (still) constitute a substantial part of their agricultural resource base (Daugstad & Lunnan, 2009; Skarstad et al., 2008).

Historically, the access to grazing pastures did not constitute a great challenge for farmers in Valdres. Rather, the crucial point was to produce enough winter fodder in order to sustain the livestock (Skarstad et al., 2008). Letting the animals graze the mountain pastures during summer meant that the pastures in the valley could be mowed and harvested. Today, relieving the valley pastures from grazing pressure so that they can be harvested is still an important incentive for taking the animals to the summer farm. All summer farmers I met in Valdres mow and harvest the pastures in the valley while the animals graze the summer farm pastures. Furthermore, the mountain pastures provide plenty of fodder to the grazing animals. A recurring argument for summer farming is that the animals on outfield pastures feed themselves. While the animals are out grazing, the farmers do not have to provide the animals with additional fodder. However, the mountain outfield pastures do not provide the livestock with sufficient nutrition to keep the lactation on a steady level. Cows eat mostly grass, and thus have to walk longer distances to satisfy their needs, an exercise requiring a lot of energy for animals of that size. Thus, cows tend to produce less milk while grazing on mountain pastures than when grazing on meadows covered only by grass in lower latitudes.

Furthermore, grass in higher latitudes is not as rich as on lower lying meadows. The summer farmers thus supplement the feed from the pastures with pelleted feed that is fed to the animals during milking. The ecological farmers try to keep the pelleted feed at a minimum while on the summer farm as they opine the animals graze sufficiently on the mountain pastures. Here an important distinction has to be made between cows and goats. While cows mostly eat grass, goats eat different weeds and plants that the mountain pastures provide. Also, they are small and agile animals, spending less energy on their grazing circles than cows. The lactation level of goats thus remains stable when grazing on summer farm pastures.

In addition to the provision of free resources in terms of pastures and fodder, another important argument for letting animals graze the mountain pastures during summer concerns issues of animal welfare. Grazing the outfield mountain pastures during summer means that the animals are outside most of the time. The fresh air and the exercise are believed to be healthy for the animals and contributing to their well-being. Hence, the summer farmers often talked about animals on mountain pastures as “happy” animals. The varied mountain pastures with grass, weeds and herbs and the fact that the animals chose which plants to eat, are considered healthy. Moreover, there are fewer insects in the mountains to molest the animals than down in the valley. When grazing on the outfield mountain pastures, the animals are in principle free to walk wherever they want. The outfield pastures are not fenced in, and limited only when bordering roads, settlements or other infrastructure. The livestock usually goes in herds and often walks the same routes.

The summer farmers all believe that grazing mountain pastures increases the milk quality. Their main argument is that animals grazing on mountain pastures eat different herbs and leaves in addition to normal grass, which allegedly improves the milk quality. In this context, most farmers refer to a study carried out by researchers from the Bioforsk research institute at Løken in Valdres (Sickel, 2013), which confirms the high quality of milk from animals grazing outfield mountain pastures. This study was mentioned on several occasions and by different actors when promoting summer farming.

However, there are also challenges involved in letting the animals graze the summer farm outfield pastures. The mobility of the livestock on the outfield mountain pastures was by some summer farmers pointed out as a rather problematic matter. The development of the Beitostølen, the tourist center of Valdres, through several construction projects, mostly in

relation to tourism, has in some cases restricted livestock mobility. Around Beitostølen, some former summer farming outfield pastures have been sold, and the grazing rights of the shareholders have been suspended. Fences have been put up to prevent the livestock from entering areas intended for sport activities or residential or cabin areas. The affected summer farmers see this as an expression of the local government's prioritization of tourism over agriculture, and lament that the importance of the mountain pastures as a resource for food production is not recognized. Cabins located in summer farming outfield pastures represent another problem in this regard. While the cabin owners approve of summer farming, as this contributes to an attractive and authentic landscape, they do not want the livestock too close to their cabin, as Ole-Jacob at Vikarbråten told me. In general, when located in the state commons, fencing around cabins in Norway is not allowed. However, he opined that fencing could indeed prevent conflicts between cabin owners and summer farmers.

The mountain pastures around the summer farms thus provide crucial resources for small-scale dairy farmers in Valdres. The grazing of these pastures is believed to contribute to the welfare of the livestock and the milk quality.

3.1.2. Milk production

Milking is the defining process of production on summer farms in Valdres. The terms *støling* and *stølsdrift*, or summer farming, mean that the livestock is milked at the summer farm. Mere outfield mountain pasture grazing of sheep or meat cattle is not considered as summer farming by the farmers. This form of resource use does not require humans to stay permanently at the summer farm, as milk production does. Thus, the term summer farming implies the presence of humans at the summer farm. As elaborated in Chapter Two, milk production at the summer farm is the prerequisite for receiving the summer farm subsidies. Hence, the political definition of summer farming also implies milk production at the summer farm. The summer farm subsidies constitute an important source of income for dairy farmers in Valdres, and are thus an important incentive for producing milk at the summer farm. The farmers emphasized them as a precondition for practicing summer farming.

Summer farm life in Valdres revolves around milking. The animals – mostly cows and in some cases goats – are milked twice a day, in the morning around 5, 6 or 7 a.m. and in the afternoon around 4 or 5 p.m. The farmers keep the same milking rhythm at the summer farm as on the regular farm. As they graze the outfield pastures at least during the day, the animals

mostly have to be called or collected for milking. Sometimes the animals return from the pastures at milking time and wait outside the barn. Each farmer has her or his own way of calling the animals, and regional patterns can be detected. Common ways of calling the livestock in Valdres include the phrases “Å takkale, å takkale” (“Oh you poor thing!”) or “Kommera, kommera, kommera!” (“Come, then!”). When the animals are close enough to the barn, they mostly return when hearing the calls. If they are further away from the barn and cannot hear the calling, or are enjoying a rich piece of pasture that outcompetes the thought of craft fodder in the barn, the farmer or the *budeie*, a female summer farmer, has to go and collect the animals. In such cases, the herd usually follows him or her to the barn. The milking takes about two hours, regardless which milking system is used.

Turning to the infrastructure and technology involved in milking, summer farms in Valdres usually have a barn in which the animals are milked. At one summer farm I visited, the animals were milked by hand outside, a method conforming to the simple mode of operation of that particular farm. The barns usually contain one compartment for every cow. The barn at the Olestølen summer farm contains a platform where six goats at a time enter and are milked. The animals are fed pelleted feed, mostly called *mjøl*, or flour, when milked. The fodder is a strong motivation for the animals to enter the barn. In general, the summer farmers I met were satisfied with the technical standards at their summer farms, which are also deemed as adequate by the municipalities’ agricultural staff (Daugstad & Lunnan, 2009). As part of the abovementioned rural development funds, farmers receive support for investments in summer farming barns. These barns seemed to be in good condition and were not mentioned by the farmers as a point of concern. Most summer farms in Valdres do not have electricity (*ibid.*). Disposal over electricity mainly depends on whether the summer farm is located in a cabin area provided with electricity or not. Others use solar cells to generate electricity at the summer farm. Even if some summer farmers wish for it, the lack of electricity was not mentioned as a major problem for continued summer farming. This confirms the finding of Daugstad & Lunnan (2009) that electricity does not constitute a crucial factor for summer farming decline in Valdres. Mainly, the milking machines are driven by engine-generators and gas is used for heating the water that is needed for disinfection and cleaning of the equipment.

A farmer told me: “Med strøm og kjøletank er det blitt på stølen slik som hjemme”, with electricity and a cooling tank the summer farm is just like home. She points to a circumstance

that I observed at most places I visited; that the process of milk production at the summer farms does not deviate from the same process at the farms. Except for one where the cows were milked by hand, the summer farms were equipped with modern milking machines, i.e. pipeline or bucket milking machines. Farmers with cows of a race that lactate up to 50 liters a day use piping systems and cooler tanks. Mostly the pipes and tanks are not mobile, and the farmers thus have two sets; one on each farm. The farmers with goats or cows of a race that lactates less than average cows, mostly use bucket milking machines. These are mobile and thus can be transported from the farm to the summer farm and back again. The farmers delivering the milk to Tine (see below) have cooling containers where the milk is stored. The summer farmers processing the milk either do this right away or store it in traditional milk-cooling containers utilizing the constantly chilled water from the mountain streams. A challenge regarding the technical standards on the summer farms is the water quality. Most summer farms are not connected to water pipes and thus rely on the mountain streams. The water from these streams does not always meet the requirements from the agricultural authorities. These demands, however, are not executed as strictly on summer farms as on usual farms. Thus, summer farming is possible albeit with simple technical means.

Producing milk at the summer farm involves considerations about the timing of the calving or kidding. The summer farmers have different views on this matter. Cows grazing mountain pastures produce less milk than cows in normal barns and with regular indoor-feeding (Daugstad & Lunnan, 2009; Skarstad et al., 2008). Most farmers in Valdres practice autumn calving, resulting in low milk production while at the summer farm (Daugstad & Lunnan, 2009). This way the milk production is easily controlled and monitored with indoor-feeding in the winter and the workload while at the summer farm is low. Others consider it economically more efficient to let the animals calve or kid from January to March so that they are at the peak of their lactation period while still being fed indoors but also have high milk production while at the summer farm. According to the study *Levande Stølar* (Tuv, 2002) this is the economically most efficient strategy. Still others consider later calving/kidding more convenient, in April / May, so that the animals are at the peak of their lactation period when grazing on the mountain pastures. The arguments for late spring calving/kidding are that mountain pasture grazing increases the milk quality and that the milk prices are at their highest during the summer months. All of the summer farmers I met in Valdres that refine their milk time the calving or kidding in spring to exploit the increased milk quality from

mountain pasture grazing. In total, between twenty percent and 32 percent of the total milk production in Valdres is produced during the summer months (Daugstad & Lunnan, 2009).

Traditionally, women were responsible for milking and cheese making and hence lived with the children at the summer farm during summer, while men stayed at the farm in order to mow the low-lying meadows. Today, this gendered division of labor still prevails on many summer farms in Valdres, albeit with exceptions. Most summer farmers live with their family at the summer farms during summer. When the school begins in August, the municipality organizes a summer farm taxi that allows for the children to commute to school. This has to be seen as part of the local government's efforts to maintain summer farming in the region. Motorized transportation allows the men to commute between the farm and the summer farm. The summer farm is part of a larger economical system, involving the farm and sometimes off-farm labor. Combining milking at the summer farm with other tasks at home or other forms of employment is challenging for many summer farmers. Anne and Gudrun at Heimre Hedalsstølen, two sisters owning a farm with a summer farm, are doing both *mannfolkarbeidet* and *kvinnfolkarbeidet* (the men's work and the women's work), as they referred to it. This means they milk on the summer farm and mow at the farm every day during the harvest period. They sleep at the summer farm and milk from 5 to 7 a.m. After breakfast, they drive down to the farm and mow until 4 p.m. before driving up again to the summer farm for milking. When the hay is dried and has to be collected before it starts raining, sometimes they drive to the farm to work again after milking until 9 or 10 p.m. After that, they drive back to the summer farm where they sleep. As this example shows, most summer farmers today are dependent on a car and commute daily between farm and summer farm. Also other tasks such as shopping, driving the kids to after-school activities or running errands requires motorized transportation.

3.1.3. Summer farm milk refinement

Milk refinement has historically been the main process of production on summer farms. In order to preserve the milk produced during summer, it had to be processed at the summer farm. Thomas at Olestølen thus characterizes summer farming as a *lagringslandbruk*, a storage agricultural practice. The dairy products produced at the summer farm such as white cheese, brown cheese, sour cream and butter constituted an essential part of the farmers' subsistence throughout the year. In some cases, the dairy products produced at the summer farm were sold, furthermore constituting a source of income for the farmers. Past and present

cheese production in Valdres is extensively documented by the journalist Helge Gudheim (2013). In his book *Kinning, bresting og ysting i Valdres. Sett i norsk og internasjonal sammenheng* (Cheesemaking in Valdres seen in the Norwegian and international context), he describes the processes of cheese production in detail, based on descriptions of and conversations with former and present *budeier* in Valdres. The book has played an important role in putting artisan cheese from Valdres on the map.

As local creameries were established and roads were built in order to collect the milk produced on the mountain pastures, the post-war years saw a substantial decrease in the production of cheese and other dairy products on Valdresian summer farms. Cheese, butter and sour cream were produced only occasionally, e.g. during weekends when the milk was not collected. However, in Valdres today, the processing of milk at the summer farm is moderately revitalized by farmers diversifying into cheese production. Nationwide, in 2013, milk was processed for commercial purposes on 71 summer farms out of 975 (Statens Landbruksforvaltning, 2014). This development has to be seen in relation to the policy and market changes described above. Small-scale farmers in Norway increasingly depend on income sources in addition to agriculture, and diversification into milk refinement and the production of quality foods is a common strategy in this regard (Bjørkhaug & Richards, 2008).

I was lucky to get to know a few summer farm cheese producers. The processing of the milk is practiced on different scales and with different aims. During summer, Vigdis on Rognåstrøe and her neighboring *budeie* produce brown cheese as part of their weekly tourist offer at the summer farm. A fractional portion of the milk that goes into the tanks is put aside, separated to achieve the whey which is then boiled down to the brown mass that is the brown cheese. The tourists are invited to stir the pot and help making the cheese. Vigdis furthermore produces a delicious *pultost* (a soft sour milk cheese) for personal consumption. Katharina on Sparstadstølen produces white cheese, brown cheese, sour cream and butter for personal consumption. The milk produced at Sparstadstølen is not collected, but is either processed or consumed fresh. Her summer farm is open for tourists during July and August and the cheese production contributes to the atmosphere and life that the visitors experience during their stay. Katharina tells them about cheese production at the summer farm in the past and today, emphasizing the continuity of this practice. Yvonne at Vikarbråten produces white cheese, brown cheese, butter and sour cream for personal consumption and for sale. At Vikarbråten

all milk is processed. The sale of the dairy products constitutes an important part of the farm's total income. Ida at Sparstad produces white cheese for sale and personal consumption, and occasionally brown cheese, butter or sour cream. At Olestølen, Kathrin processes the entire milk and makes different types of *chèvre*, fresh cheese, brown cheese and yoghurt. The products are for personal consumption and sale. In 2014, Kathrin quit her job as a teacher in order to concentrate on and dedicate herself to cheese production, which she has made into her main source of income.

An aspect that attracts attention in this description is that all the cheese makers I met in Valdres are women. Historically, the women processed the milk because they were the ones living at the summer farm with the children, while the men were harvesting winter fodder on the low-lying pastures. The reasons for the endurance of this gendered division of labor is an interesting topic, but one that lies outside the scope of this thesis.

These cheese producers are acquaintances or at least know of each other, and are interested in the processes of cheese production and distribution on other summer farms. Through personal networks or more formal ones like the *Gards- og Stølsnettverket*, the farm and summer farm network, they exchange knowledge and experiences. The cheesing skills are acquired in different ways: some have learnt at the *Sogn Jord- og Hagebruksskole*, Norway's only ecological farming school that offers cheese making courses. In addition to this more formalized education, most of the *budeier* have learnt from other *budeier*. Kathrin, for example, learnt to make brown cheese by an older *budeie* in Hallingdal, a valley close to Valdres. Most of the *budeier* I met in Valdres take in younger *budeier* such as me to pass on their knowledge.

The methods for making cheese on summer farms in Valdres today are basically the same as the ones described in historical literature on the topic (Gudheim, 2013). To produce the hard white cheese, a historically most common type of cheese in Valdres, the milk is heated. Bacteria then are added to sour the milk for a better taste. Rennet separates the casein from the whey. For the latter to occur, the hardened milk is cut into small pieces that are sieved and pressed into molds. Once in the mold, the cheese is salted and turned daily during the maturing that can last up to several months. In many parts of Norway, Valdres included, the whey, which in other countries is considered a waste product, is further processed into the distinct brown cheese. The whey is heated and boiled while continuously stirred for several

hours until most of the liquid has evaporated and a thick and viscose mass remains. At this point some *budeier* add milk, cream or syrup for a sweeter taste and creamier consistence, others prefer their brown cheese to consist only of whey. The mass is then kneaded until it is cold and hardens. The butter is mostly churned with a separator, which is also used to make the sour cream.

The *budeier* I met who make a living out of cheese production all work in their own cheeseries. The cheeseries I visited were modest and practical. The basic elements include a large pot for heating the milk, a system that allows heating the milk slowly, a handle, molds, a refrigerator for storing the cultures and a large sink for cleaning. As the cleaning is mostly done by hand, large pots for boiling water are indispensable. Cheese production is thus possible even with the limited technology of many summer farms in Valdres. None of the four summer farms I visited that produce cheese for professional sale dispose over electricity. The stoves and the refrigerators run on gas. Running water is mostly installed. The requirements to hygiene in food production in Norway are relatively strict and controlled by the Norwegian Food Safety Authority. With the opportunity to boil water and wash and steam all the utensils used in the cheese production, the requirements for hygiene are met at the summer farms. The agent of the Food Authority in Valdres is personally acquainted with summer farming, its technological challenges and limitations and is very mindful in this regard when carrying out her office, the cheese makers told me.

3.1.4. Harvest of the summer farm pastures

As pointed out above, obtaining enough winter fodder in order to sustain the livestock historically constituted a great challenge for dairy farmers in Valdres (Skarstad et al., 2008). The summer farm pastures constituted indispensable resources in this regard. In addition to being grazed, the summer farm pastures, mainly *innmark* pastures, were harvested to feed the livestock through the winter (Skarstad et al., 2008). Today, the collection of winter fodder from the mountain pastures is rare in Valdres. The farmers concentrate the fodder production in the most fertile and easy accessible low-lying fields. More areal is vacant in the valley due to farm closure, and can thus be rented for the harvest of winter fodder. Furthermore, fodder is increasingly purchased. Hence, the summer farm pastures are rarely harvested, which results either in overgrowth or their re-use for grazing. On the summer farms I visited, the infield pastures were often used as night-pastures for cows, a common strategy for keeping the fodder intake high to ensure high milk production on the summer farm.

3.1.5. *Meat production at the summer farm*

A few summer farmers engage in meat production in addition to milk production at the summer farm. This production is mostly small-scale and intended for private consumption only. For instance, during the summer 2014, Thomas and Kathrin at Olestølen had three pigs on an infield summer farm pasture. They were feeding on roots and shrubberies on the field as well as old bread soaked in whey from the milk production. Private unauthorized slaughtering is prohibited in Norway, and hence the pigs were transported to a nearby slaughterhouse. In this case, the meat production generates costs rather than economic income, but still contributes to the self-sufficiency of the family.

3.1.6. *Sharing the workload: budeier and volunteers*

A common strategy for dealing with the workload and related challenges is to engage someone who takes care of the milking and the barn work. *Budeie* is the traditional working title for women milking at the summer farm (be it a temporary worker or the farmer herself) and is still in use in Valdres today. Several of the summer farms I visited had a *budeie* working at their summer farm for a while during the summer. Most *budeier* are acquaintances of the farmers seeking practical experience in farming as part of their agronomical education. Others choose this job for recreational reasons and view it as a pleasant holiday activity, as was the case with myself the two summers I was working as a *budeie* at the Olestølen summer farm. At this summer farm, the *budeie* Hilde, a friend of Kathrin and Thomas, is living at the cabin at the summer farm for three weeks each summer. During this period she is responsible for milking the cows. Her payment is “*ffjellet, freden og roen*” (“the mountain, the peace and the quiet”) and free accommodation. Hosting voluntary workers interested in agricultural praxis on the summer has become more and more common in Valdres, especially among the ecological and more alternative summer farmers. Usually the volunteers live and work at the summer farms, taking part in different aspects of the summer farming lives. There are diverging opinions about how much this actually reduces the workload. Kathrin told me that having volunteers at the summer farm often creates more work than it diminishes. For her and Thomas, conveying the values involved in their way of life and agricultural practice is their main motivation for letting volunteers stay with them.

3.1.7. *The summer farm landscape: a landscape of production?*

Through the described practices of production summer farmers engage with the mountain pastures and constitute the *stølslandskap*, the summer farm landscape. The summer farm landscape is temporal, constituted through centuries and in some cases millennia of summer farming. Historically, the high grazing pressure of cows, goats and horses at the summer farms kept shrubberies and trees down. The harvesting of winter fodder from the *innmark* furthermore kept these areas cleared and open. The collection of firewood for purposes of heating the farmsteads and the cheese kettles kept the summer farm landscape free from trees even beneath the tree line. The harvest of the outfield and infield mountain pastures, the grazing and trampling of the animals and the deforestation has not just kept the landscape open, but also brought about a specific flora and fauna. The summer farm landscape is by natural scientists found to contain a great biodiversity (Bele et al., 2011, 2013). The flora in the summer farm landscape is characterized by grass and herbs, but also contains mushrooms and other species. The fauna of the summer farm landscape includes a variety of insects that again feed specific birds and rodents. The summer farming landscape is furthermore characterized by physical structures. As the *budeier* were living at the summer farms with their children during summer, farmsteads, or *sel*, were built as well as stables for milking and barns for storing winter fodder and firewood. To prevent the animals from entering the *innmark*, fences were put up around these pastures.

Constituted through the described processes of grazing, harvesting, clearing and general management of the landscape, the *stølslandskap*, then, is essentially a landscape of production, in the sense of an “agriculturally productive landscape that has been formed through generations of labor and the technological development of farming” (Vergunst, 2012, p. 173). However, due to a substantial decline in summer farming, the summer farm landscape in Valdres is increasingly being overgrown by shrubberies and trees. As elaborated above, the grazing pressure on Valdresian summer farms has been reduced substantially during the last century, and the collection of fodder and firewood from summer farm pastures has decreased in the same period. With fewer summer farms with active agricultural production, fences, barns and in some cases – when not re-used as cabins – the farmsteads decay.

3.1.8. Concluding remarks

Summer farming in Valdres is, in essence, about grazing the mountain pastures, a resource most summer farmers say they cannot afford to do without. Letting the animals graze the mountain pastures means they have to be milked at the summer farms. An additional important incentive for milking the livestock at the summer farms is the summer farm subsidies. The collection of winter fodder and of firewood, as well as meat production, are other, less common, practices of agricultural production at Valdresian summer farms. The processing of milk into cheese and other dairy products is another process of production carried out at summer farms in Valdres. Today, summer farmers in Valdres are (re)discovering the processing of milk as a second income source, and business development within this sector is increasing. An old practice of production is thus revived at summer farms in Valdres. Hence, summer farming in Valdres is in essence (still) a practice of agricultural production.

3.2. Distribution

3.2.1. Distribution of summer farm milk

The summer farmers who do not process their milk deliver it to Tine SA, the biggest Norwegian dairy cooperative. Until the agricultural agreement of 1995, which opened the dairy sector for competition, the company de facto had a monopoly over the entire dairy value chain (Bjørnenak, Moen, Riis, & Mørch von der Fehr, 2013). Even if the cooperative now is competing with other actors, Tine is still by far the biggest and most powerful dairy company in Norway. The Norwegian dairy sector is strongly regulated by the state. All Norwegian dairy companies are subjected to the national price adjustment scheme, securing that all farmers receive the same price for their milk, independent of geographical location or what the milk is used for (ibid.).

This principle of equality is both a blessing and a curse for summer farmers in Valdres. On the one hand, the farmers who do not process the milk themselves depend on Tine collecting the milk for continued summer farm milk production. Tine is obligated to collect the milk at every farm in the country as long as the farm is accessible for Tine's vehicles (Tine, 2014), including summer farms located in the mountains. The extra costs this generates are not covered by the summer farmers themselves but collectively by all the members of the

cooperative. The summer farmers are well aware of this, and some express their concerns over the decline in summer farming and what this may mean for future summer farm milk production. The transportation costs per liter milk rise when the total milk production in the mountain regions declines (Daugstad & Lunnan, 2009). On the other hand, summer farm milk is not distinguished as such but usually goes into the same tanks as regular milk. Summer farm milk is thus not a protected trademark in Norway. Dairy products that are sold as summer farm products are usually made from conventional milk but with a higher amount of fat and salt. According to the summer farmers, this is a waste of quality both for the consumers who do not get to taste “real, high quality” summer farm milk and for the producers who are not economically compensated for the quality of their milk. Through the price adjustment scheme all farmers receive the same price per produced liter of milk. This evokes dissatisfaction among many farmers. They argue that it is documented that milk produced on outfield mountain pastures is of higher quality than regular milk, and thus think it would be fair to receive a higher price for summer farm milk. A part of the perceived problem is the centralization of the creameries. Since the last local creamery in Valdres was shut down in 2006, the milk from the summer farms is processed and further distributed at creameries far away. According to the summer farmers, *det lokale særpreget*, the “local touch” of the milk and thus part of its quality is thereby lost.

There is one exception to this rule. In July 2013, Tine launched its *TineMjølke frå stolar i Valdres Lettmjølke*, TineMilk from summer farms in Valdres Light milk. This milk consists exclusively of milk produced at summer farms in Valdres and is sold in supermarkets in Eastern Norway in the weeks 28-35 (Tine, 2014). Its package design distinguishes it from regular milk. It pictures cows on mountain pastures and describes summer farming in Norway as a traditional agricultural practice producing high-quality milk. The milk has received the *Spesialitet-merket*, The Speciality Label, a quality label for food produced in Norway on local resources that fulfills certain production requirements (Tine, 2014). According to Tine, the project proved a success in 2013 (50,000 liter of summer farm milk were sold) and was continued the next year (Seterbrukaren, 2013). According to the project leader Rolf Tobiassen, the aim of the project was to give the consumers “a taste of the Norwegian mountain summer” (ibid.). Three of the farmers I met deliver their milk to this product line. They perceive this as a step in the right direction regarding the recognition of the quality of summer farm milk. However, the producers receive the same price for this milk as for regular

milk. Some farmers consider this unfair as they believe the summer farm milk is of a higher quality, a topic I return to below.

3.2.2. *Distribution of farmstead products*

In contrast to the summer farmers delivering their milk to Tine, farmers processing the milk on their summer farms are responsible for the distribution of their products. Different strategies are chosen. In general, it can be noted that the distribution of products processed directly at the summer farms in Valdres is small-scale, short ranged and often based upon personal relationships. Furthermore, the summer farmers aim at combining the distribution of their products with narratives about their origin and production.

Summer farm cheese producers in Valdres complain that as a small-scale producer in Norway it is hard to sell your products in supermarkets. Supermarkets in Valdres take in few locally produced products. Some small-scale producers perceive this as a problem. They are aware of the existing consumer demands for their products and believe that the supermarkets in Valdres should sell products from the region. Furthermore, some believe that if the supermarkets would sell their products this would save them a lot of work.

The sale of artisan products directly from summer farms is common in Valdres. This is often combined with tourism. At the Olestølen summer farm, the visitors at the *Åpen støl*, Open summer farm, get to taste the different summer farm products and learn about their origin and their production. Afterwards, they are invited to purchase the products at the cheesery. At the Olestølen summer farm, the *Åpen støl* with an average of 80 visitors a day are by far the days with the highest product turnover during summer. For Kathrin and Thomas this is the desirable form of distribution: the consumers visit the summer farm and learn about the relations and conditions of production inherent in the products they purchase. Also at summer farms not engaging in tourism, like the Vikarbråten, products can be purchased directly at the summer farm. The consumers have mostly heard about the summer farm through word of mouth, know the farmers personally or have read their advertisements. The consumers often combine the purchasing of the products with a hike in the area as most summer farms are located far from the main road (e.g. it takes ten minutes to drive to the Olestølen from the main road and about twenty minutes to reach the Vikarbråten). As many of Valdresian summer farms are located in popular areas for hiking and exercising, consumers also drop in by chance, attracted by the signs commonly found at the summer farms signaling the sale. To

facilitate the purchase and keep up with the trend in Norway where bankcards have largely replaced cash, some summer farms have wireless card terminals.

Direct sale to private customers by post or by delivery is also quite common. The cheese-producing summer farmers all have a network of acquaintances, both inside and outside of Valdres who regularly order their products. The summer farmers also sell their products at different events in and around Valdres. The *Trollrock* music festival at Beitostølen, the Valdresian food festival *Rakfiskfestivalen* or the Valdres fair in Oslo once a year are examples of events where summer farming products are sold at small stands. Furthermore, several hotels and restaurants in Valdres offer local and traditional food and are important customers for summer farmers producing cheese and other dairy products. These are ordered by the customers and delivered by the summer farmers. Most summer farmers moreover deliver their products to one or several shops. These are mostly specialized shops selling niche products; ecological or locally produced, traditional products. One example in this regard is the *Bitibua*, a small kiosk on the roadside outside of Beitostølen selling different locally produced Valdres specialties: cheese and butter, *kurv* (a Valdresian sausage), *rakfisk* (fermented sprout), coffee and *lapper* (Norwegian pancakes) for passers-by. During the summer months, the road through Beitostølen is highly frequented by tourists driving over Valdresflya and the turnover from the sale is quite high according to the vendor. I visited him at the kiosk one afternoon in August. That day the flow of customers, Norwegian and foreigners, was constant. The most interesting product seemed to be the Norwegian brown goat cheese, and the vendor was happy to tell the customers that this cheese was produced on summer farms in the area using traditional methods. According to the vendor the customers appreciate the products at the Bitibua because these are ‘traditional’ and locally produced specialties that cannot be purchased in the common supermarket.

Marketing constitutes an important part of the process of vending summer farm products. Unlike their colleagues delivering the milk to Tine, the farmers who process and sell their own products have to market them. Most summer farmers advertise their products through word of mouth and on the Internet: on facebook, on the tourist portal valdres.com or on personal websites. Marketing and distribution of their products can be a challenging task for the farmers. For Kathrin, for example, it is less the know-how or the lack of customers that is the problem but rather the lack of time. Finding new customers involves a lot of research and marketing. Delivering products by car or post takes time and effort. During my stay at

Olestølen, I often spoke with Kathrin and Thomas about possible customers of their products. They are especially interested in alternative initiatives in urban areas that distribute locally produced and small-scale agricultural products. Another challenge for the farmers concerns setting the price: they are convinced that their products are of higher value than regular products found in the supermarket. They are furthermore aware of certain consumer groups' willingness to pay more for that value. Still, Kathrin is afraid of pricing her products as high as she could and, in her opinion, should, for fear of losing customers. In Kathrin's opinion, a solution to this problem would be better communication between producers and the agreement on prices. This topic was discussed at an excursion of the *Gards- og stølsnettverket*, the farm and summer farm network. The ones present agreed that they all would benefit from fixed prices on locally produced summer farm products. Despite these challenges concerning the distribution, the cheese producers do not have problems with selling off their products, especially during summer. Thus, with the current distribution patterns, the size of production does not exceed the amount of products sold.

3.3. Consumption

The thesis of the post-productivist transition in agriculture in developed economies asserts that there has been a change in agriculture's economic role from the production of primary products (food and fibers) to the provision of public goods and services. As discussed in Chapter One, this thesis and the related concept of post-productivism have been refuted and modified as they were criticized for being too narrow and for ignoring the continuity of productivism (Almstedt, 2013; Burton & Wilson, 2012; Evans et al., 2002). This has led to the recognition of the coexistence of productivist and post-productivist attitudes and practices as expressed in the concept of multifunctionality. The alleged "shift in emphasis [...] from material production to service provision" (Mather et al., 2006) can be conceptualized as a change from agricultural "landscapes of production" to "landscapes of consumption" (Rettie, 2010; Stacul, 2010; Stewart & Strathern, 2010). Agriculture is now "the basis of a burgeoning tertiary sector predicated on 'cultivating' the desires of urban or foreign visitors to view and experience traditional rural landscapes and support their sustainability" (Heatherington, 2011, p. 3). Through tourism, leisure and aestheticism, the agricultural landscape and the countryside in general become places of consumption (ibid.). Against this theoretical backdrop, I will in the following describe practices of consumption at Valdresian summer farms.

3.3.1. Consumers

Summer farmers in Valdres are well aware of the trend of and growing demand for local, traditional, small-scale quality products and agrotourism or geo-tourism. For some of them, these niche markets present an opportunity for diversification into summer farm-related businesses in terms of products and tourism related to the summer farm. With Valdres being a popular tourist destination and the Riksvei 51, a road highly frequented by tourists heading for the mountains and the national parks of southern central Norway, tourists and consumers enter the summer farmyard.

As already noted by anthropologist Anne-Kathrine Brun Norbye (2010) who carried out fieldwork on summer farms in Hallingdal, the neighboring valley to Valdres, there are different categories of summer farm visitors. These do also apply to Valdres. “Customers” often come with their car to buy summer farm products. The transaction typically does not take long as they already know what they are looking for. “Tourists” are typically people who either drive past Valdres on their way over Valdresflya or are staying at one of the hotels or camping sites in the area. When buying products at the summer farm, the tourists mostly take their time to walk around and have a look at the place and the animals. They often ask questions and are interested in the work and activities at the summer farm. Another type of visitors are the “hyttefolk”, the cabin people, or temporal “amenity migrants”, as Funnel & Parish (2001) call them. They usually feel a strong connection to the place and to summer farming (Norbye, 2010), and typically go for hikes and often drop by the same summer farms during their stays.

3.3.2. „Å komme opp på stølen”

„Å komme opp på stølen”, meaning to arrive at the summer farm, is a special experience for most visitors. To buy cheese at the Olestølen summer farm, visitors have to either walk or drive the way up to Olevann, the lake beneath the summer farm. Going by road, one has to turn off the Riksvei 51 south of Beitostølen and enter the Olevegen where visitors are encouraged to pay a fee of 50 kroner (approx. six US\$) for the maintenance of the road. During the first kilometers, the road winds and slowly climbs through a fir forest and passes a few houses. Gradually the fir trees become more scattered and birches take over as the first cabins and former *heimstøler* appear. The landscape opens up and on a clearing surrounded by birches, juniper and sporadic fir trees a flock of kid goats graze. Continuing upwards,

maybe detained by the herd of cows from the summer farm Heimre Hedalsstølen slowly crossing the road and staring at the car, one reaches the first summer farms. The small wooden houses are surrounded by *innmark*, fenced-in mowed fields. On one of the summer farms about 80 goats graze or are milked in the barn. The road continues upwards, passing moors surrounded by scattered birches and junipers. The Olefjell, the mountain above Olevann, and the mountains in the North appear on the horizon. Finally, after passing a small hill, the last birches are passed and Olevann, the Ole Lake, and the red and brown wooden summer farms of the *Ole Sameige*, the cluster of summer farms surrounded by harvested infield pastures and grazed meadows appear. Maybe the goats and horses are spotted grazing at the hillside. This neat and cultivated scenery is framed in by an alpine backdrop with mountains and a far-reaching view. A wooden sign at the roadside signals the frontier between the *Statsallmenningen*, the state common land, and the Ole Sameige, the land belonging to the summer farms in the area. Continuing up the road, one encounters an old *melkerampe*, a small wooden construction with old milk churns of aluminum, as a remainder of the milk production that used to be the defining activity in this summer farm landscape. At a small parking lot the visitors can step out of the car and walk the last slope to the Olestølen. The infield pastures surrounding the *sel* and the barn are fenced in by *skigard*, a fence built using a historical method, and thus contributes to the impression of a traditional agricultural landscape. The sign in shape of a white goat says “Olestølen Mikroysteri” or Olestølen micro-cheesery.

3.3.3. *The purchase of summer farm products*

The consumption of summer farm products includes a lot more than just the purchase of the product and its final consumption. It includes the consumption of the summer farm and its landscape as such. As I will elaborate in the following chapter, farmers offering summer farm products make an effort to communicate the relations of production that constitute their products. Experiencing the summer farm and being in the summer farming landscape are important aspects of the transactions taking place there.

In order to purchase the products, the visitors have to enter the *setervoll*, the infield pastures surrounding the summer farm, through a wooden gate. Buying products at summer farms in Valdres involves interacting with the people living and working there; be it the farmers, helpers or volunteers. As I lived and worked as a *budeie* at the Olestølen summer farm during my fieldwork in Valdres, at times I assumed the role of the vendor when visitors came.

During the transactions, customers usually ask questions about the products and life on the summer farm in general. My impression was that most of the visitors have certain images and ideas about summer farming and seize the opportunity of the trade to talk to the people living and working at the summer farm. In general, the visitors and customers take their time while buying products at the summer farm. They often ask if they can have a look at the stable where the goats are milked or take a stroll around the summer farm. But the impetus for conversation also comes from the vendors. The conversations between buyers and vendors and the vendors strolling around make an experience out of the purchase rather than an impersonal market exchange.

3.3.4. *Tourism at the summer farm*

The consumption of the summer farm and its landscape becomes particularly evident in summer farm tourism. The *Åpen Støl*, open summer farm, at Olestølen is an example of what summer farm tourism in Valdres may look like. Every Wednesday in July Kathrin and Thomas open up their summer farm for visitors. The concept is to give the tourists “*en smak av stølsliv*”, a taste of summer farm life. Thomas shows the tourists around the summer farm. He tells them about the daily routines at the summer farm, about the animals, the landscape and the milk and cheese production. The children get to pet the animals. In the farmyard whey is boiling in the old cheese kettle to be made into the traditional brown cheese. The kettle is heated with logs of juniper. The visitors are invited to sit down and stir the whey with a big wooden spoon. They are also invited to enter the *sel*, the summer farmhouse, and to sit down at the table. Candles are burning and a smell of coffee and *kvikako*, Valdresian pancakes, is filling the air. On a table at the wall there are plates with different kinds of cheeses, *kurv*, marmalade and butter. Kathrin presents each product to the visitors and talks about how they are produced. By pointing out that only the coffee and the butter are not produced at the summer farm, the meal is presented as traditional *stølskost*, summer farm food and the summer farm emphasized as a site of food production. The *kvikako* are served and the visitors are invited to taste the products. After the meal, Kathrin opens the sale in the cheesery.

Even though it takes on different forms and is practiced on different scales, some general features of summer farm tourism in Valdres can be summed up. As noted by Norbye (2010), tourists have certain expectations that are influenced by general ideas and narratives about Norwegian summer farms. The traditional brown cheese, butter and *rømmegrøt*, sour cream porridge, are products usually associated with summer farms. Furthermore, they often have

romanticized ideas about the life at summer farms as an old-fashioned, traditional agricultural way of life. A third set of expectations concerns human-environment relations at the summer farm. This involves the expectation to see different kinds of animals at the summer farm, grazing the outfield pastures against the backdrop of the mountains (ibid.). These expectations are usually met by the farmers providing summer farm tourism in Valdres. *Brunostkoking*, boiling whey for making brown cheese, is a common activity at summer farms open for tourists. At the Olestølen and the Rognåstrøe, brown cheese is made only on the days when the summer farms are open to tourists or on special occasions such as a photo shoot for the homepage of VNK at the Olestølen. The tourists' expectations about a traditional, old-fashioned farming way of life at the summer farm are also met to a certain degree by old objects and buildings at the summer farms or the farmers' assurances that the brown cheese and the *kvikako* are made with traditional recipes. The farmers thus emphasize the continuity of practices and activities on the summer farm. Animals grazing the mountain pastures confirm the tourists' expectations of summer farmers living off the resources the mountains offer. However, as I will discuss in the following chapter, the summer farmers stress that the milk and food production on summer farms are forms of livelihood even in a modern world and that summer farming thus is not a remnant from the past but a sustainable agricultural practice.

Summer farm tourism in Valdres is based on experiencing – and to some extent taking part in – “real” farm life. This offer responds to increasing demands for taking part in real rural life and is thus consistent with a general trend in Norway towards ecotourism and agritourism (Daugstad, 2005). These demands and expectations became quite obvious to me the day I was visiting Liastølen, a summer farm museum at Beitostølen. This is a summer farm museum located in a former *sel*, a summer farmhouse. There, visitors can enter an old farm house, enjoy *kvikako* with sour cream, marmalade and coffee and learn about summer farming. As I was conversing with some tourists from Spain and from Haugalandet in South Western Norway, it came up that I was currently living and working at a summer farm close by. The man from Haugalandet became very enthusiastic and told the Spanish tourists that this was something they just could not miss; an actual summer farm with milk and cheese production. “It doesn’t get more Norwegian than that!” he tried to convince them. His promotion seemed to work, and we arranged that they would visit me at the summer farm the same day. A few days later the man from Haugalandet also came with his grandson. They were all very interested in learning about the processes of milk and cheese production at the farm, wanted

to have a look inside the summer farm house and even joined me in the barn while I was milking. This example shows a fascination many people have for what they perceive as real summer farming. The tourists assured me that the summer farm museum was interesting, but that it was far more special to visit a “real” summer farm. Thus, an important aspect of summer farm tourism in Valdres is perceived authenticity related to active farming.

Opening the summer farms up to tourists also comes with some challenges on part of the summer farmers. The double role of tourist host and vendor on the one side, and *budeie* and summer farmer on the other side is not always easy to manage. As we have seen, many visitors combine the purchase of summer farm products with a visit on the summer farm. They often take their time and want to chat with the *budeie* or the person selling the cheese. As life on the summer farm is busy, this sometimes constitutes a dilemma for the summer farmers who want to be hosts for the visitors and at the same time have to comply with their duties on the summer farm. As already noted by Norbye (2010), for some *budeier* it is challenging to set the price for the tourism at their summer farm. Diversifying into tourism involves charging the visitors for experiencing the summer farm, something that used to be gratis or still is in other contexts. This topic was discussed at a meeting of the *Gards- og Stølsnettverket* I attended. The members agreed that they would have to be more confident in their role as tourist hosts and view the experiences they offer at their summer farms as services that can and should be charged.

The scale and profitability of summer farm tourism varies from one farm to another. As already noted by Daugstad and Lunnan (2009), there is a lack of public data on this subject. It is thus not possible to draw any general conclusion as to whether diversification into summer farm related businesses constitutes a significant source of income for summer farmers in Valdres. Based on my own fieldwork, I can say that summer farmers in Valdres are engaging in tourism to different degrees and on different scales. In some cases, the scale of tourism is too small for generating any significant income, and in some cases the balance is even negative. When I asked one summer farmer whose tourism activities generates more expenses than income why she engages in summer farm tourism she told me that it is not about the money but about giving people an insight into what she perceives as a nice and important tradition. Others like Kathrin and Thomas at the Olestølen summer farm have made tourism in combination with cheese production an important part of their total income. The organization of the *Åpen Støl* at Olestølen requires about five people in full activity the whole

day. With an average of 80 visitors each Wednesday in July, the total turnover from tourism is significant. Most of the income is generated through the product sale on these days. Even if Thomas and Kathrin emphasize that the conveyance of values is an important reason for why they engage in tourism, the economic aspect of it cannot be underestimated. Thus, it is important to distinguish between those summer farmers who make tourism related to the summer farm to one of their additional occupations and invest a high amount of time and effort into it accordingly, and those who do tourism “*ved siden av*”, on the side, more like a hobby. Regarding the former group exemplified by Thomas and Kathrin, it must be concluded that small-scale tourism on the summer farm can constitute a viable economic practice. This is true especially when combined with the production and sale of summer farm products.

3.3.5. Concluding remarks

Valdresian summer farms are increasingly opening up to visitors, customers and tourists. By providing the experience of a traditional agricultural practice, summer farming as such is consumed. Particularly through tourism based on the experience of real farming life, the agricultural production itself is being consumed. Also the on-farm sale of summer farm products includes the experience of “real” summer farming and thus the consumption of this agricultural practice. Moreover, tourists and visitors moving through it in the context of leisure and recreational activities consume the summer farm landscape visually and experientially.

Based on the presented data, summer farming as an economic will in the following be analyzed on the basis of the theoretical framework outlined in Chapter One and under consideration of the structural conditions of Norwegian agriculture discussed in Chapter Two.

3.4. Summer farming: economic and ecological adaptation

Summer farming in Norway is usually explained in terms of economic and ecological adaptation to a mountainous environment (Daugstad, 2006; Daugstad et al., 2014). Against the backdrop of political economy conceptualizations of agrarian change, this explanation is questioned in this thesis. The literature discussed in Chapter One argues that structural conditions and macro-processes increasingly define agriculture in contemporary Europe. From this it follows that summer farming in Valdres has to be seen in relation to the general context of Norwegian agriculture, changing markets and policies. Based on the data presented

in Chapter Two and this chapter, does ecological adaptation still explain why farmers practice summer farming in Valdres today?

Most small-scale dairy farmers in Valdres still perceive summer farming a viable aspect of their dairy production. The decline in summer farming in the area is caused by a general decline in small dairy farms; those who stay in the sector mostly continue summer farming (Daugstad & Lunnan, 2009; Skarstad et al., 2008). An important reason for summer farming in Valdres is the extensive mountain pastures accessible around the summer farms suited for grazing and the collection of fodder. Letting the livestock graze these pastures during summer leaves the low-lying pastures around the farm available for harvest. Summer pasture grazing is believed to increase the animal welfare. Moreover, the summer farm pastures are of a high quality. Based on these considerations, summer farming in Valdres can (still) be explained partially in terms of economic rationality and ecological adaptation to a mountainous environment.

There are furthermore important structural reasons for the continuity of summer farming in Valdres. Recalling the Chapters One and Two, the literature on agriculture in advanced societies suggests that small-scale farming “that is in a sense marginal” (Stewart & Strathern, 2010, p. 5) in relation to agribusiness enterprises will decline as a result of economic pressures (Bjørkhaug, 2012). In a globalized and neoliberal food market, small-scale milk production is a vulnerable economic practice in Norway today. Financial challenges have forced dairy farmers in Valdres to exit milk production, which has resulted in a substantial decline of summer farms in the region. In this context, Norwegian small-scale dairy farmers are increasingly dependent on state subsidies in order to stay in farming. Simultaneously, marginalized small-scale farming is “central to many issues of heritage and conservation” (Stewart & Strathern, 2010, p. 5) and thus experiences a revaluation. In Norway, the agricultural authorities and the agricultural sector use this revaluation as a legitimization of efforts to maintain small-scale farming as a system of agricultural primary production. As part of its multifunctionalist agricultural policy, the Norwegian state supports summer farming for its multiple functions. The governmental economic support through RMP and SMIL constitutes a crucial source of income most small-scale dairy producers in Valdres cannot afford to do without.

Moreover, small-scale farmers in Norway are increasingly dependent on second income sources, and dairy farmers in Valdres usually have other jobs in addition to farming (Bjørkhaug, 2012; Daugstad & Lunnan, 2009; Skarstad et al., 2008). In Valdres, some farmers diversify into summer farm-related businesses; mainly tourism and the production of dairy products. This trend concurs with an increasing niche market for agricultural products labeled as local, artisan and traditional, which in Valdres results in a demand for summer farming products and summer farm tourism. In accordance to Norwegian multifunctionalist agricultural policies, farm-related business development is economically supported and promoted. In Valdres, politicians, rural developers and the farmers' organizations perceive summer farm tourism and summer farm products as value adding strategies that can save small dairy farms.

Hence, diversification into summer farm businesses, such as tourism or the processing of milk products, appears as a strategy to ensure the economic viability of vulnerable small-scale dairy farms (Bryden, 2010; Maddox, 2010; Paxson, 2010; Vaccaro, 2006). It is an expression of the agency of Valdresian summer farmers and their ability to adapt and innovate in the face of agrarian structural change (ibid.). Faced with economic pressures, they scan their economic opportunities at hand, taking advantage of the trend towards multifunctionality in Norwegian agricultural policies and of the growing niche market for small-scale specialty foods. However, not all farmers wish or can diversify into tourism or farmstead dairy production, a point I will discuss in detail below.

In conclusion, summer farming is not merely an expression of farmers' economic and ecological adaptation to a mountainous environment. It is furthermore an economic adaptation to structural changes in Norwegian agriculture as well as to changing markets and consumer demands. In both cases, summer farming can be explained in terms of the economic rationality of summer farmers (Vaccaro, 2006). However, summer farming also includes non-economic and non-ecological motives, to which I will turn in Chapter Four.

3.5. From production to post-production and from landscapes of production to landscapes of consumption?

Recalling Chapter One, a dominant thesis in the literature on agriculture in advanced societies is that agriculture in such countries has undergone a post-productivist transition. According to

this thesis, the role of agriculture and of the countryside in general has changed from (agricultural) primary production to the provision of non-food goods and services. A post-productivist agriculture is allegedly sustained through state support aimed at the provision of non-food services and values as well as through business development based on these values and services. As discussed above, this thesis has been criticized and modified. It has been argued that the co-existence of productivist and post-productivist attitudes and practices is a more accurate conceptualization of the changes taking place and that multifunctionality is a term better apt to grasp the agricultural discourse and practice in times of agrarian restructuring (Almstedt, 2013; Evans et al., 2002; Wilson, 2001). The thesis of the coexistence of productivism and post-productivism implies that large-scale and industrialized farms are most likely to survive in a neoliberal and globalized food market. Small-scale agricultural producers will be squeezed out of the market unless they are maintained through governmental support of their post-productivist functions or diversify into farm-related businesses. This theoretical framing would result in the hypothesis that summer farming in Valdres as an agricultural practice producing milk and fodder is disappearing. It would further suggest that if summer farming persists, it is maintained through its post-productivist functions: through state subsidies for its provision of non-food values and through diversification into farm-related businesses based on these values. Does this hypothesis correspond with the empirical reality on Valdresian summer farms? Moreover, a related thesis regarding agrarian structural change is the transition from landscapes of production to landscapes of consumption (Rettie, 2010; Stacul, 2010; Stewart & Strathern, 2010). It corresponds to the thesis of the changing economic role of the agricultural sector from material production to service provision (Heatherington, 2011). This thesis generates the hypothesis that in the course of agrarian restructuring the Valdresian summer farming landscape has changed from a being a landscape of production to becoming a landscape of consumption. Is this so?

From a structural viewpoint, there is a substantial decline in active summer farms in Valdres and in Norway in general. As elaborated in Chapter Two, this is due to the difficult economic conditions of dairy farming in Norway. Summer farm closure means decreasing grazing pressure on the summer farm pastures. It furthermore implies a reduction in human intervention in the landscape through practices such as the harvest of summer farm pastures and the lumbering of trees and shrubberies. This results in the regrowth of the summer farming productive landscape described above. Moreover, unless the summer farms are

reused as cottages or otherwise, summer farm closure leads to the decay of buildings and other physical structures. A striking example is the Olestølen summer farm. It is the only remaining active summer farm in a *stølslag*, a cluster of nine summer farms. About 30 goats, four horses and three pigs graze an area that used to be grazed by around 140 animals. The reduced grazing pressure changes the landscape significantly. The most obvious changes are the increase in juniper and the appearance of birches. Reduced lumbering further reinforces the regrowth. Hence, in the course of agrarian structural change the productive summer farming landscape is gradually decreasing.

Simultaneously, the summer farm region in Valdres is increasingly becoming a site for recreation, tourism and leisure activities, often based on farming or the agricultural landscape. Such activities have been identified as features of post-productive landscapes of consumption (Slee, 2005; Woods, 2011). In the case of the Ole *stølslag*, the cluster of summer farms at Olevann, most of the summer farmsteads now function as holiday lodges. One former summer farm is the base for horse trips in the area. Tourists ride to the Ole Lake from Beitostølen, receive a traditional dinner in the old *sel*, the summer farmstead, and are picked up by buses that bring them back to Beitostølen. Locals, cabin owners and tourists go jogging or hiking in the area during summer and cross-country skiing in the winter. Olestølen, the only remaining summer farm with milk production in the summer farm cluster, offers farmstead dairy products and tourist activities.

These tendencies imply that the summer farm landscape increasingly exhibits features of a landscape of consumption. However, to conclude that the summer farming landscape in Valdres is undergoing a transition from a landscape of production to a landscape of consumption would be reductionist and misleading as it would exclude most of the active summer farms still left in the region. Even if these have decreased substantially, there are nevertheless 199 active summer farms left in Valdres. The anthropologist Jo Vergunst argues for engaging with specific rather than with generalized landscapes (Vergunst, 2012). The focus on specific summer farms and their landscapes provides a different perspective on the matter.

As elaborated above, summer farming is (still) first and foremost a system of resource use. The farmers rely on the mountain pastures for grazing and for harvesting the low-lying fields during summer. Thus, the mountain pastures of Valdresian summer farms are used for

purposes of agricultural production. Moreover, milk production is the key activity of summer farming in Valdres. This is certainly a matter of terminology: *stølsdrift*, summer farming, is defined by the farmers themselves and by the agricultural and environmental sector as milk production at a summer farm. In Valdres in 2013, 199 farmers produced milk at a summer farm during at least four weeks. As elaborated above, everyday life at Valdresian summer farms revolves around milking. Most farmers in Valdres engage in conventional milk production at the summer farm, which means they deliver the produced milk to the dairy cooperation Tine.

The grazing and milk production at Valdresian summer farms have to be seen in relation to the summer farm subsidies and hence to the specific context of Norwegian agriculture. Norwegian agriculture is characterized by a coexistence of productivist and post-productivist attitudes and practices and aimed at a multifunctional agriculture. What differentiates Norway from most comparable countries is that the maintenance of agricultural production, even in marginal areas and even if not profitable in economic terms, is an outspoken goal of Norwegian agricultural and rural policies. The argument legitimizing these policies is that the services provided by the agricultural sector are supplied most efficiently if coupled to agricultural production. Correspondingly, agricultural subsidies in Norway serve a multifunctional purpose. As elaborated in Chapter Two, the agricultural and environmental authorities conceptualize summer farming in Valdres as a multifunctional agricultural practice. It receives economic support for its maintenance of cultural landscapes including cultural heritage and biodiversity, but the requirement for receiving the support is milk production at the summer farm during at least four weeks a year. Small-scale dairy producers in Valdres are largely dependent on state support. Therefore, the summer farm subsidies are important incentives for continued primary production at Valdresian summer farms.

Moreover, small-scale farmers increasingly depend on second income sources and a common strategy is to diversify into on-farm businesses. This trend has been identified as a common feature of post-productivist agriculture as it implies economic strategies other than agricultural primary production. It furthermore marks a transition from landscapes of production to landscapes of consumption as on-farm diversification into businesses such as tourism implies the consumption of the landscape and its amenities (Rettie, 2010) or even farming itself (Heatherington, 2011). Only a fraction of Valdresian summer farms—the estimates vary between nine and thirteen percent—offer consumption-based services such as

the sale of farmstead dairy products or tourism. There is, however, an increase in summer farm-related businesses in the region. Tourism is offered at several summer farms. The concept is that of geotourism/agritourism and the experience of real farming is the product on offer. Hence, agricultural production remains a central aspect of summer farming even in the context of tourism. A second sector into which Valdresian summer farmers increasingly diversify is the production of cheese and other dairy products at the summer farm. This business development is a revival of a productive practice at Valdresian summer farms. Active agricultural production thus constitutes the basis of summer farm-related businesses in Valdres.

In conclusion, summer farming certainly exhibits features of a post-productive agricultural practice. In the view of Norwegian agricultural and environmental authorities and of the local government and tourist industry, summer farming is believed to produce a set of non-food values and exert cultural and environmental functions. Furthermore, summer farmers in Valdres increasingly diversify into farm-related businesses by offering non-food services such as tourism. However, outfield pasture grazing and milk production are (still) the key activities on Valdresian summer farms. The observed post-productive elements and processes occur in combination with primary production at the summer farms. Hence, engaging with specific rather than generalized places (Vergunst, 2012, p. 175), it appears that summer farming is a practice of primary production *and* provides services and values. Outfield pasture grazing and milk production (still) lay at the heart of summer farming in Valdres. Furthermore, the revival of summer farm cheese production as a diversification strategy adds to the notion of the summer farm as a site for agricultural primary production. Hence, the summer farming landscape exhibits features of a landscape of consumption and of production (Norbye, 2010). Its productive elements are supported through the Norwegian subsidy system that is aimed at the combined agricultural production of primary products and provision of goods and services (Tunón et al., 2014; Vergunst, 2012). In the political economy terminology of this thesis, summer farming in Valdres is a multifunctional agricultural practice; it provides a set of values and services in addition to producing milk and fodder.

Which values the farmers associate with summer farming and identify in the summer farming landscape is the subject of the following chapter.

4. The values of summer farming and of the summer farming landscape

As discussed in Chapter Two, the agrarian and the environmental sector, rural developers and the tourist industry perceive summer farming in Valdres as a multifunctional agricultural practice that produces and conserves certain values in addition to food and fibers. These actors see different cultural, social and environmental values in the summer farming landscape (Tunón et al., 2014). This chapter turns to the perspectives of the farmers. Which values do they associate with summer farming and identify in the summer farming landscape? This question is embedded in a theoretical discussion on farmers' values and attitudes in the context of the described agrarian structural change. The changing economic role of agriculture from material production to service provision and the multifunctionality of agriculture raise questions concerning the farmers' values and attitudes regarding farming. Do the farmers share the view of policy makers, rural developers and the tourist industry that summer farming not only produces food and fibers but also non-commodity social, cultural and environmental values and services? And in this context, how do they perceive the summer farming landscape?

Recalling Chapter One, the changing role of agriculture does not necessarily lead to a change in farmers' attitudes towards farming. It has been argued that farmers mostly do *not* take on a post-productivist ethos and, on the contrary, continue to exhibit productivist attitudes (Vergunst, 2012; Wilson, 2001). Others have found that some farmers do support the argument that agriculture's role in society includes more than food production and appreciate that their contribution to collective goods is acknowledged (Rønningen et al., 2004). These possibly conflicting views of the farmers show that multifunctionalism is a contested topic within the agricultural sector (ibid.).

This discussion touches on a more general theoretical debate within the sociology of agriculture about farmers' attitudes and values regarding farming and about agriculture's and farmers' roles in society. As elaborated in Chapter One, the main motivation behind farming was long thought to be (exclusively) economic (Siebert et al., 2006). This thesis has been modified to acknowledge farmers' complex value systems and diverse work ethics (Emery,

2014). A thesis that yet has to be falsified is that farmers exhibit “ethics of productivity” and are guided by a “farming ethos” (Stewart & Strathern, 2010; Wilson, 2001). These concepts imply that, according to the farmers, farming not just produces certain values but is a value in itself (Árnason et al., 2012). This notion has been identified as an important aspect of the cultural norms of farmers (Vergunst, 2012).

The general theoretical stance underlying these discussions is an actor-oriented approach to agrarian structural change (Bjørkhaug, 2012). This position implies that, in order to fully grasp what is going on in agriculture, farmers’ attitudes, motivations and values in relation to farming have to be taken into account (Duesberg et al., 2013). In the following I will thus turn to the emic perspective of the farmers regarding their summer farming practice and the summer farming landscape. In this chapter I draw mainly on the empirical data gathered in the course of ethnographic fieldwork in Valdres.

4.1. The values of summer farming

Summer farmers in Valdres consider summer farming first and foremost as a system of resource use; an agricultural practice producing food and fibers. The farmers hence associate a range of agrarian and economic values with summer farming. This attitude towards summer farming can be interpreted as an expression of a farming ethos or an ethic of productivity elaborated above (Emery, 2014; Stewart & Strathern, 2010; Vergunst, 2012; Whitehouse, 2012; Wilson, 2001). From the farmers’ perspective, the mountain pastures constitute essential agrarian resources and are important inputs for the overall farm economy. Summer farming is perceived as a way of making use of these resources by grazing. Moreover, mountain pasture grazing leaves the low-lying fields vacant and available for harvest. Some farmers furthermore harvest additional fodder and in some cases firewood at the summer farm. In this context, some farmers emphasize summer farming as an agricultural practice making use of Norwegian resources, at times alluding to Norwegian food security and self-sufficiency. As only three percent of Norwegian land is arable, utilizing the outlying mountain pastures is perceived as a strategy for producing food on domestic resources.

According to the farmers, the role of summer farming is above all to produce high quality milk. The summer farm milk is believed by the farmers to be of a higher quality than regular milk. This knowledge corresponds with scientific studies on milk from animals grazing

Valdresian mountain pastures (Sickel, 2013). The biodiversity and the specific composition of different plants in the mountain regions of Valdres have been found to increase the pasture quality and contribute to the quality of summer farm milk (*ibid.*). Summer farm milk is shown to contain high amounts of unsaturated fatty acids and antioxidants. A high concentration of carotene gives the summer farm milk a yellow shade. Farmers in Valdres are well aware of the quality of the summer farm milk and are pleased that this knowledge finally has been documented scientifically in the cited study. During my fieldwork the summer farmers referred to this study at various occasions.

As most summer farmers in Valdres are professional farmers and thus partially depend on farm economic output, they are to some extent guided by instrumental values in relation to summer farming. To them, the grazing of the mountain pastures, the milk production and the harvest of low-lying field are practices aimed *inter alia* at farm economic output. Furthermore, summer farms increasingly turn into sites for diversification into tourism and cheese production; practices aimed at additional commercial gain. Finally, the economic support farmers receive for summer farming by the state constitutes an important motivation for practicing summer farming. In sum, summer farming is perceived as a practice generating financial values, which constitutes the main motivation for practicing summer farming. This affirms the thesis of historical sources on summer farming in Valdres, which explain this practice in terms of economic and ecologic adaptation to a mountainous environment. Also contemporary studies on summer farming in Norway have emphasized this economic aspect of summer farming (Daugstad & Lunnan, 2009; Skarstad et al., 2008). However, here it is important to note that the dominant instrumental value is to make a satisfactory income and not the maximum income (Duesberg et al., 2013).

In addition to these productive values, the summer farmers associate a range of environmental, cultural and social values with summer farming.

The summer farmers in Valdres all emphasize the environmental values produced by summer farming. They know and emphasize that grazing and clearing the mountain pastures contribute to a specific vegetation and biodiversity, which is considered as an environmental value. This ecological impact of summer farming has been widely documented in Norway (Bele et al., 2011, 2013). Summer farming as an extensive agricultural practice constituted through mountain pasture grazing is thus by the farmers perceived as a sustainable form of

resource use. In this context some summer farmers allude to the globalized food system, arguing that using local resources means less import of fodder from abroad. This argument was put forward by the conventional and by the alternative farmers, even though the former tend to use more pelleted feed as they usually have more animals than the farmers processing their milk on the farm. Another environmental value summer farmers see in summer farming concerns animal welfare: animals on summer farm pastures are outside, free to move around and feed well on the healthy mountain pastures, factors believed to contribute to their well-being.

Moreover, farmers in Valdres hold that summer farming produces and sustains a set of cultural values. Summer farming is in general perceived of and represented as a “tradition”. Tradition in this context alludes to the historical continuity of this practice over several centuries or even millennia. As a traditional agricultural practice, summer farming is perceived as a cultural heritage, both material and intangible. The summer farm houses, the fences around them and other objects such as the cheese kettles or old cooling systems are emphasized as the material cultural heritage of summer farming. While most summer farmers use the old buildings, sometimes renovated, others have built new cabins. However, all of the summer farms I visited are to some extent kept in a traditional style, exhibiting old objects such as old timber or traditional craft objects such as wooden cheese molds. Some summer farmers emphasize the historical continuity of the summer farm by building and maintaining physical structures such as *skigard*, fences built in a traditional style, or an old cooling system for the milk. Furthermore, the summer farm cultural landscape, with its specific biodiversity and aesthetic qualities is perceived as a part of summer farming’s material cultural heritage.

According to the farmers, the knowledge and practices associated with summer farming constitute its intangible cultural heritage. Summer farming is perceived by the farmers as a traditional agricultural practice based on traditional knowledge and practices. These include locating the animals in the summer farming landscape, moving through this landscape, calling on the animals, collecting fodder and firewood or cooling the milk without a refrigerator. Especially emphasized as summer farming’s immaterial cultural heritage is the cheese making. The cheese makers in Valdres stressed that summer farms always have been sites for cheese production. As elaborated above, the summer farm milk was usually processed on the summer farms. When the roads were built and the creameries started to collect milk from the mountains, processing on the summer farm became rare. During the last decade, cheese

making at summer farms in Valdres has experienced a revival (Gudheim, 2013). Summer farmers have begun to take up again cheese making at the summer farm and in this regard refer to the tradition of cheese making in Valdres. Old and traditional recipes and methods are employed and this is communicated to the customers and visitors. For example, Kathrin at Olestølen learned to make brown cheese by an old *budeie*, a summer farm milkmaid. She emphasizes this circumstance to underline the ‘authenticity’ of the cheese. Not only the recipe but also the methods of cooking, stirring and molding the cheese are done strictly after the old *budeie*’s instructions. Often, the recipes vary from cheese maker to cheese maker, according to their conception of which recipe is the most traditional one. A point of contention is whether the brown cheese should consist merely of whey or if syrup and cream or milk should be added in the end. The argument revolves around which recipe is the most traditional.

One example is the *Kvit Ole*, a hard white goat cheese produced at Olestølen. When making it, Kathrin heats the milk up to 26 degrees, even if she learnt at a cheese-making workshop to heat it up to 32 degrees. Her argument is that the old *budeier* did not heat the milk to more than 26 degrees, and she aims to do it in the traditional way. Interestingly, Kathrin uses bacteria imported by post from Belgium to sour and give taste to her cheese. This foreign aspect of the cheese, however, is not perceived as flawing the cheese’s authenticity. An important impetus for the revival of cheese making in Valdres was Helge Gudheim’s book *Ysting i Valdres* (2013). In this book, cheese makers from Valdres, old and young, are presented, and their cheese making methods are documented. Through emphasizing the continuity of this practice, cheese making is explicitly represented as a traditional practice and cultural heritage. However, foreign recipes are also employed for making cheese. At Olestølen, Kathrin produces delicious *chèvre* after a French recipe. This cheese is not represented as traditional but labeled as summer farm cheese and is an important diversification strategy at the summer farm as it is a quality product in demand. Even if the cheese makers on summer farms in Valdres make great efforts to keep their cheese production as ‘traditional’ as possible, the fact that most of them produce cheese for sale puts certain restraints upon the production in terms of regulations concerning equipment and hygiene. For Kathrin, this sometimes constitutes a moral dilemma when she has to opt for a less traditional method in order to conform to the regulations of The Norwegian Food Safety Authority.

As holders of summer farm-related knowledge and performers of summer farm practices, the summer farmers to a certain extent view themselves as *kulturbærere*, “carriers of culture”.

This became apparent when the summer farmers talked about other summer farmers. For instance, Kathrin told me that Katharina at Sparstadstølen is an important carrier of culture, referring to her traditional mode of cheese production. In this regard, some farmers see it as an important part of their summer farming practice to convey their traditional agrarian, cultural and gastronomic knowledge to others. As elaborated above, it is quite common at summer farms in Valdres to take in volunteers who either plan on starting their own farm or cheese production or who are just interested in farming. Also in this practice the summer farmers see themselves as passing on valuable ‘traditions’ and know-how that constitute the cultural heritage of summer farming. As summer farming is perceived as a valuable tradition, an important motivation for the summer farmers is to continue this tradition. This confirms the findings of Daugstad et al. that summer farmers in Norway emphasize the cultural and traditional aspects of summer farming (Daugstad et al., 2014).

Finally, the farmers associate several social values with summer farming: summer farming and related activities are important sources of recreation and well-being for the farmers. To Vigdis and her husband at Rognåstrøe, their summer farm is like a cabin. Cabin life constitutes an important aspect of the dominant Norwegian culture. The cabins are usually located in nature and used for recreational purposes. Vigdis told me that she and her husband could not leave the farm during summer and travel or go to a cabin as they have to take care of their farm and the animals. Summer farming allows them to spend the summer in the mountains without neglecting their livestock. It thus constitutes a welcomed break from everyday life at the farm. Also Ole-Jacob at Vikarbråten pointed to the summer farm’s meaning as a place for recreation and peace. He considers himself lucky to be able to live and work during summer in an area that other people seek for recreational purposes and for being in nature.

Social anthropologist Norbye (2010) found that *stillhet* and *fred og ro* (silence, peace and quiet) are important aspects of summer farm life in Hallingdal, a finding that I can confirm based on my own data from Valdres. The summer farmers often contrast the quiet and peaceful summer farm life with the busy life down at the farm. The summer farm is cherished for its relative disconnectedness due to its location and detachment from the Internet and mobile networks. At the Olestølen, the *sel* is a *mobilfri sone*, a “cell phone-free zone”, mostly to the astonishment of visiting children and to the delight of their parents. However, this relative detachment from the outside world is increasingly being replaced by connectivity. As

most summer farms in Valdres today are accessible by car, summer farmers frequently run errands such as shopping or transporting the children to after school activities while living on the summer farm. The term *turbobudeie*, or turbo-milk maid, is sometimes used to describe the summer farmers commuting between the farm and the summer farm. The term has both positive and negative connotations: mobility makes life on the summer farm easier but also restricts the peace and quiet of summer farm life. Another social value that farmers associate with summer farming is the maintenance of small-scale milk production in the region. As elaborated above, summer farm closure is a result of the decline in small-scale dairy production in Valdres (Skarstad et al., 2008). Thus, the farmers perceive active summer farming as a sign of continued small-scale farming in Valdres.

In conclusion, the farmers associate a range of values with summer farming. First and foremost summer farming is perceived an agricultural practice producing high-quality milk and fodder. This accords with similar findings from other summer farming regions in Norway (Daugstad et al., 2014; Tunón et al., 2014). Furthermore, it is believed to produce and conserve a set of environmental, cultural and social values. The summer farmers thus exhibit different attitudes and values in relation to summer farming. Yet, the basic attitude among the farmers I met can be termed as an ethic of productivity (Whitehouse, 2012) and an expression of “productive values” (ibid.); summer farming is perceived and valued primarily as an agriculturally productive practice. This became obvious to me the day I was talking with Kathrin about the neighboring farm. The woman who owns the summer farm and who spent her summers there as a child now runs a riding business at Beitostølen. During summer she organizes riding trips in the area around the summer farm. Groups of tourists ride from Beitostølen to the summer farm where they are served a meal at the summer farm before a bus collects them and returns them to Beitostølen. According to Kathrin, this business is very successful. She told me that she and Thomas would probably earn more money through pure tourist business at the summer farm than through milk production. However, for her and Thomas, not engaging in agricultural production at the summer farm is out of the question. The whole point of what they are doing there, she told me, is to harvest the outlying mountain pastures to produce quality food. Capitalizing on the summer farm life and the summer farming landscape without actually using the resources in agricultural production would be pointless in her opinion. This episode is an indicator of the farmers’ strong ethics of productivity in relation to summer farming. To them, summer farming is above all a productive agricultural practice and its role is to produce high quality food. The multiple

values produced and conserved by summer farming are externalities, that is, positive spin-offs of agricultural production. Without agricultural production these additional valuable outcomes would be lost and summer farming as such would lose its value. This confirms the findings of Rønningen et al. (2004, p. 1), who in a study about the legitimacy of multifunctionality in the Norwegian agricultural sector conclude that “the greatest legitimacy within the agricultural sector is still the “traditional farmer role”, seeing the farmer mainly as a food producer and collective goods as by-products”.

4.2. The perception of the summer farming landscape

The farmers’ values and attitudes regarding summer farming are expressed in their perceptions of the summer farm landscape (Daugstad et al., 2014; Vergunst, 2012; Whitehouse, 2012). In regard to the overall question of this chapter, in the following the farmers’ perception of the summer farm landscape will be explored. Three narratives about the landscape I encountered during my fieldwork will be presented and subsequently analyzed.

The first narrative concerns the emergence of the summer farming landscape. Farmers in general perceive it as a traditional landscape. The notion of traditional is in this context used by the farmers to point to the constitution of this landscape through centuries or even millennia of summer farming, alluding to its temporal nature. The farmers explained how different attributes in the landscape are the results of summer farming. The open pasturelands are perceived as results of the trampling and grazing of animals as well as of the collection of firewood. The absence of juniper in the summer farm landscape is explained as a result of the traditional use of juniper for heating the cheese kettles. The neat and cleared infield pastures around the *sel* are seen as results of the harvest of these fields. Through practicing summer farming (taking the livestock to graze the mountain pastures, clearing the pastures from bushes and trees, maintaining the buildings) the farmers see themselves as carrying on the tradition and thus constituting the summer farming landscape. The farmers moreover see the conservation and constitution of the summer farm landscape as part of their task as farmers. They often expressed the importance of *landskapsskjøtsel*, the tending of the landscape. This is, according to the farmers, most efficiently done through agricultural production – that is, through summer farming. Kathrin and Thomas, for example, emphasize that a reason why they have goats on their summer farm is that these are effective tenders of the landscape

because they eat the young birches and shrubberies, while “cows just eat grass”. Hence, the summer farm landscape is not perceived as static and as existing outside of human practice. Rather, it is understood as emerging through the work and daily rhythms of the farmers (Whitehouse, 2012). The emic term *stølslandskapet*, the summer farming landscape, thus implies a landscape constituted by summer farming and, as such, implies a landscape of production.

The second set of narratives concerns the values the farmers identify in the summer farming landscape. In general, the farmers value the resources inherent in the summer farming landscape in terms of pastures for grazing. Where outsiders see an aesthetically appealing landscape with a wide view, the farmers see abundant grazing grounds. Plain areas without wetlands and free of trees and shrubberies are identified as particularly valuable as they are perceived as good grazing grounds. In addition to these agrarian values, the farmers moreover identify a range of non-economic environmental and cultural values in the summer farming landscape. On the one hand, these are intangible cultural values: the traditional knowledge and practices that constitute summer farming and produce this specific landscape. This knowledge and these practices, on the other hand, materialize in physical cultural values: in structures such as fences or farmsteads and in the general appearance of the landscape. The grazed and cleared landscape again constitutes the environmental values identified in the landscape: the specific biodiversity that is perceived as a result of long-term livestock trampling and grazing and of the clearing of trees and juniper.

The third narrative in which the farmers’ perception of the landscape and their attitudes towards summer farming are expressed concerns *gjengroing*. This word refers to the regrowth and reforestation of the landscape. The summer farm landscape is undergoing great changes due to the decline in summer farming. Declining trampling and grazing pressure accompanied by decreasing clearing and deforestation leads to regrowth of the outlying mountain pasturelands. This development is causing great concern among summer farmers as it is perceived as a disappearance of the traditional summer farming landscape. Without exception, these landscape changes are considered as negative. The farmers speak of the invasion of juniper and birches and their colonization of the summer farming pastures. Mainly the landscape changes are referred to in aesthetical terms as a loss of view. This discourse thus also contains the aesthetical valuation of the open summer farming landscape. Pastures free of shrubberies and trees are perceived as beautiful. Grazing animals and specific plants found in

the grazed pastures further embellish the picture. Correspondingly, the farmers do not find an overgrown landscape aesthetically appealing. Furthermore, the farmers express concerns that the regrowth results in the loss of the biodiversity traditionally identified in the summer farming landscape. Kathrin, for instance, showed me how the advancing juniper creates shadow, which impedes the growth of specific plants traditionally found in the summer farming landscape. The regrowth is moreover perceived as a loss of cultural heritage and an expression of the loss of the traditional know-how that constitutes summer farming. According to the farmers, ceasing agricultural production at the summer farm thus not only results in the disappearance of valuable agrarian resources, but also in a loss of environmental and cultural values traditionally identified in the summer farming landscape. The farmers relate the regrowth of the summer farming landscape to external structural factors (Whitehouse, 2012). They are well aware that farm closure leads to a decline in summer farming. Thus, the regrowth of the landscape is perceived as an expression of the precarious economic situation of small-scale dairy farming. Some farmers in this regard alluded to what they consider an irony regarding regrowth. In their view, the national and local governments consider the summer farming cultural landscape – a valuable cultural and natural heritage that should be conserved. However, the difficult economic situation in small-scale dairy farming, which the farmers to some extent blame on Norwegian politicians, forces many farmers to exit the industry, resulting in the regrowth of this landscape. Hence, in the view of the farmers, the same politicians who say they want to conserve the summer farming landscape are to be blamed for its disappearance.

The farmers' perception of the landscape expressed in these narratives can be explained in terms of their "productive relationship" (Whitehouse, 2012) with the land. Recalling Chapter One, it has been argued that "it is within a meshwork of mutual constitution that people view, read, feel and narrate landscape." (Whitehouse, 2012, p. 161). Landscapes are hence relational (ibid.); their value lies in the eyes of the beholder. This implies that the farmers' experiences and identity as farmers working the landscape, expressed in their farming ethos (Stewart & Strathern, 2010), determines how they perceive the landscape and the values they identify in it (Okeley, 2001; Whitehouse, 2012). Their active engagement with the land through agricultural production determines their perception of the landscape that moves beyond simple aestheticism (Okeley, 2001). In this regard, anthropologists have found that farmers tend to see the agricultural landscape as a landscape of production. The notion of seeing here refers to the embodied understanding of a landscape from within that landscape (ibid.).

As argued above, to the farmers, summer farming is first and foremost a practice of agricultural production and the summer farming landscape a landscape of production. The farmers' aesthetical appraisal of the open landscape is thus rooted in a deeper relationship to the resources it contains in terms of grazing grounds. This circumstance can be illustrated by an example from my fieldwork. One afternoon I was talking to Anne and Gudrun at Heimre Hedalsstølen about the regrowth of the landscape. I thought the regrowth was perceived negatively because it meant the loss of a traditional landscape. However, the sisters framed the regrowth as a loss of grazing ground for their cows. As cows mainly eat grass, shrubberies and birches make it difficult for them to graze. They have to walk longer distances in order to find sufficient amounts of fodder. Furthermore, the shrubberies tend to scratch open the cows' udders and can thus compromise the animals' health. Anne and Gudrun's appraisal of an open landscape is thus grounded in their valuation of the resources an open landscape provides in terms of pasture. It is in essence a valuation of agriculturally productive land (Stacul, 2010; Whitehouse, 2012). Thus, to the farmers, the regrowth of the landscape means a loss of the agrarian resources inherent in this landscape. This confirms the findings of previous studies on summer farming in Norway (Daugstad et al., 2014; Tunón et al., 2014). Daugstad et al. (2014) argued that regrowth is causing economic concerns among summer farmers as it is perceived as a loss of nutritious and good pastures. The disapproval of the regrowth is thus an expression of a fundamental sense of loss; the loss of important resources and of an agriculturally productive landscape. From the 'production' viewpoint of the farmers, the regrowth represents the degradation of agriculturally productive land (Stacul, 2010). This confirms findings from other anthropologists (Vergunst, 2012; Whitehouse, 2012) who argue that the cultural norms of farmers include an appreciation for the agricultural productive landscape and hence a disapproval of unproductive land represented by regrowth.

The farmers' farming ethos can furthermore explain why the cultural and environmental landscape values are perceived as lost when agricultural production ceases. The farming ethos implies a conventional conception of farming as a practice first and foremost producing food and fibers (Vergunst, 2012). Hence, the environmental and cultural values identified in the summer farming landscape are perceived as externalities of agricultural production. Outfield pasture grazing and human activity at the summer farm is the very basis for upholding the range of values found in the summer farming landscape (Tunón et al., 2014). The moment

milk production at the summer farm ceases and the pastures lay fallow, the values the farmers see in the summer farming landscape are lost.

Moreover, the farmers' perception of the landscape expresses a strong ethic of productivity (Whitehouse, 2012). The summer farming landscape is believed to emerge through the agricultural practice of summer farming. Hence, the landscape is seen as an expression of the productive labor of the farmer – or lack thereof. The open landscape is perceived as an expression of the farmers' productive values. Likewise, the overgrown summer farming landscape is interpreted as an expression of the difficult economic situation of small-scale dairy producers and a decay of the farmers' productive values. This means that the aesthetical appreciation of the open landscape in essence is an appraisal of the productive labor that kept and keeps the landscape open (Vergunst, 2012; Whitehouse, 2012). Juniper and birches are not considered beautiful because they are perceived as a neglect of the farmers' productive values. The idea of how the landscape should be is thus bound up with ideas and attitudes towards farming and the farmers' role (Árnason et al., 2012). In conclusion, the farmers' ethics of productivity result in an aesthetic of productivity.

4.3. The conveyance of summer farming's multiple values

In the previous subchapters it was argued that even though the farmers do associate a range of cultural, environmental and social values with summer farming and the summer farm landscape, this practice and the landscape it constitutes are viewed primarily in terms of agricultural production. In their communication with visitors to the summer farm, consumers and with the broader public, however, the farmers emphasize summer farming's cultural, environmental and social values, thus pointing to its multiple functions.

One example is the marketing of the summer farm milk by Tine. Until recently, Valdresian summer farm milk was not distinguished from conventional milk in the Tine product line (see Chapter Three). In 2013, the milk label *TineMjølkk frå stølar i Valdres Lettmjølkk* (TineMilk from summer farms in Valdres Light milk) was launched. This process was initiated by the dairy cooperation Tine. *TineMjølkk frå stølar i Valdres* presents the milk explicitly as summer farm milk to the consumers. Its package design points to the cultural heritage aspect of summer farming, as well as to the environmental benefits of this agricultural practice. A short text emphasizes the historical continuity of summer farming, representing it as a traditional

agricultural practice constituting a cultural heritage. The photos of meadow flowers and cows grazing the mountain pastures point to the cow's welfare and to the biodiversity associated with summer farming.

As elaborated in Chapter Two, *Norsk seterkultur*, the Norwegian summer farmers' association, is currently making efforts to establish a trademark for summer farm products (Norsk Seterkultur, 2015). This endeavor is supported by *Valdres Kultur- og Naturpark* (Valdres, 2015). According to Katharina Sparstad, responsible for the project within *Norsk Seterkultur* and consultant in *Valdres Kultur- og Naturpark*, the aim is to make summer farm products available for consumers and, in a second step, compensate the farmers economically for producing high quality milk, a subject that will be dealt with below. Sparstad pointed out that a summer farm trademark would distinguish summer farm milk from common milk by emphasizing the cultural and environmental aspects of summer farming as well as to the increased gastronomic value of milk from summer farm pastures. In her opinion, such a trademark would convey to the consumers the multiple values of summer farming. The *Valdresmerket/Merkevaren Valdres* (see Chapter Two) is a similar attempt to call attention to the cultural and environmental values believed to constitute summer farm products through labeling.

Furthermore, the communication of summer farming's cultural and environmental values is an important aspect of on-farm sale of summer farm products and of summer farm tourism (see chapters 3.2 and 3.3). The farmers hope to convey the cultural and environmental values they associate with summer farming by letting the visitors see and experience summer farming as a traditional mode of production constituting a valuable cultural landscape and by talking to them about the summer farm mode of production. The *Åpen Støl* at Olestølen provides a good example in this regard (see chapter 3.3.4). Farmers Thomas and Kathrin show the visitors around at the summer farm while they tell them about different aspects of summer farming. When the visitors are invited in to the *sel* to taste the products, Kathrin introduces every product and talks about its production. The traditional know-how and the historical continuity of summer farming are emphasized, as are the environmental aspects such as the animal welfare and the biodiversity conserved through mountain pasture grazing. The aim of Kathrin and Thomas is that the consumers of the summer farm products become aware of the multiple values the farmers associate with summer farming. Furthermore, some farmers receive voluntary workers (and anthropologists) in order to convey the values they

associate with farming and summer farming, or point to these values on their homepages or facebook sites.

The farmers' emphasis on the multiple functions of summer farming follows the same logic as the multifunctionality discourse described in chapter 1.3.1 and Chapter Two. Summer farming is represented not merely as an agricultural practice producing milk, but as a practice producing and maintaining cultural and environmental values. According to the farmers, its function thus spans beyond the mere production of food to include cultural and environmental functions. The findings and discussions of the previous chapters offer two interpretations of the farmer's efforts to communicate the values they associate with summer farming.

Firstly, emphasizing the multiple values associated with summer farming is a strategy to enhance the economic value of the summer farm products. Summer farm products are marketed as products with environmental, social and cultural value added. The farmers try to convey these values to the consumers of their products and to capitalize on them (Paxson, 2010). The implicit argument is that the commercial value of summer farm products is derived from the non-economic (cultural, environmental, social) values that constitute them (ibid.). Taking the difficult economic situation of Norwegian small-scale dairy farmers into account (see Chapter Two), this value adding strategy appears as rational economic behavior. Furthermore, in emphasizing the cultural, environmental and social values of summer farm products, the farmers respond to a changing market and consumer demands for value added products (see chapter 2.2.4).

Secondly, emphasizing the values associated with summer farming can be interpreted as an effort to legitimize and hence maintain summer farming as an agricultural productive practice. The farmers stress that the basis for the cultural, environmental and social values associated with summer farming and the summer farming landscape is active milk production at the summer farm. Thus, by emphasizing the multiple valuable outcomes of summer farming, summer farming as such is legitimized (Rønningen et al., 2004). As elaborated in Chapter Two, this argument is the rationale behind the multifunctionality discourse in Norwegian agricultural policies. Such an interpretation would moreover be sustained by Minnich's argument regarding the instrumentalization of summer farming's cultural heritage in the face of summer farm decline in the Alps (Minnich, 1989). He argues that the cultural heritage

aspect of summer farming is emphasized only in farming communities where summer farming is declining and is used as a legitimation for its maintenance.

However, the conveyance of the non-food values inherent in summer farming and its landscape at times presents a paradox (Bringslid, 2012) to the farmers. Norwegian anthropologist Bringslid has coined the term “*bygdeutviklingas paradox*” (2012), the paradox of rural development, which points to the tension that can result from the staging and marketing of “authentic” practices and ways of life. Over-communicating the cultural heritage aspects of for instance an agricultural practice can undermine the authenticity of that practice when it is marketed as merely a tradition and not an actual (modern) way of life. In this regard, Thomas at Olestølen expressed his concern that overemphasizing the cultural heritage aspects of summer farming might undermine its true essence. To him, summer farming constitutes a mode of agricultural production. The cultural heritage values associated with summer farming are in his eyes externalities of agricultural production and would be lost if production was to cease. This has to be seen as an expression of the farmers’ productive relationship with summer farming (Whitehouse, 2012) and their farming ethos, discussed above. Without agricultural production, the cultural and environmental values associated with this practice are lost, according to the farmers. Therefore, even if the farmers invest time and effort in communicating the cultural values they associate with summer farming, they simultaneously emphasize that “*det er slik vi lever*”: this is how we live. They try to convey that summer farming is an actual form of agricultural production that constitutes an important part of their livelihood.

4.4. Concluding remarks

The farmers value summer farming and its landscape first and foremost in productive terms (Vergunst, 2012; Whitehouse, 2012). To the farmers, active agricultural production lies at the heart of summer farming. It is perceived as an agricultural practice producing high-quality milk, and the summer farming landscape is understood as a landscape of production (Stacul, 2010). The farmers principally perceive themselves as farmers and milk producers. This can be conceptualized in terms of a farming ethos or the ethic of productivity (Bryden, 2010; Stewart & Strathern, 2010). Farming to some extent constitutes the livelihood of the summer farmers, which is why it is valued above “post-farming” (Vergunst, 2012). This finding is especially interesting in the light of the political and economic concepts of the changing

economic role of agriculture, discussed in Chapter One, and the restructuring of Norwegian agriculture explored in Chapter Two. To the farmers, primary production lies at the heart of agriculture, even though the political and economic context would imply otherwise. Inherent in this perception of summer farming primarily in productive terms is a potential critique to multifunctionalist conceptualizations of summer farming, which give priority to the cultural and social values produced and maintained by this practice (Bringslid, 2012; Heller, 2011). To the farmers, summer farming is much more than a cultural heritage with environmental benefits. It is an agricultural practice constituting an important part of their livelihood as farmers.

However, in addition to producing high-quality milk, the farmers view summer farming as an agricultural practice with various environmental, cultural and social functions. Though not articulated as such, the farmers thus perceive summer farming as a multifunctional agricultural practice.

While farmers in some cases criticize the over-emphasis on summer farming's multiple functions, the values associated with summer farming are underlined and communicated to outsiders, such as visitors and tourists (Paxson, 2010). On the one hand, this is the case when the cultural and environmental values associated with summer farming can add to the economic value of summer farm products. On the other hand, emphasizing the values associated with summer farming can be interpreted as an effort to legitimize and hence maintain summer farming as an agriculturally productive practice.

5. Summary and outlook

This thesis set out to explore why farmers in Valdres engage in summer farming, on the one hand, by exploring how the structural conditions of Norwegian agriculture influence summer farming and, on the other hand, by analyzing the practices and perceptions of the farmers in this context. These issues were discussed in relation to the conceptualizations of agriculture's changing economic role. At the outset of the thesis, three objectives were established to approach this subject.

The first aim, pursued in Chapter Two, was to contextualize summer farming in Valdres and to explore how current developments in Norwegian agriculture influence this practice. The analysis was embedded in the theoretical discussion on agrarian restructuring and the changing economic role of farming. The basic assumption behind this approach is that farming is increasingly defined by external political and economic structures, and that identifying these provides important answers as to why summer farming is practiced in Valdres today. Chapter Two not only provided an (etic) explanation of why summer farming makes sense in regard to these structural conditions, but also explored how summer farming is conceptualized in agrarian and environmental policy documents and by rural developers. It thus presented an outsider's perspective on summer farming.

A major finding of Chapter Two was that Norwegian agricultural policies are characterized by a coexistence of productivism and multifunctionalism, and that contemporary Norwegian agricultural practices exhibit both productivist and multifunctionalist features. Protectionism is a still defining feature of Norwegian agricultural policies. A main goal of these policies is to maintain agricultural production throughout the country, an issue that is part of the rural development agenda of preventing centralization. However, in the context of globalization and neoliberalization, the country is increasingly being tied to international trade agreements and the protectionist agricultural model has come under pressure. In this context, productivism (or neo-productivism) has been identified as one of the major trends defining Norwegian agricultural policies and practices. Agricultural production is increasingly outsourced, whereas domestic farms are becoming more industrialized and specialized as they increase in size. In this process, smaller and less efficient farms are forced out of the sector.

Simultaneously, Norwegian agrarian policies have since the 1970s emphasized the multifunctionality of agriculture. The argument that agriculture produces a range of positive externalities and therefore is valuable to society beyond the mere production of food and fibers has led to a revaluation of marginalized farming. In this context, the Norwegian agricultural sector is increasingly exhibiting post-productivist features. On the one hand, in line with the multifunctionalism of Norwegian agrarian policies, farms are being economically and otherwise supported for their environmental and cultural functions. In accordance with the aim of rural and agrarian policies to maintain active farming across the country, this support is mainly coupled with agricultural production. Agricultural multifunctionality is thus emphasized in order to legitimize continued state funding for and protection of the agrarian sector both in the domestic and international contexts. On the other hand, the state promotes business development based on farm-related resources, which increasingly constitutes an important diversification strategy for Norwegian farmers. This trend concurs with growing market demand for green products and services such as ecotourism or locally produced specialty foods.

It was argued throughout Chapter Two that these conditions are important for understanding summer farming in Valdres today. On the one hand, the continuity of productivism in Norwegian agricultural policies and the advantage of productivist farming in the context of a globalized and neoliberal food market impose restrictions on summer farming in Valdres. Summer farms are always part of individual farm systems, and in Valdres these are exclusively small-scale and to a large extent dependent on state subsidies and additional sources of income. Increasing economic pressures on small-scale dairy producers has resulted in a substantial decline of summer farms in Valdres and beyond. On the other hand, an important finding of Chapter Two is that summer farming in Valdres has experienced a revaluation in the context of multifunctionalism and the integration of agriculture into larger rural development objectives. Summer farming is viewed as a multifunctional practice, producing a set of valuable externalities in addition to producing milk. National and regional governments support summer farming economically for its cultural and environmental functions. Economic support for agriculture's non-food outputs has frequently been conceptualized as a turn towards a post-productivist agrarian sector. In the case of summer farming in Valdres, however, state support does not bring about a post-productivist agricultural practice since the support is coupled with active milk production at the summer farm. The promotion and support of summer farming must be seen as a policy measure

targeted at a multifunctional agricultural practice, simultaneously producing milk as well as cultural and environmental externalities that are deemed as valuable. Moreover, summer farming in Valdres has experienced a revaluation due to its potential for regional value added and hence its importance for rural development. In this context, summer farms are promoted as an integral part of the Valdresian cultural and natural heritage, and value-adding practices based on these cultural and environmental aspects of summer farming are supported. Emphasis is put on diversification into summer farm-related businesses, mainly through tourism and the production of processed dairy products. This development coincides with increasing consumer demand for ecotourism and local and traditional food. Chapter Two concluded that while agrarian restructuring puts restraints on Valdresian summer farming, changing agricultural policies and market demands simultaneously provide new opportunities for this agricultural practice.

Summer farming is usually explained in terms of ecological adaptation to a mountainous environment. Throughout Chapter Two, it was, however, argued that attending to the political and economic conditions of Norwegian agriculture generates new and crucial insights into why summer farming is practiced in Valdres today. The major finding presented in Chapter Two was that the focus on agriculture's multifunctionality leads to a revaluation of summer farming. Its multiple functions provide farmers with new economic opportunities that contribute to the viability of this agricultural practice.

The discussions in Chapter Two have implications for the political economy conceptualizations of agrarian change applied and discussed in this thesis. Post-productivism and post-productivity are indeed unsuitable for describing Norwegian agriculture, as a continuation of productivist policies and practices is observable in the agrarian sector. In this regard, multifunctionalism and multifunctionality are better conceptualizations of Norwegian agricultural policies and practices. As analytical terms, however, productivism and post-productivism have proven to be convenient as they illuminate two different aspects of agriculture that, as argued, exist side by side. Furthermore, the findings in Chapter Two indicated that although the discourse and policies of post-productivism and multifunctionalism have been rightfully criticized for being assets of a neoliberal turn in agricultural policies and for contributing to the marginalization of small-scale farming, in some cases they provide such farming with new (economic) opportunities. Especially in times of economic marginalization of small-scale farming, these should not be ignored. This means

that the analytical concepts of post-productivism and multifunctionalism should include the notion of the possible supportive effects of multifunctionalist and post-productivist agrarian policies and practices, provided that they are applied critically and remain sensitive to specific contexts. In this regard, the findings from Valdres indicate that these terms should be attentive to the issues of rural development, value addition and state subsidies.

Moving from the macro- to the micro-level, Chapter Three explored the farmers' practices and strategies in the context of the structural conditions of agriculture in Norway, analyzed in Chapter Two. The unit of analysis was the economic processes at specific summer farms. The literature on agriculture in advanced economies suggests that farming's economic role is reconfigured in the course of agrarian restructuring. A common theory is that economic pressures, changing markets, and post-productivist and multifunctionalist discourses and policies lead to a reorientation away from primary production toward the provision of post-productive agricultural services. This implies a shift in emphasis from production to consumption in the agrarian sector. Keeping in mind the multiple functions of summer farming, this thesis suggests that summer farming might be changing from being a practice of agricultural primary production to becoming a post-productive practice, and that the summer farming landscape is becoming a landscape of consumption rather than that of production. The findings of Chapter Two seem to partly support this claim, as summer farming is increasingly conceptualized as a multifunctional agricultural practice supported and promoted for its environmental and cultural functions. Chapter Three thus set out to test this claim by exploring the economic processes on summer farms on the basis of the empirical data gathered during fieldwork in Valdres.

In Chapter Three, it was argued that mountain pasture grazing, and milk and cheese production—all practices of production—constitute the central economic processes at Valdresian summer farms. All farmers emphasized that the main motivation behind summer farming is to exploit the agrarian resources offered by the mountains in terms of pastures. Taking the livestock to graze on the summer farm pastures furthermore allows for the harvesting of low-lying fields during summer. In this regard, summer farming can still be explained in part as an ecological adaptation to a mountainous environment. Chapter Three showed that milk production was the defining practice of summer farming in Valdres. The life and work on summer farms revolve around milking, which the farmers emphasized as the central aspect of summer farming. Without milk production, no summer farming, a farmer

told me. Moreover, cheese production is being taken up again by several Valdresian summer farmers. Another incentive, in the structural sense, for milk production at the summer farm is the summer farm subsidies, which constitute an important part of the income for small-scale dairy producers. In sum, different productive practices constitute the main economic processes of contemporary Valdresian summer farms. It follows from this that summer farming in Valdres (still) constitutes a practice of primary production and thus cannot be conceptualized as a post-productive agricultural practice. Accordingly, taking the individual summer farms as the unit of analysis, the summer farming landscape constitutes a landscape of production.

Turning to distribution, the vast majority of summer farmers in Valdres are engaged in conventional milk production, delivering their summer farm milk to the dairy cooperation Tine. This further supports the claim that summer farming in most cases is a practice of primary agricultural production and not a provider of post-productive services. The farmers who process milk at the summer farm, however, mostly sell it there.

The summer farm becomes a place of consumption when visitors and tourists come to buy farm products, engage in recreational activities in the summer farming landscape or seek to experience “real” summer farm life in the course of tourist activities. Consumption is thus tied to the supply of farm products and activities on the summer farm. This consumption, however, always takes place in addition to the agricultural production on the summer farm. The farmers promote summer farm tourism based on active agricultural production (outfield pasture grazing, milk production and in some cases cheese production) on the summer farm. Moreover, the majority of Valdresian farmers do not engage in summer farm business development such as tourism or on-farm milk processing. On regular farms without new business development, the consumption of the landscape or of agriculture itself is not taking place.

Thus, the major finding of Chapter Three is that summer farms in Valdres are primarily places of production. Even if the farmers increasingly turn to post-productive strategies on their summer farms by offering tourism or selling farmstead products, these activities are based on active agricultural production on the summer farms. Such summer farms are thus places of both production and consumption (Norbye, 2012). This finding refutes the notion that marginal farming with potential for new business development merely turns into a post-

productive practice providing services for city dwellers and that the agricultural landscape turns into a landscape of consumption in the course of agrarian restructuring. The data presented in this thesis show that even if summer farmers are increasingly turning to post-productive strategies and even if summer farming is increasingly supported for its post-productive functions, primary agricultural production based on the exploitation of mountain pastures remains the central economic process on Valdresian summer farms.

On a conceptual level, this implies that the concept of post-productivity is certainly useful for understanding recent developments in Valdresian summer farming. When the notion of production is excluded entirely, however, the concept is of no use for understanding this agricultural practice. Likewise, the concepts of landscapes of production and landscapes of consumption proved useful for understanding the economic processes of Valdresian summer farms. However, being conceptualized as a dualism, they obscure the fact that summer farms are places of both production and consumption. The findings imply that the notion of consumption is most relevant in relation to farm-related business development, but should not be applied uncritically to all marginalized farming. In the context of agrarian structural change, concepts such as landscapes of consumption need to be sensitive toward the scale and unit of analysis in order not to reduce complex realities.

Based on these findings, it was argued in Chapter Three that apart from being an ecological adaptation to the mountainous environment, summer farming in Valdres must also be seen in some cases as an adaptation to the structural conditions of Norwegian agriculture. In the face of financial pressures in the small-scale dairy sector, the summer farm subsidies constitute a much-needed source of income and are thus an important incentive for practicing summer farming. Furthermore, diversification into summer farm-related businesses constitutes an economic strategy of adaptation to challenging economic conditions. The farmers take advantage of summer farming's multiple functions as sources for value added, and of a changing market in which the demand for farmstead products and farm-related experiences is increasing. However, even though the theses regarding agrarian structural change would suggest otherwise, only a handful of Valdresian farmers engage in summer farm based business development. The findings of Chapter Two regarding the opportunities provided by the multifunctionalist and post-productivist policies to summer farming in Valdres must thus be relativized on the basis of the findings of Chapter Three. The data from fieldwork on Valdresian summer farms show that summer farming remains first and foremost a practice of

primary agricultural production. In cases where farmers take economic advantage of summer farming's post-productive elements, this is always in combination with milk production and, in some cases, cheese production on the summer farms.

Here, a topic emerges that was only briefly touched upon in this thesis. Several farmers pointed out that they do not wish to or lack the resources to diversify or to convey the cultural and environmental values linked to summer farming. In their opinion, the multifunctional rural and agricultural policies are beneficial only to those who are willing and able to engage in practices of value added and of communicating summer farming's multiple functions. In this regard, it would be interesting to explore who benefits from the multifunctionalist agricultural and rural policies. The data from my fieldwork suggest that farmers with alternative farming styles are the ones most likely to profit from such policies, as they seem to place more emphasis than conventional farmers on agriculture's multiple functions.

A central issue in the discussion of agrarian structural change is the farmers' values and attitudes towards farming and their perceptions of the agricultural landscape in the context of the changing economic role of farming. Chapter Two, which focused on the perspectives of the agrarian and environmental sectors, the tourist sector and that of rural developers, concluded that summer farming experiences a revaluation based on its multiple functions, with post-productive values gaining in importance. The aim of Chapter Four was to explore the farmers' perspectives on summer farming and the summer farming landscape—i.e. the values the farmers associate with summer farming and identify in the summer farming landscape.

A major finding of this thesis is that the farmers view summer farming primarily as an agricultural productive practice by which the mountain pastures are exploited to produce high-quality milk. In Chapter Four, the observations from Chapter Three were combined with the accounts by the farmers and data from participant observation to argue that they associate a range of agrarian and economic values with summer farming. To the farmers, summer farming constitutes first and foremost a practice of primary agricultural production. Hence, in their view, the rationale behind summer farming is principally ecological and economical: it is about exploiting the resources located in the outlying mountain pastures to produce high-quality milk, while at the same time relieving the low-lying fields from grazing pressure to enable their harvest. The motivation behind summer farming is thus to a large extent

instrumental. That the farmers emphasize summer farming's productive elements confirms the thesis of the farmers' ethos in times of agrarian structural change. Even if summer farming in some cases is changing from being merely a practice of primary production to increasingly incorporating service provision, and even if it is valued for its cultural and environmental externalities in addition to milk production, the farmers (still) perceive summer farming as an agricultural practice of food production, and see their role first and foremost as that of food producers.

The farmers emphasize that summer farming produces and maintains a set of cultural, social and environmental values. These values, however, are perceived as externalities of agricultural production on the farm—i.e. mountain pasture grazing and summer farm milk and cheese production. According to the farmers, these values would be lost if agricultural production on the summer farm was to cease. Summer farming is thus perceived by the farmers as a multifunctional agricultural practice, its main and basic function being primary agricultural production based on the exploitation of mountain pastures.

Finally, it was argued that the farmers attempt to convey the values they associate with summer farming to visitors to the summer farms and to consumers of their products and of summer farm experiences. The farmers emphasize that outfield pasture grazing and summer farm milk production are first and foremost practices of food production. Furthermore, they communicate that grazing and dairy production on the summer farms produces and maintains a set of cultural and environmental values. The farmers' emphasis on the multiple values they associate with summer farming can be interpreted as a strategy of adding to the economic value of the summer farm products and hence as an economic strategy in the face of economic pressures in the agrarian sector. Moreover, it may be interpreted as a way of legitimizing summer farming, a practice that is not viable in mere economic terms. In both cases, the emphasis on and the communication of summer farming's multiple functions and its multiple valuable outcomes can be seen as strategies of adaptation to challenging economic conditions in Norwegian small-scale agriculture.

The multiple values produced and maintained by summer farming, and hence summer farming's multifunctionality, were particularly emphasized by the farmers who engage in new business development on their summer farms, such as tourism and on-farm cheese production and distribution. This can be seen as a strategy of adding to the economic value of their

products, as consumers increasingly demand products and activities with environmental and cultural value added.

It was further argued that the farmers perceive the summer farming landscape as being constituted and maintained by their productive work. Hence, it is perceived as a landscape of production. The open landscape is valued because it constitutes a productive landscape, expressing the farmer's productive values. Correspondingly, the farmers dislike the overgrown landscape, because they perceive it as a loss of nutritious pastures. In some cases, overgrowth is perceived as an expression of the decay of the farmers' productive values. Moreover, the farmers relate the regrowth of the summer farming landscape to external factors and view it as an expression of the difficult economic situation in the small-scale dairy sector. These valuations were explained in Chapter Four in terms of a farming ethos or an ethic of productivity. Based on anthropological accounts of the farmers' landscape perceptions it was argued that the farmers' productive relationship to the summer farming pastures determines their perceptions of this landscape. In this regard, a shortcoming of the thesis is that the factors influencing the association of non-productive values with summer farming and the summer farming landscape were not explored. An interesting topic for further research would be to investigate to what extent the values that the farmers associate with summer farming are related to their farming style, personal background or other factors such as sources of secondary income. Drawing on the data from the fieldwork in Valdres, an initial finding in this regard is that the farmers who farm ecologically tend to place more emphasis on the cultural and environmental values of summer farming than conventional farmers.

Recalling the findings of Chapter Two, the way the farmers view summer farming thus differs from how summer farming is perceived by the agrarian sector, the environmental and cultural heritage sector, the tourist sector and by rural developers. Whereas the latter emphasize summer farming's post-productive elements and promote it as a multifunctional practice with potential for business development based on its multiple functions, the farmers view summer farming primarily as an agricultural practice of primary production. To the farmers, summer farming's post-productive elements are clearly of secondary importance.

Ethnographic fieldwork proved to be the most apt method not only for observing the economic practices on Valdresian summer farms, but also for accessing the farmers' views on summer farming. As argued, the farmers' views differ from the outsider's perspective, which

gives priority to summer farming's post-productive elements and promotes it as a multifunctional agricultural practice well-suited for new business development. In contrast, the farmers view summer farming's environmental, cultural and social values as externalities of mountain pasture grazing and summer farm dairy production. This difference between the outsider's and insider's perspectives on summer farming could only be revealed through detailed participant observation in the course of ethnographic fieldwork on Valdresian summer farms.

6. Bibliography

- Almstedt, Åsa. (2013). Post-productivism in rural areas: A contested concept. In Linda Lundmark & Camilla Sandström (Eds.), *Natural resources and regional development theory* (pp. 8-22). Umeå: Institutionen för geografi och ekonomisk historia, Umeå Universitet.
- Almås, Reidar. (2002). *Norges Landbrukshistorie IV*. Oslo: Samlaget.
- Almaås, Reidar, & Brobakk, Jostein. (2012). Norwegian Dairy Industry: A Case of Super-Regulated Co-Operativism. In Reidar Almaås & Hugh Campbell (Eds.), *Rethinking Agricultural Policy Regimes: Food Security, Climate Change and the Future Resilience of Global Agriculture* (pp. 169-190). Bingley: Emerald.
- Almås, Reidas. (1994). The rise and fall of agricultural policy cycles: from planned economy to green liberalism. *Journal of Rural Studies* 10, 10-15.
- Amilien, Virginie, Schjøll, Alexander, & Vramo, Lill Margrethe. (2008). *Forbrukernes forståelse av lokal mat*. Oslo: SIFO.
- Amit, Vered. (2000). *Constructing the Field: Ethnographic Fieldwork in the Contemporary World*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Árnason, Arnar, Ellison, Nicolas, Vergunst, Jo, & Whitehouse, Andrew (Eds.). (2012). *Landscapes beyond land. Routes, Aesthetics, Narratives*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn.
- Battershill, Martin R. J., & Gilg, Andrew W. (1997). Socio-economic constraints and environmentally friendly farming in the Southwest of England. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 13, 213–228.
- Beer, Bettina. (2008). Einleitung: Feldforschungsmethoden. In Bettina Beer (Ed.), *Methoden und Techniken der Feldforschung* (pp. 9-13). Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Bele, Bolette, Norderhaug, Ann, Kvarnström, Marie, Linkowski, Weronika Axelsson, Tunón, Håkan, & Wissmann, Jörgen. (2011). Seterbrukets biologiske kulturarv som ressurs for en bærekraftig framtid. Sluttrapport interreg-sma-prosjekt. *Bioforsk Rapport*, 7(72).
- Bele, Bolette, Norderhaug, Ann, Kvarnström, Marie, Linkowski, Weronika Axelsson, Tunón, Håkan, & Wissmann, Jörgen. (2013). Utmarksbeiting i Norge og Sverige, fra tradisjonell bruk til muligheter i framtida – verdier og utfordringer. *Utmark - tidsskrift for utmarksforskning*, 1.

- Bele, Bolette, Tunón, Håkon, & Røe, Paul Sverre. (2014). Natur- og kulturarv som bærekraftig verdiskaper - Sluttrapport Interreg småprosjekt. *Bioforsk Rapport*, 9.
- Bjelland, Anne Karen. (2012). "Helseferie vest ved havet": Bygdeutvikling og markedsføring av lokalt særpreg. In Mary Bente Bringslid (Ed.), *Bygdeutviklingas paradoks* (pp. 119-142). Oslo: Spartacus Forlag.
- Bjørkhaug, Hilde. (2012). Exploring the Sociology of Agriculture: Family Farmers in Norway - Future or Past Food Producers? In Dennis Erasga (Ed.), *Sociological Landscape - Theories, Realities and Trends* (pp. 283-304). InTech.
- Bjørkhaug, Hilde, & Richards, Carol Ann. (2008). Multifunctional agriculture in policy and practice? A comparative analysis of Norway and Australia. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 24(1), 98-111.
- Bjørnenak, Trond, Moen, Espen R., Riis, Christian, & Mørch von der Fehr, Nils-Henrik. (2013). *Plan eller marked? Om reguleringsregimet for markedet for videreforedling av melk*. Oslo: Hovedorganisasjonen Virke.
- Bowen, Sarah, & De Master, Kathryn. (2011). New Rural Livelihoods or Museums of Production? Quality Food Initiatives in Practice. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 27(1), 73-82.
- Bowler, Ian. (1985). Some consequences of the industrialization of agriculture in the European Community. In Michael J. Healey & Brian Ilbery (Eds.), *The Industrialization of the Countryside* (pp. 75-98). Norwich: GeoBooks.
- Bringslid, Mary Bente. (2012). Bygdeutvikling når alternativet er avvikling: Innleiing. In Mary Bente Bringslid (Ed.), *Bygdeutviklingas paradoks* (pp. 1-36). Oslo: Spartacus Forlag.
- Bryden, John. (2010). From an Agricultural to a Rural Policy in Europe: Changing Agriculture, Farm Households, Policies and Ideas. In Pamela J. Stewart & Andrew Strathern (Eds.), *Landscape, Heritage, Conservation. Farming Issues in the European Union* (pp. 141-167). Durham: Carolina Academic Press.
- Burton, Rob, Kuczera, C., & Schwarz, G. (2008). Exploring farmers' cultural resistance to voluntary agri-environmental schemes. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 48(1), 16-37.
- Burton, Rob, & Wilson, Geoff. (2012). The Rejuvenation of Productivist Agriculture: The Case for 'Cooperative Neo-Productivism'. In Reidar Almaås & Hugh Campbell (Eds.), *Rethinking Agricultural Policy Regimes: Food Security, Climate Change and the Future Resilience of Global Agriculture* (pp. 51-72). Bingley: Emerald.

- Carrier, James G. (2012). Protecting the Environment the Natural Way: Ethical Consumption and Commodity Fetishism. *Antipode*, 42(3), 672-689.
- Carrier, James G., & Luetchford, Peter G. (Eds.). (2012). *Ethical Consumption: Social Value and Economic Practice*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn.
- Daugstad, Karoline. (1999). *Mellom romantikk og realisme. Om seterlandskapet som ideal og realitet*. Trondheim: NTNU.
- Daugstad, Karoline. (2006). *Kvinnens rolle i seterbruket – før og nå*. Trondheim: Norsk Senter for Bygdeforskning.
- Daugstad, Karoline, Fernández Mier, Margarita, & Peña-Chocarro, Leonor. (2014). Landscapes of transhumance in Norway and Spain: Farmers' practices, perceptions and value orientations. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift - Norwegian Journal of Geography*, 68(4), 248-258.
- Daugstad, Kristin. (2005). *When the farmer becomes a provider of landscapes and agri-tourism and the tourist wants to be part of "real rural life". A story of insiders and outsiders in the Norwegian landscape*. Paper presented at the The 14th Nordic Symposium in Tourism and Hospitality Research, Akureyri, Iceland.
- Daugstad, Kristin, & Lunnan, Tor. (2009). Stølsdrift i Valdres: Flaskehalsar for stølsdrift og nye stølstilknytt næringer – eit forprosjekt. *Bioforsk Rapport*, 4.
- Daugstad, Kristin, Rønningen, Katrina, & Skar, Birgitte. (2006). Agriculture as an upholder of cultural heritage? Conceptualizations and value judgements—A Norwegian perspective in international context. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 22, 67–81.
- De Walt, Kathleen M., & DeWalt, Billie R. (2011). *Participant Observation: A Guide for Fieldworkers*. Lanham: AltaMira Press.
- Demoissier, Marion. (2011). Anthropologists and the Challenges of Modernity: Global Concerns, Local Responses in EU Agriculture. *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures*, 20(1), 111-131.
- Denzin, Norman K., & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (2000). Part III: Strategies of Inquiry. In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 366-378). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Duesberg, Stefanie, O'Connor, Deirdre, & Dhubháin, Áine Ní. (2013). To plant or not to plant—Irish farmers' goals and values with regard to afforestation. *Land Use Policy*, 32, 155-164.
- Emerson, Robert M., Fretz, Rachel I., & Shaw, Linda L. (2007). Participant observation and fieldnotes. In Paul Atkinson, Amanda Coffey, Sara Delamont, John Lofland & Lyn

- Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of Ethnography* (pp. 352-369). London and Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Emery, Steven B. (2014). Hard Work, Productivity and the Management of the Farmed Environment in Anthropological Perspective. In Lindsay Hamilton, Laura Mitchell, & Anita Mangan (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in management* (pp. 90-104). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Evans, Nick, Morris, Carol, & Winter, Michael. (2002). Conceptualizing agriculture: a critique of post-productivism as the new orthodoxy. *Progress in Human Geography*, 26(3), 313-332.
- Flick, Uwe. (1998). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. London, New Delhi and Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Funnel, Don, & Ramola, Parish. (2001). *Mountain environments and communities*. London: Routledge.
- Gasson, Ruth. (1973). Goals and values of farmers. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 24, 521-542.
- Gray, Ian, & Lawrence, Geoffrey. (2001). *A Future for Regional Australia: Escaping Global Misfortune*. Oakleigh: Cambridge University Press.
- Gudheim, Helge. (2013). *Kinning, breisting og ysting i Valdres. Sett i norsk og internasjonal samanheng*. Ulnes: Mat & Kultur.
- Gupta, Akhil, & Ferguson, James. (1997). Discipline and Practice: 'The Field' as Site, Method, and Location in Anthropology. In Akhil Gupta & James Ferguson (Eds.), *Anthropological Locations. Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science* (pp. 1-46). Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Halbmayer, Ernst & Salat, Jana. (2011). *Qualitative Methoden der Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie*. Wien: Universität Wien.
- Hammersley, Martyn & Atkinson, Paul. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice. Third Edition*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Heatherington, Tracey. (2011). Introduction: Remaking Rural Landscapes in Twenty-First Century Europe. *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures*, 20(1), 1-9.
- Heller, Chaia. (2011). Another (Food) World Is Possible: Post-industrial French Paysans Fight for a Solidaire Global Food Policy. *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures*, 20(1), 89-110.
- Hillestad, Margaret Eide. (2012). *Valdres-Landbruket*. Oslo: AgriAnalyse.

- Ilbery, Brian, & Bowler, Ian. (1998). From agricultural productivism to post-productivism. In Brian Ilbery (Ed.), *The Geography of Rural Change* (pp. 57-84). Harlow: Longman.
- Innovasjon Norge. (2015). *Utviklingsprogrammet - landbruks- og reindriftsbasert vekst og verdiskaping*. Oslo: Innovasjon Norge.
- Jones, Michael. (1988). Land-tenure and landscape change in fishing communities on the outer coast of central Norway, c. 1880 to the present. Methodological approaches and modes of explanation. *Geografiska Annaler*, 70(1), 197-204.
- Kirchengast, Christoph. (2005). *Sozial- und kulturanthropologische Betrachtungen zur Almwirtschaft in Österreich*. Wien: Universität Wien.
- Lamnek, Siegfried. (2005). *Qualitative Sozialforschung*. Weinheim: Psychologie Verlags Union.
- Langthaler, Ernst. (2010). Landwirtschaft vor und in der Globalisierung. In Reinhard Sieder & Ernst Langthaler (Eds.), *Globalgeschichte 1800-2010* (pp. 135-169). Wien: Böhlau.
- Lowe, Philip, Murdoch, Jonathan, Marsden, Terry, Munton, Richard, & Flynn, Andrew. (1993). Regulating the new rural spaces: the uneven development of land. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 9(3), 205–222.
- Mackay, Michael, Perkins, Harvey C., & Espiner, Stephen. (2009). *The Study of Rural Change from a Social Scientific Perspective: A Literature Review and Annotated Bibliography*. Lincoln: Lincoln University.
- Maddox, Richard. (2010). Euroliberal Pastoralism and Rural Development in Southern Spain. In Pamela J. Stewart & Andrew Strathern (Eds.), *Landscape, Heritage, and Conservation: Farming Issues in the European Union* (pp. 195-224). Durham: Carolina Academic Press.
- Marsden, Terry, Munton, Richard, Ward, Neil, & Whatmore, Sarah. (1996). Agricultural geography and the political economy approach. *Economic Geography*, 72(4), 361-376.
- Marsden, Terry, & Sonnino, Roberta. (2008). Rural development and the regional state: denying multifunctional agriculture in the UK. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 24, 422–431.
- Mather, Alexander S., Hill, Gary, & Nijnik, Maria. (2006). Post-productivism and rural land use: Cul de sac or challenge for theorization? *Journal of Rural Studies*, 22, 441-455.
- Mendras, Henri. (1967). *La fin des paysans*. Paris: SEIDES.
- Minnich, Robert Gary. (1989). Tradition in the face of modernization. Cultural continuity and 'deagrarization' in the villages of Ukve / Ugovizza, Kanalska Dolina / Val Canale. *Slovene Studies*, 11(1-2), 97-108.

- Narotzky, Susana. (2001). Economic anthropology. In Neil J. Smelser & Paul B. Baltes (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 12* (pp. 4069-4073). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Norbye, Anne-Kathrine B. (2010). *En fornemmelse av støl. Om meningsdannelse av sted og moderne stølsliv i Hallingdal, Norge*. Oslo: Det samfunnsvitenskapelige fakultet.
- Norbye, Anne-Kathrine B. (2011). *Det er her jeg lever*.
<http://www.sv.uio.no/sai/forskning/aktuelt/aktuelle-saker/2011/norbye.html> (3.3.2015, 21:37)
- Norderhaug, Ann, & Sickel, Hanne. (2002). Levande stolar og kulturlandskap. In Ann Norderhaug & Hanne Sickel (Eds.), *Sluttrapport til Norges Forskningsråd og Statens Nærings- og Distriktsutviklingsfond* (pp. 1-31). Oslo: Det Kongelige Selskap for Norges Vel.
- Norderhaug, Ann, & Sickel, Hanne. (2007). A Norwegian summer farming landscape. A presentation of the characteristic summer farming landscape in south central Norway. In Bas Pedroli, Anne van Doom, & Geert de Blust (Eds.), *Europe's living Landscapes. Essays exploring our identity in the countryside* (pp. 67-81). Zeist: KNNV Publishing.
- Norsk Seterkultur. (2015). *Årsmelding Norsk Seterkultur 2014-2015*. Norddal: Norsk Seterkultur.
- Okeley, Judith. (2001). Visualism and Landscape: Looking and Seeing in Normandy. *Ethnos*, 66(1), 99-120.
- Paxson, Heather. (2010). Locating Value in Artisan Cheese: Reverse Engineering Terroir for New-World Landscapes. *American Anthropologist*, 112(3), 444-457.
- Pedersen, Ragnar. (1974). *Sæterbruket på Hedmarken. Fra system til oppløsning*. Gjøvik: Hedmarksmuseet og Domkirkeodden.
- Reinton, Lars. (1955). *Sæterbruket i Noreg. I. Sætertypar og driftsformer*. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Reinton, Lars. (1957). *Sæterbruket i Noreg. III*. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Reinton, Lars. (1957). *Sæterbruket i Noreg. II. Anna arbeid på sætra, sætra i haustingsbruket og matnøytsla elles*. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Refsgaard, Karen. (2010). Multifunctional Agriculture and Rural Development – A Story From Norway. In Pamela J. Stewart & Andrew Strathern (Eds.), *Landscape, Heritage, Conservation. Farming Issues in the European Union* (pp. 169-193). Durham: Carolina Academic Press.
- Rettie, Kathy. (2010). Place, Politics and Power in the Cairngorms National Park: Landscape, Heritage and Conservation. In Pamela J. Stewart & Andrew Strathern (Eds.),

- Landscape, Heritage, and Conservation: Farming Issues in the European Union* (pp. 105-141). Durham, North Carolina: Carolina Academic Press.
- Riksantikvaren. (2011). *Rapport Oppland – Valdres: verdiskapingsprogrammet på kulturminneområdene*. Oslo: Riksantikvaren.
- Rød Larsen, Bente. (2012). Innhold eller innpakning. Om stedets betydning for maten vår. In Mary Bente Bringslid (Ed.), *Bygdeutviklingas Paradoks* (pp. 143-172). Oslo: Spartacus Forlag.
- Rønningen, Katrina, & Burton, Rob. (2013). Multifunksjonelt landbruk under nyproduktivismen? Et vesteuropeisk perspektiv. In Reidar Almaås, Hilde Bjørkhaug, Hugh Campbell, & Christian Anton Smedshaug (Eds.), *Fram mot ein berekraftig og klimatilpassa norsk landbruksmodell* (pp. 59-84). Trondheim: Akademika Forlag.
- Rønningen, Katrina, Flø, Bjørn Egil, & Fjeldavli, Elsa. (2004). *The legitimacy of a multifunctional agriculture*. Trondheim: Centre for Rural Research.
- Sickel, Hanne. (2013). Særskilte kvaliteter ved melk fra utmarksbeiter i fjellet - muligheter for merverdi? *Bioforsk Fokus*, 8(2), 152-153.
- Sickel, Hanne, & Svalheim, Ellen. (2010). *Seterlandskapet – der fjell og skog møtes. Historikk, betydning og skjøtselsråd*. Oslo: Sabima.
- Siebert, Rosemarie, Toogood, Mark, & Knierim, Andrea. (2006). Factors affecting European farmers' participation in biodiversity policies. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 46, 318–340.
- Skarstad, Håkon Johs., Daugstad, Kristin, Lunnan, Tor, & Sickel, Hanne. (2008). Vilkår og tiltak for å opprettholde stølsdrift i og utanfor verneområdene. *Bioforsk Rapport*, 2(3).
- Slee, Richard. W. (2005). From countrysides of production to countrysides of consumption? *The Journal of Agricultural Science*, 143(4), 255-265.
- Solheim, Svale. (1952). *Norsk Sætertradisjon*. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Spradley, James P. (1979). *The Ethnographic Interview*. Belmont: Wads.
- Stacul, Jaro. (2010). Contesting Consumption: Changing Meanings of Landscape in Northern Italy. In Pamela J. Stewart & Andrew Strathern (Eds.), *Landscape, Heritage, and Conservation: Farming Issues in the European Union* (pp. 225-242). Durham: Carolina Academic Press.
- Statens Landbruksforvaltning. (2014). *Miljøstatus i landbruket for 2013. Tematisk vurdering av miljøstatus og miljøutvikling i landbruket*. Oslo: Statens Landbruksforvaltning.
- Stewart, Pamela J., & Strathern, Andrew (Eds.). (2010). *Landscape, Heritage, Conservation. Farming Issues in the European Union*. Durham: Carolina Academic Press.

- Tine. (2014). *Om Tine*. <http://www.tine.no/om-tine>. (1.2.2015, 16:32)
- Tunón, Håkan, Axelsson, Weronika, Linkowski, Weronika Axelsson, Norderhaug, Ann, Wissmann, Jörgen, & Bele, Bolette. (2014). Views of landscape. Reflections on the governance of scandinavian transhumance. *Baltic Worlds*, 6(3-4), 53-60.
- Tuv, Kjell Håvard. (2002). *Prosjekt Levande Stølar: Sluttrapport*. Oslo: Det kongelige Selskap for Norges Vel.
- Urry, John. (1990). *The tourist gaze*. London: Sage Publications.
- Vaccaro, Ismael. (2006). Postindustrial valleys: the Pyrenees as a reinvented landscape. *Social Anthropology*, 14(3), 361-376.
- Valdres Natur- og Kulturpark. (2014). *Valdres Natur- og Kulturpark*. http://www.valdres.no/new/index.php?option=com_k2&view=item&layout=item&id=302&Itemid=848 (12.12.2014, 15:35)
- Valdresdesign. (2014). *Merkevara Valdres*. <http://valdresdesign.no/default.asp?nid=389&lid=1> (3.1.2015, 23:45)
- Vergunst, Jo. (2012). Farming and the Nature of Landscape: Stasis and Movement in a Regional Landscape Tradition. *Landscape Research*, 37(2), 173-190.
- Vittersø, Gunnar. (2012). *Ren idyll? Forbrukets betydning for bygdeutvikling med utgangspunkt i lokal mat og hytteliv*. Oslo: Sifo.
- Welch-Devine, Meredith, & Murray, Seth. (2011). 'We're European Farmers Now': Transition and Transformations in Basque Agricultural Practices. *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures*, 20(1), 69-88.
- Whitehouse, Andrew. (2012). How the Land Should Be. Narrating Progress on Farms in Islay, Scotland. In Arnar Árnason, Nicolas Ellison, Jo Vergunst, & Andrew Whitehouse (Eds.), *Landscapes Beyond Land: Routes, Aesthetics, Narratives* (pp. 160-177). New York: Berghahn Books.
- Wilson, Geoff A. (2001). From productivism to post-productivism . . . and back again? Exploring the (un)changed natural and mental landscapes of European agriculture. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 26(1), 77-102.
- Witzel, Andreas. (2000). Das problemzentrierte Interview. *Forum: Qualitative Sozialforschung*, 1(1).
- Woods, Michael. (2011). *Rural*. London: Routledge.

7. Appendix

7.1. Abstract

With the recognition of agriculture's multifunctionality – i.e. the notion that farming produces a set of environmental, cultural and social values in addition to food and fibers – European agriculture has moved beyond being merely a sector of primary production to including the provision of non-food goods and services since the 1980s. This raises questions regarding the changing economic role of agriculture, its function in society and the farmer's role. Embedded in these discussions, this Master's thesis explores contemporary summer farming – the seasonal vertical movement of livestock – in Valdres, Norway. Based upon ethnographic fieldwork on several summer farms in Valdres, it examines the regional political and economic context of summer farming, analyzes summer farming as an economic process and explores the farmers' perspectives on summer farming and its landscape. The study concludes that while the continuation of productivism in agrarian policies has led to a substantial decline in summer farms in Norway, multifunctionalist agrarian policies provide new opportunities for summer farming in Valdres. As agriculture becomes integrated into rural development objectives, farmers are economically and otherwise supported for summer farming's environmental and cultural functions, i.e. conserving a specific cultural landscape and cultural heritage. Furthermore, summer farms are increasingly becoming sites for diversification into tourism and artisan food production. Even though Valdresian summer farms thus exhibit characteristics of a landscape of consumption, milking remains the defining economic practice around which summer farm life revolves. This is reflected in the farmers' perceptions of summer farming as a practice of agricultural primary production and, accordingly, the summer farming landscape as a landscape of production. According to the farmers, the environmental and cultural benefits of summer farming are externalities of mountain pasture grazing and summer farm dairy production. These findings imply a potential tension between the emphasis that agrarian, environmental and rural policies tend to place on small-scale and marginal farming's post-productive aspects and the farmers' perceptions of farming and the agricultural landscape.

7.2. German abstract

In Zusammenhang mit der Anerkennung der landwirtschaftlichen Multifunktionalität – die Auffassung, dass Landwirtschaft zusätzlich zu Nahrungsmitteln und Rohstoffen eine Reihe an kulturellen, ökologischen und sozialen Werten produziert – ist die europäische Agrarwirtschaft seit den 1980er Jahren zunehmend zum Dienstleistungssektor geworden. Diese Entwicklung wirft Fragen bezüglich der ökonomischen und gesellschaftlichen Funktion der Landwirtschaft sowie der Rolle der LandwirtInnen auf. In der vorliegenden Masterarbeit wird die Almwirtschaft in Valdres, Norwegen, in Bezug auf diese Diskussionen untersucht. Basierend auf ethnographischer Feldforschung auf mehreren Almen in Valdres werden die politisch-ökonomischen Bedingungen der Almwirtschaft dieser Region erarbeitet, Almwirtschaft als ökonomischer Prozess analysiert und schließlich die Perspektiven der LandwirtInnen auf die Almwirtschaft und die Almlandschaft beleuchtet. Die Ergebnisse zeigen, dass, während die produktivistische landwirtschaftliche Politik der letzten Jahrzehnte zu einem andauernden starken Rückgang der norwegischen Almwirtschaft geführt hat, die zunehmend multifunktionalistische Agrar-, Regional- und Umweltpolitik eine Neubewertung der Almwirtschaft zur Folge haben. Diese wird insbesondere aufgrund ihrer kulturellen und ökologischen Funktionen für den Erhalt eines landwirtschaftlichen Kulturerbes und einer spezifischen Kulturlandschaft gefördert. In diesem Zusammenhang sind Almen attraktive Orte für die Entwicklung von Tourismus und lokaler Milchveredelung geworden. Die Almen in Valdres weisen somit zunehmend Charakteristiken einer Landschaft der Konsumption auf. Jedoch ist die Milchproduktion (immer noch) der zentrale ökonomische Prozess, um den sich das Leben auf der Alm dreht. Diese Beobachtung entspricht der Sichtweise der LandwirtInnen. Für sie stellt die Almwirtschaft hauptsächlich eine Praxis der landwirtschaftlichen Primärproduktion dar. Dementsprechend nehmen sie die Almlandschaft als eine Landschaft der Produktion wahr. Ihnen zufolge sind die kulturellen und ökologischen Leistungen der Almwirtschaft positive Externalitäten der weidenden Tiere und der Milch- und Käseproduktion auf der Alm. Diese Ergebnisse implizieren ein Spannungsverhältnis zwischen der Betonung der Agrar-, Umwelt- und Regionalpolitik der post-produktivistischen Elemente kleinstrukturierter und marginalisierter Landwirtschaft einerseits und der Sichtweise der LandwirtInnen andererseits, für die häufig die produktiven Aspekte derselben im Vordergrund stehen.

7.3. CV

Alexandra Meyer, BA

11.08.1987

alexandra.meyer@univie.ac.at

Education

- | | |
|---------|---|
| 10/2015 | Master of Arts in Social and Cultural Anthropology
University of Vienna |
| 2012 | Bachelor of in Arts Social and Cultural Anthropology
University of Vienna |
| 2008 | Programa Especial Integrado (Individual Studies Program in Philosophy)
University of Salamanca |
| 2006 | Upper Secondary Diploma
Stavanger Katedralskole |

Current Employment

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| since 09/2015 | Coordinator of the SOWI STEOP+ (Introductory and orientation period at the Faculty of Social Sciences)
StudienServiceCenter at the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Vienna |
| since 09/2015 | Lecturer
<i>Anthropological writing</i>
Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology, University of Vienna |

Work Experience

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| 09/2013– | Student assistant |
| 08/2015 | StudienServiceCenter at the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Vienna |
| 03 – 07/2015 | Lecturer
<i>UE Organization of 11th Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies</i>
Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology, University of Vienna |

- 04 – 06/2012 Research assistant
HUSK (Center for Drug Research), University of Stavanger
- 06 – 08/2011 Research assistant
Department of Social Sciences, International Research Institute Stavanger (IRIS)

Talks and Workshops

- 6/2015 Guest lecture "Agriculture and cultural heritage: summer farming in Norway"
as part of the lecture *The immaterial cultural heritage of Austria*,
Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology in cooperation with UNESCO
Austria, University of Vienna
- 4/2015 Organizer of the workshop *Teaching and learning after post-modernism*
10th Vienna Anthropology Days, Vienna
- 06/2013 Talk "The cultivation of snow. Local strategies of adaptation to changing weather
in Tyrol"
as part of the workshop *Let's Talk About the Weather. Anthropology and Climate
Change*,
8th Vienna Anthropology Days, Vienna

Volunteer Experience

- 10/2014– Member of the Student Organizing Committee of the 11th Conference on
09/2015 Hunting and Gathering Societies
- 11/2009– Local Coordinator Vienna of the Moving Anthropology Student Network
7/2013 (MASN)

Language Skills

- Norwegian Native
- German Native
- English Excellent
- Spanish Excellent
- French Basic

