

**Building Resilience through Post-
Productivism:
The case of farmers' markets**

This thesis is submitted in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Emma Louise Glendinning

**School of Planning and Geography,
Cardiff University**

October 2012

Abstract

The UK's agricultural system has been subject to many crises and challenges. In the 1980s this prompted new agricultural policies seeking to diversify agricultural production and farming livelihoods. A number of diversification pathways have been opened to farmers, one of these being 'alternative' food networks. Whilst this diversification of agriculture and thus farming incomes has been suggested to provide a more resilient agricultural system, there appears limited understanding of the dynamics not just of the system but within the system. Through taking an ethnographic approach this research project therefore seeks to uncover the development of resilience of those within the system whilst simultaneously seeking to understand how this affects the resilience of the market system as a whole.

In order to gain a detailed insight into a farmers' market community a case study research strategy was taken. Data was gathered through active participation in the market community at Garrington farmers' market in west Wales. Through working with different stallholders at the market for one year, the interactions, tensions and complexities of the community were witnessed and explored. Twenty five further days were spent with farmers and producers, away from the market, at their place of production. Ethnographic interviews were carried out whilst working alongside producers providing a deep and rich understanding of each producer, their production ethos and what the farmers' market provided to them.

The research explores how farmers and producers react to differing challenges, both environmental and economic. It demonstrates their vulnerability to these and the limitations to their individual adaptive capacities. Further, it explores the possibility of farmers' markets to provide a community of practice and a community of coping for producers, yet the lack of realisation of this potential. Within this the tensions of the farmers' market definition are recognised; the expectations held by differing producers explored and the challenge of standardising an 'alternative' food network examined.

This research argues that the social networks of farmers' markets have the potential to offer vital contact to others to aid innovation and learning. However, this potential is seemingly diminished when issues of trust, power and hierarchy are introduced through producer expectations. Here then the suggestion is made that if such social networks are to fulfil their potential they must balance diversity with specialisation, competition with co-operation and innovation with stability. This could be achieved through formulating standards, standards that are flexible, able to be locally interpreted and made applicable to each local context. Such suggestions require good governance but through their implementation could help develop the resilience of both individuals within a system along with the system as a whole.

KEYWORDS: farmers' markets, alternative food networks, resilience, community of practice, community of coping

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to thank my three supervisors, Dr. Gareth Enticott, Dr. Gillian Bristow and Dr. Andrea Collins. I am immensely grateful for their guidance, support and encouragement throughout the PhD process. I would also like to acknowledge Dr Keith Halfacree who gave me the confidence to apply for a PhD scholarship after my undergraduate studies and ignited my interest in rural geography.

I am indebted to the farmers, producers and managers at Garrington Farmers' Market. Without their welcome, their interest in my research and their willingness to let me work alongside them for a year this study would not have been possible. Thank you for the cups of tea, for the amazing food, for the jokes and for giving me the opportunity to become part of the market community, it is definitely an experience I will remember forever.

I am extremely grateful to the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) for funding my PhD scholarship and to the BRASS (Business Relationships, Accountability, Sustainability and Society) Research Centre for providing the supportive environment in which to study. Thanks go to all the staff members and my fellow PhD students in BRASS for their friendship and support over the years, being a part of BRASS has definitely enhanced my PhD experience.

Thanks to my Mum and Dad for always supporting my quest to learn and to my brother, Lewis, for providing the next 'aim' along with the support to help me reach it.

Last but definitely not least, thank you to my husband Mark for your patience, your wise words and your encouragement. Thank you for believing in me and giving me the confidence to pursue my ambitions.

Contents

<i>Prologue: Challenges, Rules and Communities: A year in the life of a farmers' market</i>	1
Spring.....	1
Summer.....	2
Autumn	3
Winter.....	5
Chapter 1: Introduction	7
1.2 Thesis Overview	13
Chapter 2: Crises, Quality and Post-Productivism	15
Introduction	15
2.1 Agricultural Crisis and Agricultural Change in the UK	16
2.1.1 Intensive agricultural production.....	17
2.1.2 Consequences for farmers' health.....	19
2.1.3 Emergence of post-productivist agriculture	19
2.1.4 Changes in agriculture in the UK.....	21
2.1.5 The range of multi-functionality	23
2.1.6 Images of multi-functional farmers	25
2.1.7 A new era of agricultural production?	27
2.1.8 Summary	28
2.2 'Alternative' Food Networks	30
2.2.1 Types of 'alternative' food networks	31
2.2.2 Local food networks.....	33
2.2.3 'Alternative' food networks and quality assumptions	35
2.2.4 Certification of quality	37
2.2.5 Summary	39
2.3 Farmers' Markets in the UK	39
2.3.1 Defining farmers' markets in the UK.....	40
2.3.2 Consumers using farmers' markets	42
2.3.3 Producers use of farmers' markets.....	45
2.3.4 Summary	47

2.4 Conclusion	47
Chapter 3: Exploring Resilience and Community Interactions	50
Introduction	50
3.1 The Concept of Resilience	51
3.1.1 Defining resilience.....	52
3.1.2 Vulnerability and resilience.....	55
3.1.3 Measuring resilience	57
3.2 Building Blocks of Resilience and Applications within Agriculture	59
3.2.1 Tackling short and long term stresses.....	59
3.2.2 Diversity, innovation and learning ability	61
3.2.3 Flexibility, local adaptations and governance	63
3.3 Social Resilience and Community Development	65
3.3.1 Characteristics of resilient farmers	65
3.3.2 Social networks and farmers' resilience	68
3.3.3 Communities of practice	69
3.3.4 Communities of coping	71
3.3.5 Community identity, relations and building resilience	73
3.4 Synthesis.....	75
3.5 Conclusion	79
Chapter 4: Research Methodology.....	81
Introduction	81
Research aim:.....	81
Research questions:	81
4.1 Case Study Research Strategy	82
4.1.1 Choice of case study.....	84
4.1.2 The case	85
4.1.3 The setting	87
4.1.4 Summary	89
4.2 Ethnography.....	89
4.2.1 Introducing ethnography	90
4.2.2 Building trust and rapport.....	92
4.2.3 Ethnographic writing.....	95
4.2.4 Limitations of ethnography.....	96

4.2.5 Summary	99
4.3 Using Ethnographic Methods	99
4.3.1 Access.....	100
4.3.2 Participant observations	104
4.3.3 Ethnographic interviews	110
4.3.4 Fieldnotes.....	113
4.3.5 Representation of ‘self’ during research and reflexivity	115
4.3.6 Ethical Issues	117
4.3.7 Analysis of fieldnotes from observation and interview days	119
4.4 Conclusion	122
<i>Chapter 5: Tales of the Unexpected! Understanding Individual Resilience</i>	<i>124</i>
Introduction	124
5.1 The Producers at GFM	125
Table 1: The producers at GFM.....	127
5.2 Developing Resilience to Specific Shocks and Stresses	148
5.2.1 Environmental challenges.....	148
5.2.2 Responding to environmental challenges.....	151
5.2.3 Economic challenges	152
5.2.4 Responding to economic challenges.....	155
5.3 Models of Resilience.....	156
5.3.1 Identifying models of resilience	156
5.3.2 Characterising different models of resilience	160
5.3.3 Changes, adaptations and innovation.....	162
5.4 Development and Consequences of Images and Scripts.....	164
5.4.1 Portraying resilience	164
5.4.2 The model of a ‘good’ producer.....	168
5.4.3 Implications for resilience	172
5.5 Conclusion	173
<i>Chapter 6: Isolation and Innovation: Market Communities and Resilience</i>	
<i>Development</i>	<i>176</i>
Introduction	176
6.1 Coping with Isolation and Developing Social Resilience	178

6.1.1 Lonely life of production	178
6.1.2 Production problems and personal positivity	181
6.1.3 Developing social resilience	186
6.2 Community of Practice	189
6.2.1 Mutual engagement, joint enterprise and shared repertoire	190
6.2.2 The significance of social capital and social ties	192
6.2.3 Competition and trust.....	196
6.2.4 Interactions and resilience.....	200
6.3 Conclusion	203
<i>Chapter 7: Interpretations, Negotiations and Standardisation. Constructing a Resilient Farmers' Market</i>	<i>206</i>
Introduction	206
7.1 Defining a Farmers' Market	207
7.1.1 A geographical definition of 'local'	208
7.1.2 Direct contact between producers and consumers.....	211
7.1.3 Demonstrating product quality.....	213
7.1.4 Local food and business size	218
7.1.5 Creating a balanced market	221
7.2 Negotiating Standards and Expectations	225
7.2.1 Creating universal markets with a local flavour.....	226
7.2.2 Standardisation and flexibility	229
7.3 Conclusion	231
<i>Chapter 8: Conclusion</i>	<i>234</i>
Introduction	234
8.1 Research Findings.....	234
8.1.1 Wider theoretical contribution	237
8.2 Research Limitations	240
8.3 Suggestions for Further Research.....	242
<i>Bibliography.....</i>	<i>245</i>
Appendix 1: Information sheet for market manager.....	264
Appendix 2: Information sheet for producers.....	266

Prologue: Challenges, Rules and Communities: A year in the life of a farmers' market

This Prologue chapter seeks to very briefly introduce the farmers' market that is the focus of this ethnographic study. Through highlighting the changes over one year, 2010, it seeks to give a flavour of the market, the producers and the challenges they face throughout the year.

Spring

It's Friday morning and in West Wales Garrington Farmers' Market is groaning with stalls selling a large variety of produce. The sun is bright but the day is cold and around the market small clusters of stallholders can be seen, some are clasping cups of hot coffee bought from the local coffee shop whilst others are waiting for the kettle to whistle on their portable stove before providing the surrounding stalls with just one of many cups of tea that will be drunk throughout the day. One bread producer takes some bread rolls up to a meat stall who are already cooking up bacon. They share the bacon rolls with a couple of neighbouring stallholders as well as the market manager if she passes before it's all eaten. Many producers have risen early to prepare for the market and this warmth and breakfast provides much needed fuel before a day welcoming customers to their stalls and trying to make sales. These late winter/early spring markets are cold, with the wind whipping up along the river and producers have to do their best to protect themselves and put on a smile for every passerby. During the day stallholders pop to pick up provisions from other stalls and there's much conversation about how busy the market has been, everyone checking if they are the only stall that has been quiet or whether, as usual it's 'that time of year'.

One of the market managers starts off on her usual market day routine; checking in with all the stallholders and making sure there aren't any problems to report. She delivers the farmers' market plastic bags to the stalls along with pocket calendars for everyone to give out to customers. There are a number of stalls absent from the market at this time of year, primarily those selling vegetables, fish, plants and honey. It is a low time of year for their production so they take a couple of months out of trading at the market. Not only would it be unprofitable for these producers to travel

to the market but the quality and quantity of produce they would have available would not be to an adequate standard to sell. Even with around half a dozen stalls missing there's still plenty of produce available from bread, milk and cheese to meat, jams and cakes. There's a huge diversity of produce on offer and a variety of stalls selling similar products to give consumers a good choice.

Throughout February the stallholders on the market organising committee gather issues, problems and comments from their fellow stallholders for discussion at the upcoming committee meeting. This is a quiet affair, headed up by the market manager and attended by a handful of producers. New bags are approved on a trial run. They are biodegradable ones. The council feel they cannot justify supplying plastic bags when other areas of the town are trying to go plastic bag free. As these are distributed around the market there are rumblings of discontent; are they big enough, are they strong enough and will they fall apart in the rain? It will take some convincing that these new bags are the way forward! One issue raised at the meeting is the advertised closing time of the market and the recognition that certain stallholders are packing up much earlier than this time. A suggestion is made that a spot check will be held at the following market to ensure all stalls are present and open at 2pm. On market day news of this check quickly spreads, each stallholder looking out for others and trying to ensure no one is caught out by leaving early. Even though this issue has been raised as a concern there's a clear community spirit; no one really wants their neighbouring stallholder to be reprimanded for leaving early.

Summer

As spring progresses into summer the daffodils give way to asparagus, new potatoes and the first strawberries appear at the market. There is great excitement about the arrival of these new products, amongst producers and shoppers alike. As new products appear producers are regularly asked 'have you grown this' or 'is this all local' and all proudly confirm. This is a market rule that is never flexible. All produce sold by a stallholder must be produced by them; this provides the market with a unique consumption experience, ensuring that consumers are able to directly speak with producers. Consumers comment on the freshness, the taste and the colour of produce, there's a buzz of appreciation from customers at how hard the producers

work and the wonderful produce they provide. Such praise is only ever acknowledged with a shy smile or a quiet ‘thank you’. The onset of summer brings back a full complement of stalls to the market. Meat producers begin to vary their products stocking up on barbecue favourites rather than roasting joints and the cake stalls start producing meringues that are placed next to the strawberries encouraging customers to enjoy a delightful summer dessert. Not only do the vegetables and fruits vary with season, as would be expected, but the whole market appears flexible throughout the year as producers alter with the change of the seasons. Even subtle changes of produce help to keep the vitality of the market throughout the year, providing seasonal variation for customers.

July and August are usually the best months for the market. There are the regular customers, those that happen to be in town with children because it is school holidays and many tourists coming to visit the county. Many producers hope that tourists will be tempted to purchase something to take home as a reminder of their holiday destination. Unfortunately the summer holiday months do not provide the influx of spending they usually do. Producers attribute this to three main issues demonstrating their vulnerability to a range of different challenges. Firstly, the 2010 summer weather leaves a little to be desired. Consumers do not want to head out and browse an outdoor market on a wet day. Secondly, during the summer months a new out of town shopping area opens, with some large high-street stores moving from their town centre location to the new retail park. This is seen to decrease the number of people who visit the town centre as consumers instead head to the new retail area for their shopping. The reduction of people in the town centre is seen to have a detrimental effect on sales at the market. Finally, the economic recession is blamed for a lack of spending. Producers are aware that certain food items and a visit to the farmers’ market are regarded as a luxury, rather than an essential expenditure, by some people. It is thought this is at least partly to blame for the lack of consumer spending.

Autumn

The first market day of October is the Harvest Fayre. The County Council (who manage the farmers’ market) has received some funding from the Welsh Government for this ‘food festival’ giving the market managers an opportunity to organise some

cookery displays as well as getting some street entertainers and musicians to the market. The aim is to create a festival feel and with more publicity than the usual fortnightly market. It is hoped that it will attract more consumers than the average market day. On such special event days the market managers make a few exceptions to the market rules. For starters they accept a few craft stalls for this market only. One regular stallholder is allowed to bring and sell apples at the market even though they have not produced them. Apples are seemingly not grown in the county but this producer has contacts to an apple grower in England and due to apples being an important part of the British harvest these are allowed at the Harvest Fayre market only. The stall is very busy, boasting a huge array of British apples with tasters of each out for passersby to try before they buy.

There's a great emphasis at the Harvest Fayre for producers to join in, to contribute to the market. This is seen at other times in the year, Easter is another example when stallholders are encouraged to decorate their stalls and to take part in the Easter Bonnet competition. There's much laughter and jollity at grown men wearing silly hats, those who have simply stuck a daffodil in their hair and one producer who has gone to the effort of knitting hot cross buns for their bonnets. Another festival type week falls on the second market day in January when the market takes part in a national campaign called 'Breakfast Week'. Producers are encouraged to think of breakfast ideas they could either sell for a small fee (typically no more than 50 pence) or offer as a free sample.

Whilst all the festival weeks and extra activities could help to boost each producer's individual sales there is an expectation around the market that all producers should join in for the sake of the market as a whole entity. A life in production is seen to be one where producers strive to produce good quality products not just for their own reputation but also to uphold a standard of local food. Production is not all about making money as an individual business but about caring for what is produced and considering others within the environment in which the produce is sold. Those that fully participate in the market, being enthusiastic and welcoming to consumers would benefit personally. However through creating a market community, one that comes together and promotes the market as a whole entity there was a clear benefit to all at the market. This expectation continues to normal market days with an expectation

that producers always make an effort to provide good quality products and customer service at every market.

Winter

As cabbages and cauliflowers take the place of beetroot and broad beans some meat producers begin to suggest customers could purchase stewing steak to put with winter vegetables for a warming casserole. As December approaches the Christmas cheer begins to build; stalls are decorated and there are Santa hats aplenty around the market. Once again a few different products appear at the market from pheasants (both dressed birds and whole, unplucked braces) to mince pies. The preserves and pickles stall offers a selection pack of Christmas chutneys renaming a few, such as their Red Hot Relish to Rudolph's Relish, for the Christmas season. The honey stall begins selling baskets containing honey, jam, marmalade, mustard and candles. Some of these are made to order whilst others are seen at the market and bought for presents. One of the nursery stalls makes up similar baskets but full of plants, ideal as a Christmas gift. For one or two markets before Christmas there is some flexibility in those manning the market stalls. Some producers obviously have extra Christmas orders they need to prepare and thus send an employee rather than the main producer or farmer to man the stall. There is still an expectation by the market managers that these people know about the products on offer in order to answer questions customers may have but there are a number of different faces working at the stalls in the lead up to Christmas. Whilst this rule may be relaxed there are grumbles and mumblings as one meat producer displays a couple of turkeys for sale that they have not produced. The market manager is quickly informed and the birds are removed from the market stall. Even during these festive times producers are unforgiving of anyone felt to be breaking or bending the rules.

From late November and into December the weather turns cold with snow falling a lot earlier in the winter season than usual. The first fall of snow looks very pretty across the mountains but prevents a couple of producers getting out to the market. Two more decide to pack up and leave early as the forecast is bad and they both have a distance to drive home. The second fall of snow is a lot heavier and falls the night of the last Friday market before Christmas, preventing six producers from even getting

to the market. Those who make it out to the market haven't come without their struggles. One farmer heads to the market in his tractor, seemingly as it was easier rather than being particularly necessary but it catches the eye of everyone in town and perhaps makes them realise that coming out on such a day is not just a struggle for them as a shopper but also for those who are providing the goods.

Due to the early snowfall it is perhaps unsurprising that the talk at the January markets focuses on the impact the weather is having on produce and costs. It is usual that the snow and cold weather hits in February time so everyone now has to be prepared for this as well as coping with what has already been and gone. Even the milder areas such as down by the coast had seen snowfall before Christmas so animals everywhere had required feeding. It is a worrying time for many especially when market days are wet and cold and therefore unattractive to all but the hardy, regular shoppers to come out and spend their money.

Chapter 1: Introduction

This thesis opens with a brief glance at an ethnographic study of a farmers' market. Through briefly documenting just some of the challenges faced by producers at the farmers' market the Prologue seeks to bring the concept of resilience to our attention. Policy makers the world over are calling for resilience as a guiding concept in rural regeneration, but what does this mean in practice? How do farmers' markets contribute to producer's resilience? Beyond this, how are farmers' markets formed and defined, are they simply areas in which resilience can be developed or are they seeking to be resilient themselves? Through spending a year in one farmers' market this thesis attempts to answer that question: what is resilience, how is it developed and how is it practiced in and through a farmers' market?

Over recent years the term resilience has entered mainstream policy discourse. Resilience promotes the necessity of individuals and systems to make appropriate choices when faced with difficulties, challenges or adversities (Manyena, 2006), with a resilient system being seen as one that can respond to challenges, adjusting appropriately without jeopardising the overall functioning of a system (Hudson, 2008). Both a succession of natural disasters and the global economic crisis of the late 2000s are felt to have promoted the need for adaptation and survival and thus have heralded an influx of the use of the term resilience and the focus on its attributes (Christopherson et al., 2010, Martin, 2011). Why is resilience important in terms of agriculture and for the farming industry and why is there a necessity to frame an understanding of farming within the concept of resilience?

The recent history of agriculture tells us much about why resilience is an important concept to farmers. Since World War II, agriculture has been marked by a series of crises, each of which have demanded adaptations and realignments by farmers in order to stay farming. By way of introduction and as a guide to the importance of farmer's resilience, I describe three of these moments of crisis and resilience.

1. Environmental Crisis
2. Financial Crisis
3. Diversification (as a resilience pathway)

The agricultural industry and subsequently farmers are constantly under pressure to provide food and nutrition for the nation. However, over the past few decades the priorities of policies and the pressure from consumers has changed with the agricultural industry having to demonstrate its adaptability as demands alter. Following World War II agricultural objectives focused on increasing productivity and self-sufficiency with the modernization and industrialization of agriculture ensuing (Mather, 1996, Ilbery and Bowler, 1998, Murdoch et al, 2003). However, by the late 1960s and into the 1970s this push for production saw the growth of food surpluses across Europe and a need to curb production. In addition, the environmental consequences of industrialisation including the physical destruction of trees and hedgerows to accommodate bigger machinery, with the subsequent loss of ecosystems and wildlife, along with the serious ecological effects of pesticide use (such as dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT)) and the effect of fertilisers and nitrates on drinking water began to be recognised by both the public and politicians. These consequences alongside the ‘declining health standards of food and animal welfare’ (Ilbery and Bowler, 1998: 78) urged a restructuring of agriculture. Such restructuring required resilience and an ability to make changes to the agricultural system that would be beneficial in the long term. Above all, it required farmers to adapt to these demands by embracing their roles not just as producers of the nation’s food supply but also as stewards of the British countryside.

Agricultural policies responded to the challenges of production and the demands of consumers through introducing conservation measures within agricultural production, however even having sought to alter the emphasis of production agriculture and farmers remain constantly challenged. In the 1990s beef production was affected by Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) which impacted on beef sales both in the UK and the export market. In 2001 the first outbreak of Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) since 1967 hit the UK. This severely affected farming livelihoods with infected animals and those within a 3km radius of the infection having to be culled along with restrictions of movement placed on animals in the near vicinity of infected animals. Not only did this affect farming profits but proved an emotional challenge for many farmers involved. Such sudden outbreaks demonstrate the vulnerability of farmers to the challenge of animal or plant disease. In addition, there are other environmental challenges, such as the weather, that constantly affect farmers. Recent

news reports have highlighted the struggle that farmers have faced during the 2011/2012 growing season with a very cold but also particularly dry winter season prompting reports of drought conditions. This was followed by the wettest summer in UK records, high rainfall and low hours of sunshine. The result is a poor harvest due to conditions that farmers have no control over. Even when faced with such conditions there is still pressure on farmers from the everyday consumer who demands adequate food supplies and the pressure that, regardless of the challenges faced, farmers need to at least break even on production costs.

Beyond these physical challenges associated with food production, producers are constantly suffering a battle with price squeezes often imposed by supermarkets. The summer of 2012 has seen uproar amongst dairy farmers as supermarkets threatened to lower the price that milk was sold for and subsequently the price they would pay to farmers. Had this been instigated farmers would have received payment that failed to cover production costs, the expectation from supermarket buyers being that they should somehow reduce their production costs in order to make a profit. Whilst consumers are tightening their purse strings due to the economic recession producers are also faced with increasing fuel and feed prices, pushing up the cost of production. Coupled with this has been the emerging recognition that a global food security crisis exists (Foresight, 2011, Horlings and Marsden, 2011 Goodman et al, 2012). This recognises that the current intensification of food production is not conducive to a long-term sustainable food supply that could feed the growing world population. There is a call to create a sustainable agricultural system (Foresight, 2011). Such a system would not only place greater emphasis to reduce the environmental consequences of food production but also seek to provide a stable, affordable and accessible food supply for all of the global population (Foresight, 2011). Producers are constantly battling and attempting to balance all these demands with their need to make at least some profit from the hours spent producing food for the nation.

How have farmers reacted to these endless challenges and demands? How have they attempted to remain resilient when faced with crises and pressures? For those who have continued to pursue a farming career, two routes have emerged since the 1990s. The first of these has been to continue to intensify production, to further industrialize and to attempt to benefit from economies of scale. Such farmers supply large-scale markets producing bulk commodities for the mass market. The alternative route for

production has been to remain small-scale in order to focus on product quality rather than product quantity. Primarily this latter route has been lead by consumer demand. The food and health scares of the 1980s and 1990s prompted some consumers to question how their food was produced, demanding greater traceability to improve the quality of production and thus the quality of the final product (La Trobe, 2001, Marsden and Sonnino, 2008). Such demands have allowed some farmers to therefore produce in a different manner, on a smaller-scale and thus less intensively. However, this approach to farming has enforced farmers to consider their income stream, appreciating that the income from small-scale production alone is unlikely to provide an adequate income to live off.

Farmers seeking to remain small-scale have therefore been seen to diversify their incomes, showing their adaptability and thus displaying signs of resilience. Farm income diversification has taken a number of different routes. For example some farmers have seen family members enrol in off-farm employment, others have created farm accommodation or on-farm activities for tourists to enjoy whilst others have progressed into processing their primary products and selling produce directly to consumers (Shucksmith and Winter, 1990, Vernimmen et al., 2003, Wilson, 2007). This last diversification route has allowed farmers and their workers to remain solely within food production, although new skills in processing and selling have been necessary to develop. It has also required the development of new routes to market for food and thus new 'alternative' food distribution networks have emerged (Goodman and Watts, 1997, Ilbery and Bowler, 1998, Renting et al, 2003). These networks have sought to be distinctively different to the conventional supermarket shopping experience. These new alternative methods of distribution aim to reconnect producers and consumers, allowing consumers to gain confidence in how their food is produced through direct contact with producers and allowing producers to gain a fairer price for their products through cutting out intermediaries and dealing directly with the consumer. The emergence of these new distribution networks and the uptake by farmers has shown the adaptability of certain farmers, their willingness to try new ideas if it allows them to continue producing food, thus displaying aspects of resilience.

The alternative methods of distribution that have emerged include farmers' markets, where farmers and other producers regularly come together in a specific location to

sell their products direct to customers; box schemes, which provide the opportunity for customers to ‘sign up’ to regularly receive a fruit or vegetable box from a local farmer who fills the box with fresh, in season produce; and community supported agriculture, where consumers buy a share in a plot of land that is then farmed and in response to purchasing shares they receive a portion of the harvest. Whilst all of these distribution lines require good quality food to be produced as customers would not continue to buy or invest if it was not to a good enough standard they do allow farmers to sell produce that might not be aesthetically ‘perfect’ but that tastes absolutely fine, meaning greater proportions of a harvest can be sold. Direct markets such as these, that directly connect producers and consumers, have therefore provided farmers with a route that has given them the opportunity to improve their economic resilience.

As well as being economically challenging, farming has become socially isolating for those involved. As the mechanization and industrialization of agriculture has developed so the number of farm workers has decreased. Farms themselves have increased in size and thus farmers have fewer neighbours. Seemingly farmers are under greater pressure to produce food yet have less social support in which to cope with such pressures. What else then, can the alternative distribution networks provide to such farmers? Do they provide social support and what does this support mean to farmers? In order to answer these questions this thesis has specifically focused on the alternative distribution network that regularly brings together a group of producers along with consumers, the farmers’ market. This provides the opportunity to establish what farmers gain from the regular contact both with other similar producers who are suffering from the same production challenges and social isolation as well as what they gain from contact to consumers who may be making demands but are also purchasing produce. What interaction occurs, between whom and does this provide support for farmers? Do they gain emotional support through seeing others and/or do they gain practical support in order to remain economically resilient through challenging times?

Through this one specific ‘alternative’ food network this thesis therefore takes the following key aim sought to be answered through investigating the three research questions given below.

Research Aim:

To establish the role of farmers' markets in developing and sustaining producer's resilience.

Research Questions:

1. How do farmers display resilience to the differing challenges of production?
2. How is resilience socially produced at farmers' markets?
3. How does the regulation of farmers' markets affect their resilience and the resilience of those trading at them?

In order to answer such questions a methodological approach that allows a full understanding of the farmers' market environment is required. For this reason an ethnographic approach has been taken within this thesis allowing the immersion of myself, as the researcher, into the farmers' market environment for a year. Through becoming part of the market community I was able to see actions firsthand, to be part of and hear conversations and to experience the market routine. In a second stage of fieldwork I spent a total of 25 days working with different producers, taking part in a routine working day of production. This allowed me to understand each producer a little better, to gain a fuller context of who they were and how they worked, the challenges they faced day in, day out but also the enthusiasm they had for producing food. It allowed for conversations about the farmers' market without any other producers hearing but these farm visits and honest conversations were made possible through building strong relationships with producers within the market environment. Through experiencing the market and the life of producers over a prolonged period of time I was able to develop an understanding of how farmers use the farmers' market, what they gain from it and how they interpret what it is. This final element, the interpretation of the meaning and purpose of the farmers' market by those involved, has emerged during the research process as an important factor that needs to be understood in order to fully appreciate the rest of the findings. Importantly it has demonstrated that whilst farmers' markets may have been established to aid farmers' resilience, to be of any use the market itself requires some kind of resilience, some kind of adaptability but in order to be adaptable or flexible the market first needs a definition to be flexible around.

1.2 Thesis Overview

The thesis is laid out as follows:

Chapter Two provides a background to the development of post-productivist agriculture, the development of multi-functional farm holdings and the images that have become associated with these. It discusses the emergence of alternative food networks, these being either production related, based on less intensive production methods than conventional agriculture, or distribution related, based on a more localised food supply chain. The chapter focuses on distribution related alternative food networks, specifically documenting the rise of farmers' markets in the UK and the emphasis that current literature affords to consumers using these markets to the detriment of understanding the producer element.

Emerging from Chapter Two is the suggestion that post-productivism has promoted adaptability, flexibility and variation in agriculture across the UK, these being adopted to reduce farmer's vulnerability and thus to help develop their resilience to ever increasing market pressures. Chapter Three therefore explores the concept of resilience, its emergence from ecological literature to its widely accepted use across various subject areas. This literature recognises the importance of understanding systems as a whole entity and so to understand and appreciate resilience within a farmers' market it is necessary not just to understand the market or its individual producers but also the interactions between these producers and how such interactions may aid resilience. Chapter Three therefore details the two widely documented types of community; a community of practice and a community of coping, which can aid individual resilience.

Chapter Four moves on to detail the appropriate methodology required to answer the research questions. It provides a detailed description of the ethnographic methodology chosen for this research project and introduces the specific case study. The chapter aims to give a detailed account of the research environment, from point of access through to representing fieldnotes in this thesis and the self-reflections this involved.

Chapters Five, Six and Seven seek to provide empirical evidence and discussion to answer the research questions. Chapter Five specifically focuses on the challenges

faced by individual producers, how these are overcome and the type of resilience this displays. Chapter Six discusses the social interaction, social networks and communities that develop within the market environment and the delicate balance of factors when seeking to develop resilience. Chapter Seven details the resilience of the market as a system, the definitions, the assumptions and the potential overarching standards. These chapters are interspersed with vignettes and extracts from the field diary that seek to provide the reader with a flavour of the research environment.

Chapter Eight concludes the thesis providing an overview of the research questions and research aims. Further to this it discusses both the limitations of this study as well as the difficulties encountered when attempting to utilise the concept of resilience. Finally, it suggests some directions for future research that have emerged from this research project.

Chapter 2: Crises, Quality and Post-Productivism

Introduction

Chapter One briefly introduced the challenges faced by agriculture in the UK since the 1940s and how the emphasis on agricultural production led to the degradation of both the natural environment and social networks in rural areas. The chapter suggested that the resulting agricultural crisis prompted a change in agricultural policies that has supported 'alternative' pathways in agricultural production. This chapter seeks to provide a greater understanding of these changes, the crisis facing farmers in the 1980s and the subsequent emergence of post-productivist agriculture that has sought to support agricultural production alongside raising the quality of the food produced, the quality of the natural environment in which it is produced and the quality of the relationships and regard held between consumers and food producers. Section 2.1 provides this overview before highlighting the different routes to diversification followed by different farmers, demonstrating that farmers may adapt to secure a sustainable income, to support their local community or to improve the natural environment, or indeed any combination of these three elements. Section 2.1 also identifies that there are 'images' of post-productivist farmers that have developed cultural scripts suggesting that diversification is regarded by some as a failure in farming. These are based on the era of farming that promoted intensive production and the scripts that may exist within post-productivist agriculture, the expectations held by those following specific diversification pathways and the subsequent consequences this has on diversification and innovation is an area open for further examination. Section 2.1 concludes with a brief investigation of the most recent reflections on agricultural change that call for 'sustainable intensification' (Foresight, 2011, Goodman et al., 2012) These new changes seek to produce a global agricultural system that prioritises environmental costs over financial gain and focuses on reducing hunger across the world.

Section 2.2 focuses on one specific diversification pathway, that of 'alternative' food networks. Rather than simply adding an income stream to allow farmers to continue food production, farmers choosing this pathway make a change to either their methods of production or their methods of distribution, signifying a move away from productivist agriculture. This section explores how the creation of 'local' food has

added to the identity of specific areas as well as discussing the quality that local food is assumed to have. The section discusses the quality expectations held by consumers but questions whether producers' expectations are known or understood. The section asks if there is a need to certify this quality and the expectations of both producers and consumers in order to safe-guard the 'alternativeness' of these food networks but in doing so acknowledges that any certification scheme would be difficult to both define and implement across what is now a diverse agricultural system.

Section 2.3 moves to discuss one specific example of an 'alternative' distribution network, the farmers' market. This network not only provides a place to sell produce but importantly provides an environment where farmers can meet with both consumers and other farmers. The section provides a brief background and definition of farmers' markets as well as discussing the consumer groups that are known to use them. Finally it moves to explore what is known about the social element of the farmers' market from a producer's point of view. It questions the specifics that are known about the non-monetary benefits of farmers' markets for producers and suggests there is more to explore in terms of exactly how these support farmers in their business.

2.1 Agricultural Crisis and Agricultural Change in the UK

'FMD (Foot and Mouth Disease) has passed but farming is still in crisis. Incomes rose last year but they are still near rock bottom and the long term trend is downwards. The public image of farming in England is bad. The industry is not attracting new entrants or investors' (Curry et al., 2002: 110)

The extract above is taken from the 'Curry Report' commissioned by the UK government following the foot and mouth disease outbreak that affected UK agriculture in 2001. This was perhaps a pinnacle in agricultural challenges, forcing the government to reconsider their management of the agricultural sector in the UK. The commissioned report called for farming to become both profitable and sustainable, to be an integral part of rural areas, providing healthy food and attractive land and encouraging the reconnection between farmers and consumers. In order to understand how and why British agriculture had reached this state of crisis it is necessary to give a brief overview of agricultural change since the 1940s before

establishing how such crises are being overcome through the emergence of post-productivist agriculture, encouraging farm diversification, and how this change is viewed within agricultural circles.

2.1.1 Intensive agricultural production

Following World War II the UK, similar to other countries across Europe, sought to become self-sufficient in food and wood (Mather, 1996). Agriculture was modernized and industrialized with chemical inputs (fertilizers and pesticides) encouraged and machinery improved to increase crop yields. Output was financially rewarded, 'thus those producers whose production was greatest gained the most in terms of financial support' (Murdoch et al., 2003: 34). Across the EU from the 1960s onwards, due to the policies put in place to support production, there was a concentration of specific types of agriculture with wheat, potatoes, milk and oilseeds being produced in Denmark, Ireland, the UK and West Germany whereas fruit, eggs, pigs and sheep were produced in France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Italy (Ilbery and Bowler, 1998). Such regionalisation demonstrates how state intervention encourages farmers to change production and practices through financial incentives (Ilbery and Bowler, 1998). The consequence of this production push was the creation of so-called 'mountains' and 'lakes' across Europe of surplus wine, butter, barley, wheat, sugar and beef (Robinson, 1990, Marsden et al., 1993, Winter, 1996).

In addition to the surplus food produced, the policies driving production also caused widespread transformation of farming and rural areas. Subsidies offered to farms promoted large scale production and the small-scale, family farm, so long the quintessential British, rural feature, began to become marginal, unable to benefit from scale economies (Robinson, 1990). Fertilisers and pesticides were leached into the UK's waterways disturbing the natural and often delicate balance of these natural ecosystems; increased production depleted the natural nutrient levels of the soil resulting in increased soil erosion (Ilbery and Bowler, 1998); hedgerows and subsequently wildlife across the UK were lost as field sizes were increased (Lampkin, 1999) and mechanization of farm machinery increased air pollution. Essentially the drive in production was seen to affect much of Britain's 'well loved components such as hedgerows, hedgerow trees, woodland, areas of rough grazing, downs, moors and wetlands' (Robinson, 1990: 136).

From the early 1980s it was recognised that the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), the driving force behind intensive agricultural production, 'had not only fundamentally altered agriculture but the countryside too' (Murdoch et al., 2003: 36). An attempt was made to curb overproduction through the introduction of a number of measures, 'the most significant of which were milk quotas and set-aside for cereals' (Murdoch et al., 2003: 36). These aimed to reduce the quantities that farmers could produce or provided compensation to encourage them to take land out of production. However, these initial EU policies failed to significantly curb overproduction and thus in the late 1980s agricultural policies began to take a different emphasis, incorporating greater conservation measures (van Koppen, 1997). Conservation was encouraged on surplus farmland and farm subsidies were 'redirected from price supports to encouraging 'environmentally friendly' farming' (Gilg, 1996: 83). Rather than rewarding farmers for taking land out of intensive production these policies offered financial rewards for environmentally sound production techniques that incorporated whole farms. The policies began to reflect that to be sustainable agriculture was required to incorporate three issues: environmental sustainability; producing food without depletion of resources or unacceptable pollution; socio-economic sustainability; providing an acceptable return for those employed in agriculture, and productive sustainability; the ability of the system to provide sufficient food (Ilbery and Bowler, 1998).

Through the intensification of production methods consumers have become detached from the grass roots level of production as the 'geographical distance[s] between food producers and consumers' has increased (La Trobe, 2001: 182). However, the UK's recent food scares and crises such as Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) (in the 1980s/1990s), Salmonella (in the 1990s) and Foot and Mouth Disease (in the 2000s) (Morris and Young, 2000, Miele, 2001, Winter, 2003 Winter, 2003a, Ilbery and Maye, 2006), have prompted 'heightened consumer awareness over quality, safety and source of foods' (La Trobe, 2001: 181). This has driven consumers to call for farmers to produce 'safe and healthy food' (Marsden and Sonnino, 2008: 427) alongside a 'visually attractive countryside' (Marsden and Sonnino, 2008: 427). As Frouws and Mol (1997) point out, it is vitally important that farmers respect the public's genuine concern for environmental quality and 'safe' food products and adhere to subsequent policy changes. Consumers voice their

concerns through their buying habits and thus farmers have been called upon to make changes, to improve the 'image' of production, this being 'rewarded' through continued sales to the general public.

2.1.2 Consequences for farmers' health

The changes in agricultural policies and public demands, as discussed above, create constant challenges for producers. Couple these with the pressures of the natural environment, such as weather and the threat of disease, the complex paperwork, financial pressures and family problems (Malmberg et al., 1997, Raine, 1999, Gregoire, 2002, Page and Fargar, 2002), all associated with agricultural production, and it is easy to see why farming is regarded as a stressful occupation. Farmers themselves are seen to work long hours with Gregoire (2002) stating that 70% of farmers work longer than 10 hours a day with few taking holidays. In addition to these challenges the mechanization of agriculture has reduced the number of labourers needed on farms and the increase in farm size has reduced the number of farming neighbours each farm has (Sutherland and Burton, 2011) resulting in farming 'becoming a more isolated job' (Malmberg et al., 1997: 109). This physical and subsequently social isolation is reported by farmers as a 'frequent cause of stress' (Raine, 1999: 265).

These strains of production have taken their toll on farmers with a number of studies identifying that the occupational group of farmers has a higher risk of suicide compared to other professionals of the same age (Malmberg et al., 1997, Simkin et al., 2003, Stark et al., 2006). Lone working gives more time for individuals to dwell on particular problems (Raine, 1999) and thus those farmers who work alone or have smaller social networks are seen to be more likely to take their own life (Stark et al., 2006). These statistics suggest that alongside the production and environmental crises that were discussed above there appears also to be a health crisis amongst farmers. This is increasingly becoming a major concern for both the agricultural community and farming as an industry (Page and Fargar, 2002: 84).

2.1.3 Emergence of post-productivist agriculture

As identified above, from the 1980s onwards agriculture across Europe was seen to be affected by financial, environmental, health and political crises and it was these that were seen to drive a change in the emphasis of agricultural policies (Marsden, 2007).

In 1992 reforms were made to the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) that aimed to ‘protect and enhance wildlife, habitats and natural resources; conserve and enhance the most attractive landscapes; and promote new opportunities for enjoyment of the countryside by the public’ (Gilg, 1996: 87). The reform began to acknowledge the spectrum of roles that rural areas hold and sought to integrate agriculture ‘within broader rural economic and environmental objectives’ (Ilbery and Bowler, 1998: 57). Rather than seeing farmers as solely food and fibre producers these reforms promoted the contributions they can make to the viability of rural areas, their ability to maintain and increase biodiversity along with defending the value of natural, rural landscapes (Potter and Burney, 2002, Swagemakers, 2003).

This change of policy focus has widely been termed ‘post-productivism’ (Robinson, 1990, Marsden et al., 1993, Ilbery and Bowler, 1998, Evans et al., 2002) not because it signalled the end of production but due to the fact that agriculture ceased to be seen as the primary function of the countryside (Wilson, 2007). Indeed, it is suggested that the term post-productivism seeks to capture changes beyond those occurring on farms, also covering wider social and economic changes occurring in rural areas (Evans et al., 2002). For this reason the emerging ‘post-productivist’ policies no longer encourage just one agricultural model focused merely on increasing food production (Evans et al., 2002) but have allowed traditional family farms promoting food quality to exist simultaneously with modern capitalist farms whose aim has been to promote food quantity (Ilbery and Bowler, 1998). This has allowed farmers to choose their own focus, their own driving force and to follow different pathways to food production. Post-productivism has therefore led to ‘differentiated or ‘new rural spaces’’ (Evans et al., 2002: 315) as different farms and different areas have sought to embrace change in differing ways. These changes have gone some way to answer the call made by the Curry Report (Curry et al., 2002) for the variation, diversity and regional character of England to be re-established.

This change in emphasis promoted by the new policies was reflected again when in 2001 changes of department names in the UK Government saw the disappearance of the word ‘agriculture’ from all central government departments (Wilson, 2007). This occurred when the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) was merged with the Department for Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR) to form the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). This transition is

seen as significant in demonstrating the importance of rural areas beyond agricultural production suggesting that farmers and agriculture are no longer seen to have a monopoly within rural areas (van der Ploeg et al., 2002). Rural areas are now seen to have ‘a mix of production, consumption and protection goals’ (Wilson, 2007: 214), acknowledging the differing land-use pressures within the UK countryside.

2.1.4 Changes in agriculture in the UK

The change in agricultural policies and the emergence of post-productivism has heightened the awareness of both producers and consumers that whilst food and fibre production should remain the ‘primary vocation of farmers’ (Potter and Tilzey, 2005: 592), this should be combined with environmental and social goals (Barnes, 2006). Farmers should be producing rural beauty and quality food along with contributing to the rural economy. Whilst this may appear a challenge such pressures allow food and environmental production to be combined (Potter and Tilzey, 2005) highlighting the positive rather than negative products of agriculture (McCarthy, 2005). Through changing production emphasis away from merely being concerned with increasing output, post-productivist policies have provided farmers with the opportunity to produce food alongside conserving the ‘images of natural beauty’ (Alkon, 2003: 272) that are seen to typify the British countryside.

In terms of changes in production in the UK, Walford (2003: 493) suggests that post-productivism provides the opportunity for farms to move from ‘concentration...to dispersion, intensification to extensification; and specialization to diversification’. As agricultural policies encouraging intensification rewarded agricultural outputs particular crops and systems of production have become concentrated in specific regions of the UK due to the fact that each region has specific conditions that best suit certain types of agriculture. Examples of factors that have led to concentration of production are seen in East Anglia where good soils and flat relief offers a prime cereal growing area whilst the lush, rich grass of the West County offers excellent grazing for dairy herds. Post-productivism aims to encourage farmers to move away from this regional concentration of production, through diversifying their farm rather than simply concentrating on producing one single crop. This has the advantage of creating a visually different and hopefully attractive countryside across the UK as well as providing farmers with income from differing crops, hopefully offering some protection if one suffers a bad harvest. By promoting extensification rather than

intensification, post-productivism has encouraged farming practices which are ‘likely to reduce the polluting effects of conventional farming practices’ (Slee, 1996: 192). It can be seen that these changes emphasise both environmental sustainability and farmer’s economic sustainability. This economic element is provided through encouraging diversification of production, providing a greater safety net for income should natural elements (such as weather or disease) or market values affect the profitability of specific crops. Whilst they may not be able to benefit from the economies of scale as seen in intensive, concentrated agricultural production the hope is that these farmers can produce better quality food in smaller quantities, benefitting from increased sale prices due to increased quality. Through seeking to enhance the appearance of the countryside, its value as a commodity is increased and thus there is the opportunity to benefit from tourism as both rural and urban dwellers visit rural areas for recreational activities. The importance of this rural tourism should not be underestimated especially as the rural gross domestic product (GDP) is greater from tourism than it is from agriculture (Marsden, 1998).

Post-productivism has provided the opportunity for rural areas to recognise and embrace their differing functions, their ecological, productive, economic, social and cultural functions (Fleskens et al., 2009). Through promoting diversification, policies have allowed farmers to continue in agricultural production alongside ‘selling’ the commodity of the countryside in various ways, from selling food products, providing holiday accommodation or providing on-farm recreational activities. Post-productivism has tried to reconnect people with the countryside, commoditising it (Wilson, 2008) so as farmers are not only producing food for consumption but rural areas that are being consumed ‘by populations in search of the rural idyll’ (Wilson, 2007: 103) This idyll is perhaps ‘a nostalgic representation of the country(side)’ (Cloke et al., 2003: 265) which is imagined as a ‘place[s] where people can live close to nature and in harmony with surrounding landscapes’ (Cloke et al., 2003: 257). Due to intensive, productivist agricultural policies these conceptualisations of the countryside have been ‘increasingly separated from conceptualisations of ‘agricultur[e]’ and ‘farming’’ (Wilson, 2007: 104). Through balancing production with environmental considerations post-productivism has sought to demonstrate the positive attributes of farming, encouraging the public to visit rural areas and thus to raise the prosperity of these areas as a tourist facility.

All of the discussions above have perhaps added a rose-tinted view of the need and consequence of farm diversification. It should not be forgotten that one of the strains of intensive agricultural production for some farmers related to financial pressures. Through the change in emphasis of farm subsidies farmers have been able to make changes with some diversifying their capital, resource or labour use to gain a more sustainable extra income (Vernimmen et al., 2003, Shucksmith and Winter, 1990). Wilson (2007) suggests that without support from diversification activities, economically marginal farmers would be likely to surrender farming altogether. The adoption of roles and sources of income outside of food and fibre production and the recognition by some farmers that they hold roles in conservation and preservation as well as production has led to what has been termed agricultural multi-functionality (Burton, 2004, Potter and Tilzey, 2005, Holmes, 2006, Wilson, 2007). Multifunctional agriculture represents the aims of post-productivism through its three key functions, 'space (stewardship, landscape, environment), production (food, security, diversity) and service functions (maintenance of rural areas, biodiversity, rural development)' (Wilson, 2007: 214) and studies of it provide a key to understanding the different levels of change seen in different farmers and hence the differentiated countryside that has emerged across the UK.

2.1.5 The range of multi-functionality

Multi-functional farmers add to their income from agricultural production through both on- and/or off-farm sources taking the opportunity to diversify their income base to remain in production and crucially to keep their business profitable. Innovation is key to making this diversification successful (Wilson, 2007) as it is the ability to innovate that provides inspiration to follow differing income pathways. The differences in innovation are shown in Wilson's (2007, 2008) suggested spectrum of multi-functionality that ranges from productivism to non-productivism. This spectrum moves from those that engage with direct marketing of food products or on-farm processing through to those seeking off-farm employment, with those entering conservation schemes and those offering on-farm tourist accommodation falling between these two. It should be noted that every innovation towards multi-functionality has 'its own specific benefits and price tag' (Swagemakers, 2003: 196) and for this reason farmers must consider not only what best fits their needs but also what fits their physical, emotional and financial abilities.

Wilson's (2007, 2008) spectrum of multi-functionality suggests that farmers can be categorised into classes of weak, moderate and strong multi-functionality. Post-productivism is seen to be 'a shift towards 'sustainable agriculture'' (Wilson, 2007: 109) with policies that promote diversification through the adoption of multi-functional agriculture aiming to reconnect markets, producers and consumers (Marsden and Sonnino, 2008). Strong multi-functionality is displayed through 'high environmental sustainability', 'low farming intensity and productivity' (Wilson, 2007: 215) as well as strong 'rural-agricultural relationships', 'short food supply chains and high(er) food quality', with the 'capacity to re-socialise or re-spatialise food' (Wilson, 2007: 235). Each of these produces an environmentally sustainable production method and a strong reconnection between food producer and consumer. Strong multi-functionality is, therefore, 'the 'ideal' model that all societies should be striving for' (Wilson, 2007: 228). Those displaying moderate multi-functionality may reconsider their production techniques and the environmental consequences of these but continue 'producing for a market that lies well outside their immediate neighbourhood and rural community' (Wilson, 2007: 233). This implies such producers they lack engagement with their immediate community and whilst they promote some environmental sustainability they 'are still linked to environmental degradation caused by agriculture' (Wilson, 2007: 233). Those continuing along a pathway of productivist ideals and production are seen to display weak multi-functionality (Wilson, 2007).

Through securing a more sustainable income, supporting rural life and development and/or farming in a more environmentally friendly way, multi-functionality is advantageous to one or a combination of three parties: the farmer themselves, the local community and the environment. Whilst, as suggested above, strong multi-functionality is the 'ideal' model, the value of moderate multi-functionality should not be overlooked. Farmers who diversify their income to incorporate non-production earnings may be classed as displaying moderate multi-functionality but are seeking to sustain a way of life, a rural livelihood and rural employment which ultimately affects the immediate rural community. It should also be acknowledged that whilst some farms rapidly adopt multi-functional changes for others the 'change may be very gradual over decades' (Wilson, 2008: 374) and thus those who initially fall into the moderate multi-functionality category may over time develop and move into the

strong multi-functional category. Indeed the pathways to multi-functionality 'are not always evenly accessible to farmers and other stakeholders' (Wilson, 2008: 370) and are also 'dependent on external drivers such as the policy environment, market forces or other 'local' obstacles such as rigid planning laws and regulations' (Wilson, 2008: 376). These temporal and spatial differences affecting the uptake of multi-functional agriculture have gone some way to recreate the diverse landscape of rural Britain. However, this landscape is not constant nor stable as certain diversification opportunities may be only temporary and farming businesses must also constantly evaluate their position to ensure they do not stagnate (Curry et al., 2002). These constant changes and evaluations begin to expose the physical challenges and pressures of diversification. Coupled with these challenges there may also be social expectations and it is these that the next section seeks to explore.

2.1.6 Images of multi-functional farmers

A key to adopting multi-functional agriculture is the attitude of a farmer and whether they value agriculture as a business or a way of life (Bryant, 1999, Wilcock et al., 1999). If regarded solely as a business a farmer will strive for profit maximisation through increased yields, thus farming intensively. Those seeing farming as a way of life are more likely 'to conserve or sustain the land in order that succeeding generations of the family may enjoy the same way of life' (Wilcock et al., 1999: 287). Perhaps due to this difference in attitude to production there is a stigma surrounding the adoption of multi-functionality and what it is seen to symbolise within the farming community. This stigma stems from the productivist era of agriculture resulting in some farmers considering those adopting multi-functionality not to be 'real' farmers (Shucksmith and Winter, 1990).

In an era when farmers concentrated solely on production and yield quantities, with little emphasis given to food quality or environmental concerns, farm tidiness, weeds in fields and yield quantities were traditionally seen to indicate a farmer's nurturing ability and thus their aptitude as a farmer (Burton, 2004, Burton and Wilson, 2006, Vanclay et al., 2007). Those seeking to diversify their incomes were regarded as 'agriculturally inept' (Shucksmith and Winter, 1990: 432). They were farmers unable to keep up with production pressures (Marsden and Sonnino, 2008) and thus had 'failed' in farming (Burton and Wilson, 2006). Such images have been developed through the creation of so-called 'scripts' (Silvasti, 2003a). Scripts are seen to

influence a farmer's way of life (Vanclay et al., 2007) due to being 'a process where people are subconsciously and consciously conditioned to follow rules and adapt values and behavioural patterns determined by society; its subculture or some ethnic or socio-economic group' (Silvasti, 2003a: 156). Farming is therefore seen to have 'a set of discrete styles' (Vanclay et al., 1998: 86), these farming styles are an 'identification of groupings of farmers that have common worldviews and/or management strategies' (Vanclay et al., 1998: 100) and each style has different values associated with it by different people within society.

Farming styles and the scripts that determine them help in understanding how and why images, assumptions and identities are associated with different types of farmers. Vanclay et al (2007) offer a general overview of farmer types suggesting that those who primarily rely on their farm for an income are viewed as 'real' farmers whereas those who seek an income from off-farm employment are labelled 'safety net' farmers. Howden et al (1998) offer perhaps a more useful classification of farming styles, suggesting there are four main farming styles: innovative, progressive, middle of the road and traditional. Innovative farmers are seen to be at the 'forefront of agricultural change' (Howden et al., 1998: 113), progressive farmers are 'up to date with the latest farm innovations' (ibid) but such farmers are seen to wait for proof that innovations are successful before adopting them. As suggested by their name, a middle of the road farmer is seen as average, one who is not necessarily profit driven but sees farming as a specific way of life (Howden et al., 1998). Such farmers are often 'torn between past (perhaps inherited) practices and more recent innovations' (Howden et al., 1998: 113). Traditional farmers are regarded as 'stuck in their ways' (ibid) and are 'not able to adapt to recently emerging farming trends' (ibid). The existence of any form of label 'acts as a social control mechanism to guide individual farmer behaviour' (Vanclay et al., 2006: 73) but perhaps what goes unrecognised by many authors is that all these labels demonstrate Burton's (2004: 196) idea that 'farmers want to farm. It gives them their identity'. Farmers are not homogenous; they have different values and practices (Busck, 2002) with 'differing worldviews and strategies' (Vanclay et al., 2007: 4). It is here that Burton (2004) identifies a limit in current knowledge suggesting that 'we must do more to understand the language of farming' (Burton, 2004: 212).

Productivist viewpoints have so far dominated the classification of farming styles but as post-productivism has developed are these stigmas and scripts still applicable across agriculture as a whole industry? Clark et al (2010: 256) suggest that 'real farmers have been defined as growing the 'right' things, conducting appropriate activities around production, making a living off a farm, carrying on a legacy of family production and being able to pass it down to the next generation' but what are the 'right' things to grow, what are the appropriate activities that farmers should be conducting? How do these differ amongst post-productivist, multi-functional farmers compared to the ideas that are already evident and recorded from the productivist era of farming? Seeking to uncover and understand post-productivist images, scripts and stigma provides the opportunity to explore the accepted motivations and actions within post-productivism, the expectations held by those who have embraced post-productivism and hence its ability as a system to remain innovative and diverse.

2.1.7 A new era of agricultural production?

Although innovation and diversification has occurred as certain farmers have sought to adopt post-productivism, the dominant global agricultural system has remained reliant on intensive production. However, following inflation in food prices between 2006 and 2008 it has been recognised that in order to create a sustainable food system, global change must be seen. Recent academic publications have shifted thoughts on food security to highlight that this should not and cannot only be regarded in terms of 'availability, access and affordability' (Goodman et al, 2012: 108) of food. Instead a sustainable food system that will provide food security for all has to embrace food production that is 'achieved through a more effective, rather than exploitative, use of resources' (Kirwan and Maye, 2013: 94). The inflation of food prices has demonstrated the vulnerability of the current, intensive, agricultural system and its exploitative use of ever depleting resources. This has resulted in a call for a change in the current agricultural system to one which puts climate change and sustainability at the fore (Foresight, 2011). It should be noted that this new system is not seen to be the end of industrial agriculture, but the beginning of 'sustainable intensification' (Foresight, 2011, Goodman et al., 2012, Kirwan and Maye, 2013). Such intensification would seek to increase the yield produced on the land without damaging the environment or natural resources (Kirwan and Maye, 2013). This new era of production is seen to be the end of cheap food, seeking to create the least

environmental damage rather than purely being concerned with financial costs (Goodman et al, 2012). Additionally this new focus of food security emphasises the need to ensure food is both affordable and available to all of the world's ever-increasing population, stressing that hunger must actually be reduced (Foresight, 2011, Goodman et al, 2012, Marsden 2013).

Horlings and Marsden (2011) suggest two ways to move to a new system, using either the bio-economy or eco-economy. The first of these involves the use of technology and genetic modification and is regarded as a weak form of ecological modernisation (ibid). The latter is seen as a stronger form of ecological modernisation building on local practices and embedding these in local areas. There is a call not to simply exclude new technologies such as genetic modification, cloning and nanotechnologies 'a priori on ethical or moral grounds' (Foresight, 2011: 11) but instead to use existing knowledge to develop new methods of sustainable production.

This new focus on sustainable intensification has, in some ways, been seen to sideline the existing provision of local food (Goodman et al, 2012, Kirwan and Maye, 2013). Yet it is the local level that is also seen to aid the uptake of a new, sustainable agricultural regime (Foresight, 2011, Horlings and Marsden, 2011, Goodman et al., 2012, Hinrichs, 2013). Hinrichs (2013) for example calls for a regional, rather than localized, food system, one which is not based on a specific territory but instead utilises the relations of the region it is based in. Horlings and Marsden (2011) call for adaptation based on local conditions, recognising that a one-size fits all approach to sustainable intensification will not lead to its success. There is a call for knowledge sharing about best practice, as well as new and existing technologies, in order to enable intensification that is sustainable within each environment it occurs (Foresight, 2011). There is still debate as to the exact route that this new agricultural regime will take and the role of local food networks within this but there is consensus that the food system is and has to continue to change in order to stop 'comprising the world's capacity to produce food in the future' (Foresight, 2011: 10).

2.1.8 Summary

This section has sought to provide a brief history of agricultural policies and their emphasis following World War II to provide some context to the crises that have been identified in agriculture since the 1980s. The final sub-section reflects on the most

recent calls for change within the agricultural system; a call for ‘sustainable intensification’ (Foresight, 2011, Goodman et al., 2012, Kirwan and Maye, 2013). Whilst this differs from the post-productivist pathways taken by some farmers since the 1980s, the knowledge gathered by those who have sought to move away from the dominant productivist agricultural regime may at least aid any emerging transition.

In the 1980s the environmental degradation and animal welfare concerns of intensive agriculture, the negative image this created for rural areas and the pressures being placed on physically and socially isolated farmers began to be acknowledged. This promoted policy change, a change that promoted farming in a more environmentally and socio-economically sustainable manner, considering both the natural resources required to support farming but also, importantly the farmers themselves. This has prompted farmers to follow differing production pathways; some have remained intensive producers whilst others have sought to create multi-functional farms, using income from sources other than direct production to support smaller farms or less intensive production. To create this diverse agricultural landscape producers have required an ability to adapt and to innovate, to follow new directions in production, selling or land-use and to evaluate these new directions, to make necessary changes to remain economically sustainable.

It is essential that these farmers remain innovative, that they regularly reassess their choices and chosen pathway to adapt to meet consumer demands alongside ensuring they remain a viable business. But beyond personal and consumer needs are there other pressures and expectations from within the agricultural system that also affect diversification and adaptability? Stigmas and cultural scripts defining a ‘good’ productivist farmer have been identified but do these exist within post-productivist agriculture? If so, how do these affect farmers, what expectations exist and do these affect their ability to adapt? Are those failing to meet these expectations remaining socially isolated, a feature of intensive agriculture that post-productivist agricultural policies attempted to diminish through reconnecting farmers with consumers and their wider rural communities. To answer these questions it is necessary to look in greater depth at those involved in diversification pathways and thus this chapter will now turn to look at the pathway of ‘alternative’ food networks.

2.2 'Alternative' Food Networks

As discussed in Section 2.1 farmers may adopt post-productivism in differing ways. Some may look to off-farm income unrelated to agriculture, others create on-farm accommodation or tourist attractions, some seek to take part in environmental schemes while others look to become part of so-called 'alternative' food networks (Ilbery and Bowler, 1998, Wilson, 2007). The first three pathways give farmers the opportunity to remain profitable within farming and to continue in agricultural production but to, perhaps necessarily, supplement their farming income with income from a different source. An added income gives the *opportunity* to farm a smaller holding or to farm less intensively but it is not given that a farmer seeking income from areas outside of production is necessarily farming in a more environmentally friendly manner. However, those choosing the pathway of 'alternative' food networks are seen to make a change in either their methods of production or their methods of food distribution. Making such a change acknowledges that the intensification of production under conventional agricultural development has raised environmental, ethical and health concerns amongst consumers (Ilbery and Maye, 2005) and that certain consumers now consider 'healthiness, environmental benefits and animal welfare' (Weatherell et al., 2003: 234) when making food choices. If farmers choose to embrace 'alternative' food networks they can be seen to be developing strong multi-functionality and thus looking at those embracing the greatest move away from productivist agriculture will provide perhaps the best place to begin to understand attitudes, assumptions and identities related to post-productivist agriculture.

Through exploring the 'alternative' food distribution network this section aims to demonstrate both what this network provides to consumers, producers and local areas as well as attributes that the food and production methods are assumed to have. It seeks to demonstrate why these assumptions are made by consumers and the potential to explore whether farmers hold similar expectations of fellow farmers within these networks. Through highlighting the potential problems in guaranteeing that the standards assumed by consumers and potentially producers are upheld this section seeks to explore whether these networks could or should be certified.

2.2.1 Types of 'alternative' food networks

'Alternative' food networks are seen to challenge the unsustainable and exploitative conventional food system (Goodman et al, 2012). Through recognising the 'importance of non-monetary values in food production and consumption' (Fonte, 2010: 1), 'alternative' food networks seek to be 'ecologically sustainable and socially progressive' (Goodman et al, 2012: 3). It is suggested that there are two types of alternative food network, production related and distribution related (Renting et al, 2003).

Production related 'alternative' food networks apply to two different 'alternatives' within production. The first promotes regional foods through the PDO and PGI designations (Protected Designation of Origin / Protected Geographical Indication) (Watts et al, 2005, Maye et al, 2007, Fonte, 2010). These labels restrict where specific food and drink (such as Parmigiano-Reggiano cheese and Champagne) can be made, along with the production methods that must be used; aiming to ensure these products remain traditional and authentic (Watts et al, 2005). Whilst this is regarded as ensuring food quality remains high it is thought to create defensive localism, driven primarily to achieve premium profits for marginal areas (Watts et al, 2005, Maye et al, 2007, Fonte, 2010).

The second production related 'alternative' food network promotes farming that is less intensive than conventional agriculture, more specifically identified as organic agriculture. Organic farming uses 'low impact, environmentally sustainable techniques' (Jacques and Collins, 2003: 32), animal stocking levels are lower than in conventional farming and no artificial chemicals, pesticides or fertilisers can be used in organic production. Organic production is certified by a number of bodies in the UK, the most prominent being The Soil Association, and only inspected and certified producers can trade their food under the 'organic' label. This ensures that consumers can have faith that all organic produce adheres to strict regulations governing the way it is produced which seeks to leave 'as small an ecological footprint on nature as possible' (Marsden and Smith, 2005: 444). However, the marketing and distribution of organic food seems not to follow the 'alternative' or sustainable route with between 70 and 80% of organic food in the UK being sold through supermarket chains (Smith, 2002, Millstone and Lang, 2003, Renting et al., 2003, Smith and Marsden, 2004). Watts et al (2005: 30) suggest that these production related 'alternative' food

networks are the 'weaker alternative systems...because they emphasize the food concerned not the networks through which they circulate'. Here the 'alternative' can be seen as becoming part of the mainstream supply chain and this can only differ if distribution related 'alternative' food networks develop.

Distribution related networks aim to provide sustainable distribution channels for food products. These are seen to 'draw into question the social and ethical values of the dominant food system' (Fonte, 2010: 12). Not only do these distribution related networks seek in some instances to improve environmental sustainability by reducing transportation of goods and developing local food supply chains they also seek to provide a fair price to producers. Again, there are two types of distribution related 'alternative' food networks, those that seek to provide a fair price to international producers (through the Fair Trade movement) and those that are seeking a local supply system. Both of these distribution related networks reconnect consumers with producers, albeit in different ways. Both are concerned with not only the food produced but those who produce it. The first of these distribution related networks, Fair Trade, seeks to provide both a fair wage and acceptable working conditions for workers across the developing world. It seeks to create an ethical and trustable food network (Maye et al, 2007).

The second distribution related network promotes short food supply chains, often where producer and consumer are directly engaged. Fonte (2010: 18) states that it is this 'strengthening of the social relations between producers and consumers at the exchange site' that is the important within these 'alternative' food networks. These include community supported agriculture (CSA), solidarity buying groups, farm shops, box schemes and farmers' markets. Solidarity purchasing groups are perhaps the only alternative food network to be initiated and run by consumers, referred to as 'citizen-consumers' (Brunori et al, 2012). These consumers wish to really take a step away from conventional channels of food consumption, seeking to form their own links to local producers. They not only want good quality food but food that is provided through a distribution channel that is built on trust and co-operation (ibid). Consumers therefore form their own networks, each with a co-ordinator who works with producers to provide all group members with local, seasonal, organic produce, directly from small farms who are trusted to produce the food in an sustainable way (ibid). These farmers then benefit from the guaranteed supply, providing them with

the support to continue farming in an environmentally sound manner (ibid). CSA engages communities in food production as consumers purchase farm shares in return for fresh produce. This provides farmers with a guaranteed income and if harvests are good every share-holder reaps the rewards; if a harvest is poor every member suffers and the farmer still has some income. This distributes the economic burden meaning such problems are not merely shouldered by producers (Jacques and Collins, 2003). This gives control of the food system to those that buy into it (Allen, 2010) but in the majority of cases would not provide a sufficient livelihood for farmers (Hinrichs, 2003). CSA may therefore be better suited to a community wishing to come together to produce their own food rather than for a farmer to diversify to. Farmers are therefore more likely to turn to direct marketing through pick your own schemes, farm shops, box schemes and farmers' markets. These 'alternative' distribution networks provide local food direct to local consumers raising the awareness of local production and reconnecting the consumer with those producing their food.

It should be noted that the majority of distribution networks refer only to supply systems. So, where Ilbery and Maye (2005: 823) suggest that alternative networks produce food 'under more organic, environmentally friendly and local supply systems' this would be a system that considers both production and distribution (it may be argued that the relationship between the citizens and producers in solidarity buying groups means that this system also ensures that production meets the expectations of consumers). A local supply system only covers the distribution element and therefore does not guarantee that production is being carried out sustainably. Some suggest that food available through local supplies, such as farmers' markets, is produced in a manner that does not cause significant environmental damage (Jones et al., 2004) but there is nothing within the local distribution system that assures this is the case.

2.2.2 Local food networks

Morgan (2008) suggests that the UK has a 'placeless foodscape' that is governed by industrialisation and standardised food products. Local food trading through direct marketing gives the opportunity to alter this; availability of products sold through box schemes, farm shops or farmers' markets 'can vary week to week and seasonally depending primarily on availability' (Jones et al., 2004: 333). Products will also vary across locations with some regions producing certain products more easily than

others. The diversity of products available in differing locations provides an identity for each place. The personal nature of alternative food networks allows those involved to ‘reclaim’ ownership of food production, ‘reconnect’ consumers with producers through shorter supply chains, ‘resist’ global capitalism’ (Kneafsey, 2010: 179). This embeds food into specific locations and creates specific relations between consumers and producers allowing them to demonstrate their ‘ethic of care’ for the people, communities, soils, animals and ecosystems involved in food production’ (Kneafsey, 2010: 185).

Alternative distribution networks or short food supply chains have sought to reconnect producers and consumers providing higher levels of mutual trust (Ilbery and Maye, 2006). This trust is built from the direct interaction between producers and consumers. Producers are suggested to be consciously seeking ‘to produce healthy wholesome food’ (Hendrickson and Heffernan, 2002: 363) as it is consumed by those they know and consumers are driven to purchase from local producers. Indeed these social connections are ‘often seen as a hallmark (and comparative advantage) of direct agricultural markets’ (Hinrichs, 2000: 296). As such, producers are providing a service to the community itself (Hendrickson and Heffernan, 2002). Payment for food is therefore seen to be ‘not just for the produce but support for the farm as a whole’ (Jones et al., 2004: 333) with trust being assigned to farmers who are seen to benefit the community as a whole. Consumers’ concerns with food are seen to be wider than the environmental issues caused through intensive production techniques and transportation and have begun to incorporate the livelihoods of producers and vibrancy of rural communities. There is an acknowledgement that rural communities were once centred around farms and food production and that perhaps a part of ‘alternative’ food networks is the reconnection to this.

Distribution related ‘alternative’ food networks are alternative to those associated with the productivist regime of agriculture. Whilst these short food supply chains offer an alternative form of distribution to conventional supermarket distribution consumers begin to make assumptions that methods of production as well as methods of selling are more authentic and less environmentally damaging (Anderson, 2008, Morgan, 2008, Pratt, 2008). Pratt (2008: 56) acknowledges that the terms ‘local’ and ‘authentic’ ‘can become synonymous, or at least immediately evoke each other’ demonstrating that such alternative food networks are seen to be connected with a

move towards an increase in food quality. However, when these alternatives are scrutinised it is acknowledged that there are only specific factors that are guaranteed to be 'alternative'. Taking organic food for instance, the only guarantee that the organic label can provide is the inputs that have gone into production, it does not guarantee small farms or just/fair trading for the farmer (Howard and Allen, 2006). When it comes to local food, this 'address(es) part of the energy question, but nothing else is guaranteed about the food itself' (Pratt, 2008: 57). However, local food has come to be 'inherently associated with certain positive attributes' (Morgan, 2008: 8), with an assumption that localizing food production 'brings social, health and environmental benefits' (Anderson, 2008: 603) and that the production of local food 'is benefitting the environment or at the very least does not cause significant environmental damage' (Jones et al., 2004: 329). All of these assumptions demonstrate what has been termed the 'local trap' (Morgan, 2008, Kneafsey, 2010), although through exploring the producer/consumer relationships developed through these 'alternative' distribution networks it becomes apparent that through building trust between parties the food can begin to meet these quality assumptions.

2.2.3 'Alternative' food networks and quality assumptions

The assumptions and quality inferences made about local food are aided by the marketing of such products (Pratt, 2008) but it is important to understand why, as Banks and Bristow (1999) suggest, the association with a specific locale is an important method of demonstrating the quality of a product. It would seem that it is perhaps the alternative method of selling within short food supply chains that promotes product quality. Local food continues to have 'no generally agreed or widely adopted definition' (Jones et al., 2004: 329). Local food is therefore perhaps seen to be less about distance travelled and more about traceability and thus trust. The alternative supply networks provide the opportunity to build trust through reconnecting the producer and the consumer. It is this reconnection that makes the supply chain 'alternative' and results in local food being commonly associated with quality food.

Within short food supply networks trust is built through face-to-face interaction between the producer and consumer (Kirwan, 2006). By seeing the 'honest hands of the farmer' (Pratt, 2008: 58) who produces the food, assumptions are made about food

quality. As discussed above, consumer concerns have prompted the growth of 'alternative' food networks as certain consumers began to question 'how food was produced, processed and handled, and how these circumstances affect people, animals and nature' (Grankvist et al., 2004: 215). The direct contact with producers within the spaces of 'alternative' food networks provides traceability, increasing trust in production techniques and thus final product quality. Producers within these networks need to recognise the importance of this reconnection to consumers 'to engender confidence in both themselves, and in the perceived quality of the produce they are selling' (Kirwan, 2006: 308). The direct contact with consumers must be used to build on the values that can be attributed to food traded in this way. Hinrichs (2000: 299) suggests that simply the 'aura of personal relations and social connection...becomes some of the "value-added"', demonstrating the importance assigned to direct interactions between producers and consumers.

Local food is seen as embedded in the locale. In other words, it is grounded in available resources and knowledge, uses local skills and traditions and helps to maintain a specific identity and sense of place (Ilbery and Kneafsey, 2000). Through direct contact with producers information regarding these resources, skills, traditions and methods of production can be gleaned, providing a product that is not only embedded within a specific place but is also 'embedded with information' (Marsden et al., 2000a: 425). Being able to gather information about production processes through seeing and speaking directly with the producer allows trust to develop; a trust that the 'honest' farmer is contributing to the local area, its visual and economic vibrancy through maintaining environmental standards and sustaining a rural business. This trust and its subsequent assumptions provide some explanation as to why local food, traded directly from producer to consumer is regularly regarded as 'quality' food.

It should be recognised that consumers still use 'quality cues' (Oude Ophius and Van Trijp, 1995: 179) when choosing foods. General consumer behaviour suggests that 'price, taste and sell-by date are the top three considerations' (Morgan, 2008: 7) when making food purchases. Other specific characteristics of food products can be observed. For instance, it is suggested that 'consumers are known to use colour and fat content of meat as an indicator of taste and tenderness, organic production as an

indicator of superior taste in vegetables, and animal welfare as an indicator of more healthy products' (Grunert, 2005: 376). However, when it comes to alternative supply chains there are certain characteristics that become acceptable and symbols of quality which would demonstrate the opposite in conventional supply chains. For example, within alternative supply chains 'imperfections or blemishes are perceived to denote produce that is natural and unadulterated' (Kirwan, 2004: 403) whereas products that are perfect are seen to be less natural, created through the addition of specific chemicals to the soil. Face-to-face interaction with producers provides consumers with the opportunity to question if a product that is not visually perfect is of a high quality, whereas the impersonal nature of supermarket shopping does not provide this opportunity. Consumers therefore have to rely on their own quality assumptions, picking out specific cues that demonstrate quality when they have no contact with the producer. The perception of what denotes quality is therefore different amongst those defining it in different retail spaces.

2.2.4 Certification of quality

Any information that seeks to convey the quality of products has to be accessible to consumers. Within alternative food networks this may be through conversations about products but it may also be linked to the creation of a local identity and ability to link food to a specific locale. Beyond the physical characteristics of the product itself all of this information must be represented in a way that consumers can interpret. Part of creating this local image, particularly at a farmers' market where farmers are brought together, is to create a community image and to keep a consistent image across the market, so as the market itself can be seen to denote quality. A question to be raised here is what specific personal standards do producers wish to uphold within 'alternative' food networks? Moreover, what do they want the network to convey to those using it and how can they trust other producers to share and uphold the same objectives?

Whilst the specifics of these desired standards require further exploration one solution to offer a guarantee of quality to consumers may lie in the certification of local, directly traded products. Indeed, Ilbery and Kneafsey (2000) claim that the first real indicator of quality is certification. What certification can provide is the ability to 'authenticate the foodstuff as organic, fair trade or a regional speciality' (Pratt, 2008:

64). These certifications can be displayed through specific labelling that can then be identified throughout the consumption environment, providing consumers with at least a starting point to signify quality. Essentially what these certification schemes aim to provide is some kind of protection against ‘copycat products’ (van Ittersum et al., 2007: 18) that could then mis-lead customers. For producers certification and labelling are seen as ‘classic ways in which market niches and higher prices are secured’ (Pratt, 2008: 68) and therefore ensuring labels and branding can only be used by producers holding certification can help to ensure they reap the best rewards for their products.

There is no guarantee that consumers would understand a certification scheme focused on local, direct food provision. Friedmann and McNair (2008) comment that consumers already suffer from ‘label fatigue’, with the proliferation of certification marks ‘undermining the purpose of informing consumers and protecting producers’ (Friedmann and McNair, 2008: 412). Labels are often hard for consumers to fully understand (Grankvist et al., 2004) with many consumers making ‘quality inferences that go beyond what the labels really stand for’ (Verbeke and Ward, 2006: 455). Consumers are seen to look for ‘humane, locally grown and living wage’ (Howard and Allen, 2006: 447) as criteria to guide their food purchasing and it is interesting to see how more than one of these criteria may be assumed to be represented by specific certification marks. Take organic production, for instance. As discussed above, this only guarantees the production methods, therefore fulfilling the desire for humane production, but when organic production is carried out on an industrial scale and traded through supermarkets it can be questioned if this really fulfils the alternative production sought by consumers and whether the supermarket chains provide a fair price to producers. If local, directly sold food were to become certified it may transpire that the assumed ‘social, health and environmental benefits’ (Anderson, 2008: 603) automatically became associated with the certification although the scheme was not guaranteeing all of these. Selling food direct can be classed as ‘Fair Trade by another name’ (Pratt, 2008: 58) through giving producers a fair return for their production but this may not be promoted or directly associated with food traded in this manner. Whatever a certification scheme can guarantee, consumers will still interpret this in their own way, through their own assumptions. This makes the

challenge of safe-guarding the ‘alternative’ nature of alternative networks of food distribution an ever increasing challenge for those working within them.

2.2.5 Summary

This section has sought to demonstrate one pathway to strong agricultural multi-functionality, specifically focusing on ‘alternative’ distribution networks. It has highlighted that whilst these networks provide local, in season food, reducing transportation of food products and reconnecting consumers with the products available to them within their local area, there are also significant assumptions made about food traded in this way. The direct contact between consumers and producers leads to the assumption that the food is of a high quality, with consumer loyalty thought to be reflected by the producer’s loyalty to provide good quality food. These consumer assumptions and expectations appear to be widely understood but if these are to be upheld what expectations do producers have of others within these networks? What role do producers play in ensuring this confidence remains? Are individual producers simply looking after their own reputation or are there expectations to safeguard the reputation of the whole ‘alternative’ distribution network? The section questions whether these assumptions can be guaranteed and the potential tensions overcome through providing some kind of certification scheme for food traded through ‘alternative’ distribution networks or whether such a scheme would itself simply be open to interpretation and thus potential misunderstanding. This chapter will now turn to explore one ‘alternative’ distribution network that reconnects consumers and food producers, the farmers’ market.

2.3 Farmers’ Markets in the UK

This section aims to provide an understanding of what a farmers’ market is, what makes it an ‘alternative’ distribution network and which consumers are known to regularly use these markets. The direct contact between producers and consumers at farmers’ markets, as suggested in Section 2.2, can develop consumer confidence in the quality of food on offer and through cutting out any others within the sale process this can provide producers with a better financial return for their products, aiming therefore to improve their economic sustainability. Beyond the economic struggles of production it is important to remember that another ‘crisis’ within agriculture, as discussed in Section 2.1, is the health of farmers particularly due to their social

isolation. Farmers' markets, unlike many other 'alternative' food networks, provide the opportunity to take time away from the farm location, placing farmers in contact with other people, including consumers and other farmers. This section therefore seeks to question what is known about the interaction that occurs between farmers and others at farmers' markets, whether this helps farmers to overcome the social isolation associated with agriculture and therefore what non-monetary benefits farmers' markets have for those trading at them.

The first UK farmers' market (FM) opened in Bath in 1997 and now, some 15 years later, there are over 700 across the country (National Farmers' Retail and Market Association, 2012a). FMs are organised by producers themselves, local authorities, community groups and other interested parties and are held in a variety of locations, including community halls, in tents and on streets, in villages, towns and cities. They range in size from a handful of stalls to around fifty producers gathering every week, every fortnight or every month. Essentially, every FM is different and distinctive, run in a specific way and supporting a certain number of local farmers and producers. Although each FM differs in certain ways to others the ultimate aim of FMs is to provide a space in which local, in season produce can be sold directly from producer to consumer (National Farmers' Retail and Market Association, 2012). It is this direct contact that results in FMs being categorised as an 'alternative' food network.

2.3.1 Defining farmers' markets in the UK

As previously discussed in Section 2.2 production related alternative food networks such as organic production are heavily regulated, with certifying bodies such as the Soil Association that check all those producing under the organic label adhere to specific rules and regulations within their production techniques. Distribution related alternative food networks such as FMs do not have such certification criteria. Due to this the term FM has been used in various ways which can confuse consumers seeking to purchase local food. A prime example of this is a leading food producer selling a range of 'Farmers' Market Soup' through supermarkets and other such stores.

With no overriding criteria used across the UK that every market advertised as a FM has to follow it is perhaps difficult to define exactly what they are. However, the National Farmers' Retail and Market Association (FARMA) has developed a set of criteria based on the principles developed by Bath Farmers' Market, the first

recognised FM to establish in the UK. FARMA use these criteria to certify those FMs that join their association and suggest that those holding certification have taken the 'first step towards running a true farmers' market' (National Farmers' Retail and Market Association, 2012). It is felt that these criteria provide a way for both producers and consumers to validate products on offer. Through this validation process the certification scheme can help to develop trust within the market place, not only between consumers and the producers they are purchasing from but also between producers who are 'reassured to know that fellow stallholders at a market are genuine' (National Farmers' Retail and Market Association, 2012). There are now over 200 certified FMs across the UK.

The core certifying criteria are as follows (National Farmers' Retail and Market Association, 2012):

1. Locally produced

Only produce from the defined area shall be eligible for sale at a farmers' market. Producers from the area defined as **local** must be given preference.

2. Principal producer

The principal producer, a representative directly involved in the production process or a close family member must attend the stall.

3. Primary, own produce

All produce sold must be grown, reared, caught by the stallholder within the defined local area

4. Secondary, own produce

All produce must be brewed, pickled, baked, smoked or processed by the stallholder using at least one ingredient grown or reared within the defined local area. The base product should be substantially altered

5. Policy and information

Information should be available to customers at each market about the rules of the market and the production methods of the goods on offer. The Market should also publicise the availability of this information.

6. Other rules

Markets may establish other criteria in addition to the above provided they do not conflict with the core criteria.

These rules are open to interpretation, for instance, the specific definition of ‘local’ for each market, and are implemented by individual markets by their managers/management committees. The definitions nevertheless provide a starting point to define what FMs are. Some kind of definition is essential if FMs are going to offer an ‘alternative’ space in which to distribute food products and act as a space to promote local food. Some basic rules, as suggested above, are required but over-regulation ‘could threaten the individuality’ (Kirwan, 2004: 405) of FMs and as discussed in Section 2.2.4 above it would be debatable if a strict certification mark would be recognised, necessary or even identified by consumers.

Beyond any written rules there are some obvious ideas about range and regularity of markets that need to be considered by market organisers and managers if FMs are to be seen to provide a realistic alternative to supermarket shopping. Markets need to provide customers with choice by having a range of stalls and a number of stalls selling the same types of produce (La Trobe, 2001, Kirwan, 2004). This gives consumers the chance to make their own assessments on quality and the ability to make food choices, just as they would be able to in the supermarket. Restrictions on the producers who can attend may provide a strong alternative nature to FMs but at the same time too few producers and too little produce will make the market unattractive for the majority of consumers. This is a delicate balance for market managers to address. Along with this there are no written rules about how regularly FMs should be run but it would seem that regularity may be a key to ensuring consumers regard the FM as a realistic alternative to supermarkets for fresh products (La Trobe, 2001, Kirwan, 2004). It is also essential for producers who need ‘a regular market...to sell their produce when it is ripe’ (La Trobe, 2001: 189). Whatever rules individual FMs decide to follow they all have two essential ingredients: consumers and producers. It is to these two elements that this section now turns.

2.3.2 Consumers using farmers’ markets

It is suggested by DEFRA that the ‘local food sector accounts for only 1-5% of the total grocery market’ (Ilbery and Maye, 2006: 354), with McEachern et al (2010: 399) stating that farmers’ markets ‘only manage to attract 13% of shoppers’. Such figures prompt the need to understand who uses FMs and if there are groups of consumers who are not using them. It is also worth considering not only what attracts those who

use the markets to them but also what is off putting for those who do not use FMs. Answering such questions can perhaps help to develop markets to be more inclusive or indeed to consider the potential need for a different type of 'alternative' food network that may be more appealing to those who are currently not able or interested in engaging with FMs.

Much research that was conducted as FMs began to develop in the UK focussed on consumers within the market space, seeking to understand who was using the markets and to provide an evaluation of FMs as spaces of consumption. It should be noted that nearly a decade has passed since many of these studies were carried out and whilst figures still suggest that FMs only attract a minority of the UK population it is difficult to conclude whether the minority of the population is the same minority as those reported on when FMs first began to develop. Whatever the exact minority currently using FMs 'particular people, places and ways of life' (Dupuis and Goodman, 2005: 361) are seen to be excluded from FMs due to the perception, as discussed in Section 2.2.3 above, that local food automatically becomes associated with quality food which is expensive and niche market (Ilbery and Maye, 2006). Watts et al (2005: 26) suggest that 'those who can afford to' have the freedom to choose to shop in specific places and if FMs are perceived to be expensive many will feel, perhaps unnecessarily, excluded from such markets. Whilst the 'majority of UK consumers are interested in local foods' (Weatherell et al., 2003: 234) it must be recognised that consumers have to balance 'between civic concerns and pragmatic needs' (Pickernell et al., 2004: 194). Therefore, even if a consumer is seeking to purchase food grown in a more environmentally sound manner, such as through organic methods, or traded through local supply chains, if they cannot afford it, or perceive that they cannot, they are likely to surrender this desire in order to make their necessary food purchases. As Hinrich (2000: 299) states, 'familiarity and trust between producer and consumer does not necessarily lead to a situation where price is irrelevant'.

Studies have shown that the majority of customers at FMs in the UK are over the age of 50 (Holloway and Kneafsey, 2000, Youngs, 2003), with under 2% of customers being under 25 years old (Youngs, 2003). Many of those using FMs are retired (Holloway and Kneafsey, 2000, Youngs, 2003) and it is suggested that for many of these using a FM was viewed as a leisure activity (McEachern et al., 2010). The

community developed within the FM is therefore ‘central to our understanding of why older consumers frequent farmers’ markets’ (Szmigin et al., 2003: 549) with such a community atmosphere reconnecting them to past experiences. Direct contact with producers and the community feeling this creates harks back to a ‘golden age when food was supposedly more nutritious and life in general more wholesome’ (Holloway and Kneafsey, 2000: 294). The atmosphere created within and by a FM is therefore essential to attracting at least this specific group of consumers.

The sociable and arguably enjoyable shopping experience (Kirwan, 2004) is just one appeal of the FM, with quality and good value food also being noted as a pull towards them (Kirwan, 2004). McEachern et al (2010: 403) found that ‘supporting the local community was cited as the primary reason’ by consumers as to why they use FMs. However, even with the best intention to support local producers food will only be purchased if it meets consumers ‘normal, food-intrinsic and practical needs’ (Weatherell et al., 2003: 241). So while the increased sense of community spirit and social interaction may enhance the shopping experience and increase trust in what is being purchased, it is the freshness and quality of products which finally determine whether products are purchased. Indeed, Hinrichs (2000) recognises that alongside concerns about agricultural production and the difficulties faced by farmers, access to healthy food is a major attraction of farmers’ markets. The ability to identify quality therefore can act to deter some consumers from using FMs. This point is recognised by Weatherell et al, (2003), who suggest differences in classifying quality between urban and rural populations. Through a study of consumers in north-east England, Weatherell et al (2003) established that many rural consumers would use a butcher to purchase ‘high quality’ meat whereas their urban counter-parts would look to pre-packed meat as a sign of quality. This again identifies the need for some consumers to have a label, symbol or certification in order to ascertain quality, as discussed in Section 2.2.4.

The difference in quality recognition and the confidence some consumers place in the labels provided by supermarkets will undoubtedly rule certain consumers out of purchasing at a FM. However, with ‘few examples of individuals actually committing to local-only purchases of food’ (Pickernell et al., 2004: 195), it must be recognised that FMs make up only a small part of many consumers’ shopping routine. The inconsistent supply of food, periodic opening times, lack of trolleys and in most cases

the inability to pay by credit or debit card at FM (McEachern et al., 2010) are in many cases superseded by supermarkets convenience, in terms of food supply, opening times and ease of shopping, as well as availability of lower priced food products (Weatherell et al., 2003). FM limitations mean that for the majority of consumers they 'can never replace the weekly supermarket shop' (La Trobe, 2001: 187), with some suggesting FMs are a 'site of additional and supplementary consumption' (Holloway and Kneafsey, 2000: 289) where 'consumers will purchase speciality goods' (Holloway and Kneafsey, 2000: 295). With this in mind, it is perhaps necessary to question why producers continue to trade within such alternative food networks and what they achieve in doing so.

2.3.3 Producers use of farmers' markets

Having discussed above that farm diversification is used primarily to provide additional income for farmers it is not surprising that most promotional literature aimed at attracting producers to FMs 'suggested benefits were predominantly economic' (Holloway and Kneafsey, 2000: 287). La Trobe (2001) identifies that whilst prices paid for food products by consumers rose by 52% between 1982 and 1992 farmers themselves only saw an 18% rise in prices paid to them for their products by supermarkets. The processing and retailing of products takes the majority of the price paid by consumers meaning that farmers are seen to only get 10-20% of the final retail price when sold through supermarkets (ibid). The economic advantage and higher income that farmers and producers can achieve from selling through FMs is therefore a huge attraction to trade through such alternative food networks. In addition, farmers waste less from selling through a FM rather than through conventional lines (Kirwan, 2004). Products may be of a high quality but if they do not meet stringent supermarket guidelines, including strict criteria on aesthetic characteristics, they will not be accepted by supermarkets. Such products are often sold at FMs with these imperfect characteristics being seen as a sign of quality and natural production (ibid).

For some producers the additional income from FMs is an added bonus, for others it is required for survival (Hinrichs, 2000, La Trobe, 2001, Youngs, 2003). Although in Youngs (2003) study of FMs in north-west England around 45% of producers valued the extra income but did not state it was essential income needed to hold their business together. For many farmers, trading at a FM does not provide a livelihood

(Hinrichs, 2003) but instead is seen to be ‘simply propping up their main farming business’ (Purvis, 2002). So, whilst producers may be attending FMs ‘primarily for commercial reasons’ (Kirwan, 2004: 402), what else do they gain from trading at such markets? Kirwan (2004, 2006) explores producers’ engagement with FMs beyond pure economics, seeing that interaction and direct contact with consumers is, as defined above, what characterises a FM as an ‘alternative’ food network. If direct interaction between consumers and producers defines alternative it seems useful to appreciate not only that it develops trust for consumers but also to seek to understand what this offers to producers. It should not be overlooked that interaction and ‘friendships built over the counter’ (Kirwan, 2006: 309) were ‘in their [producers] business interests to cultivate’ (Kirwan, 2006: 309). However, it would appear that there are emotional as well as economic advantages to such interaction. Those producers who trade at FMs have ‘a sense of pride in what they produce’ (Kirwan, 2004: 404) and the interaction with customers endorses this through providing a ‘sense of respect, reputation and personalised recognition for what they [producers] do’ (Kirwan, 2006: 311).

Beyond the continued food purchasing, direct feedback and encouragement provided to producers by consumers at FMs these spaces also provide a chance for producers to meet, it could be assumed, other like-minded producers. Producer contact with other producers is a key element of FMs, with the ‘camaraderie between stallholders’ (Youngs, 2003: 523) contributing to the atmosphere at FMs, creating a sociable, pleasant and ‘alternative’ shopping environment for consumers. Yet beyond creating a good atmosphere for consumers what else does this camaraderie and interaction provide for consumers themselves? Hinrichs (2000: 299) suggests that social interactions may go beyond the instrumentalism of making sales and that producers seek ‘family-like social bonds with other sellers’. Kirwan (2004) touches on the fact that such connections *can* provide support to producers who take comfort in talking to others about mutual difficulties in food production. However, is this support present at farmers’ markets and how is it valued by producers? If less than half of producers using FMs feel the income generated from them is *essential* to their business (Youngs, 2003) what non-monetary benefits does a FM provide that make it an attractive place to trade? Whilst consumer support is essential if FMs are to continue, the relatively unexplored producer element of FMs needs uncovering. This will not only help to

understand the advantages, beyond economics, of why producers trade at them but will also establish how FMs can be enhanced to support producers choosing post-productivist methods of production and/or distribution.

2.3.4 Summary

This section has provided a brief overview of farmers' markets highlighting the lack of a universal definition to classify them but identifying that they provide a market space where 'local' producers can sell their produce directly to consumers. Farmers' market studies have identified that consumers enjoy the sociable shopping experience of these markets (Kirwan, 2004) but that it is only a small minority, mainly older generation customers, who choose to shop at farmers' markets. The convenience of supermarkets, the infrequency of some farmers' markets, the ability to judge food quality without specific labels and the perception that food at farmers' markets is more expensive can be off-putting for many potential customers. This section therefore asks what producers gain from trading at farmers' markets and what are the non-monetary benefits? As producers are affected by the continual challenges of production what benefits are there to trading at farmers' markets? Can FMs provide the social support needed by isolated producers and can they provide support for producers to remain innovative and to adapt over time? This final element, as suggested in Section 2.1, is seen as essential to success in post-productivist agriculture.

2.4 Conclusion

Agriculture in the UK has long been governed by national and European policies with the emphasis between the late 1940s until the 1980s primarily on intensifying food production. By the 1980s consumers within the UK began to pressurise policy makers seeking to alter the emphasis of agricultural policies due to both environmental and human health concerns. A gradual change of policies through the 1990s has recognised that farmers are not simply food producers but 'custodian[s] of the land' (Jacques and Collins, 2003: 30) and 'stewards of the natural resources of the countryside' (Marsden and Sonnino, 2008: 422). They create and maintain a bio-diverse countryside (Potter and Burney, 2002). These policies have encouraged farmers to move away from solely concentrating on the quantity of food they produce and to focus on the production of high quality food, landscape protection and/or

supporting rural communities. This has enabled farmers to diversify their farm holding and income streams, some moving into food processing and selling, others creating on-farm tourist attractions and accommodation with others seeking off-farm employment for family members. This chapter has focused on one particular diversification route, 'alternative' food networks, demonstrating how these enable producers to remain solely in food production but to change the manner in which they either produce or distribute their food. Section 2.3 specifically focused on the FM, an 'alternative' distribution network which provides an opportunity for local producers to gather together to sell local food directly to consumers. This particular example is used as it not only has potential to provide the advantages of diversification as discussed above but also provides an opportunity for producers to meet similar others in an otherwise socially isolated career.

FMs provide producers with a space to sell their food directly to consumers, reducing the transportation of the food and increasing the amount of the final sale price that goes directly to the producer. However, beyond this simple economic advantage to producers Section 2.3 questions if there are other, non-monetary, benefits of trading at FMs. Whilst agricultural policy changes and the subsequent diversification of agriculture has sought to overcome the crisis of environmental degradation, animal welfare and public health concerns, farmers still face the everyday challenges of production, having to cope with environmental and economic challenges alongside the social isolation that accompanies farming. Farmers must continue to be innovative and adaptable to ensure their business remains economically viable as well as remaining inspired to keep mentally strong when working independently for many hours each day. What then, if anything, does the social contact with others at FMs provide to these producers? Is it used to remain motivated, to share concerns and emotions, to learn of new ideas, to seek advice from others and, importantly, what are the dynamics of these social networks? It is this final point that raises the second element of the FM that this chapter has highlighted as a subject to be explored.

Section 2.2 highlighted that the direct contact with producers within 'alternative' food networks leads consumers to assume the food available is of a higher quality with some consumers assuming it is produced in an environmentally sustainable manner. Section 2.3 again raises this issue of assumptions as it seeks to provide a definition of a FM, a 'title' that is widely used across the UK but holds no certification to

determine exactly what a FM is. Having highlighted that consumers hold specific assumptions about farmers' markets this chapter therefore asks whether producers hold such assumptions? How do they define what a farmers' market is and do they hold expectations of those who trade with them at a farmers' market? In Section 2.1 the cultural scripts and stigma historically held by intensive farmers were discussed but do such expectations still exist within post-productivist agriculture? If so, how have they changed, what is expected of such producers and of the places that demonstrate post-productivist agriculture, such as farmers' markets? It would seem that an understanding of any such expectations is essential if the social networks between producers at farmers' markets are to be sufficiently understood.

This chapter has documented the change in agriculture and emergence of post-productivism. It has shown that crises in agriculture have been overcome through farmer's adaptability, their ability to follow new pathways enabling them to remain in agricultural production alongside appreciating their role in the preservation of rural areas, the reconnection of producers and consumers through shorter food supply chains and in increasing food quality (Wilson, 2007). Even having embraced change though, farmers are still challenged due to the nature of agricultural production. The questions raised in this chapter highlight the need to understand how diversification pathways help farmers to cope with and overcome these challenges. The specific focus of the FM discussed in this chapter allows for the study of a pathway that still focuses farmers' efforts on agricultural production whilst also providing an environment in which social networks can help. In order to investigate the potential benefits it is essential that these social networks are fully understood, not only for what they provide but also in how they create the context within which they are seen.

Chapter 3: Exploring Resilience and Community Interactions

Introduction

Chapter Two highlighted that to overcome the challenges of production farmers have had to show their adaptability in times of crisis. Challenged with environmental degradation, concerns about animal welfare and diminishing consumer confidence in food many have turned to new production pathways, diversifying their farms and/or extensifying production to produce food in a manner that respects both the food product being produced and the rural landscape that is also being maintained through production. This has required innovation and adaptive capacity in order to maintain viable businesses alongside meeting the demands of consumers and communities. This adaptability in the face of adversity can be seen as a form of resilience and ultimately the changes introduced by agricultural policies, as discussed in Section 2.1, aimed to produce a more resilient agricultural system. Even having made changes, farmers are constantly faced with the day to day challenges of production, this in itself requiring resilience to continue farming.

In order to understand this connection to resilience this chapter seeks to document the rise in the use of the concept across natural, social and economic systems. It explores the various definitions of resilience within different disciplines and how these can be combined to help suggest ways to measure a system's resilience. Throughout all definitions of resilience a key to explore and measure it 'is the presence of demonstrable, substantial risk' (Fleming and Ledogar, 2008: 10) and 'a resilient system adjusts and responds in ways that do not damage or jeopardise function' (Hudson, 2008: 173) of each particular system. Whilst a risk, shock or stress is needed to measure resilience Section 3.2 explores the various characteristics that are needed to develop a resilient system, such as trust, innovation and adaptability. Ultimately what this section demonstrates is that in order to build resilience 'human beings should be at the centre of any resilience programme' (Manyena, 2006: 444) as it is their ability to share knowledge that creates the opportunities to adapt and change. This is taken forward to Section 3.3 to investigate how community development can aid both learning, which increases the ability to innovate in order to

develop resilience, and support strategies to cope with the emotions of specific challenges.

The focus of Sections 3.2 and 3.3 seek to investigate the concept of resilience and its applicability to agriculture. Section 3.3 documents the individual characteristics seen in resilient farmers, including those classified as multi-functional in Chapter Two, highlighting that certain individuals are more resilient than others. This section continues by exploring the potential benefits of social networks in developing resilience. Questions were raised in Chapter Two about the benefits the contact to others at farmers' markets may provide to those trading at them and Section 3.3 suggests that this contact could provide an educational and/or an emotional role for farmers. However, it also identifies that these roles will be reliant on community relations and community identity, questioning whether some form of standardisation of farmers' markets, as suggested in Chapter Two, is beneficial or not. Finally, Section 3.4 provides a synthesis of Chapters Two and Three aiming to draw together the key concepts and research questions which define the focus of this research study.

3.1 The Concept of Resilience

It is suggested that the concept of resilience was first proposed in the 1970s (Lele, 1998) with the word itself being 'derived from the Latin word *resilio*, meaning 'to jump back'' (Manyena, 2006: 433). Resilience was first used to describe the ability of natural ecosystems to withstand changes and surprises (Adger, 2000) and it is recognised that resilience has long been used in physical, engineering and ecological sciences (Martin, 2011). The term is now used in studies of 'natural, social, technological and economic' systems (Manyena, 2006: 443), with Pendall et al (2010: 72) stating that the idea is being 'flocked' to by 'scholars and practitioners across the disciplines...as a quality of people, structures or places'. It is suggested that 'the succession of major environmental disasters that have afflicted local communities in different parts of the world' (Martin, 2011: 2) is a major reason why resilience has become a term used across a broader range of subject areas. Studies of such disasters regard the measure of resilience as the speed of recovering of functions following such events (Tobin, 1999, Martin, 2011). The economic crisis of the late 2000s appears to have created an upsurge in the use of the resilience concept within economics, investigating how local and regional economies respond to stresses,

disturbances and shocks (Martin, 2011). Indeed, Christopherson et al, (2010: 3) believe this growth in the attention to the concept of resilience may be ‘a response to a generalized contemporary sense of uncertainty and insecurity and a search for adaption and survival’.

Whatever the exact reason for the increase in the attention given to the concept of resilience it is now widely used across many disciplines and has ‘entered national, regional and local policy discourses’ (Martin, 2011: 33). However, some suggest that caution should be taken when referring to the concept across disciplines feeling that it ‘cannot be transferred uncritically from the ecological sciences to the social sciences’ (Gallopín, 2006: 299). Here Gallopín (2006) differentiates between the responses of biological and social systems suggesting the former is ‘purely reactive’ to disturbances whereas the latter is ‘both reactive and proactive’. This demonstrates that ‘resilience is not a unitary concept with a precise and universally accepted definition’ (Martin, 2011: 3). Therefore this chapter will now turn to attempt to demonstrate a number of the meanings attributed to the concept of resilience through which some key attributes will be identified.

3.1.1 Defining resilience

There are a host of definitions of resilience, each being subtly different and ultimately implying that the concept has a slightly different focus in different subject areas. For some, resilience is seen as a system’s ability to maintain a constant, relatively unchanged functionality whilst withstanding stresses and shocks (Perrings, 1998, Hudson, 2008, Barnes, 2009). What this suggests is that a resilient system remains on the same development pathway after a shock as it was on previous to any perturbation. Such a definition would imply that resilience will preserve both ‘ecologically or socially undesirable situations as well as desirable ones’ (Levin et al., 1998: 225), which perhaps raises a question over this definition of resilience in directing the development of systems. A broader definition of resilience is provided by Manyena (2006: 436) who suggests that resilience allows ‘communities to make appropriate choices within the context of their environments’. This suggests that resilience is the ability of systems to either remain on the same development pathway or to move to a different pathway depending on what is perceived to be achievable and appropriate at the time of a stress or shock. Perhaps slightly more useful in defining whether a change or choice can be defined as resilient is Fleming and

Ledogar's (2008: 7) acknowledgement that 'resilience has been most frequently defined as positive adaptation despite adversity'. What this final definition seemingly clarifies is that to be resilient any change must be positive, not just in coping with the immediate stress but in creating a system which as a whole is positive. This is demonstrated within regional economic resilience literature by Bristow (2010: 53) who suggests that a region's resilience can be defined as the 'ability to experience positive economic success that is socially inclusive, works within environmental limits and which can ride global economic punches'.

Even when the above discussion is considered, a clear and agreed definition of resilience remains difficult to pinpoint. King (2008: 122) suggests that there are three responses a system may display to a shock or stress:

- '-restore a system to a desirable domain
- allow the system to return to a desirable domain on its own
- adapt to the changed system because changes are irreversible'.

Each one of these responses is seen to demonstrate the system's resilience yet they demonstrate very different pathways and different levels of intervention. These differences are again recognised by Adger (2000: 349) who suggests that resilience is the 'buffer capacity or the ability of a system to absorb perturbations, or the magnitude of disturbance that can be absorbed before a system changes its structure by changing the variables and process that control behaviour'.

King (2008) suggests that there are three different models of resilience which are grounded in different epistemologies and therefore offer differing understandings of developing, maintaining and defining resilient systems. The three categories are engineering resilience, ecological resilience and adaptive capacity resilience (King, 2008). The engineering model of resilience focuses on consistency within a system and promotes the idea that a system has an optimal design. Martin (2011) describes this form of resilience as 'plucking', where a system moves away from its stable state before moving back to what is seen as the optimal state. To be resilient a system must maintain efficient functionality and this 'can be measured by the speed at which the system returns to the stable point or trajectory following a perturbation' (Gallopín, 2006: 299). Ultimately this definition of resilience focuses 'on resistance to shocks and stability near equilibrium' (Martin, 2011: 6).

The second model of resilience is ecological resilience which ‘focuses on the role of shocks or disturbances in pushing a system beyond its ‘elasticity threshold’ to a new domain’ (Martin, 2011: 9). A characteristic of ecological resilience is that there are multiple domains or states that provide a stable system (ibid). Having this multiple domain approach provides difficulty when measuring the resilience of a system. For many, resilience is measured through the magnitude of the shock that can be absorbed before a system has to restructure (Gallopín, 2006, King, 2008, Martin, 2011) but it may also be the amount of time before this ‘new normal’ is aspired to and accommodated by a community (Pendall et al., 2010: 74). The time taken for it to be accepted as the new and stable pathway (Martin, 2011). Whether a system remains in its pre-shock domain or moves to a new pathway, King (2008) stresses that the underlying functionality of the system is maintained. This is one of the primary differences of this model of resilience and the third model.

The final model of resilience is adaptive/adaptive capacity resilience. This model of resilience focuses on the ability of a system to adapt either in anticipation of a change or as a reaction to a change (Martin, 2011). The capacity to adapt is seen ‘to be broader than capacity of response; specific adaptations may include modifying the sensitivity of the system to perturbations’ (Gallopín, 2006: 301). Resilience in this form is seen to be a continuation of development through the ability to adapt and change function as required and in anticipation of requirements. This model of resilience ‘suggests that a system moves cyclically between four domains: conservation, release, exploitation and reorganization’ (King, 2008: 114). It is recognised that this third model of resilience needs those governing to have certainty and agreement in order for systems to function and that bad decisions will lead to ‘serious, perhaps irreversible consequences’ (ibid: 115). This final model could therefore be seen as the most complicated to both achieve and to measure.

To be adaptable and have the ability to change requires an element of open-mindedness to new opportunities and developments. The adaptive model of resilience focuses on evolutionary changes rather than a system simply reaching an equilibrium and remaining on the same pathway (Simmie and Martin, 2010). As Pike et al (2010: 62) state, ‘resilience through adaptability emerges through decisions to leave a path that may have proven successful in the past in favour of a new, related or alternative

trajectory'. It requires a future vision and aims in addition to the ability to embrace change as needed. Without the ability to adapt and change 'individuals and societies may get 'locked-in' to undesirable states or processes' (Perrings, 1998a: 503). Processes that are applicable and successful at one point in time may not remain appropriate or sustainable over the longer term and adaptability ensures that systems are able to change rather than becoming fixed on following one specific pathway. It is this adaptability that can help to maintain long-term functionality and success of a system and it is this that demonstrates the system's resilience.

As studies of resilience have developed and it has been applied within various differing subject areas it appears that the definition of resilience has itself developed. It is now regarded as an holistic concept (Bristow, 2010); a process that allows systems to 'adjust and respond in ways that do not damage or jeopardise effective functioning' (Hudson, 2010: 12) but that also consider the position of the system within wider and larger networks. Through adaptation natural systems are seen to have developed the capacity to cope with localised stresses and strains but perhaps more importantly to also cope with large-scale, both fast and slow, changes (such as climate change). This demonstrates that the resilience of systems has to consider not only the localised pressures but also the much wider, even global pressures that the system itself is exposed to. Leach et al (2010: 63) highlight this in the suggestion that 'a sustainable system would combine not only measures to control outbreaks at source as they arise, but also be positioned to respond adaptively to emergent outbreaks, thus conferring resilience and to identify, track and respond to longer-term shifts'. All this demonstrates that resilience is 'a dynamic *process*, not just a characteristic or property' (Martin, 2011: 14).

3.1.2 Vulnerability and resilience

As resilience 'increases the capacity to cope with stress' it is seen as 'a loose antonym for vulnerability' (Adger, 2000: 357) but it needs to be recognised that vulnerability and resilience are two different things and that 'the absence of vulnerability does not make one resilient' (Manyena, 2006: 443). Vulnerability is seen as a systems susceptibility or exposure to harm whereas resilience is the capacity to cope or recover from perturbations (Gallopín, 2006, Briguglio et al., 2008). Vulnerability is the underlying, inherent characteristics of a system, whereas resilience can be

developed through defined actions (Briguglio et al., 2008) as shown by the proactive adaptability of a system in preparation for potential disturbances. One example of underlying vulnerability and the ability to build resilience is seen in the case of forest fires as discussed by Levin et al (1998). In dry and hot conditions many forests are vulnerable to fires starting; these often begin as small fires burning debris that has collected on the ground. It has been recognised that putting out small fires, which clear the debris on the forest floor, keeps the forest in a very vulnerable condition. The debris builds up meaning that any subsequent fire is likely to be larger (as there is more fuel to burn) and therefore could have more damaging consequences. If small fires were allowed to burn, debris would be cleared and thus the forest system has less chance of exposure to larger fires. The forest would still be vulnerable to fires, but less vulnerable to large fires and thus small adaptations in the management of forest ecosystems can mean they are more resilient to the shock of a fire as such a shock can be coped with and the ecosystem can maintain functionality following a fire.

This distinction between vulnerability and resilience is applicable across disciplines, not just in natural systems. Martin (2011) discusses the effects of the UK's economic recession in the 1980s, suggesting that the regions that were dominated by heavy industry, such as Wales and north-west England were particularly vulnerable to the economic downturn. This is seen to be due to the lack of diversity within these regions, diversity being an underlying condition that aids economic development. Such areas were therefore vulnerable to shocks to the economic system and diversification of local economies was required to reduce vulnerability and to build resilience. It is suggested that in such situations policy measures and management systems are required (Briguglio et al., 2008) to focus and lead the development of resilience as the whole system requires a change which is perhaps best introduced from outside of the system led by those who can visualise the role of the system in the bigger picture of society.

Responses to reduce vulnerability of any system are therefore seen to 'reduce exposure, enhance coping capacity, strengthen recovery potentiality and bolster damage control (i.e. minimize destructive consequences' (Bohle et al., 1994: 38) and therefore would enhance a system's resilience. Taking steps to reduce vulnerability therefore goes hand in hand with increasing a system's resilience; however, a system's limited exposure to specific shocks/stresses and thus lack of vulnerability

does not mean that it is inherently resilient. Resilience must be developed and it is suggested that the best case scenario for systems is to build and develop resilience to potential shocks and stresses even if they are not necessarily particularly vulnerable to specific risks (Briguglio et al., 2008). There is a need to balance choices made and to appreciate the scale of potential shocks and stresses a system may be exposed to as ‘through simplistic management regimes, robustness and resilience are lost’ (Levin et al., 1998: 227).

3.1.3 Measuring resilience

Through the discussion of differing definitions of resilience it can be identified that measuring a system’s resilience is difficult as it could involve measuring the coping capacity, the capacity of response or the adaptive capacity of a system (Gallopín, 2006). To be able to establish the continuity, return to normal or reformation of a system’s functionality the ‘fundamental identity of the system’ (Barnes, 2009: 398) must first be defined. This proves difficult as this is seen to be ‘a constantly changing parameter’ (Lele, 1998: 250) and thus to establish if a system has returned to a particular state is a complex process. Martin (2011: 15) suggests there are four dimensions to understand a system’s reaction to shocks and each of these could be observed as the system responds to a shock over time. First is the resistance to the shock, which is seen as the ‘vulnerability or sensitivity...to disturbances or disruptions’. Recovery from a shock is the second dimension which can be measured through the ‘speed and extent of the recovery’. The third dimension considers the extent of ‘structural re-orientation’ that is required to overcome a shock and the effect and changes this makes on the system as a whole. The final dimension is the ‘renewal or resumption of the growth path’ that was followed ‘prior to the shock’. These four dimensions enable the impact of a shock to be explored over time as a system recovers and can help to overcome the difficulties of trying to establish the changing identity of a system which could ultimately demonstrate resilience.

A system’s resilience is often seen to relate to the underlying characteristics in the area, with Manyena (2006: 445) stating that the building blocks for disaster resilience are ‘local adaptation strategies, culture, heritage, knowledge and experiences’. These underlying characteristics can be found at a national level, with Perrings (1998a: 510) suggesting that the use of resources is prescribed by ‘social rules, structures of rights

and obligations, norms and moves'. When measuring a system's adaptive capacity Tol and Yohe (2007: 226) suggest that there is a 'list of potentially significant determinants...includ(ing) a wide range of economic, social, political and cultural traits'. Adger (2000: 357) sums this up through stating that 'no single indicator captures the totality of resilience' and with so many potential characteristics that could enhance a system's resilience it is difficult to predict how a system would react to specific perturbations. It is therefore difficult to determine if a system will be resilient until some kind of stress or strain is placed onto the system itself.

The ability of a system to cope with a stress or strain is seen as a measure that is linked to shorter term, perhaps one off perturbations, whereas a system's adaptive capacity allows larger adjustments over a longer period of time allowing the system to exist and function whilst encountering a long term stress or strain (Gallopín, 2006). Measurement of engineering or ecological resilience can, as such, be completed soon after the occurrence of a shock or stress through measuring the magnitude of the disturbance and establishing how quickly the system returned to its normal, functioning pathway or to a new, stable pathway (Perrings, 1998a, King, 2008, Martin, 2011). Quite simply, the larger the shock before a system moves from its current state the more resilient it is seen to be and the quicker the system returns to its pre-shock pathway or to a new pathway the greater its resilience (Martin, 2011).

Adaptive capacity is perhaps more difficult to measure and quantify as 'the factors from which systems draw to create adaptive capacity is different for different risks' (Tol and Yohe, 2007: 227). Essentially, an 'observable characteristic or outcome' (Pendall et al., 2010: 73) necessary to measure resilience is often absent or only emerges as adaptation occurs and this re-orientation can take time to be completed. Adaptive capacity responses demonstrate that there are 'multiple narratives, each suggesting different pathways to different sustainabilities' (Leach et al., 2010: 64) and therefore it is only after a system has re-established functioning in the chosen pathway that development, growth and other indicators of success can be measured to determine if the new pathway has been a successful choice and thus demonstrates resilience.

3.2 Building Blocks of Resilience and Applications within Agriculture

As highlighted in Section 2.1 the concept of resilience is discussed across a wide range of subject areas and whilst there is some variation in how resilience is measured and exactly the form it takes there are some key components, which are accepted across a variety of disciplines and are seen to develop a system's ability to adapt and become resilient. For instance, when referring to social resilience Gunderson (2000: 436) suggests that 'learning, trust and engagement' are essential to develop policies that embrace 'local objectives but must be continually modified and be flexible to adaptations' (Gunderson, 2000: 433). When highlighting the components of resilient local economies Simmie and Martin (2010) suggest the importance of diversity, innovation and the adaptability to local pressures. Focusing specifically on developing resilient food systems, Pingali et al (2005: 514) suggest that resilience strategies should be based on 'strengthening diversity; rebuilding local institutions and traditional support networks; reinforcing local knowledge; and building farmers' ability to adapt and reorganize'. These common building blocks of resilient systems are all inter-linked and this is discussed in Sections 3.2.3 and 3.2.4 below but it is first important to explore the priorities that might be given to these different components depending on the temporality of a shock and the adaptive capacity of a system.

3.2.1 Tackling short and long term stresses

When looking at the resilience of a system and the response of a system to stresses and strains it is suggested that the temporality of different perturbations and its cause may require different styles of action and that different styles of action demonstrate resilience in different situations. This is examined by Leach et al (2010: 59) who categorise a shock as a disruption that is 'transient under otherwise continuous trajectories' and stresses as 'enduring, long-run shifts to the directions of the trajectories themselves'. Lele (1998: 228) uses the example of the shock of a severe drought and the effect this may have on an agricultural system, comparing this to the effect of the stress of a 'significantly drier climatic regime', suggesting that the ability to cope with the short term shock does not necessarily provide resilience to the longer term stress. It is therefore suggested that these 'small perturbations should be utilized to build resilience rather than be suppressed' (Lele, 1998: 251). Shocks to systems thus play an important role in their ability to develop long term resilience. As Wolfe (2010: 140) suggests, 'the past will strongly condition the range of possibilities that

lie open in the future’, recognising that the ability to develop, learn and grow from shocks can provide a greater range of options to systems over time.

What the above implies is that to demonstrate resilience to a shock there may be a need for some adjustment within a system, whereas to demonstrate resilience to a stress there may be a need for adaptation of a system (Gallopín, 2006, Hassink, 2010, Leach et al., 2010). It is here that Leach et al (2010) make a distinction between controlling a shock or stress and responding to it. Take for instance a pest attack on a crop, this can be controlled through the application of particular pesticides which seeks to keep the crop growing and to provide stability to the farmer through the production of the crop and sale to market. Here a shock has been *controlled* and the system remains stable. However, small adjustments, such as considering the variety of seed sown the next year if one is more disease prone than another, shows a *response* to this one off shock. Leach et al (2010) argue that this response demonstrates resilience rather than simply a farmer seeking stability. Taking the example of the stress of a transition of an agricultural system to drier climatic conditions, this may be *controlled* by installing irrigation to fields of crops already being grown, whereas it may be *responded to* by altering the crops grown, growing only those crops that can cope with less water availability. Responding and adapting to the change is seen to build robustness which is seen as long term resilience (Leach et al., 2010). Here the distinction is made between adjusting (a small change where the same crop may be grown just a different variety) and adaptation (where completely different crops are grown) to cope with shocks and stresses respectively.

Both the ability to adjust or to adapt demonstrates a system’s resilience, showing the system is seeking to respond to a shock or stress rather than simply seeking to control it. What this prevents is the non-resilient trait of becoming ‘locked into an outmoded or obsolete structure’ (Simmie and Martin, 2010: 30). Whilst it is recognised that resilience is not necessarily all about adaptation, also being demonstrated by a system’s ability to continue to function following a stress or shock (Hassink, 2010), there is a necessity for a system to adjust or adapt where needed to aid long term resilience. As Levin et al (1998: 228) recognise, ‘the mechanisms that provide short term resilience may also compose a rigidity of structure that erodes the capacity to respond to disturbances over longer term scales’. Relating this to the discussions in

Chapter Two it can be recognised that certain farmers who have embraced post-productivism have sought to adapt their farm with the long term future in mind. Whilst they may have been able to continue farming at some level without much change for many multi-functional farmers this was becoming unprofitable or, due to diminishing resources (such as soil properties) was operating at a level that was not sustainable and would not support the continuation of the farm business over time. The stress of farming conditions, pressures to produce at specific levels and a squeeze on prices has seen some farmers adapt their businesses to incorporate income beyond primary agricultural production. As de Haen (2008: 29) identifies ‘diversification of sources of livelihood and production is another well-established strategy of risk aversion’. Avoiding longer term risks through diversification has therefore provided many multi-functional farmers with resilience over time rather than remaining locked into intensive production. However, there are some key characteristics, both of individuals and of systems, that develop and maintain resilience. These characteristics are needed to help and support adaptation and change and are discussed in the proceeding sections.

3.2.2 Diversity, innovation and learning ability

The first aspect and probably the most widely noted characteristic of resilient systems is that of diversity. Diversification within systems may not build resilience itself but a ‘lack of diversification...exacerbates vulnerability’ (Briguglio et al., 2008: 5) and this in itself demonstrates a lack of resilience. Ecosystems are seen to be more resilient if they have a greater diversity within them (Hanley, 1998). For instance if stresses of disease, pest or climate were to attack a diverse ecosystem there are elements that have the potential to survive and thus to provide a basis on which to rebuild the ecosystem (Hassink, 2010). Simmie and Martin (2010) suggest that the greater the diversity of a local economy the greater its ability is to cope with shocks and stresses. It is suggested that the old industrial cities of the USA survived economic crises due to the fact they had the diversity of manufacturing, education and health institutions (Christopherson et al., 2010) that provided a varied basis for development and employment. Bristow (2010: 156) neatly connects these ideas from ecosystem and economic literature stating that to be resilient systems ‘require diversity (as opposed to uniformity) in the number of ‘species’ of business, institutions and sources of energy, food and means of making a living’. Diversity is key as it is seen to provide

access to a wider range of new information and knowledge (Simmie and Martin, 2010).

Whilst there may be a clear advantage of having a diverse system, it is suggested that certainly within economic systems having the presence of competition helps to develop resilience (Hanley, 1998, Levin et al., 1998, Bristow, 2010). Levin et al (1998: 227) suggest, for example, that ‘companies that always have to fight for survival develop resilience much more fully’, this being due to the fact that they have to continually develop and enhance their production. If there is competition within a system, businesses have to constantly develop and innovate to remain profitable, to ‘keep up’ with others and this will help to build resilience. Where diversity may provide access to more information, competition provides the impetus for actors within a system to use that information to adapt in order to remain at the forefront of the system and to adjust as changes occur within the system itself.

Having a diverse range of actors within a system provides access to new knowledge and having competition provides the necessity to constantly learn, to take on new knowledge and to explore innovations. However, whilst knowledge may exist within the system it is the ‘linkages and connectivity across time and among people that helps to navigate transitions through periods of uncertainty’ (King, 2008: 122). Such connections help to develop trust which is frequently stated as a key element of resilient systems (Hanley, 1998, Levin et al., 1998, Adger, 2000, Gunderson, 2000). Trust is needed to share problems, to discuss ideas and the development of trusting relationships helps develop knowledge exchange. As suggested in Chapter Two the reconnection of producers and consumers in short food supply chains develops mutual trust (Ilbery and Maye, 2006). The trust that producers are developing and marketing good quality products attracts consumers to purchase food directly from producers and the direct and honest consumer feedback and loyalty helps producers to develop their products (i.e. to innovate). However, as questioned in Chapter Two, does this exist at farmers’ markets? What connections do these provide for producers, how is trust developed and what role do these play in aiding farmer’s adaptability?

Developing trusting relationships leads to greater knowledge exchange but, for knowledge sharing to develop resilience, actors must learn from each other as it is

learning that provides ‘the capacity to improve performance’ (Wolfe, 2010: 142). Learning is therefore seen as another key component of resilience (Lele, 1998, Gunderson, 2000, Hudson, 2010). The ability to learn is essential in developing knowledge, following innovations and thus developing resilience. When looking at multi-functional farmers (discussed in greater detail in Section 3.3 below), many are seen to be more educated (Vernimmen et al, 2003) than other farmers, demonstrating their ability to learn. Those with a greater ability to learn will seemingly have a greater variety of diversification pathways open to them. For some farmers their goal is purely based on increasing profit which is achieved through maximisation of yield production. Farmers with this mindset become locked into constantly intensifying production and for some the conditions, such as landscape or soil properties, cannot support this constant intensification. It is essential for these farmers to realise that resilience is developed from the maintenance of crucial elements such as soils (Levin et al., 1998) and that some areas of production are able to support intensive production whereas other areas are less able to. As recognised in many areas of resilience theory a ‘change to the self-perpetuating status quo is sometimes desirable’ (Hanley, 1998: 246) and agriculture is no different here but this requires the ability to learn, to innovate and to change. Farmers diversifying their farms down new production pathways need to have not only willingness but also an ability to learn new skills that will be essential for the long term success/resilience of diversification activities.

3.2.3 Flexibility, local adaptations and governance

The preceding section highlighted the importance of diversity, competition, trust and learning ability as essential building blocks of a resilient system yet putting new knowledge into action needs flexibility and adaptability. A system’s adaptive capacity is therefore key to determining its resilience (Gallopín, 2006, Tol and Yohe, 2007, King, 2008, Simmie and Martin, 2010). Some authors suggest that flexibility is inbuilt (Leach et al., 2010) which implies that it cannot be learnt but is a property of a system or person. This may provide some explanation as to why some farmers who struggle in productivist agriculture diversify their income whilst others decide not to, as well as the pathways that different producers take to diversification. However, just as a region’s ability to adapt is seen to be ‘shaped by the region’s industrial legacy and the scope for re-orientating skills, resources and technologies inherited from that

legacy' (Martin, 2011: 15), so diversification in farming can be seen to be affected in the same way. Beyond their own skills that may aid adaptability, which partially depend on farmers' education and age (Vernimmen et al., 2003, Wilson, 2007), the resources available to a farmer may depend on the farming networks that have developed or been maintained, the natural resources (such as soils and water) available to them and how these have been altered by previous farming regimes as well as their access to additional labour that may be required to implement a diverse range of on- and off-farm functions. To develop resilience systems therefore need to embrace 'localised activities that are embedded in the capacities of the local environment' (Bristow, 2010: 156). For some farmers, the resources available to them and the local conditions mean that intensively growing arable crops is a resilient system to be part of, for others their resilient system involves extensive hill-grazing of livestock and for others to be resilient they require diversification outside of production. Each of these is governed by specific local conditions demonstrating that systems will differ across space as local conditions alter and thus what is applicable and resilient in one location may not be elsewhere.

Martin's (2011) 'industrial legacy' may not only be linked to the physical resources available in specific areas but may also be affected by the images of farming and the stigma associated with diversification which was explored in Chapter 2. Such opinions can restrict the pathways that are deemed acceptable to follow and when such customs 'are codified into law or reinforced by institutions [they] can prevent societies from responding to small shocks' (Perrings, 1998a: 516). Here a delicate balance emerges, as a 'vital ingredient' of resilience is 'having a common understanding of a shared problem' (Levin et al., 1998: 233), but to develop resilience systems must be open to new innovations that may come from outside of the immediate community/system. Such innovations, as discussed above, must become localised and made locally appropriate but at the same time should not be governed by standards or customs that informally control systems. For this a key ingredient of resilient systems is the development of effective governance (Levin et al., 1998) that will allow 'a greater degree of internal closure, less dependence on decisions taken elsewhere' (Hudson, 2008: 174) through seeking new innovations and making them specific to local conditions. This would seem to require collective working and information sharing which were suggested as building blocks of resilience in the

preceding section and will be explored in greater detail in Section 3.3 below, which explores how communities allow for knowledge to be shared and made context specific at the same time.

3.3 Social Resilience and Community Development

Section 3.2 has discussed the key components of resilience, demonstrating the necessity for systems to learn, to innovate, being flexible and adaptable. These are all desirable properties but in many cases must be implemented through human interaction. This section therefore seeks to investigate this human element, what it can provide but also the necessary factors that will allow members of social networks and communities to come together and communicate to develop their own individual resilience. Understanding these elements can help to frame an understanding of the social networks that may develop within farmers' markets, how these could develop farmers' economic and emotional/social resilience and the tensions that may also develop. Before exploring the community dynamics it must be acknowledged that certain people have more resilient personalities than others and the characteristics of farmers seen to take pathways to more resilient agricultural production are therefore discussed at the beginning of this section.

3.3.1 Characteristics of resilient farmers

In Chapter Two the pressures of agricultural policies, intensification, financial and health concerns were all uncovered as driving forces behind farm diversification. Farming is seen as a stressful occupation, requiring long working hours often in a socially isolated environment. Some individuals are able to cope with these pressures better than others, displaying greater individual resilience. The personality traits of resilient individuals have been explored within the field of psychology. These traits include having 'optimistic, zestful and energetic approaches to life' (Tugade and Fredrickson, 2004: 320), having 'the ability to adapt to life's ever-changing landscape' (Waugh et al., 2008: 1045), displaying 'resourcefulness, self-confidence, curiousness, self-discipline, level-headedness and flexibility' (Jackson et al., 2007: 6), having 'goals or a vision for the future' (Hegney et al., 2007: 8) and generally being 'intelligent with a strong sense of self' (Jackson et al., 2007: 3). Those who are seen to be more resilient are able to remain positive and confident and are seen to have better physical health (Tugade and Fredrickson, 2004, Waugh et al., 2008). Humour

is commonly seen as a way to keep a positive focus (Tugade and Fredrickson, 2004, Hegney et al., 2007).

Whilst many farmers would be defined as resilient people through being ‘strongly focused on working hard and are ‘tough’ in the face of adversity’ (Hegney et al., 2007: 8) it may be suggested that there is a ‘scale’ of individual resilience. Take, for example, the different routes that farmers have chosen to take to diversify their incomes, as discussed in Section 2.1. The different levels within the spectrum of multi-functionality display different levels of producer resilience. For instance, those demonstrating strong multi-functionality are likely to still be subjected to the challenges of agricultural production and to continue to innovate to meet consumer demands as well as maintaining and improving their own income. Those who show moderate multi-functionality are perhaps less adaptable and less innovative, therefore displaying fewer resilient characteristics, and those displaying weak multi-functionality are seen to lack adaptive capacity and thus lack resilient personalities. Alongside the characteristic personality traits discussed above and the need to be innovative it is necessary to mention that certain physical characteristics and personal skills have been identified as aiding or restraining farmers’ ability to diversify.

Age can play a role in whether farmers embrace multi-functionality. Whilst some well-established farmers will adopt change for future farm prosperity, multi-functionality is seen more regularly in younger farmers (Wilson, 2007). Part of this is due to the extra work outside of agricultural production that multi-functionality entails and this is not seen ‘to be well suited to the older group’ (Vernimmen et al., 2003: 220). In addition, younger farmers are more conservation-orientated (Burton and Wilson, 2006) and it may be suggested that this is due to the image or identity of farming they have created through ‘a trade or tertiary education’ (Bryant, 1999: 248). This suggests that there is a greater emphasis placed on less intensive farming at agricultural college and an acknowledgement that this is being demanded by consumers. Younger farmers are also seen to be ‘more likely to adopt riskier farm development strategies’ (Dimara and Skuras, 1999: 309), with multi-functional pathways regarded as more risky as many are not tried and tested over long periods of time.

For those seeking to develop strong multi-functionality the ability to be innovative is very important. High levels of innovation are needed for those engaged in direct marketing or on-farm processing activities (van der Ploeg et al., 2002) in order for farmers to capture an appropriate market for their newly established goods/services. Alongside innovation adopters of multi-functionality must have both the ability and the commitment to learn new skills. Their ability to do this can determine the route to multi-functionality that a farm takes. For instance, a farmer wishing to develop on-farm processing must be prepared to learn about and embrace hygiene and quality regulations as these are high on the current political agenda (Marsden and Sonnino, 2008). It is perhaps therefore unsurprising that multi-functional farmers are often seen to be more educated (Vernimmen et al., 2003). This education may provide other characteristics that help with the adoption of multi-functionality or at least the willingness and ability to learn. Farmers that develop multi-functionality often have good accounting systems (Vernimmen et al., 2003). Such knowledge is essential in order to maintain different functions of the farm and if accounting knowledge is sparse it may be a daunting prospect to simultaneously take on multiple income pathways. In addition, Barnes (2006: 293) notes that multi-functional farmers often have a 'higher technical efficiency' than others. The fact that adopters of multi-functionality may be 'better performers compared to profit maximising farmers' (Barnes, 2006: 293) may make extensification more economically attractive to this group of producers. If farmers are to grow less intensively they require sufficiently high yields in order to ensure production methods remain viable.

The pathway to multi-functionality may also be determined by family size or access to labour. Extra labour is unlikely to be required for those who seek multi-functionality through entering conservation schemes. Off-farm employment requires a sufficient agricultural workforce to maintain the farm whilst a member of the family, often a farmer's wife, works off the farm. On-farm tourist accommodation is likely to require just one or two people to maintain facilities and thus not a huge amount of 'extra' labour. However, if a farm moves to direct marketing and/or on-farm processing of goods these are labour intensive, requiring workers to continue the agricultural production, alongside the processing and direct marketing of goods. This route to strong multi-functionality is 'therefore often adopted by households with abundant (family) labour resources' (van der Ploeg et al., 2002: 109).

3.3.2 Social networks and farmers' resilience

In addition to the characteristics above Vernimmen et al (2003: 217) suggest that multi-functional farmers have 'good or strong social networks' and suggest that these networks may improve performance through creating innovation and information sharing. This will act to enhance the knowledge of opportunities available to farmers as well as evaluations of these opportunities which will provide a greater knowledge base on which farmers can make development decisions. As suggested in Section 3.2.2, learning and innovation can be borne from interaction with nearby actors and farmers are seen to 'turn to their family, other farmers and their friends' (McLaren and Challis, 2009: 272) during difficult times. Jackson et al (2007: 6) acknowledge that 'we all need a network of people who can be called upon for guidance and support when needed' and it is suggested that 'strong networks were seen as something that was developed by resilient people' (Hegney et al., 2007: 8).

If farmers who diversify are seen to be more resilient and resilient people are seen to have strong social networks it is perhaps unsurprising that multi-functional farmers are seen to 'utilise social capital as their investment in technology is less' (Sutherland and Burton, 2011: 253). Questions may be raised here as to the exact role of these social networks, do they provide emotional support to cope with the challenges of agriculture, do they provide guidance and new innovative ideas to aid farmers adaptive capacity or do they provide a combination of these? What is shared with others in these social networks and how do the relationships within them begin and develop? To begin to answer these questions the social networks within post-productivist agriculture need to be explored. An initial understanding of these relationships and how they are utilised can be framed within existing literature examining 'communities of practice' and 'communities of coping'. A community of practice provides connections that aid learning and innovation (Wenger, 1998). A community of coping provides emotional support to help cope with difficult situations (Korczynski, 2003). If farmers are required to both innovate and adapt to remain economically resilient and manage emotionally stressful situations they arguably require elements of both these types of communities to truly become resilient within agricultural production. This chapter now turns to introduce these communities, seeking to establish the core characteristics of each community type. The identification of these characteristics will then provide a basis on which to investigate,

in Chapter Six, whether either or both of these communities are developed within the 'alternative' food network of a farmers' market.

3.3.3 Communities of practice

The 'communities of practice' concept focuses on 'learning through social participation' (Wenger, 1998: 4) and at the heart of the concept is the notion that involvement or activity is required for people to learn (O'Kane et al., 2008). The literature on communities of practice identifies that people assemble in a group (community) in order to do specific things (a practice) 'in everyday life, in the workplace and in education' (Barton and Tusting, 2005) and that through this participation individuals learn and develop tacit knowledge informally and through experience (Barton and Tusting, 2005, Amin and Roberts, 2008). The social networks that develop through assembling to perform specific tasks are 'important in acquiring information' (Sligo and Massey, 2007: 171) and learning is therefore enhanced 'through collaborative social interaction and the social construction of knowledge' (Brown et al., 1989: 40). Communities of practice are therefore seen to provide knowledge through 'shared practice, rather than it being transferred in a linear fashion from master(s) to learner(s)' (Morgan, 2011: 101). Learning is regarded as 'a life-long process resulting from acting in situations' (Brown et al., 1989: 33) and therefore the learning provided within the settings for activities is concerned with '*becoming* a practitioner not learning *about* practice' (Brown and Duguid, 1991: 48).

Wenger (1998) identifies three specific aspects that create a community of practice; mutual engagement, joint enterprise and shared repertoire. Through carrying out activities together members interact in many ways creating mutual engagement. Members need to have a common endeavour, such as selling local, fresh produce direct to consumers, to bring them together, in a joint enterprise. Finally, the use of 'common resources of language, styles and routines' (Barton and Tusting, 2005: 2) provides the community with a shared repertoire through which they can interact. These three elements are themselves linked and cannot occur without each other. For instance, Morgan's (2011) study of organic farmers found that whilst these farmers may have shared similar production techniques without a clear joint enterprise that brought them together, a community of practice did not form between the farmers. The joint enterprise provided the space in which to engage mutually and it is through

this engagement that repertoires of practice can be developed and shared between similar practitioners (Morgan, 2011).

In order to produce and transfer knowledge to provide learning within these informal situations social capital is required (Putnam, 1995). Social capital 'refers to our relations with one another' (Putnam, 1995: 665) and is identified by establishing the social ties that exist within a network or community (King et al., 2009). It is suggested that there are three types of social capital; bonding, bridging and linking (High et al., 2005, King et al., 2009). These are explained by High et al (2005) using differences between group member's social classes; bonding capital exists between those with similar socio-economic characteristics, bridging capital between those with shared interests and goals but different socio-economic characteristics, and linking capital is the vertical relationships between social classes. These exact definitions, taking into account social class, may not be directly applicable to agricultural studies. It may be more relevant to think of those with similar farm types or techniques (e.g. arable farmers or organic farmers) who share bonding capital, those within farming with the same outlook but with different farm types (e.g a large scale arable farm and a large scale dairy farm, or an organic vegetable grower and an organic livestock grower) who may share bridging capital and then the interaction between large and small scale producers, organic/non-organic, local suppliers and suppliers of multiples that may be seen as linking capital. This is merely a suggestion but it links well to ideas mooted by O'Kane et al (2008: 190) in whose study dairy farmers are seen to 'maintain regular and intensive discourse (or conversation) with each other in their attempts to hone their expertise and produce the best results from the resources available to them'.

The strength of a social tie can be defined as the 'combinations of the amount of time, emotional intensity, the intimacy (mutual confiding) and the reciprocal services' (Granovetter, 2002: 61). Strong social ties are therefore 'built over relationship longevity' (King et al., 2009: 12) and this develops trust as 'the more we connect with other people the more we trust them' (Putnam, 1995: 665). Developing trust within a community is important as people 'share and learn from trusted others' (King et al., 2009: 12) and thus such ties would develop the bonding capital discussed above. However, if the emphasis of communities of practice is to aid learning and thus

innovation then weak ties are important with the best networks being seen as those that provide new connections to provide access to new knowledge and potentially new innovative ideas (Murdoch, 2000). Such connections help to ensure communities do not simply become dependent on one development pathway (Roberts, 2006, King et al., 2009), enabling them to see beyond their ‘inevitably limited core view’ (Brown and Duguid, 1991: 51). Whilst new ideas and information is endorsed or rejected by those within communities weak ties are essential in providing information to aid and enhance learning and innovation and thus are important for building and maintaining resilient systems.

The community of practice idea has been applied to agricultural systems in a number of studies (see, for example, O’Kane et al., 2008, Turner, 2010, Morgan, 2011). These have all focused on farmers linked through specific production choices; organic farmers, adopters of agri-environment schemes and English wine producers respectively. These could all be classed as sharing a joint enterprise focused on similarities of production. Do such communities form between those who share the joint enterprise of specific distribution channels, such as alternative food networks? Murdoch (2000: 413) suggests that networks in rural districts emerge ‘through the aggregated activities of small, varied and specialised production activities’, which are all features of alternative food networks. Does the joint enterprise of alternative food networks provide the opportunity for mutual engagement and if so what shared repertoire is developed between those within these communities? Investigating this gives the opportunity to establish if and how innovations are spread between these producers and how producer/business resilience may be developed through trading within alternative food networks.

3.3.4 Communities of coping

Korczynski (2003) suggests that within workplaces strong but informal communities can develop that provide solidarity to those within the workplace giving them support to cope with the challenges within that environment. Such communities are termed a ‘community of coping’ (Korczynski, 2003). This idea has been developed through the study of interactions between workers within a call centre environment where colleagues are seen to ‘seek support from each other’ (Korczynski, 2003: 58). Community members are brought closer together through sharing similar experiences

and problems (Korczynski, 2003) and through exchanging stories of these problems, the study notes that solutions can be found, as well as providing support to community members in order to cope with the challenging, stressful, and in the call centre environment, abusive situations.

As discussed in Chapter Two farming is a very challenging occupation. Farmers face pressures from agricultural policies and consumer expectations, attempting to cope with the ‘conflicting ideas about what a safe and sustainable food system might look like’ (Lockie, 2006: 313). Additionally, producers face the physical challenges of production, such as bad weather and animal diseases, that ultimately affect harvests and incomes. In addition to these, farmers also face social isolation due to their working environment. If workers in other challenging situations are seen to work cooperatively (Lipsky, 1980) and seek to cope with difficulties ‘communally and socially’ (Korczynski, 2003: 58) farmers working in isolation would appear to lack the opportunities and contact that would help them cope with the challenges of agricultural production. How, therefore, can alternative food networks that bring farmers together, such as farmers’ markets, help to overcome this social isolation? Do they provide the opportunity to share experiences and stories with similar others and is this social contact used by farmers to help cope with the challenges of agricultural production, thereby aiding their individual resilience?

Individual resilience is built around two aspects: the first is an individual’s ability to use resources to cope with a situation and maintain their own well-being; the second is how a community and culture surrounding an individual provides and supports access to the resources that are required (Ungar, 2008). What then does bringing producers together provide to them? Two significant factors to help develop individual resilience are ‘social support and sense of belonging’ (McLaren and Challis, 2009: 263). These can only develop through interaction with others. Developing a sense of belonging, for instance, ‘occurs when individuals feel valued, needed and significant within their environment’ (McLaren and Challis, 2009: 263). Beyond social support, does trading through alternative food networks provide a sense of belonging to help develop farmers’ individual resilience? Hegney et al’s (2007) study in rural Australia sought to identify the resilience of individuals to environmental adversities finding that ‘being a valued member of that community’

allowed 'supportive networks' to be established (ibid). Does this occur in alternative food networks? Is every farmer trading within these networks automatically a part of the community or are there specific expectations that must be met before being an accepted member and benefitting from the social support that may be provided by others within this environment? Investigating how the areas where farmers come together, for example farmers' markets, are utilised as communities providing social support will provide an insight into their significance in developing and maintaining farmers' individual resilience.

3.3.5 Community identity, relations and building resilience

The personal interaction between parties in both a community of practice and a community of coping provides a sense of belonging within each specific community, with participation in such communities being seen as 'a complex process that combines doing, talking, thinking, feeling and belonging' (Wenger, 1998: 56). As discussed above this helps to develop individual's own personal, emotional resilience. However, the process through which individuals become 'members' of communities and develop the feeling of belonging involves each person negotiating 'ways of being a person in that context' (Wenger, 1998: 149). Communities of practice 'produce abstractions, tools, symbols, stories, terms and concepts that reify something of that practice in a congealed form' (Wenger, 1998: 59). To understand and share these reifications members must become 'encultured' (Brown et al., 1989, Brown and Duguid, 1991). This involves members learning to talk the correct language and perform the correct actions as defined by the core of each community (Brown and Duguid, 1991). Developing the accepted language and actions within a community provides an identity to those within that community and actions that are deemed not to be acceptable or language which is not conducive to learning within a specific community is rejected (Barton and Tusting, 2005).

This collective identity is seen as 'an important component of communal knowledge' (Morgan, 2011: 101) as the meanings are negotiated and therefore 'the community and its viewpoint.....determine how a tool [in this instance knowledge, innovations] is used' (Brown et al., 1989: 33). This demonstrates the importance of local level power (Murdoch, 2000) as communities 'come(s) to denote an intellectual boundary in which certain practices and pursuits are deemed consensually desirable' (O'Kane et

al., 2008: 194) and therefore a ‘profound connection between identity and practice’ (Wenger, 1998: 149) is observed. Mills et al’s (2011) study of the implementation of agri-environment schemes by collective groups of farmers in different areas in Wales demonstrated that such groups (or collectives) can effectively implement different environmental management schemes in different ways. The study clearly demonstrates that different groups of farmers may have different motivations to participate in environmental schemes and will have different resources available to them. Importantly then, a ‘one size fits all’ approach is usually far from appropriate. The communities of practice concept identifies that learning is situated in actions but it is also noted that knowledge itself is situated (Brown and Duguid, 1991) and therefore communities of practice sees ‘localised practitioners develop localised practices that may differ in levels of compatibility with the practices of other groups’ (O’Kane et al., 2008: 195). Without specific knowledge and interpretations innovations may not suit local elements and therefore learning and innovating to fit local conditions is essential for success.

In Chapter Two the standards that define farmers’ markets were discussed but discussions within this chapter would suggest that the communities that may form at farmers’ markets may negotiate their own identity, meanings and thus universal standards may be difficult to implement. How can standards be developed that allow for both flexibility and standardisation; standards that can formalise the definition of farmers’ markets without diminishing their emphasis on local food and local conditions? Within the communities of practice concept members of communities are seen to move across and between different communities and whilst doing this they ‘move texts across contexts’ (Barton and Hamilton, 2005: 23). Importantly, during such transitions the meanings and functions of texts are changed to become context specific (Barton and Hamilton, 2005). If knowledge is negotiated, then policies or standards implemented from higher powers are always negotiated at a personal level to fit into specific local order or places (Tusting, 2005). This is termed by Timmermans and Berg (1997) as ‘local universality’, the creation of standards that through negotiation are made universally local. For standards to work there is a need for variation across space and time with standards always ‘transforming and emerging in and through local negotiations’ (Enticott, 2012: 79). There appears here a very delicate balance. Can all standards aiming to define a farmers’ market be flexible?

Can they all be negotiated locally and made specific to each market? Does the formalisation of standards, even locally, strengthen the community and aid producers' learning and coping? How are standards determined and negotiated and by whom?

Local negotiations and interpretations to develop locally applicable standards would appear to provide the flexibility necessary to develop resilience. However, within informal communities there appears a delicate balance between how the informal relationships help 'challenge top down thinking' (High et al., 2005: 12) and how the power and meaning developed within the communities becomes controlled by the central few (Roberts, 2006). Social ties that are too strong may lead 'to cognitive lock-ins' (Hassink, 2010: 55), the inability to envision and enable change. Innovation is key to resilience but importantly here, as discussed in Section 3.2.3, resilience is also seen to need good governance (Levin et al., 1998, Briguglio et al., 2008). There is a requirement for communities to have 'a small central core of members who meet regularly to enable effective communication and decision-making' (Mills et al., 2011: 80), but these members must embrace change, encouraging innovation and adaptations and accepting the changes this may bring to the system's identity in order to maintain community resilience. Within the 'alternative' food networks literature the ability of farmers to innovate, adapt and diversify at an individual farm level is well documented (Shucksmith and Winter, 1990, Vernimmen et al, 2003, Wilson, 2007) but how do these individual characteristics play out within the communities of 'alternative' food networks and what identities are afforded to such space? Investigating this will help establish if 'alternative' food networks are simply collections of individuals with resilient traits or whether such traits are used collectively to develop resilient communities.

3.4 Synthesis

This section aims to synthesise Chapters Two and Three highlighting the connections between them and the questions that have been raised from the literature which this thesis will seek to answer.

Farming is a challenging profession with farmers having to constantly 'keep up' with changes in agricultural policies along with consumer demands. Over-production and environmental degradation has seen the agricultural system hit crisis point, in terms of

the environmental consequences of production, the economic strain of production and the effect of changing demands on farmers' physical health. As agricultural policies have changed in an attempt to create a more sustainable system so farmers have demonstrated their adaptability. Farmers have followed differing pathways to production, diversifying their income streams creating what is hoped to be a more resilient agricultural system. However, farmers are still subject to the stresses and strains associated with production (such as challenging weather or animal disease), they are still affected by consumer demands and they are still affected by the rising price of production and constant price demands of supermarkets. These challenges require farmers to be flexible, adaptable, innovative and resilient.

How then is this resilience developed? Having diversified their income base how do these farmers adapt to the challenges they face within production? How does diversification aid the different types of resilience needed by producers? In order to answer these questions it is necessary to look at a route to agricultural diversification which also provides social interaction and it is for this reason that farmers' markets are the focus for this study. Farmers' markets reconnect consumers with producers as farmers sell food direct to customers. However, they also bring together farmers, within a community, providing a chance for farmers to interact with similar others. Beyond the economics, what does this farmers' market community provide to farmers?

To remain resilient farmers need to remain adaptive and innovative and in order to adapt they require access to new ideas and new knowledge. Farmers must also be able to cope emotionally with the challenges of production and this requires access to social networks to share concerns and seek comfort. Does the gathering of producers at farmers' markets provide access to either or both of these necessary elements of resilience? In order for producers to share knowledge through a community of practice there is a necessity to share a common aim, a joint enterprise that brings them together. As no strict standards exist which govern farmers' market how is this joint enterprise established? What expectations do producers have of the market and of others trading within it? How do farmers expect others to 'behave' at farmers' markets in order to define what the market is and therefore are some farmers 'accepted' and others not?

If farmers need a significant common aim to bring them together in order to create a space in which information and ideas can be shared and support shown to others, Chapters Two and Three have suggested the potential in creating standards that govern farmers' markets, to create this common aim. However, this immediately causes contradictions with the emphasis of farmers' markets, their ability to reflect local areas through the produce on offer, their ability to be flexible and adaptable to provide a resilient place for farmers to trade their produce. If such areas were standardised across the UK, surely this would impact their ability to be resilient? Chapter Three introduces the concept of 'local universality' (Timmermans and Berg, 1997) to counter this tension. The idea is that standards can be both universal and local through adapting them to suit specific local needs and demands. Is this possible at farmers' markets? Are there certain standards that should be universal with little flexibility and others that should be more adaptable? Who defines these standards and how does this impact on who is 'accepted' at farmers' markets? Whilst such standards may seek to make farmers' markets themselves resilient, can this be done alongside supporting and developing the individual resilience of the producers trading at them?

As can be seen there are a number of questions emerging from Chapters Two and Three and through bringing these together they provide the following central research aim for this research study.

Research Aim:

To establish the role of farmers' markets in developing and sustaining producer's resilience.

In order to meet this aim the synthesis above highlights a number of important aspects. The challenges faced by producers and their adaptability in the face of adversity must be understood. This will demonstrate their own resilience as a producer. This resilience (or lack of resilience) may come from personal attributes but to adapt and innovate there is a necessity to have access to new knowledge and new ideas which comes through social contact to others. Farmers' markets provide an opportunity to connect to others so in order to understand whether this contact helps producers adapt and cope with challenges this social interaction must be understood. It must be understood both in the context of learning and knowledge exchange as well

as in terms of its provision of emotional support to otherwise isolated farmers. It is also imperative to seek an understanding of the dynamics of this interaction within the context of the farmers' market. The discussions above have opened up debate concerning the definition of farmers' markets and the need for some standardisation to bring producers together with a need for flexibility to allow for local conditions. It would appear that the formation of a definition and its regulation by producers must be understood to provide an insight into the dynamics of the social interaction. This suggests that understanding the 'construction' of the farmers' market is important in order to understand the resilience gained from it. In order to seek a clear understanding of these issues the following research questions will frame the rest of this thesis.

Research Questions:

1. How do farmers display resilience to the differing challenges of production?
2. How is resilience socially produced at farmers' markets?
3. How does the regulation of farmers' markets affect their resilience and the resilience of those trading at them?

Throughout this thesis the farmers' market is taken as an individual system, regarded as a 'collection of interacting parts' (Foresight, 2011: 10). These parts include rules that 'define' the system, the producers within the FM, the consumers using the FM and the managers of the FM. Seeking to understand each element of FM, how the elements interact and the effect this has on the market 'system' will provide the holistic understanding that is called for within resilience studies (Bristow, 2010). Of course, the FM system itself is part of the wider agricultural system, this again being a collection of interacting elements. Through detailing why 'alternative' food networks, including FMs, have developed, (see Chapter Two), shows how these networks are positioned within the agricultural system. Through exploring and understanding the FM as a system in its own right seeks to document not only the resilience of the FM system but what can be taken from this individual system and applied to the wider agricultural system.

3.5 Conclusion

This chapter has explored the development of resilience as a concept used to define natural ecosystems and has traced its acceptance across a host of various disciplines. The suggestion is that a rise in disasters and shocks to differing systems, such as natural environmental disasters and economic recessions, has promoted its use across a range of subject areas (Christopherson et al., 2010, Martin, 2011). The discussion has demonstrated that defining resilience is a complex task, with King (2008) suggesting three different models of resilience. These models differ in their opinion of how many functional domains a system can have; engineering resilience views systems as having one optimal, stable state; ecological resilience posits a system as having multiple states that can provide stability; and adaptive resilience suggests systems are constantly adapting in anticipation of a perturbation or as a reaction to it (Martin, 2011). With different definitions resilience becomes difficult to measure, particularly if systems are seen to be constantly adapting and able to work in different states. In order to measure and establish resilience specific characteristics have been identified. These demonstrate the potential of a system to adapt and include trust, learning ability, innovation, flexibility, effective governance and the ability to adapt to local conditions. This demonstrates the need for social interaction as resilience becomes to be acknowledged 'as a process of social learning, of using human capacities and knowledge to reduce vulnerability and reduce risk in the face of the unknown and unexpected' (Hudson, 2008: 173).

Taking the idea that innovation and adaptability is generated through social learning there is some concern that within agriculture 'social networks...are shrinking and it is clear that increasing mechanization and efficiency savings on farms have led to more isolated patterns of work, with fewer shared tasks' (Gregoire, 2002: 472). Without social interaction it could be suggested that farmers lack the connection to new knowledge that ultimately is required to adapt and innovate. However, another consequence of this increasing social isolation is the concerning data that suggests that farmers, particularly those that work alone, have a high risk of suicide compared to other occupation groups (Simkin et al., 2003, Stark et al., 2006). What this chapter therefore suggests is that 'alternative' food networks, specifically those based around distribution, that bring farmers together into a community may promote social capital, information sharing and thus both innovation and coping ability of those within them.

Establishing not only if and how these communities stimulate interaction and innovation between individual producers but also how the communities themselves are adaptable, how they are governed and how flexible this governance is to changing expectations and identities could help develop strategies to enhance the long-term resilience of 'alternative' food networks. It is this that has focused the research questions stated in Section 3.4 and from these the appropriate research methodology will be discussed in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4: Research Methodology

Introduction

Chapters Two and Three have highlighted the potential importance of farmers' markets in bringing farmers together, providing a place where social interaction could occur and that this interaction may play a part in developing farmers' resilience. The synthesis provided in Section 3.4 has identified the following key aim and research questions for this thesis.

Research aim:

To establish the role of farmers' markets in developing and sustaining producer's resilience.

Research questions:

1. How do farmers display resilience to the differing challenges of production?
2. How is resilience socially produced at farmers' markets?
3. How does the regulation of farmers' markets affect their resilience and the resilience of those trading at them?

It is apparent from these research questions that it is essential to gain a rich understanding of the research setting, not just documenting the interaction that occurs but seeking to uncover why it occurs and importantly to appreciate the context in which it occurs. It is this that will allow the social relations and the tensions to be defined and investigated. For this reason a case study strategy has been chosen seeking to understand the 'real-life' context of the farmers' market. This is done through using an ethnographic approach, with one year being spent actively participating within the farmers' market community. This longitudinal element of the study is hugely important. This continual contact to the community allowed me, as the researcher to become a trusted part of the community. I have worked on market stalls, participated in events and shared many conversations with producers over the year. Unlike other resilience studies this seeks not to take a snapshot in time following a specific perturbation but to chart the use of the community to help develop and maintain resilience of farmers throughout the 'general' life of production.

This chapter seeks to document the methodological approach taken. It begins by setting up the case study as the chosen research strategy and introduces the specific case chosen for this thesis, Garrington Farmers' Market. Following this a background to ethnography is provided, acknowledging the complexities and limitations of this type of research. Section 4.3 goes on to detail the process of data collection, from gaining access to the market through to writing and analysing fieldnotes. It documents the details of the days spent working at the farmers' market; this was carried out every fortnight for a year, as well as the 25 days spent working with different producers outside of the market at their place of production. These 25 days provided the opportunity to seek a greater understanding of the producers through ethnographic interviews. This research approach has provided a huge amount of valuable data and the final sub-section of the chapter details the processes of data analysis and presentation of fieldnotes throughout the rest of the thesis.

4.1 Case Study Research Strategy

The research questions, as stated above, are focused on understanding how farmers display resilience, how they use farmers' markets and how resilience of farmers' markets is developed. Within these questions this study will seek to understand why markets are used, defined and negotiated in certain ways by specific farmers and producers. As Yin (1994) suggests the case study research strategy is preferred when research questions ask 'how' or 'why' and it seems therefore, in this first instance, an appropriate strategy to follow. The case study research strategy is also preferred when the research is focused on a real-life context without being controlled by a researcher (Yin, 1994). Resilience must be understood in context, indeed resilience may be developed differently by producers in different places. As this study seeks to understand how resilience is specifically developed and sustained through attending a farmers' market it must be understood and studied in the context of the farmers' market. In order to fully investigate and seek to understand resilience connected to alternative food networks and specifically farmers' markets this must be studied in context and understood through the conditions surrounding the specific setting and taking a case study research strategy allows this to occur. Here it becomes essential to shed any pre-conceived ideas, seeking to find suggestions from the case study through

inductive analysis (Punch, 2005). This allows for ideas to be developed throughout the research and during analysis in order to fully appreciate the depth of the case.

An essential element of case study research is seeking to understand events through an holistic focus rather than through individual components (Yin, 1994, Punch, 2005); it focuses on understanding how and why events occur or linkages made over time rather than simply focusing on 'mere frequencies or incidence' (Yin, 1994: 6). This fits neatly with the viewpoint that resilience must be understood in an holistic manner (Bristow, 2010). The resilience developed within a farmers' market will not simply be uncovered through establishing the linkages between producers. Resilience requires such elements as trust, innovation, competition and diversity (Hanley, 1998, Bristow, 2010, Simmie and Martin, 2010, Wolfe, 2010). All of these elements must be understood in order to understand not just whether social ties exist between producers but what they provide and why they provide what they do. In addition, the definitions of a farmers' market, how these are negotiated and the expectations these invoke amongst producers must all be understood if the individual social ties and bonds between producers are to be understood. Essentially the farmers' market must be understood as a complete entity if the resilience provided by it is to be understood and the case study strategy supports this holistic approach and understanding. Due to seeking to understand all elements of a system case study research supports the use of a wealth of different materials, with sources such as 'documents, artifacts, interviews and observations' being seen as a 'unique strength' (Yin, 1994: 8) of taking a case study design.

As Bryman (2001) suggests, case studies are not a sample of one, meaning that grand generalisations cannot be drawn from them. For this reason it must be acknowledged that in some instances they are seen to lack rigour (Yin, 1994). However, through seeking to fully understand a single case, deeply exploring each element of it without pre-conceived ideas the unique knowledge and understanding of the case can be established. Exploring the unique features and how these differ or share similarities to other cases, other research and generalizations, theories can develop (Stake, 1995, Bryman, 2001, Punch, 2005). This therefore allows for theoretical propositions (Yin, 1994) to be made through the depth of the knowledge gained from the case study research model, which can then be applied to further situations over time to formulate new general concepts and formal theories.

4.1.1 Choice of case study

As previously discussed in Chapter Two (Section 2.3) there are currently no strict regulations determining when a market can be called a farmers' market and when it should be called a producer market, local food market and other such variations. Unlike other food labels like fair trade or organic there is no requirement to have any kind of certification before naming a market a farmers' market. However, there is a certification scheme run by the National Farmers' Retail and Market Association (FARMA). The certification gives a definitive radius that the market defines as 'local' and states that 'all products sold should have been grown, reared, caught, brewed, pickled, baked or processed by the stallholder' (National Farmers' Retail and Market Association (FARMA), 2011). FARMA argue that having this certification ensures that those shopping at the market are getting 'the "real deal"' (National Farmers' Retail and Market Association (FARMA), 2011) and suggest that using a certified farmers' market gives customers the confidence that they 'are buying the freshest, most local produce possible, supporting your local community and economy, and helping the environment by reducing food-miles' (National Farmers' Retail and Market Association (FARMA), 2011).

Without the necessity to hold certification to be called a farmers' market there are a number of markets across the UK that could have been chosen for this study. However, the FARMA certification provided one clear definition of a farmers' market, with the standards forming an object of this study. For this reason the list of possible UK farmers' markets to study was reduced just to those that held FARMA certification. This PhD study is being carried out in Wales with the intention at the outset to focus on Welsh food and production so only the FARMA certified farmers' markets within Wales were considered for the study. On a practical note this list was then reduced to the four certified markets within south and mid Wales, following Hammersley and Atkinson's (1995: 41) suggestion that 'pragmatic considerations must not be under-estimated in the choice of settings'.

One of these farmers' market is held just once a month and therefore would have limited the feasibility of getting the depth of fieldwork completed within the time frame allowed for the PhD study. The other three farmers' market are all held every fortnight. Two of these farmers' markets are comparable in size, each hosting between 25 and 30 producers whereas one was significantly smaller with on average

10 stalls. The larger two farmers' markets both featured in national newspaper lists of the top 10/12 farmers' markets in the UK in 2010. These lists are compiled by experts in the field of local and good quality food, suggesting that both of these markets were of a particularly high standard. Due to their size and success the list of possible case studies was therefore reduced to these two markets. As both of these farmers' markets were well-established and well-regarded attention was turned to the area from which the producers trading at them came from. One was based in a prime Welsh speaking county whereas the other was based in a county where English was widely spoken. As I do not speak or understand spoken Welsh this language factor determined the final choice of case study.

Throughout this thesis the farmers' market will be called Garrington Farmers' Market. Throughout the research process consideration was given as to whether or not the market should be kept anonymous. During the research producers were constantly informed that they would remain anonymous and whilst none are named within this thesis when presenting extracts from my field diary, taking away any information that would provide a clue as to who the individual producers were would take away the context in which information was given. Therefore, to aid the understanding of the data and to provide a context to this a pseudonym will be used instead of the market's name. The market and its setting are described in the following two sections in order to provide a setting and context of the chosen case.

4.1.2 The case

Garrington Farmers' Market opened in the summer of 1998. It began as a trial monthly market but quickly moved to become fortnightly in response to consumer and producer demand. The market is an outdoor market held every other Friday and advertised as being open from 9am-3pm although in reality most stall-holders are ready to sell as of 8.30am and many pack up by 2.30pm. It is located on a walkway between a small parade of shops and the river that flows through the town. The row of shops that make up the shopping centre is home to many traditional high street stores although the town is currently subject to retail decentralization with a handful of these stores moving to a new out of town shopping development in the summer of 2010.

There are approximately 29 stalls at the market, separated into two areas; a stretch of stalls along the river itself and a further selection of stalls in the small square at one end of the group of shops. The market is advertised with large banners hung in prominent places along the main road through the town and boards direct customers from one end of the market down to the other. The agricultural diversity in the area means a large variety of products are available at the market including meat, fish, vegetables, bread, cheese, jams, preserves and cakes. Around 25% of the stalls sell raw meat products with another 25% of the stalls selling baked products including cakes, breads and pies. Vegetable and fruit stalls make up around 15% of the market, with dairy products (milk and cheese) making up around 12%. There is a selection of producers waiting to join the market but currently there is not the stall space to accommodate anyone else.

The County Council manages the farmers' market. A fee of £25 per market day allows each producer to have a table and umbrella/canopy. Early on a market morning workers employed by the Council put out the umbrellas and stack the tables ready for the producers when they arrive from around 7.30am. Producers are encouraged to bring their own banners to advertise their products. By 8am the market space is a hive of activity as producers arrive and unload boxes, crates and refrigerated units of produce. Once unloaded producers leave their stalls and park up their vehicles for the day. The market worked hard to gain the FARMA certification mark which has created a strictly regulated yet distinctive market. In FARMA's annual awards Garrington Farmers' Market has been named the Best Farmers' Market in the Wales region twice in recent years. The market was also runner up in the Rural Farmers' Market category in the FARMA awards a few years ago

There are usually at least two members of the Council 'Food Team' present at the start of the market day. They answer any questions that stallholders may have as well as checking the stalls have only the produce they should be stocking. Being a Council run venture to promote local food the market is a prime advertising space for other events that are being run in the county. This includes the county's Fish Week which is advertised from spring and is held in early summer. Leaflets and booklets promoting local food are displayed on most of the stalls and distributed by the council to be displayed on market days and back home in farm shops and the like. There is an expectation that all stallholders will promote and display information of events that

are happening around the county. Being in the centre of town during a working day the market does attract local chefs from pubs and restaurants who browse the stalls looking for suitable local produce they may be able to use. It is also a prime opportunity for anyone wishing to promote a food event to producers or to try to get items for a fundraising event to come out and speak to producers face-to-face.

4.1.3 The setting

The county which is home to Garrington Farmers' Market boasts a high quality natural environment. With just 71 persons per km² the population is relatively sparsely populated in comparison to other Welsh counties (Pembrokeshire County Council, 2008). There are 38 conservation areas in the county, with 37.3% of the county's land area falling into a National Park and 6.8% of the county's land area being designated a Site of Special Scientific Interest (Pembrokeshire County Council, 2008). The county also houses industry. A harbour in the south west of the county is one of the largest natural harbours in the world and is therefore the industrial hub of the county housing oil refineries, a power station and ferry ports. The county also boasts a large tourist industry, with 29.9% of the workforce being employed in distribution, hotels and restaurants, which is higher than both the Welsh and UK average.

The county has low levels of deprivation with only 2 of the county's 71 areas falling into the most deprived 10% of areas within Wales. A further 4 areas are found in the most deprived 10-20% areas of Wales. These figures are measured on factors such as access to a car, owner occupied accommodation, overcrowded accommodation and unemployment. The county is a prime area to retire which is demonstrated in population figures. Between 1999 and 2009 the number of those aged 55 years and older increased by 21.2% whereas the number of people aged 25-39 years in the county decreased by 16.0% (Welsh Assembly Government, 2008). This results in a higher death rate than the UK average (11.5 deaths per 1000 compared to 9.1 per 1000) and a lower birth rate than the UK average (10.9 births per 1000 compared to 12.8 births per 1000).

When it comes to farming the county has a diverse range of agricultural holdings. There are just over 2200 active agricultural holdings in the county (Welsh Assembly Government, 2008) with the average holding size being slightly below the Welsh

average (35.39 hectares in the county compared to 38.2 hectares across Wales). Due to its relatively lowland landscape and thus more favourable climate and topography than many areas in mid and north Wales, the county has more arable land than the rest of Wales, with 27.7% of the farmland being arable land compared to the 14% Welsh average. Number of cattle/calves per holding is greater than the Welsh average (141 in the county compared to 90 across Wales as a whole). In contrast, the county has significantly lower numbers of sheep/lamb per holding (322) compared to the Welsh average (597).

Relating the agricultural area to Murdoch et al's (1993) suggestions of a differentiated countryside, the county falls between the preserved and clientelist countrysides. There is support for Welsh farming from the pensioners migrating into the county and from the tourists visiting and the idea that farmers in the county help to attract tourists through their local produce and keeping the beauty of the landscape places the county into Murdoch et al's (1993) 'preserved countryside' category. However, figures for the county show that between 2004 and 2009 the number of full-time farmers dropped by 14.5% whereas the number of part-time farmers increased by 10.6% (Pembrokeshire County Council, 2008). What this suggests is that the farmers in the area need to look elsewhere for an income in order for their income to be sufficient. In Murdoch et al's (1993) classification of a 'clientelist countryside' they determine that money to support agriculture is largely gained from state subsidies and external sources. This is not necessarily the case within this county with producers looking to diversify their employment rather than their land being insufficient to support their farming and thus being eligible for a number of subsidies. It would seem that there is no clear cut category of countryside into which the county would fall but whilst some local residents support local producers it is the tourist population that brings in the biggest income to the county's producers. Many producers at the farmers' market acknowledge that their sales significantly increase during the summer months when tourists flock to the county. Farmers are therefore preserving the land to enhance and sustain the tourist trade yet are having to look for extra income (sometimes within the tourist trade with bed and breakfasts, farm shops and farm parks) in order to keep their production economically viable.

4.1.4 Summary

A case study research strategy has been chosen for this study as it allows events to be understood in an holistic manner, considering not just what occurs but the context in which it occurs. This is extremely important for this study as it is the context in which social interactions occur that is of interest, the context of the farmers' market and how interactions are affected by the complexities of the market itself. The chosen case study market, Garrington Farmers' Market has been introduced in this section. The market has been running for over 10 years and is an award winning market with around 25 stalls. Importantly, it is also FARMA regulated. This element of the market must be appreciated. It formed a clear part of the decision making process and will be important in establishing an answer to the third research question which specifically queries the impact of regulation on farmers' markets. Having established the strategy, the chosen market and its setting, the chapter will now turn to the specifics of the research approach and processes of data collection.

4.2 Ethnography

Having explored the research strategy to be taken and introduced the specific case study this chapter now turns to document how this is to be done. The methods chosen need to allow for a full exploration of the farmers' market, to understand what it is, how it is 'created' and defined, the expectations within it, the interactions that occur between all those involved in it and also to understand who the 'actors' are. To understand the context of the farmers' market, how farmers interact within it and the expectations they have for it, it is necessary to understand who they are within the farmers' market. Therefore each producer must be understood in terms of their motivations, their expectations and their life in production. This not only requires an holistic and contextual understanding of the farmers' market, but necessarily requires a research method that provides an in-depth approach to the research problem, one that would allow the farmers' market and the actions within it to be comprehensively understood. It is for this reason that an ethnographic approach has been taken for this research study.

This methodological approach will stand this research apart from other studies of resilience. Whilst this is a topic which is becoming widely documented much of the current resilience literature is focused on the response of areas and regions to

economic challenges (for example Bristow, 2010, Hassink, 2010, Wolfe, 2010). Much of this has sought to take current definitions of resilience, to define characteristics of resilience or resilience frameworks that would display resilience and to apply these to specific areas or regions to establish if they have shown adaptability and thus resilience in the face of adversity. Taking an ethnographic, longitudinal approach will allow for a greater understanding of not just whether resilience exists, but how it is developed and why certain elements are or are not present. This will provide a greater depth of understanding of resilience within the farmers' market, seeking to understand resilience through its components and through the context in which these are applied, negotiated and either accepted or rejected.

4.2.1 Introducing ethnography

Ethnographic methods are defined as participation 'in people's daily lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, asking questions' (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995: 1). Through this participation information gathered using ethnographic methods is seen to 'convey the inner life and texture of a particular social group or locality' (Jackson, 2000: 238). Ethnographic methods seek to observe actions within the settings they occur, aiming to understand 'how the people involved see their own actions and those of others, and the contexts in which the actions take place' (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995: 6). Ethnographic methods therefore recognise that 'social researchers are part of the social world they study' (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995: 16) requiring immersion into specific cultures or communities in order to understand practices 'in a contextual and holistic manner' (Jackson, 2000: 238). Discussions in Chapter Three raised the importance of understanding resilience as an holistic concept (Bristow, 2010). Using ethnographic methods allows participation and thus understanding of the farmers' market system, network or community. It allows for the elements of resilience, such as diversity, competition and trust to be explored within the market setting and in the context of the market. As Hammersley and Atkinson (1995: 2) state, ethnography 'bears close resemblance to the routine ways in which people make sense of the world in everyday life'. Using ethnographic methods within this study therefore allows for the understanding and investigation as to how producers and consumers make sense of and use the market as part of their life in production.

The anthropologist, Malinowski, is seen as a pioneer of ethnography, using ethnographic research methods to study natives in faraway and 'exotic' cultures (Junker, 1960, Van Maanen, 1988). Indeed Cloke and Cook (2007: 37) suggest that 'ethnographic research has developed out of a concern to understand world-views and ways of life of actual people in the contexts of their everyday lived experiences'. Such studies have developed the method of ethnography yet Junker (1960: 52) suggests that 'the contemporary scientist faces a shortage of unstudied esoteric cultures'. Ethnography's subsequent development demonstrates that present day ethnography is not all about studying an exotic community for a number of years (Crang and Cook, 2007). Ethnographic methods have been used in human geography research since the 1970s (Crang and Cook, 2007). This development within geography was in opposition to the attitude of positivist geographers who felt the need to completely detach themselves from research, mainly gathering quantifiable data. What geographers expressed through the use of ethnographic methods was their belief that cultures 'could be made sense of only through in-depth observation, in situ' (Crang and Cook, 2007: 7). Baszanger and Dodier (1997) suggest that a study is in situ when the subjects being studied can behave in a 'natural' manner, one not affected by the study arrangements.

Whilst the brief descriptions above detail the use of observation, Mason (2002: 55) clearly states that 'ethnography is not defined by observation methods'. An observer may be seen as someone who sits back to watch activities from a detached position (Crang and Cook, 2007), the positivist attitude, whereas an ethnographer immerses themselves into a culture so as they experience and participate in the 'everyday rhythms and routines' (Crang and Cook, 2007: 37). Ethnographic studies therefore are seen to investigate human activities in a way that uses an empirical approach whilst not coding intentions and findings at the time of data collection and importantly has 'a concern for grounding phenomena observed in the field' (Baszanger and Dodier, 1997: 10). This grounds any findings within the context in which they were studied, allowing coding to develop from the data rather than through researcher's pre-conceived ideas.

Perhaps this final point forms the main emphasis of ethnography, the idea that it can be used 'to obtain an insider's view of society' (Taylor, 2002: 3). It was for this reason that ethnographic techniques were used to gather the data for this PhD study.

In order to understand the producer community, the social networks within the market and the development of resilience I had to attempt to become an ‘insider’ who could be party to activities, conversations and discussions in order to gain an ‘intimate familiarity’ (Hughes et al., 2000: 4) with the market community. There is a distinction between ethnography and using ethnographic techniques and this is both the time scale of the study and amount of immersion within a community (Fetterman, 1998). Looking reflexively at this PhD research some may suggest that it is not ethnography but simply uses ethnographic techniques due to the fact the farmers’ market only occurred every fortnight. However, I attended every market throughout the year, as well as spending time with producers outside of the market space, attending market meetings and staying at a local farm bed and breakfast (all discussed in Section 4.3) and thus was immersed within the market community at every available opportunity. It is advocated that ethnographers should spend ‘at least a year’ (O’Reilly, 2005: 93) with those being studied as this is ‘seen as a natural cycle during which most rituals and events will be observed’ (O’Reilly, 2005: 93). It may therefore be suggested that this study lies somewhere between a full ethnography and a study using ethnographic techniques. A whole year was spent immersed in the market community but due to the nature of the regularity of the market such immersion did not occur every day of the year.

4.2.2 Building trust and rapport

As discussed above, ethnographers are required to spend a considerable amount of time interacting with and observing the culture or community under study. As Van Maanen (1988: 2) states this ‘usually means living with and living like those who are studied’ which allows for the build up of trust and rapport. By taking the time to develop this, an ethnographer can ask more questions and glean more information from the situation being studied. As ethnographers gain familiarity within the community they move from being seen as a ‘distant associate’ (Junker, 1960: 47) to a ‘somewhat closer friend’ (Junker, 1960: 47) and with this comes a greater acceptability or right to ask specific questions (Junker, 1960). In order to gain trust and rapport it is essential for any ethnographer to accept direction in even simple tasks, being a ‘non threatening learner’ (Lofland and Lofland, 1995: 56). These initial steps help to build a relationship with those being studied and ethnographers must be sure to ‘adopt an attitude of ‘respect’ or ‘appreciation’ towards the social world’

(Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995: 6) in order to aid their research. Through taking time and working alongside those being studied 'people become accustomed to their [the ethnographer's] presence and begin to behave more naturally' (Bryman, 2001: 307). Ethnography therefore takes time, it is not something that should be used if time is too limited; time not only helps those being studied grow used to and develop trust with the researcher it also 'helps the researcher internalize the basic beliefs, fears, hopes and expectations of the people under study' (Fetterman, 1998: 35).

The actions needed to build trust and rapport can create a number of problems. One suggested problem is that of 'going native' (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995, Bryman, 2001). Bryman (2001: 300) describes this as a point when ethnographers 'lose this sense of being a researcher and become wrapped in the world view of the people they are studying' leading to 'over rapport' (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995: 110). This refers to the consequence of talking in depth to one group of people, to them opening up to the researcher about particular issues and the effect this has on the researcher's independence and objectivity. Being seen developing a greater rapport with certain people within a community can limit the rapport that can then be built with other members of that community. Within this study for instance, if I had been seen spending a great deal of every market day enthusiastically speaking with the market manager it may have been difficult to have built a trusting relationship with a number of producers who may well have viewed me as a threat or a spy if I was too closely connected to the market manager.

The issues above are more prominent when the people being researched know that the researcher is gathering data from them. Such researchers have the 'advantage of being able to move about, observe, or question in a relatively unrestricted way' (Lofland and Lofland, 1995: 73). However, in some cases there is a need to research covertly. Perhaps one of the most well known ethnographic research studies conducted covertly is the sociologist, Laud Humphreys' study of what he termed The Tearoom Trade. This study looked at gay sexual activities in public toilets around an American city and Humphreys had been warned that the gay community had been previously studied yet the bars and restaurants they had used had not been anonymised in the write up (Stephens et al, 1998). Understandably, they were wary of researchers and for this reason Humphreys undertook his research covertly. In order to do this Humphreys became a 'gay voyeur (someone who gains sexual

pleasure by watching)' (Stephens et al., 1998: 97). Whilst researching covertly can give ethnographers access to research environments that would otherwise be closed to them it carries with it the issue of deception. The possible consequences of this deception (such as the hurt caused to 'participants') must be weighed up against the opportunities the research might offer to those being studied.

Those researching covertly can at times be caught out when those they are researching take part in activities they are uncomfortable doing themselves. When carrying out an ethnographic study, researchers are expected to take part in everything, whether this is serving tea and coffee, looking at photos or the extreme of carrying out illegal activities (Lofland and Lofland, 1995). It is the ability and willingness to participate in every activity that can help a researcher become accepted into a community or culture. Indeed, Bryman (2001: 301) suggests that 'a failure to participate actively might indicate to members of the social setting a lack of commitment and hence a loss of credibility'. Perhaps one of the most famous ethnographies is Whyte's 1955 study of 'Cornerville', an Italian slum in Boston. Those within the study knew that Whyte was undertaking research in order to write about their community but it was his involvement with the groups in the community, taking part even when they carried out illegal activities that helped him to be accepted and therefore to have access to gather a diverse range of information from all areas of the community (Whyte, 1993). This may be compared to Patrick's 1973 study of gangs in Glasgow (Bryman, 2001). Patrick was carrying out this study covertly but withdrew when he was expected to carry a knife and become involved in the gang's violence (Bryman, 2001). Whether conducting ethnographic research overtly or covertly a researcher may come across these issues and dilemmas, which will be specific to each research project. It is perhaps only when they occur that a researcher can make a decision as to the best course of action, whether to join in or not and the consequences this may have on the research project as a whole.

What is important in any ethnographic study is that a researcher must see, hear and interpret the culture that is experienced (Van Maanen, 1988). Ethnographic research is carried out through a 'combination of looking, listening and asking' (Lofland and Lofland, 1995: 70) and it is important to be as thorough as possible when collecting and recording data (Grills, 1998). It is essential that researchers note down as much information as possible about the happenings in 'the field', from the exotic to the

mundane activities (O'Reilly, 2005). Details of such activities should be noted down 'completely divorced from moral judgements' (Whyte, 1993: 287) so that the findings can be interpreted as you go along without researcher biases (Junker, 1960). For this reason 'the course of ethnography cannot be predetermined' (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995: 24). If ethnography is carried out properly any pre-set questions will get altered with the course of the research (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995). Ethnography is therefore seen as flexible research and researchers often do not start with strict hypotheses (O'Reilly, 2005).

4.2.3 Ethnographic writing

Ethnography and ethnographic techniques are often seen to 'denote(s) both a research process and the written outcome of the research' (Bryman, 2001: 291). Van Maanen (1995: 3) suggests that 'ethnography is a story telling institution' with Hughes et al, (2000: 10) agreeing that 'ethnographers are story tellers'. Ethnographic writing is 'reflexive and audience attentive' (Grills, 1998: 199). To begin writing a researcher must start by translating the language used in the field setting (Cragg and Cook, 2007). For some this may be a foreign language, such as Whyte who researched an Italian area of Boston, whereas for others it may be the dialect of an area or the using of slang words to fit into a community or culture. When writing, such language has to be made appropriate for the audience it is written for, whether this is academics or others (Cragg and Cook, 2007). However, it is important not to lose the sentiments and to include examples as ultimately an ethnography should be a 'written representation of a culture' (Van Maanen, 1988: 1) which is 'empirical enough to be credible and analytical enough to be interesting' (ibid: 29).

Van Maanen (1988, 1995) suggests a number of different ways to write ethnographic research which each give a different emphasis to these data. These are:

- *Confessional tales*-these writings are 'highly personalized' (Van Maanen, 1988: 73) making the researcher the centre of the writing to display how they 'came to know a given social world' (Van Maanen, 1995: 8).
- *Dramatic tales*-these involve a 'narration of a particular event or sequence of events of obvious significance to the cultural members studied' (ibid: 9).

- *Impressionist tales*-these are rarely written into ethnographic writing but kept as an anecdote that may be used within a presentation or more likely as a humorous story among friends, reliving a particular moment in the field.
- *Realist tales*-the researcher is usually absent from such writings with ‘the text focused almost solely on the sayings, doings and supposed thinkings of the people studied’ (Van Maanen, 1988: 47).
- *Formal tales*-such writing is ‘out to build, test, generalize and otherwise exhibit theory’ (ibid: 130).
- *Critical tales*-these writings place the culture within a wider context that may not be recognised by its members and aim to ‘shed light on larger social, political, symbolic or economic gains’ (ibid: 127).

In reality ethnographic writing is often a combination of the above perhaps moving, as this PhD study will do, from realist tales through to critical tales. Confessional tales are often included within ethnographic writing to elaborate on realist accounts and prove that the researcher was actually there in the field (ibid). Whilst it is important to demonstrate that the researcher was in the field and learnt about the community or culture it is recognised that by taking ‘I’ out of the text seemingly gives the written ethnography greater authority (ibid).

4.2.4 Limitations of ethnography

Ethnography is not without its criticisms. Van Maanen (1995: 5) sums up ethnographic research as ‘a wonderful excuse for having an adventurous good time while operating under the pretext of doing serious intellectual work’. With much initial ethnographic work being carried out in exotic locations over a period of at least a year it is perhaps unsurprising that ethnography has developed such a reputation. As has already been discussed ethnographic studies do not begin with ‘pristine hypotheses to be tested later ‘in the field’’ (Crang and Cook, 2007: 19). This results in the first steps within the field being ‘tentative and uncertain’ (Hughes et al., 2000: 16), with ‘initial fieldnotes that are disjointed and wandering, and first interviews dotted here and there with naïve questions and our own, at times, careless responses’ (Hughes et al., 2000: 16). Ethnographers must take the time to acquaint themselves with the culture or community to be studied and whilst at first researchers are bound

to 'feel very strange, insecure and lacking in confidence' (O'Reilly, 2005: 96) it is only by taking the time and patience to observe and take part that this can be overcome.

However long a researcher spends in the field it is suggested that 'there can be a continual, often subtle, but always painful sense of separation between the observer and the observed' (Lofland and Lofland, 1995: 52). Even though a researcher may have become part of a community this socialization does not mean they have access to every point of view (Baszanger and Dodier, 1997). This highlights the need for self reflection throughout ethnographic fieldwork (Phillips, 2000). Researchers must question what they are being told, why they are being told this by certain people and the motives behind sharing this information. At the same time researchers must also consider what they are not being told. Researchers need to take the time to get to know communities and cultures so as they can profess to understanding what it is they are getting told (Grills, 1998). By spending an extended time in the field, researchers can 'cross check information they obtain and interpretations they develop' (Davies, 1999: 86). This cross checking process should help researchers to question what is missing from their fieldwork and establish how it can be developed further wherever possible.

A researcher must also understand their own subjectivity (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995, Phillips, 2000, Crang and Cook, 2007). In general there is an expectation that research is objective, a researcher studies something they are detached from. An ethnographer cannot claim to do this; they become attached to a community or culture for a prolonged period of time. The attached nature of the research is what stands it apart from other research techniques. It does, however, create a difficulty for ethnography to be regarded as objective (Phillips, 2000). Some suggest that research does not need to be objective as long as the researcher understands their own subjectivity (Crang and Cook, 2007). Researchers must consider who is influencing them; this goes beyond those within the research setting. The type of person the researcher is, their background, interests and life experiences will influence both the research that is open to them and what they see within that research. The people in a researcher's life, outside of the research setting, will also influence the findings of a study. Every researcher must understand that research 'is affected by researcher values' (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995: 14). Researchers must consider their

subjectivity and self reflection in order to convince those reading their research study that what they observed, heard and noted down within the research setting would match that of any other similar researcher who went into the same area (Van Maanen, 1988). It is for this reason that ethnographic writing is rarely written 'in a detached, scientific, third person style' (Crang and Cook, 2007: 9). Such writing does not demonstrate the processes and powers affecting the researcher and therefore there is a necessity to acknowledge these processes within ethnographic writing to show how they have been resolved or at least considered.

Ethnography is usually small-scale; in many cases it involves the study of just one case study (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995, O'Reilly, 2005). It is 'not representative in the way that findings can be generalised statistically to a wider population' (O'Reilly, 2005: 199). Every researcher undertaking ethnographic research may therefore come up against the dilemma of how to 'ensure their research is thorough, rigorous, systematic and convincing' (Crang and Cook, 2007: 14). For Crang and Cook (2007: 14) this is done by ensuring research is 'theoretically sampled, saturated and adequate'. Researchers should be aware that 'generalization is not always the primary concern' (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995: 41) and should consider whether it is the depth or the breadth of research which is the most important to them. As Grills (1998: 63) suggests if 'we sacrifice quality for quantity, we short change...those persons whose perspectives we seek to understand'. Ethnography offers a depth of understanding that many other research methods lack so whilst it may be criticised for lacking breadth and therefore the ability to generalise from these data it offers an in-depth insight into a single or small number of cases.

Having got to know a community or culture over a prolonged period of time ethnographers research findings may lead to an "ethical hangover" (Lofland and Lofland, 1995: 16). This can develop as a researcher begins to feel uneasy or even a sense of guilt over what they have seen within the research environment and how their interpretation may be seen as a betrayal by those in the study. Indeed once the research is written up ethnographers may be criticised by their informants for telling a story incorrectly, for putting the wrong emphasis on a story, or for putting them at risk (perhaps by detailing illegal activities). Such interpretations would be a betrayal of those that have welcomed the researcher in over an extended period of time (Lofland and Lofland, 1995). There are ways to protect participants, the simplest being to use a

pseudonym for the names of people or the name of the area studied. Whyte, for instance, refers to the slum he studied as ‘Cornerville’ (Whyte, 1993). Some researchers may take the time to show those they have researched their writings for their comment. However this approval can result in the insistence of changes that the researcher may not agree with. As with any research method, ethnography has ethical issues, some of which may not become apparent until the research is published. Nevertheless researchers should be aware of issues developing during the research process and act to reduce or eliminate them as soon as possible.

4.2.5 Summary

Ethnography involves the immersion into a potentially unknown culture for an extended period of time. This therefore makes it ‘time consuming, intensive and exhausting work’ (Hughes et al., 2000: 10), a ‘demanding, labor-intensive, and painstaking endeavour’ (Grills, 1998: 29) to complete ‘disciplined and sometimes tedious work’ (Lofland and Lofland, 1995: 57). Ethnography seeks to give those who may otherwise be silenced a voice (Hughes et al., 2000). Prolonged and direct involvement with a particular community or culture gives the researcher a vast knowledge of that world (Hughes et al., 2000); a world in which they actively participate in activities whilst gathering data at the same time (Baszanger and Dodier, 1997: 10). As with any method ethnography is not without its critics, but as long as a researcher is reflexive during data collection and throughout the ‘write-up’ they can clearly demonstrate the strengths and weaknesses of each individual study.

4.3 Using Ethnographic Methods

This section of the chapter details the methods used for data collection within this PhD study. It begins with the details of gaining access to the farmers’ market before discussing the observations and interview techniques used to immerse myself, as the researcher, within this environment. Fieldnotes and field diaries are an integral part to any ethnographic study and thus the techniques used to make fieldnotes are discussed below. This is followed by problems and ethical dilemmas encountered before entering and once in the field. The final sub-section then reviews the techniques used for data analysis.

4.3.1 Access

Before undertaking research ‘the real challenge lies in gaining access’ (Grills, 1998: 53). For this study it was necessary in the first instance to gain access to the farmers’ market as a space to study and then to gain access to work with each producer on their stall. The farmers’ market is managed by the County Council with the council’s ‘Food Officer’ taking a lead in the management. As I wanted to work with producers at the market over a specific period of time the fieldwork was carried out overtly. I therefore needed to obtain access to the market and the Food Officer was used as a ‘gatekeeper’ (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995) to access the market. As Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) state it can be unavoidable not to use a gatekeeper and certainly for the ease of access to the market the Food Officer was the obvious person to approach to approve access to the market for research. Different studies need gatekeepers for different reasons. In his study of Cornerville, Whyte used a gatekeeper named ‘Doc’, who was well educated and well known in the area under study (Whyte, 1993). Being brought into situations with Doc, Whyte was more trusted and welcomed than if he’d gone alone. Doc and other such gatekeepers have been the key to gaining informal access to many social spaces. As such I was using my gatekeeper to gain ‘official permission’ (Hammersley and Atkinson 1995: 63) to study the market. In a place that has a manager rather than a simple social space gaining official permission from a gatekeeper is usually necessary. For me the gatekeeper granted me access into the market space and from that point onwards access onto each market stall would also need to be negotiated.

The first contact made with the Food Officer was by telephone to establish if she was able to grant me permission to study the market. After a brief explanation of my research, access to use the market as the focus of the study was granted and it was suggested that the best thing for me to do was to meet the Food Officer at the market on the next market day (approximately 10 days from the day of making contact). On meeting the Food Officer I had the opportunity to discuss the nature of the research a little further. I also produced a short document that detailed the aims of the research, my academic credentials and contact details for myself and my supervisor (see Appendix 1). Importantly during this first visit to the market the Food Officer took me to meet every producer face-to-face at their stall. I was introduced to every producer and whilst being given the market tour the Food Officer gave me a little bit

of information about every stall. I had prepared a short introductory leaflet about myself and my research to pass to every producer (see Appendix 2). The information given to the producers was an abridged version of that given to the Food Officer. It is not uncommon to create 'multiple versions of the same project' (Crang and Cook, 2007: 41) and it was shortened to make it more accessible for a busy farmer/producer to quickly glean the information they may need about the research being carried out.

It is suggested that the personal introduction from the Food Officer should at least give the research the best chance of starting at a good standing point; 'a strong recommendation and introduction strengthen the fieldworker's capacity to work in the community and thus improve the quality of data' (Fetterman, 1998: 34). Being introduced by the market manager helped me to begin my research with access from a trusted individual. Taking the time to go around with the Food Officer and have a short conversation with every producer helped me to begin to build a rapport with each producer which would be important for the months of research that were to follow. Grills (1998: 53) suggests that there is a necessity to demonstrate an 'appropriate self presentation along with a convincing account' in order to gain access to the activity or community that a researcher wishes to study. So whilst I had prepared written information of my project I had also been careful to dress smartly but casually for the day at the market.

It should be recognised that the negotiation of access did not finish once access to the market was granted. As Bryman (2001: 297) states 'simply because you have gained access to an organisation does not mean that you will have an easy passage through the organisation'. Access to work on stalls and to visit producers for a day at their place of work was negotiated through the schedule of fieldwork. Even when physical access is granted Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) suggest that access is continually negotiated in order to get people to open up and share data. This will be discussed within the participant observation and interview sections of this chapter. However, during the time working on the market I came to realise that I had inadvertently negotiated access through interaction with one particular producer at the market. It became apparent on my first visit to the market that to work alongside the producers at the market I would need to arrive somewhere between 7.30 and 8am every market day. Realistically the best option to ensure I was there on time was to stay the night before in the local area. I asked the Food Officer and her colleagues if there were any

places of accommodation that could be recommended in the town and it was suggested that I spoke to one stallholder who had a bed and breakfast around 3 miles outside of Garrington.

For the duration of my observations I stayed at this bed and breakfast which was owned and run by the parents of the stallholder. Each week I would usually get asked by the producer I was working with if I wanted something to eat or a cup of tea quite early in the market day. I would have to politely decline this as I had had such a big breakfast and I made the effort to explain that I had enjoyed a breakfast at my overnight accommodation. Invariably this was meant with a smile or a nod, a pleasantry that I had stayed in the area the night before, an exclamation at how good those breakfasts were or an expression about how 'nice' the family at the bed and breakfast were. It became apparent that those running the farm were a long standing, local, farming family. By staying with them I was seen to be supporting the local producers and farmers. The son of the family who ran the market stall was well regarded within the market and having his acceptance helped to displace any suspicion that may have arisen from me being taken around the market by the manager. As Junker (1960: 43) states, I was, although I did not realise it at the time, 'winning acceptance from leaders of informal groups' which helped me to gain greater acceptance, trust and respect at the market.

In order to ensure every producer I spent a day with understood what I was doing I would usually begin a market day by chatting to the producer about what my study was about and they in turn would inform me a little about their farm or production. Many would begin by asking me, 'what is it again you are looking at?', and from answering this conversations would begin. To ensure that all stallholders were prepared to talk freely to me as a researcher I reassured them all that they would remain anonymous throughout the research and subsequent write up (this and other ethical issues are discussed in Section 4.3.6). Such openness helped to build trust and rapport from the start of the day and conversations would develop as the day went on. It was essential to be helpful at the start of each day (see also observations section below), either letting the producer get on whilst I observed and chatted or helping to lay out a stall (which ever was preferred) as I needed to build up trust with each producer in order to gain access to their stall, their thoughts and their experiences of the market during the day I was with them. It was essential to start the day well to get

the most out of each market day and it was essential to realise that problems with access 'ordinarily involves the researcher's relations with members' (Lofland and Lofland, 1995: 53).

It must, of course, be acknowledged that there were potential problems through using the market manager as the 'official' gatekeeper to the market. The manager was obviously in a position of power within the market and this can create possible tensions for the research participants if they did not exactly follow the market rules. I attempted to reduce such tensions by assuring participants that I was conducting independent research for a university project as well as explaining my own independent reasons for choosing to study this particular farmers' market. Despite this, throughout my research there were some producers that did not understand what I was doing at the market. Even having explained to one producer that I was at university in Cardiff and freely chose to study Garrington Farmers' Market and therefore had approached the council for permission she commented that 'I would see the market organisers when I went back to the office'. Another came up to me one day to ask if I had the organiser's telephone number and indeed if I was 'still working at the market'. Such comments only came from a couple of producers and I do not believe that this was due to a lack of trust in the market manager. I simply think that my information was looked over, put to one side and then forgotten about and as the market only happened once a fortnight my role did not get discussed regularly for everyone to appreciate exactly who I was and what I was doing. The position of trust the market manager held with the producers and the excellent position this put me in with the majority of the producers far outweighed these small confusions among two or three producers.

Hammersley and Atkinson (1995: 66) suggest that the market manager may 'attempt to exercise some degree of surveillance and control' over the research in order that the market is portrayed in a favourable light. However, after the initial introduction to each producer I was left to make my own contact with the stallholders I wanted to work with and spent the whole day on their stalls. This meant that whilst the market manager would stop and ask how my research was progressing there was little opportunity to direct my study. At no point in time did I feel any pressure from the market manager to alter anything I had observed. I was welcomed to and attended market meetings, which allowed me to observe the debates and disagreements of the

market as they played out behind the scenes. After one of these meetings the market manager took the opportunity to stop and talk to me at the market to justify the position she had taken in one of the debates. It was only fair that I took the time to listen to this as all the stallholders who had been present at the meeting would have been able to and did talk to me on market days. Through such conversations I felt I had become an accepted member of the market community. People stopping to talk to me about certain issues as they would with other producers gave me a sense that I was fitting in (Crang and Cook, 2007) at the market.

4.3.2 Participant observations

I attended Garrington Farmers' Market for all but one market day throughout the year of 2010, observing the market, the interactions and the functioning of the market through both directly working with stallholders and through wandering the market speaking with producers as I went through. For half of the year I specifically worked with producers on their stalls, getting to know them and their neighbours and building trust. The second half of the year I used to get a more general feel of the whole market throughout the market day, walking through the market, stopping to help producers if needed or just to have a conversation, observing all the time the workings of the market environment. Using participant observations gave me, as the researcher, the chance to gain a depth of understanding about the farmers' market that would not have been possible using other research techniques. Kusenbach (2003: 460) suggests that 'an outsider's view of a setting that lacks a local vantage point necessarily remains superficial'. Participating in the market and working with producers thus enabled me to become part of the market community and to develop an understanding of the market from an insider's perspective.

Having attended the market and been introduced to all the producers I attended on 12 different market days to work with different stall-holders. These stalls were spread throughout the market, allowing me to see the way each area of the market functioned. Through working on one stall I usually managed to see exactly what happened on the stalls either side and in the majority of cases it was the neighbouring stallholders that shared a lot of conversation time. This meant that it was not necessary for me to spend time on every single stall on the market. An effort was made to sample stalls selling a variety of products; of the 12 stalls I worked with, 4 sold cakes and/or breads, 2 sold fruit or vegetables, 5 sold meats and 1 sold plants.

Junker (1960) suggests four different ways in which participant observation can be carried out:

- Complete Participant-this is when research is carried out covertly, when the researcher is already part of the group they wish to research. One noted problem of this type of research is that the researcher often only sees things from an 'insider's' perspective and thus lacks a connection to wider society.
- Participation as Observer-this is where the researcher joins in with the community they are researching. Those within the community know that the researcher is conducting research but do not know the exact details of the research. One suggested problem of this approach is that participants may not happily share information.
- Observer as Participant-in this instance those being researched know who the researcher is and what they are researching. Using this approach it is suggested that researchers can gain the trust of participants enabling them to learn a lot from them. Researchers should consider though the reasons and motivations behind the information that participants share with them.
- Complete Observer-participants know they are being observed and the researcher does not attempt to hide any observations to the extreme of filming research locations. This is criticised as researchers are seen simply as observing rather than actually participating in activities.

Spradley (1980) has a similar classification but uses the terms 'complete participation' (Spradley, 1980: 61), 'moderate participation' (Spradley, 1980: 60), 'active participation' (Spradley, 1980: 60) and 'passive participation' (Spradley, 1980: 59).

Throughout this PhD project I tried to be Junker's (1960), 'observer as participant' and Spradley's (1980) 'active participant'. In this vein I wanted 'to do what other people are doing, not merely to gain acceptance, but to more fully learn the cultural rules for behaviour' (Spradley, 1980: 60). However, as was recognised in the previous section, there were some producers who had misunderstood exactly who I was and what I was researching so my participation would at times unwittingly fall into Junker's (1960) categories of 'participant as observer' and 'observer as participant'. It is not unusual to be 'oscillating' (Junker, 1960: 38) between

categories, with some members of the group seeing a researcher more as a participant and others seeing them more as an observer.

In the week leading up to each market day I made contact by either telephone or email with the producer that I was hoping to work with. I ensured that I explained once again about my research and would ask if I could work with them on their stall at the market. I was not declined by any producer that I asked. I believe that a primary reason for this acceptance was that I had used the Food Officer as a gatekeeper to the market. Fetterman (1998: 33) suggests that 'the trust the group places in the intermediary will approximate the trust it extends to the ethnographer at the beginning of the study'.

Having gained permission to work on a producer's stall for the day I would arrange to meet the producer as soon as they arrived at the market. From this point onwards I would begin to take instruction on what to do. For Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) my age may well have affected my attitude towards being given direction on what to do; they suggest that those who are younger feel more at ease in looking less competent. Certain producers had their routine of setting out a stall and normally did this independently so asked that I did not help otherwise it would confuse them. Others were grateful of an extra pair of hands and would instruct me how to lay out their stall. The majority of producers gave me a money belt to wear, showed me their cash box or demonstrated how to work their till. This gave me permission to serve customers and therefore fully participate behind the stalls.

Typically I would arrive at the market somewhere between 7.30am and 8.15am. Having helped set up a market stall there was usually at least half an hour before any rush of customers came to the market. During this time I was usually shown what happened with the money, I was informed what products were available and their prices and often I was given an apron to wear so as I looked like part of the stall. This was important for me, to be seen as a participant, but it was a way of producers demonstrating their trust in me to serve customers. It also allowed customers to recognise that I was part of the market. Many of the producers wear matching aprons that display the County's Local Produce Mark, a distinction that the council has developed to support local producers and businesses. This provides customers with a

recognisable mark that they can identify with and therefore if I was wearing an apron with this mark I could be seen as part of this community.

Throughout every market day I was allowed to serve customers, chatting to both them and the producers. On the majority of the days the producers I was working with would spend time chatting to producers on the stalls either side of them. There were general conversations concerning what everyone had been doing over the last two weeks, family stories and activities being shared as well as talking about market issues or other problems in production such as the cold weather. I was able to participate and was included in many of these conversations and through these gleaned a great deal of information about the market and the producers. Just as Grills (1998) suggests I may not have looked as if I was studying the market because I was simply engaging in it, taking part in conversations or 'hanging out' (Grills, 1998: 95) but these were all essential ways to gather information. Some producers left me alone for a period of time on their stall whilst going to buy an extension lead or knife that they had forgotten to bring with them, or heading to the bank or to pay a bill. For many producers I was doing them a favour by being able to man their stall allowing them to do a few things whilst they were in town.

Many customers were regulars at the market and would greet the producers as friends, often stopping for conversations. I would be introduced many times during the day to various customers who often showed a keen interest in my research. On certain stalls, particularly the meat stalls, customers would ask for some advice about how to cook something. At this point in time I always passed them to the producer as I did not feel that I should provide such advice. This happened throughout the day when I worked on the stall selling plants as people asked for advice or brought in plants they wanted the stallholder to look at. As I could not assist with this I spent the majority of this particular market day observing rather than participating.

I attempted to join in with everything taking place at the market to 'become part of the natural surroundings or settings' (O'Reilly, 2005: 13). On the market day held on Good Friday all the producers were asked to take part in an Easter bonnet competition. I knew that the stall I was due to work on that day would participate in this and therefore I made a bonnet to wear at the market. It was commented throughout the day that I had joined in with this and such actions helped me to fit into

the community. During a market day I would often drink at least one cup of tea with the producer I was working with. It was all part of the day, to keep warm or to have a quick chat to a few other stallholders as a producer walked through the market to buy the tea from a café or coffee shop. As I became known and trusted I was given a £20 note by a producer and asked to pop to the coffee shop to buy drinks for 5 or 6 producers 'and one for yourself'. On another market day I was included in a practical joke, where a producer's prize cow horns were hidden by neighbouring stallholders whilst I was helping him load his van. They laughed at the fact they had made me so worried that it might have been my fault if they had been stolen. Having this joke played on me gave me a sense of being a trusted member of the market community.

Every producer was expected to keep their stall open until at least 2pm. Some would pack up immediately, whereas others stayed until 3 or even 4pm. I would help to pack away a stall, carrying boxes to vans, dismantling tables and rolling up signs. At this point in the day I was regularly given something for my time on the stall. This ranged from a sack of potatoes plus 2 bags of vegetables, through to a pack of sausages or a cake. This was a sign of gratitude for the work I had done and the flexibility it had given producers to go and do a few other things. It was often commented that I had been a 'great help', although on many days I did not feel as though I had worked particularly hard.

Having spent 6 months (February to July) observing the market by working with producers I spent a further 6 months (August to February) at the market where I was not fixed to a specific stall every week. As some producers had left me alone on their stalls during the day I had to question what their typical market day on the stall was if I was not working with them. Locating myself on one specific stall each market day had given me a good insight into the way each stall worked but I had not experienced the market as a whole on any particular day. Spending 6 months within the whole market space helped to fulfil the two purposes of participant observation: 'to engage in activities appropriate to the situation and to observe the activities, people and physical actions of the situation' (Spradley, 1980: 54). I took the time to wander through the market, stopping and talking to as many producers as possible as I went along. Some days I would look after a stall whilst a producer went to grab a cup of coffee or went to the toilet, whereas on other days I would help out on a stall when they were exceptionally busy for a short period of time. I both participated in the

market and stood back to observe the market during these market visits. These visits gave me a chance to arrange interviews (discussed in Section 4.3.3) and gave me a chance to stop and talk to as many producers as possible over the course of a number of markets.

As well as the days at the market I also attended the two market meetings that happened during the course of the year and the Annual General Meeting. I found out about a market meeting one Friday at the market and specifically asked the market manager if I would be allowed to attend. As the meetings were open to any producers to attend I was welcome to attend them and was added to the producer mailing list to receive the general invitation that all producers received to attend future meetings. Unlike at the market, I took an observer rather than a participant role at the meetings. I did not feel I knew enough about some of the topics being discussed and I also wanted to remain neutral in the eyes of as many producers as possible. This, I hoped, would ensure I had the best chance of gaining the trust of every producer at the market. Attending the meetings allowed me to appreciate the workings of the market, to see how decisions were made and to hear discussions and debates about changes in the market. Attending these meetings gave me a wealth of understanding about the market; including an understanding not just of how the market ran but of the social networks that develop between specific producers at the market. There were differences of opinion between certain producers and it was only by seeing these in the meeting situations that I could begin to appreciate some the differences that may have been displayed on market days.

Another benefit of attending market meetings was that my email address was added to the mailing list that was used to email producers. From this I received the letters and plan of the market sent to the producers before each market day. This detailed any changes at the market, so I was aware of issues that might be discussed at the market and producers that were leaving or joining the market. Receiving these documents gave me a greater insider's view and understanding of the market, helping me to prepare for each market day in order to be both knowledgeable and interested in the discussions that were likely to occur.

4.3.3 Ethnographic interviews

Having spent nine months working at the farmers' market and observing market days it was important to gain further access and insight into producers' lives and thoughts to provide a depth of understanding to the observations already made. Initially I planned to conduct semi-structured interviews with producers but came across two obstacles that caused this route to be reconsidered. Firstly, having gathered together an interview schedule and completed one pilot interview with a producer at their farm shop it became apparent that through narrowing ideas to specific questions the detail and depth of the research was being lost. I was gaining nothing more than answers to pre-set questions and no insight into the life of the producer outside of the market place. This style of interview appeared inappropriate to fulfil the aims of the research. I was not allowing for observations 'at different times of the day and different days of the week' (Bryman, 2001: 303) but instead was creating an unnatural and perhaps sterile interview environment. Secondly, trying to secure an hour of any producer's time to sit down for an interview was difficult. Many lacked the time to commit to this as production was key and as a researcher I needed to fit into and around their schedule of work. I therefore re-evaluated the research plan, asking to spend a day at each producer's place of production, helping them and in the process seeking to understand the nature of production and the identity of the producer within their production environment.

The ethnographic interview is seen more as a conversation than an interview (Spradley, 1980, Grills, 1998) and if carried out successfully 'feels like natural dialogue but answers the fieldworker's often unasked questions' (Fetterman, 1998: 39). It is essential then that the aim of the ethnographer within this situation 'is to facilitate conversation' (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995: 143). Due to this and the nature of ethnography such interviews are not based on specific questions but the researcher 'will usually enter the interviews with a list of issues to be covered' (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995: 152). Having spent nine months at the farmers' market and following the direction that ethnography requires constant analysis throughout the research process (O'Reilly, 2005: 185), questions had emerged and it was the themes surrounding these that were probed during the time conducting ethnographic interviews. The themes were based around production, the background of each producer, the challenges they faced and what the farmers' market provided;

the farmers' market itself, what it meant to them as a producer, how they used the market and the definitions they attributed to it; and finally, the concept of resilience, the aspects they felt were important and how they had changed and planned to change in the future. These were broad themes and many times through being shown around a farm or through helping to make products conversations emerged that covered the changes that had already occurred over the years and the struggles that had been and were being faced with production. These conversations could last all day. Some producers would come back to themes that had been discussed as they thought of other things throughout the day. There was no set agenda leaving the conversation to flow in a manner which suited each specific producer and as I was working with producers during this time no conversations were recorded. The day's work and the conversations were instead all captured in a field diary at the end of the working day.

As a researcher using this style of interviewing there was a necessity to both actively and intensely listen (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995, Rubin and Rubin, 1995), making a 'systematic effort to really hear and understand what people tell you' (Rubin and Rubin, 1995: 17). However, to encourage conversations, particularly when spending a whole day with producers, there is a necessity for researchers to inject some personal views (Grills, 1998). This must be done in a delicate manner but through this conversations are likely to be enhanced, developing detail and contradictions by developing a mutual, honest conversation. Of course this is delicately balanced and a researcher must ensure the emphasis of the interview is to 'understand what the interviewees think' (Rubin and Rubin, 1995: 19).

In total I visited 25 producers outside of the market day, spending one day with each producer in order to carry out an ethnographic interview. These days varied in nature across the producers, with some I harvested vegetables, others I fed cattle or helped separate sheep, I shelled whelks, gutted pheasants, made sausages, burgers and pies and potted up baskets full of plants. I arrived to start 'work' with one producer at 5.30am, whilst others welcomed me at 9am. Some had finished preparing products by early afternoon whilst with others I had to work until early evening. The length of the day plus the difficulty of the work varied with each day of production. Whatever was happening during the day of production, whatever the weather I had to be prepared to take part if I was to fully utilise the ethnographic interview. By this point in time I had become part of the farmers' market and knew how things happened each

fortnight. Visiting producers within their place of production was a new experience. To aid the relationship within this production space I had to become comfortable in the position of an 'acceptable incompetent' (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995: 99), asking questions when I was unsure of what to do. There were times when I was particularly concerned as to the task I had been given and the consequences if I did not carry it out correctly. One of these was when I was tasked with cutting daffodils. The flowers needed to be in exactly the correct stage of flower and cut to an exact length. Being a novice I was slower than all the other pickers in the field, determined that I would not cut a flower not ready or too short, knowing that such flowers would have to be discarded and would thus be unsellable. Here I felt a sense of duty to take my time having been told by the producer on arrival just how hard it was to get all the pickers to pick perfect flowers. The second concern arose when I was asked to make burgers. I was provided with pre-weighed balls of burger mix and asked to press the burgers. I was concerned at pressing them too hard, worried that I would ruin the burger. Having pressed about a dozen the farmer checked up on my skills, informing me that they all needed a perfect round edge and I would have to re-press all those I had already done. The farmer was ready for this. I was new and we had a laugh about the situation. The burgers were re-pressed and I carried on making many more. These examples demonstrate that even though access and trust had been negotiated and developed with producers prior to carrying out an ethnographic interview the situation each day required my willingness and ability to learn in order to be accepted into the space of production.

Certain producers were unable to let me help with the production process but still welcomed me to part of a day in production, either watching what they did and seeing their production set up or accompanying them on their daily or weekly delivery round. All of these processes provided an insight into the life in production and the opportunity to strike up conversation, seeking to draw out the themes that I hoped the ethnographic interview would explore. Just two producers could not let me experience their production. One declined because it was out of season and the other due to the fact that their kitchen was too small to have anyone else in it when production was in full swing. I still took the opportunity to travel out to see these producers, seeking to understand a little more about the market, their business and products. Whilst these were invariably a different style of ethnographic interview to

those that could be carried out over a whole day they were still based on the themes highlighted through observations.

There was one producer that I had not met at the market as he had an employee work the market stall. Whilst I was welcomed to see the production process and to interview the business owner there was a distinct difference between this and the other interview days. I had to work harder to build rapport and to engage the producer in conversation. This ethnographic interview did not provide the richness or depth of information gleaned from research days with other producers. However, this was a single case and having got to know all other producers within the market space and in many cases arranging to visit them for a day helping with production at the market I had already developed a relationship with them. This had a great advantage as recognised by Hammersley and Atkinson (1995: 141) who note that ‘when interviewing people with whom one has already established a relationship through participant observation, little further work may be required’. Through seeking to spend time with the producers to really understand them there was a sense that I was really interested in knowing what the life of production was all about and producers used the time I was with them to show this to me. Many of the farmers showed me their animals with pride, one putting me on the back of a quad bike to show me the new calves that were just a few days old. Through taking the time and opportunity to visit and understand production within the site where it occurred I began to see the identity of the farmers within this context, an advantage of using ethnography to understand the same people within various locations (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995).

4.3.4 Fieldnotes

Fieldnotes ‘record what the researcher learns, day by day, about the people and places under study’ (Crang and Cook, 2007: 50). Indeed ‘the fundamental concrete task of the observer is taking fieldnotes’ (Lofland and Lofland, 1995: 89). Detailed fieldnotes were made throughout both the periods of participant observation and interviews. Whilst working on stalls at the farmers’ market I was able to keep a small notebook in my pocket or somewhere on the stall in which I could jot down key observations during the day. Such notes consisted of ‘the little phrases, quotes, key words, and the like that you put down during observation and at inconspicuous moments’ (Lofland and Lofland, 1995: 90). Making such notes helped to jog my

memory when I came to write up full descriptions of the day but I was careful not to be continuously making notes as this ‘runs the risk of making people feel self-conscious’ (Bryman, 2001: 304). After each market day I had a two hour drive home and during this drive I recorded key observations ‘putting otherwise “wasted” time to productive use’ (Lofland and Lofland, 1995: 92). These notes and recordings were then typed up.

As detailed above, the majority of the interview days were spent participating with a producer in their place of work. During these days I took part in production and this inevitably lead to me being unable to make notes during conversations and activities. At the end of each day with a producer I wrote down notes and reflections about the experiences of the day. It was essential to record these notes on the day as ‘the sooner you record your observations the more vivid and detailed your account’ (Spradley, 1980: 70). This usually took a number of hours but as suggested by Wolfinger (2002), recalling events in the order in which they occurred greatly helped my memory of the key observations. This ensured that I would get the most out of my research days, acknowledging that ‘there is no advantage in observing social action over extended periods if inadequate time is allowed for the preparation of notes’ (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995: 179).

Both the fieldnotes from the market days and from days spent outside of the market interviewing producers provide a record of what I have experienced. They aim to chronologically record what happened during the day in a detailed, clear, comprehensive and non ambiguous way (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995, Bryman, 2001, Crang and Cook, 2007). Fieldnotes provide the basis on which any ethnographic report is written and therefore should include descriptions of location, physical space, peoples’ interactions, the researcher’s interactions and reflections of the research process (Crang and Cook, 2007). Others suggest that fieldnotes should be separate from a field journal (Spradley, 1980) which records the researcher’s feelings and emotions separately to a recording of the happenings of the day. In this study feelings were written into the main fieldnotes as suggested by many researchers (for instance Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995, Lofland and Lofland, 1995, Bryman, 2001). Fieldnotes realistically contain only a fraction of a researcher’s memory from a research area (Van Maanen, 1988) and a researcher automatically codes memories into their own language as they are noted down (Spradley, 1980). Thus it was wise to

combine my feelings within the happenings of the day. This helped to ‘evoke the times and places of the ‘field’ and to call to mind the sights, sounds, and smells of ‘elsewhere’ when read and reread ‘at home’ (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995: 176).

As suggested by Crang and Cook (2007) routines and rhythms of the market and interview days were noted in the fieldnotes. For a market day this included the time that stalls arrived, who was present, what the weather was like and what was distributed by the council. Minus the weather, these details were often the same each week but it was important to take note of reoccurring patterns (Spradley, 1980) as these help to understand the setting and to notice when disruptions occur. I tried to take photographs, as suggested by Bryman (2001), at the market, especially when there were special events taking place. However, it was awkward taking photographs during the majority of that days that I was working with producers.

Spradley (1980: 67) suggests that ‘the ethnographer must make a verbatim record of what people say’. In some cases this was possible. However, it was not possible in all instances and during the interviews it was not always possible to recall the exact phrasing used but I was able to record the sentiment. In fieldnotes I ‘distinguished between ‘native’ and ‘observer’ terms’ (Spradley, 1980: 67). Such a distinction is necessary in order to create a comprehensive and truthful ethnographic account. It was also essential to understand that when making fieldnotes that my personal background would affect what I saw and what I wrote down (Wolfinger, 2002). For this reason it was necessary to be self-reflexive throughout the research process.

4.3.5 Representation of ‘self’ during research and reflexivity

Through presenting or concealing certain aspects of their lifestyle and identity researchers display a specific image of themselves, an image through which others construct their identity (Hughes et al., 2000). Presentation and appearance is therefore hugely important when developing relationships with people in the field (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995). Therefore it is essential when carrying out any research, but particularly when seeking to become an accepted member of a community, to dress, speak and act accordingly (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995).

As suggested by Fetterman (1998), it was essential that I wore the correct clothes, but these differed depending on what I was doing. A day at the market required a clean but casual appearance. If it was raining I needed to have a waterproof jacket. If it

was cold I needed a hat, scarf and gloves. I needed sensible footwear, to keep my feet warm and dry and to provide some form of padding for the whole day spent on my feet. Working on certain plant stalls and vegetable stalls I needed to be prepared to get dirty when handling products. On other stalls I needed to remain clean throughout the day. Working with some stallholders I fitted in wearing a warm fleece jacket; for others I needed a smarter coat to portray the image of the products. Heading out for days in production I need wellington boots, waterproof trousers and thick thermal clothing for some visits and clean shoes and everyday casual clothes when visiting others. It was important to create the 'right' image to let each producer know that I was prepared for the day ahead and that I had some knowledge of their production and expectations.

In addition to considering my personal appearance there was also a need to engage with producers and it is acknowledged that to develop a good research relationship there is a need to share knowledge, information and experiences 'about ourselves, just as we expect others to tell us about themselves' (Grills, 1998: 63). Such information must be appropriate and through sharing different personal information I became aware of different identities that I was portraying to producers, all truthful but all slightly different. Certain producers would talk to me about the university experience, having been to university themselves or having children at university. They wanted to hear about my studies but also about the student life. This involved discussion around participation in clubs and societies and the social element of studying, some of the producers could identify with. Others wanted to know of my hobbies and interests and I was more than happy to discuss my volunteering commitments and enjoyment of outdoor pursuits. I was still the same person, whichever element of my social life I highlighted but the identity this portrayed to different producers was obviously different.

As my research progressed from working on the market stalls to spending a day working on farms or in production I had to be prepared to do everything and anything that was asked of me. To be accepted everywhere I went I had to show willingness to at least try everything that was asked of me. I had purposefully gone to see what happened each day behind the scenes so I had to give it my best shot, even if I had to be constantly aware that I might be very slow or not doing things quite right and thus would have to ask for assistance or surrender my position to someone who was faster.

I did though have to try. During one research day I was shown an ‘easy’ way to gut and pluck a pheasant when all you wanted was the crown. This involved standing on the wings of the bird and basically pulling the head off hoping that the innards would come with it. Having seen this done a couple of times I was asked if I’d ‘like to have a go’. The pheasants were an added extra to this producers stall so it didn’t matter if I did it wrong as there was something that could have been done with the meat. I agreed to try and whilst it took a strong stomach proceeded to sort out about four pheasants whilst the producer then took them and sorted them to be packaged. Having done a couple the producer turned to me saying ‘you’re a rural girl aren’t you?’ With some bemusement I confirmed I was and was told that someone who’d grown up in the town wouldn’t have tried what I just had. Whilst I knew at the onset I had to give everything a go to get the most out of my research it perhaps helped that I had been brought up in a rural area, had regularly visited farms, used to watch my Mum and brother pluck pheasants that had been delivered from the local shoot and generally spent a childhood getting dirty mucking in with keeping chickens and growing vegetables. The knowledge and appreciation of what I might see at all these places must have been influenced by my prior experiences which turned out to be very beneficial.

There were also many times when I was asked where I was from. When I would reply, Kent, there was often surprise with producers saying ‘oh, so you’re not Welsh then?’ Very often this would then continue to questioning about whether I had any Welsh in me. My grandparents were Welsh hill farmers and my father was born in Wales. Having blood relations who had not only lived but farmed in Wales was a huge advantage it would seem. It was often greeted with a nod of appreciation or a comment that I would understand things. I was very open and honest that my father was the one brother in the family that had moved away from farming and indeed that my grandparents had moved from Wales to a farm in Cheshire when my father was still young. However, this seemed to make little difference, I was still seen as having farming in my blood and therefore at least some kind of understanding of the situation.

4.3.6 Ethical Issues

Whilst the majority of people knew and understood that I wasn’t and never had been working for the Council I do feel a lot of them felt that I could ‘sort the market out’.

Some even asked if I would want a market manager's job when I finished as I had at least gone out, talked to them and therefore would really understand the market. There is an element that at the end of the PhD I will need to provide some feedback to the market itself but it was difficult to explain that I had not been employed to find out about the market and that the research questions were being independently developed without input from the Council. Having left the field I was emailed by one producer to ask my opinion on a matter which had come up time and time again about the market trading weekly. I was asked because I had spoken to everyone and they valued my opinion on the matter having seen it over time and as an 'outsider'. I had heard many arguments for and against the market going weekly and a number of things that would need to be considered if it did go weekly. Therefore, instead of providing a definite yes it should or no it should not I did my best to provide a response that took into account everything I heard and raised a number of financial, organisational and logistical factors that could be overcome but would need to be considered if the market were to go weekly. It was pleasing that there was enough trust and faith in my research for the producers to approach me for my opinion but I had to be careful in how I made my response.

During my research the UK experienced one of the closest fought general elections of the last decade. Garrington's local MP visited the market a few weeks before the election took place. He actually visited the day after the first televised debate between the party leaders which had caused a great talking point throughout the day at the market. It was expected that I would join in the conversations about this and at least give some kind of opinion. One producer checked that I 'was going to vote' and I think there would have been outrage if I had said no. There were a lot of opinions flying around and a lot of unease when the Coalition was actually being debated and formed and there was no way that I was allowed to stay completely quiet through any discussions. There was a necessity that I watched exactly what I said and expressed but I was expected to have an opinion on the matter and to share that with others. To not do so could have jeopardised my position of trust within the group.

It was also essential that when I shopped at the market, which I tried to do most weeks when I went, that I spread this shopping around a number of the stalls. I did not want it to look as if I had favourites or to simply go to those that gave me the best discount. This could be difficult especially when I was spotted with a bag from one bakery stall

and the ladies selling stoneground flour and wholemeal bread gave me a frown. These ladies had been very welcoming towards me and I felt obliged to explain that I really was not a fan of wholemeal bread and that was all they sold. Following this they convinced me that their wholemeal bread was not like you buy in the shops so I bought a small loaf to try. This was indeed true and I could then vary my bread buying between the two bakery stalls. I even felt compelled to buy the odd cake or packet of biscuits even if I did not really want them so that I could support all the stalls and bought a few Christmas gifts of preserves and pickles so as I could share my spending around the market. I do not know if anyone was paying attention to the shopping I was doing, indeed nobody ever commented, but I felt that if I was doing any I had to share this around. There was one stall in particular that seemed to be very generous when I went to purchase and even tried to give me something for helping out for about 15 minutes when they were a person down one week and very busy. Having spent a day working on the farm the generosity increased and I felt a little comfortable so I began to insist on paying for the extra packet of sausages they wanted to gift me for free. It was a case of being grateful and polite but forceful at the same time.

4.3.7 Analysis of fieldnotes from observation and interview days

It is important to recognise that analysis ‘feeds into research design and data collection’ (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995: 205). This became apparent early on within my research process when it was identified that seeking to understand resilience of producers at a farmers’ market also needed to consider the definitions of the market, the interpretations around this and the overall resilience of the market. Emerging from this was a realisation that the resilience of producers and the market were so intertwined it was difficult and perhaps unhelpful to separate them and that data collection should focus on understanding the research setting as well as understanding the relationships within the specific setting. Analysis was therefore an integral part throughout the research process. This involved ‘piece[ing] things together, figuring things out, gaining focus and direction’ (Crang and Cook, 2007: 132). Whilst analysis and formulation of ideas continued throughout the research process it was only having gathered all these data that full analysis of the fieldnotes could be completed.

A grounded theory approach was taken to analyse these data. Importantly this approach allows categories and concepts to emerge from the research material rather than being preconceived (Punch, 2005). This provides a rich understanding of the farmers' market environment and through identifying codes, categories and themes from the qualitative data allows for its rigorous analysis (Glaser and Strauss, 2008). A grounded theory approach to analysis requires a great deal of researcher input as they must seek to fully understand the data, allowing themes to emerge from it without being influenced by their own 'biases, beliefs and assumptions' (Strauss and Corbin, 1998: 97). However, as O'Reilly (2005: 189) suggests, 'you are inextricably linked to your data at every stage of the process, so why try and clean yourself out at the analysis stage?'. Exploring the emerging concepts allows researchers to get closer to their data, providing the opportunity to really deeply understand the data gathered.

As recommended, analysis began with a thorough reading of fieldnotes, seeking to refresh my memory and place the words back into the context in which they were recorded (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995, Crang and Cook, 2007). From this some initial themes were developed. These codes were the first step towards uncovering and analysing data (Lofland and Lofland, 1995, Gubrium and Holstein, 2001, Crang and Cook, 2007). Themes consisted of the social aspect of the market, the definition of a farmers' market, the images and stories displayed at a farmers' market and quality. From here, the themes were further disaggregated. For instance, the social aspect of the market theme was divided in relation to the social contact with consumers, the social contact to producers, the difficulties shared with others through social contact, the positives gained from the social contact and the social contact to others outside the market space. These were linked to other sub-themes for instance how the quality of products was developed or displayed through social contact to consumers.

The focus of the coding resulted in the formation of two main categories: understanding the resilience of individual producers and understanding resilience of the farmers' market. From here such themes as the challenges shared by producers were coded, including weather, animal disease, price increases, a decrease in sales and time pressures. Through exploring each of these challenges the resilience of individuals could be explored, their learning ability, adaptability, use of the market

and contact to others in developing resilience and their expectations. Some of these themes overlapped with understanding the resilience of the market as a whole system.

A decision was made early in the analysis process not to use qualitative software programmes such as NVivo. Whilst computer aided analysis is seen by some researchers 'to facilitate an accurate and transparent data analysis process' (Welsh, 2002) it would depend on the exact analysis being undertaken. Using a computer system to merely code and retrieve data 'offers no great conceptual advance over manual data sorting' (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996: 170). As the days carrying out research both in the market environment and in differing production locations were varied and different it would have been difficult to systematically search for specific words throughout my fieldnotes. Such searches may have saved time within the analysis process but it would have been difficult to ensure that I had recovered all examples if an electronic search for specific words or phrases had been performed. Manual data sorting therefore would appear to provide a more thorough and accurate start to the research process in this instance. Bryman (2001) suggests that coding data using a computer programme is just a way to quantify data; attempting to demonstrate rigour in analysis through statistical outputs. As this study aims to understand how and why resilience is developed within farmers' markets it seeks a full contextual account and such quantification is unlikely to provide this. The emphasis of the case study strategy and ethnographic methods chosen have been to highlight and study resilience in the context of a farmers' market, specifically Garrington Farmers' Market, and the fragmentation of data that can occur through computer aided analysis can take away the context, each fragment being seen as just a piece of codeable data rather than offering understanding within the wider picture of the research findings (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998, Fielding and Lee, 1998, Bryman, 2001). Through leafing through notebooks of fieldnotes and drawing out themes and codes I felt much more at one with the data. Being able to fully appreciate the context of the fieldnotes I needed to be back in the specific environments, a market day, a day on a farm; I needed to 'recover the sights, sounds and experiences of being in the field' (Fielding and Lee, 1998: 74). Sitting in front of a computer did not allow this freedom of thought, indeed Lofland and Lofland (1995: 201) suggest that 'computer programs and electronic displays seem often to hinder rather than to help the cognitive acts of synthesis and pattern recognition'. Through disconnecting from the computer and

reconnecting with my handwritten notes, themes emerged and through careful highlighting, note taking and diagram drawing these themes and codes were recorded, explored and developed.

Once analysis was completed consideration was given to the presentation of fieldnotes, identifying that ‘writers have to offer sufficient evidence to support the credibility of their claims’ (Grills, 1998: 241). Caulley (2008: 425) suggests that the opening of any ethnographic writing ‘aims to involve the reader and to hook them to continue’, indeed ‘often...ethnographies begin with passages that ‘set the scene’ by way of introduction to the entire work’ (Atkinson, 1990: 62). The prologue aimed to provide this hook, a flavour of the research, the research environment and the study that was to follow. Within Chapters Five, Six and Seven the fieldnotes that form the basis of this study are displayed in two ways. The first of these is referred to within the empirical chapters as a vignette. These seek to condense the findings on a particular subject (Hughes et al., 2000), focussing attention ‘on recurrent patterns of events, speech acts and descriptions’ (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996: 114). These are reconstructions of events brought together through a theme to illustrate specific points. The second of these forms is referred to as an extract from the field diary. This is a direct extract from my fieldnotes, used to illustrate or confirm a specific point demonstrating that ‘ethnography is not only based on fieldnotes but may refer directly to them’ (Davies, 2001: 215). Essentially these extracts and vignettes aim to bring the research to life giving a ‘sense of realism, truth, authenticity and authority’ (Caulley, 2008: 432) through creating a ‘high sense of realism, of life, of movement, of action’ (Caulley, 2008: 429).

4.4 Conclusion

This chapter has documented the case study research strategy and ethnographic approach taken within this study. Section 4.3 has sought to detail the research process from the point of access at Garrington Farmers’ Market, through observations and ethnographic interviews, writing fieldnotes and finally to analysing and presenting these data. It also highlights the reflexive nature of the research process and the ethical issues encountered along the way. This ethnographic approach to the research has allowed the farmers’ market, the connections within it and the tensions and the loyalties to be uncovered. It is these that can provide an insight not just into whether

the market develops farmers' resilience but why it either does or does not. This depth of understanding through becoming part of the community has sought to not just uncover the barriers to producer interaction but also to understand these barriers. Through seeking to appreciate the constant development of resilience, rather than simply measuring how resilient something is following a stress or a shock, it provides a step forward in resilience studies. It highlights the importance of understanding the delicate nature of the dynamics of a system which has been possible through taking a longitudinal, ethnographic research approach.

Chapter 5: Tales of the Unexpected! Understanding Individual Resilience

Introduction

Chapter Two discussed the emergence of post-productivist agriculture, an emergence of policies that have encouraged less intensive agricultural production, highlighting the importance of natural resources and the value of wildlife, habitats and natural beauty as both a public good and a commodity (Gilg, 1996). Post-productivism has provided the opportunity for farmers to continue to produce food products but through diversifying their income in various ways, from processing primary products to selling directly to consumers or providing on-farm accommodation and activities, farmers have been able to reduce the pressure created both on themselves and on the natural resources by intensive agricultural production. By moving away from a one size fits all approach to production it has allowed farmers to farm in a way that best suits them. This diversification of income has been termed agricultural multi-functionality (Burton, 2004, Potter and Tilzey, 2005, Holmes, 2006, Wilson, 2007), where producers to move away from the norms seen in productivist agriculture, taking steps to build a sustainable environment alongside receiving an adequate income.

The above explanation may perhaps sound idyllic but it is important to recognise that these producers like any working the land are subject to specific environmental challenges and as with any other business are susceptible to economic challenges. Through establishing how producers respond to specific perturbations gives an indication of their specific characteristics and thus their resilience to these challenges. This chapter therefore seeks to take the definitions and models of resilience explored in Chapter Three and apply them to producer responses at Garrington Farmers' Market (GFM) in order to provide an understanding of producer resilience at GFM. It aims to answer the first research question, which seeks to examine critically how farmers display resilience to the differing challenges of production.

This chapter begins by introducing the producers at GFM, detailing who they are, what they sell and why they sell at a farmers' market. This aims to provide a context to the vignettes and field diary extracts throughout the following three chapters. Section 5.2 then provides a descriptive explanation of the environmental and

economic challenges faced by producers at GFM, seeking to define them as either a stress or shock taking the definitions provided by Leach et al (2010) which were discussed in Chapter Three. Through exploring how producers respond to these specific challenges the chapter seeks to categorise the producers into one of King's (2008) models of resilience, engineering resilience, ecological resilience or adaptive capacity resilience. It is suggested that the producers do not fall neatly into one or other of these models through demonstrating specific characteristics from differing models. Furthermore, it would appear there is a distinction in response and therefore the model of resilience differed depending on whether the challenge had an environmental or economic basis. Through identifying these differences Section 5.4 explores the portrayal of resilience between producers at GFM establishing that new 'scripts' and stigma surrounding post-productivist agriculture appear to be emerging. Where discussions in Chapter Two suggested that multi-functional producers had moved away from the 'scripts' of productivist agriculture this chapter suggests that these producers are now subject to meeting new expectations. Just as the 'scripts' documented to govern productivist farming had consequences on whether producers altered their production and diversified their income these emerging 'scripts' are seen to influence the ability to build trusting relationships, to share information and therefore for producers to develop their business to remain resilient.

5.1 The Producers at GFM

Table 1 aims to provide an introduction to the 29 producers at GFM providing information regarding the products they sell at GFM, a brief biography of each producer as well as detailing the supply chains they sell their products through and why they have chosen to sell through FMs. This information clearly demonstrates the vast array of products on offer at GFM, from vegetables and flowers to cheeses and preserves. It also shows the diversity of producers' backgrounds. Some such as Producer AC is a young lady, in her twenties just starting out in production and hoping that trading at GFM will provide a stepping stone to opening her own farmers' market in her local town. She began selling at GFM during 2010. Producer W on the other hand is in his forties and has opened a plant nursery in the last 10 years having already worked for a number of years in a totally different career. He sees the farmers' market as a place to sell his products as well as to market his nursery. He's

been selling at GFM since 2005. Then there are producers such as Producer N, two generations of the same family working together on their inherited family farm. They sell at GFM as they feel passionately that local food should be directly sold and therefore they are reliant on such short supply chains to sell their products. They began selling at GFM in the year 2000.

For some producers GFM and other direct sales make up the majority of their sales. Other producers sell through a wide range of other outlets, some such as Producers E and I supply a whole host of small, local stores around the area. Others, such as Producer U sell the majority of their products into the catering trade. Producers such as Producers F and X sell through their own shop and others, such as Producers R and L supply supermarkets; indeed in 2011 Producer L supplied one major supermarket chain with all the daffodils to sell in their Welsh stores. This clearly demonstrates the difference in size and scale of production of the producers trading at GFM.

The producers trading at GFM do so for a variety of reasons. The primary reason for some to sell at FMs is the economics of direct selling, meaning that they get a better value for their products. Others enjoy the social element of GFM, the contact to both consumers and fellow producers. Some producers want to educate consumers. Producer D for example wants to enthuse consumers to use fresh herbs in their cooking and feels he can do this through educating them as to what is available and how they can use them. Others are simply passionate about their products and about selling them.

The information within Table 1 clearly demonstrates that along with the diverse range of products on offer at GFM there is great diversity amongst the producers themselves. From their backgrounds, their aspirations and their motivations each producer is different from the others trading around them at GFM but they are all connected through choosing to sell their products within this particular 'alternative' food network.

Table 1: The producers at GFM

PRODUCER NAME	NATURE OF BUSINESS / PRODUCTS SOLD	BRIEF PRODUCER BIOGRAPHY	SUPPLY CHAINS USED	WHEN AND WHY PRODUCER BEGAN SELLING AT FARMERS' MARKETS
Producer A	Mixed Farm. Range of seasonal vegetables sold at GFM.	Male farmer in his 40s, has always been a farmer. Family farm-GFM stallholder runs the vegetable production; his brother runs the livestock production. Livestock is sold for slaughter, this is not part of their direct selling due to it not being financially worthwhile. Employs 3 workers to help with the vegetable side of the farm plus help from his Uncle.	Contracted to one supermarket to supply potatoes and cauliflower. Certain vegetables supplied to the schools in the county. Supplies a number of local shops including butchers and farm shops. County's online food co-operative.	Traded at GFM for around 4 years. Asked along by market manager to specifically sell potatoes and expanded from there. Initially viewed it as 'just a place to sell', now really appreciate the day out and actually seeing people returning having enjoyed their product-very rewarding.
Producer B	Small bakery. Run from owner's kitchen. Range of cakes and breads including a range of gluten free	Two ladies working as business partners for around 5 years. One has experience in restaurant trade; she does the majority of the baking. The other does more of the marketing and selling, she works the market stalls. Both aged 40s/early 50s. They aim to use organic and locally sourced ingredients	Began trading at town markets but not successful. Currently trade at two local FMs, some local food festivals as well as supplying local	Traded at GFM for 3 years. Aim of trading at FM was to trial products before owning a café or supplying further afield. It is an outlet to sell their products.

	products sold at GFM.	wherever possible. Their product focus has changed from savoury to sweet products due to the cost of producing a good quality savoury product. Aspire to own a café but are waiting for both the 'right' location and the 'right' time given the current financial climate.	cafes and a local wholesaler. They also provide buffet lunches for local organisations.	
Producer C	Organic livestock farm. Organic beef and lamb sold at GFM.	Stallholder is the Farm Manager. Male, 30s, big rugby fan. Studied History before attending Agricultural College. Worked at Newbury Organic Centre as first farming employment so has always farmed organically. Regularly attends talks and conferences to keep up to date with trends and fashions. Works on a profit share with the farm owner. Employs a part-time stock man and sometimes receives help from his father on the farm. Has recently received planning permission to convert a farm building to a cutting room in order to cut transportation costs of travelling off farm to cut meat. Currently grows potatoes to supply to a wholesaler. Thinking of branching into vegetables but would need a guaranteed market.	5-10% of produce sold at GFM. Supply restaurants (West Wales and Swansea) and farmshops. Also sell some through an organic co-operative that due to its size is able to sell to 2 supermarkets. Sell to this co-operative as it is a stable order and a guaranteed good price. County's online food co-operative.	Traded at GFM for 2 and ½ years. Approached by market manager to trade as previous organic stall was leaving GFM. Direct selling has the potential to be more profitable than selling to a co-operative. Very much enjoys the social aspect of direct selling, telling consumers the 'story' of the product.

<p>Producer D</p>	<p>Plant nursery. Large range of herbs sold at GFM.</p>	<p>Business is run by stallholder and his wife, aged in their 40s. He has been in horticulture since age of 14, went to college then worked up the ranks at a large garden centre. Moved to Wales from East of England 13 years ago to bring up his daughter in a 'better' environment. Has been Chairman of the FM committee. Delivers for county's online food co-operative, money from this helps to run his van in the quiet times of year. Aspires to have a shop onsite at his nursery with herb gardens to provide customers with inspiration.</p>	<p>Local food and plant festivals in West Wales. Has supplied local schools in order for them to establish herb gardens. County's online food co-operative. Will not sell to wholesaler as the money it is not financially worthwhile.</p>	<p>Unsure how long traded at market. Likes direct selling as enjoys the customer contact. Passionate about getting people to use herbs in cooking, pass this on through direct selling. Wants to support the local economy and raise awareness of food security issues.</p>
<p>Producer E</p>	<p>Dairy / Milk processing plant. Milk, cream and butter sold at GFM.</p>	<p>Male farmer, married with two sons, aged in his 40s. Always been a farmer, brought up in the local area. Began as beef producer but the BSE crisis made beef production financially challenging so he diversified down the dairy line instead. Bought a new farm and began converting to organic but with little support from local shops to take organic milk he moved away from organic conversion to running a conventional dairy herd and bottling his own milk. Due to the strain of long hours in dairy farming he stopped farming, expanded the</p>	<p>Local shops/farmshops, local businesses, old people's homes, rugby clubs and cafes. Previously supplied local schools but lost contract to cheaper supplier. Used to supply 4 milkmen but these have stopped as cannot compete with low</p>	<p>Traded at GFM ever since it started. Was approached by the market manager as they were the only bottling plant in the area. Very much enjoy seeing people at the market, answering questions and putting trust back into buying. When he supplied schools he welcomed the school children to</p>

		<p>bottling plant and bought in milk from neighbours. Sold bottling plant in early 2011 due to financial strain and is moving out of production altogether.</p> <p>Employs 4 workers.</p>	<p>price of supermarkets.</p> <p>County's online food co-operative.</p>	<p>his farm for them to learn where their milk came from-this was very important to him and directly selling allowed this educational aspect.</p>
Producer F	<p>Livestock farm with onsite farm shop. Pork, lamb and beef as well as home-made pies and pasties sold at GFM.</p>	<p>Female stallholder who runs the farm with her husband, aged late 40s with teenage children. She is currently Chairman of GFM.</p> <p>Alongside running their farm they bought a local shop when their children were small, supplying local produce to the local community. 10 years ago they expanded into processing their own produce, butchering meat onsite and 6 years ago developed their own farmshop with a small café on their farm.</p> <p>They employ a sausage maker and someone to work in the farmshop/café.</p>	<p>Own farmshop. Farm shops and other local shops in the south of the county. County's online food co-operative.</p>	<p>At least 5 years, had to wait 18 months to get on market due to their already being stalls selling meat on the market. FM is a good shop window for them as they do not supply any shops in the town. They also use it to promote their farmshop.</p>
Producer G	<p>Livestock farm. Free-range chickens / chicken meat sold at GFM.</p>	<p>Two generations working on a family farm. Husband and wife team run the chicken side of farm but he also still helps his father with the cows and sheep. Aged in their 30s/early 40s with young children.</p> <p>Family farm always focused on beef and lamb</p>	<p>1 other local FM. Butchers and farmshops across three counties make up the majority of sales. Supply 2-3</p>	<p>Traded at GFM for around 3 years, since establishing the chicken production side to their farm. Had to wait to get onto GFM as there was already a</p>

		<p>production but following the 2007 foot and mouth scare prices rapidly declined and the farm needed to change in some way. Considered large scale sheep production but this did not seem financially worthwhile. Final choice was between a children's indoor play area or to diversify their production to include chickens, couple decided on the latter option. Initially worked with local turkey farm to slaughter animals before installing temporary portacabins on the farm. Hoping to build a proper shed for slaughtering in summer 2011.</p> <p>Currently sell the beef and lamb direct to the abattoir but considering starting to kill and butcher these themselves. He has taken part in Welsh Government agricultural discussion groups. He is also treasurer for another local FM.</p>	<p>restaurants. Have worked with the Producer U to secure some customers and combine some deliveries. County's online food co-operative.</p>	<p>chicken producer with a stall. Want to educate children where food comes from and this is possible at a FM. Plus, the price achieved through selling direct is greater than when selling to farmshops.</p>
Producer H	<p>Cheese producer. Range of artisanal cheeses sold at GFM.</p>	<p>Family business started in 1982. Two generations now involved, father and sons. Business began when the family came to the UK from Holland and have combined Dutch and Welsh cheeses. Over the years they have developed many cheeses with various flavours winning many awards. Cheese production carried out on farm</p>	<p>Static market stall in local town market. Festivals/shows. Number of South Wales FMs. Shop onsite at farm. Cheese shops and delis</p>	<p>Producer feels that if the product is of a good quality it should be sold by the person who produces it. It is this they feel that makes production worth doing.</p>

		with buildings being developed as the production grew. There is now a purpose built cheese making room. Family is branching into their own distillery onsite.	across the UK.	
Producer I	Egg producer. Free-range eggs sold at GFM.	Couple in their 40s/50s who moved to the area in 2001. Initially he did contract milking for their neighbour and they kept a few chickens. By 2005 they had expanded chickens to 200 in their back garden as people 'liked their eggs'. A barn around 20 minutes from their house came available which they took on to expand. Initially delivered mainly to the south of the county but another egg producer offered them his round in the north of the county and into neighbouring counties when retired from egg production. Their aim is to produce eggs for 10 years then to assess where their business is and what they want to do.	Many local shops supplied and an independent supermarket. Doesn't believe in wholesale as can get better money selling direct and is not big enough to need a wholesaler to help distribute product. County's online food co-operative.	Took the place of the retiring egg producer at GFM (whose delivery round he also took on). As a producer they believe in local food and want to give a guarantee of quality that trading at a FM provides. GFM provides contact to other producers as well as publicising their business and where else their eggs can be purchased.
Producer J	Flour Mill. Range of flours and breads sold at GFM.	Business run by a couple in their 60s. In the 1980s they bought and restored a water mill next to their house. They now mill flour every day. Water Mill is both working to produce flour and as a tourist attraction. Stall	All flour and produce is sold through short supply chains either directly from the mill, from their	Trade at GFM to promote local produce and the local community. Producer feels this is the way to tackle climate

		at GFM run by wife and a friend.	village local produce market and GFM. County's online food co-operative.	change. Traded at GFM near enough from when the market started.
Producer K	<p>Preserve producer.</p> <p>Business run from owner's home kitchen. Range of jams, marmalades and preserves sold at GFM, including a diabetic range and a range of diabetic cakes.</p>	<p>Family business headed by lady in her 50s. Works mainly with her husband and one daughter. Has a number of other children, one of whom is now married into Producer N's family. Producer began making jams and preserves when her children were young, initially just made what could be foraged and sold at boot fayres.</p> <p>As customers liked produce branched into producing on a larger scale. Focusing now on diabetic range as only producer in this range-this range took time to develop to produce a good product but now award winning. As well as labelling their own produce she produces for some other producers who then label the produce themselves.</p>	<p>Local farmshops and shops, shows (such as Royal Welsh Show), food festivals (such as International Food Festival in Cardiff) and markets. Festival at Euro-Disney in January.</p> <p>Approached by a supermarket 5 years ago for the diabetic range but declined on advice of others-wanted to keep own their identity.</p>	<p>Feels it is important to support local things such as GFM as they are set up to support local producers. Market provides a day out, away from production. Being face to face with consumers allows the producer to market, this was particularly important with their diabetic range of products.</p>
Producer L	<p>Small family farm. Daffodils (flowers and</p>	<p>Producers are a couple in their 60s with grown up children. They met at college and have been farming for over 30 years. This particular business they have had for</p>	<p>Products at supplied to a local wholesaler who trades with a national</p>	<p>Have traded at GFM since it began-as a producer they really welcomed the market starting.</p>

	bulbs), asparagus and soft fruits sold at GFM.	<p>28 years. They used to have an on farm Pick Your Own Scheme but this is no longer profitable. They have branched into different types of daffodils having been passed knowledge from a retiring grower who wanted someone to carry on the production and knowledge to the next generation. The couple are active in local Growers Associations and the like.</p> <p>Approximately 5 years ago they were going to sign to supply a major supermarket chain but this fell through and thus to safeguard themselves they now trade through wholesalers rather than directly with the supermarkets.</p> <p>The couple run their farm employing a lot of Eastern European workers, arranged through an agency. These workers usually spend short time periods at the farm, seeing through the harvesting of one specific product.</p>	<p>supermarket. Soft fruit is also supplied to a wholesaler in Cardiff. Much of the produce is sold directly from their farm, from local farmshops and local stores although they note these have declined in number in recent years. Previously supplied an independent supermarket with 12 stores across South Wales-no longer possible with fuel prices. County's online food co-operative.</p>	<p>These enjoyment of growing from this producer comes from going and out and selling the product to customers. They also make better money from selling the products direct, for this reason they will sell as much as they can directly to the consumer before selling to wholesalers.</p>
Producer M	Co-operative of producers. Range of cakes, pies, preserves and	Co-operative is part of a national organisation of co-operative markets that sell surplus produce. Anyone can join the co-operative for a 5 pence share. There are 8 co-operative market stalls across the county, each person	Two other local FMs. Run the market stall on other days in the town and at other locations	Been at GFM since it began. Want to support the local economy and they feel this will only develop through working

	occasionally eggs sold at GFM.	can sell a small amount of produce and a percentage of the sale money goes to those running the local co-operative to cover rents, insurance and the like. This stall has 2-3 people who regularly bake and sell on it with producers at GFM selling through the stall at other local events and on non FM weeks.	across the county.	together as a local community. See the FM as an opportunity to get producers together to support each other as well as to make a living.
Producer N	Livestock farm. Range of pork, lamb and beef sold at GFM including a diverse range of sausages and burgers.	Two generations of the family working together on family farm. Strong Welsh speaking family. Previous family generations have been small-holders and slaughterers. Farm inherited from Grandfather but these two generations have heavily expanded the farm. Farm was split in the 1990s when one brother took the dairy side of the production and the other continued along the slaughtering side. Family have expanded farm on demand such as starting to rear pigs when they could not guarantee the bacon they were buying in. Diversification into focusing on meat production and processing as a consequence of Foot and Mouth Disease, they had just expanded the farm when this hit in 2001 and needed to add value to their products. Family working on the farm	Many local food markets and FM across South Wales. Started out selling at a number of boot fayres until FMs began to boom. Previously supplied restaurants but currently a lack of trade here, emphasis being placed on investigating selling to local B and Bs and hotels. County's online food co-operative.	Began selling at GFM in October 2000. Through selling locally and directly they achieve a better value for their product. Family feels that local food should be direct food.

		is father, mother, son and daughter-in-law (who is daughter of Producer K) with help from a neighbour who works as a farm hand as needed.		
Producer O	Plant nursery. Range of plants sold at GFM with a focus on bedding plants and vegetables.	Couple in their 60s met at Horticultural College and have had their nursery for over 30 years. They are winding down as nearing retirement. Previously grew a few acres of vegetables for local shops but stopped as so many shops have closed. Have supplied and advised the County Council for many years with plants for their displays across the county. They still plant the spring planters for the local towns. Always played a part on the market committee and they are very community focused being involved with the local school, young farmers' club, local fundraising events-both running activities and sitting on committees.	Shop on nursery site but much quieter than it used to be. Previously did plant shows but these are now too expensive. The County Council now provides their biggest contract.	Been at GFM since it began. Following the demise of local shops this provided a place to sell and to advertise their nursery. They also wanted to be part of GFM as it is part of the local community as a producer.
Producer P	Fish Producers. Run from converted garage of owner's house. Range of fish,	Couple in their 50s run the business. He is from a fishing family and has always been a fisherman. He used to sail a lot, selling abroad. Whilst he was catching a lot of fish the price never changed and there are now a lot more restrictions on fishing. For these reasons they	FMs and local food markets across South Wales. Food festivals. Some small farmshops. Local restaurants and	Approached by the local Food Officer to take part in Fish Week, a county festival 8-10 years ago. They were unsure whether to take part but did and

	shell-fish and crabs (both live and dead), fish pates and quiches sold at GFM.	decided to start selling direct. He still catches fish to sell but they also buy some stocks in. Both of them prepare the fish, she does the cooking side. They have taken part in a number of television shows about fishing.	tearooms-would like the income security through guaranteeing more restaurant orders. FMs are main income alongside hotels and restaurants.	ended up selling out quickly- they felt that the FM was the next obvious step to take after such success.
Producer Q	Sheep farmer and wool maker. Sheepskin rugs and other sheepskin products sold at GFM.	Lady in her 40s, married with teenage children. She rears specialist sheep breeds to shear and use the wool. Runs farm and weaving/rug making business alone. From a farming background and loves having the sheep to rear as well as working with the product afterwards.	Local and national festivals but primarily sales are mail order.	Been trading at GFM since it began. Provides a shop-window for the products in the local area.
Producer R	Goat's Milk producer. Range of yoghurts, cheeses and confectionary sold at GFM.	Lady in her 40s with two young children set up the business with the support of her parents and family in 2005. Aim of the business is to be 'everything goat'- producing milk, cheese, confectionary and meat. Inspired to develop the business due to her children having eczema that is helped by goats' milk and her own lactose intolerance but tolerance of goats milk. The	Sell through a South Wales wholesaler, a number of products to an exclusive supermarket and one cheese to a supermarket. They will only supply to those who	Started selling at GFM in 2005 when they first set up business but stopped as they expanded. Moved back to local FMs 2-3 years ago due to the recession. Always focused on Wales FMs as wanted to be close to home

		<p>target market is therefore those with dietary requirements. They were the first to develop a goats' milk confectionary range.</p> <p>Whole family involved in the business, her father runs the FM stall and does the accounts, her mother sorts the packaging and goods in and out, she is both hands on with the animals but also does the marketing and a lot of food festivals, her eldest daughter is now the chocolatier.</p> <p>Began farming the goats to use the milk for production, due to costs they are currently downscaling animal numbers and increasing production by buying in milk. This has cut the number of staff required to help on the farm, hence saving money. Within the last year they have upgraded the facilities onsite in order to produce cheese onsite as well.</p> <p>Currently looking at the opportunity of expanding to include a cows' milk and buffalo milk range of products.</p>	<p>will keep their name on the product. Currently in negotiations with one supermarket to take a large range of their products.</p> <p>Food festivals across the UK, although they have recently cut down on these, staying more local to keep fuel costs down. Through these they have gathered 700-800 online customers.</p> <p>FMs and local produce markets-they take fudge over cheese to many local FMs.</p>	<p>but struggled to get on many as another local goats' cheese producer on many local FMs.</p> <p>2005-started making goats cheese and were at the market. They use FMs as a marketing opportunity not for a good income. Use the direct contact with customers at FMs and food festivals to trial produce and for feedback but get most of their online customers from food festivals. Attend local FMs to ensure that local people are still aware of their business.</p>
Producer S	<p>Small bakery.</p> <p>Large range of cakes and pasties</p>	<p>Business run by man in his early 30s from a unit on his family's farm. FM stall run by his mother with occasional help from his aunt. Began selling cakes</p>	<p>Local FMs, other local shops. Some traded through a local</p>	<p>Began selling independently at the market 4 years ago when began the business. Already</p>

	sold at GFM.	through the co-operative stall at GFM (Producer M), his take won a national award and as it would never get marked as his as part of the co-operative he decided to branch out and start his own business. Now expanding to take on a purpose-built production unit away from his family farm with potential to have an onsite shop.	wholesaler. Opening a unit with a shop onsite.	knew about GFM and wanted to continue trading there having done so through the co-operative (Producer M).
Producer T	Specialist pork and limited boar producer. Large range of sausages plus a smaller range of cuts of pork sold at GFM. Pheasants also sold when in season.	Farm owned and run by lady in her late 40s. Employs one worked who has worked for a number of local producers and is very well regarded for his butchery skills. Owner used to be a dairy farmer but moved out when quotas began to make it unprofitable. When a dairy farmer she also kept Aberdeen Angus beef cattle and tried to set up a producer co-operative to get good sales and returns for this quality product-was unsuccessful at convincing others to agree to this so moved out of production. Came back into production with a high quality product (specialist pork and boar breeds) and with the intention to sell direct to get a good return for the product. She was going to become organic but found this was not profitable.	Food Festivals across South Wales along with local food markets and FMs. Priority given to food festivals as these bring in more money. Supply 2-3 local restaurants. Mail order available.	The direct interaction at FMs allows them to find out what needs changing or altering in their products. It also provides the opportunity to answer questions about the product, recommend flavours and educate people on how to cook certain products-this means they get great sales through the direct contact with potential customers.

<p>Producer U</p>	<p>Family livestock and dairy farm. Range of turkey products sold at GFM.</p>	<p>Three generations running a family arable, beef, dairy and turkey farm. They are very proud of their family farm and the history of it. All the male family members have gone through agricultural college and the producer who runs the stall at GFM has now stepped out of the dairy side of the farm as his nephews have come in with new ideas. All decisions about the farm are made together as a family and require everyone's agreement. The beef and arable farm is now reducing in size as they seek to specialise the production.</p> <p>The turkey side of the business was started 50 years ago when the producer's mother reared a handful of turkeys 'and the rest is history'. They have grown the business from there and now one son, his wife and two daughters run this side of the business. They have 6 holdings with turkeys on them.</p> <p>He is passionate about business and making money and will alter the business in order to get the best out of it. He is a director of the county's online food co-operative and vice-Chairperson of GFM committee. He feels it is important to be fully involved with the market.</p>	<p>Hotels and restaurants locally and across South Wales. FMs and some local produce markets across South Wales.</p> <p>County's online food co-operative.</p>	<p>Been trading at GFM for 6 years. Started to sell at GFM having realised that they would make a lot more profit from selling turkeys and cuts of turkey direct to the public rather than just selling whole catering turkeys. Realised that direct selling was the 'next big thing' and therefore wanted to get into it. They are also very proud of their product and want to sell it and the FM was an obvious place to promote sales through direct contact with consumers.</p>
-------------------	---	---	--	--

<p>Producer V</p>	<p>Specialist breed livestock farm. Range of beef along with lamb and mutton sold at GFM.</p>	<p>Male producer in his 40s, lives on the farm with his wife and children. Cousin of Producer G and son-in-law of one of the producers connected to Producer M. He has brought together 3 family farms those belonging to his grandparents, his parents and himself to run with help from his father and brother. Regards himself as ‘asset rich’ with 550 acres of land.</p> <p>His grandparents were dairy farmers with their own milk round as a family they progressed to breeding cows and selling from the farm, then moved to Friesian cows but were then hit by BSE so decided they needed to move to a specialist breed of animal and have come full circle to selling direct again. Initially moved just to sheep to specialise but missed the cows so moved into breeding Longhorn cows as well. He shows the cows as this is all part of being a specialist breed producer.</p> <p>His parents run a garden and tearooms, attracting around 25,000 people a year. His brother is a National Park Warden as well as helping on the farm.</p> <p>He adores the natural beauty of the local area, regarding himself as a custodian of the land. He wants to keep</p>	<p>Local FMs, food festivals/special fayres across South/Mid Wales. ‘Honesty’ shop attached to gardens. Main sales from farmgate, doesn’t want to take less through selling to a wholesaler. Used to do telesales but not had time, now employing a marketing person to get back onto this.</p> <p>Goes to office complex at lunchtime of market day- ‘like a mobile sandwich man’, leaving his father in law to run the FM stall.</p>	<p>Been selling at GFM for around 3 years. Initially began once a month alternating with another specialist producer. Started attending every market this season.</p> <p>Sees selling direct as the way forward as you lose money selling through a middle man. Feels that FMs are all about reconnecting producers and consumers to develop trust in produce as well as receiving first hand feedback about products. He also uses the space to promote his parents’ garden.</p>
-------------------	---	---	--	---

		<p>farming traditions, he is proud of his farm, how he farms it and the meat he produces. He would like to expand and build a restaurant as part of his parent's tearoom but needs the funds to do this.</p> <p>He is very community focused, running local fundraising events and is Chairman of another FM in the county.</p>		
Producer W	<p>Plant nursery with onsite shop.</p> <p>Range of ornamental plants and vegetables sold at GFM.</p>	<p>Couple in their 40s with young children who run a nursery next door to their house. He was previously a structural engineer before moving out of this to open the nursery in 2000/2001.</p> <p>They have recently altered the range of plants sold due to stopping heating polytunnels due to fuel costs and have changed their range to keep up with DIY crazes, now noticing an increase in vegetable plants they sell.</p> <p>During the summer they sell other local produce in their shop including potatoes, strawberries and cream. Additionally they welcome groups such as the WI to planting demonstrations in their coffee shop. He visits local schools and have children to visit the nursery to learn about growing vegetables.</p>	<p>Onsite nursery.</p> <p>Used to do a number of local plant shows but these have significantly reduced in number.</p> <p>County's online food co-operative.</p> <p>Don't sell to farmshops as need plants to be well looked after this acts as an advert for nursery and they cannot be sure that they will be well cared for at other shops.</p>	<p>Began selling at the market in 2005 initially sharing the stall with another nursery man, they used to man the stall for half a day each. They use the market to sell plants but also importantly to promote their onsite nursery.</p>

		He has recently taken a role on the market committee feeling that everyone has a duty to take their turn and he was yet to take a term of office.		
Producer X	<p>Bakery. Large variety of yeast based breads (savoury, sweet and flavoured), bread rolls and sweet products (such as doughnuts, Danish pastries) sold at GFM.</p> <p>Some flavoured breads made specifically for the market-not otherwise sold in their shop.</p>	<p>Family business run by a man in his 60s who comes from a family of bakers. It has grown from one shop into 2 shops, one with an in house café. All the bread is baked at an industrial unit, much of it worked by hand and baked overnight ready for the shops to open each morning. Owners son is now heavily involved in the baking and his daughter-in-law runs the stall at GFM.</p> <p>Trading at GFM has provided the opportunity for the business owner to really think what they were putting into their produce, now only use free-range eggs and source meat locally.</p>	<p>Bakery in the town centre and another in local town.</p> <p>County's online food co-operative. Local shops and restaurants as well as supplying produce to large local events.</p>	<p>Began selling at the market around a year ago having been approached by the market manager to fill a gap on the market. Being a local business they were hugely enthusiastic to support the local market.</p>

<p>Producer Y</p>	<p>Vegetable farm. Range of in season vegetables, grown with organic principles but not organically certified sold at GFM.</p>	<p>Couple in their 50s with two teenage sons. They started farming with ½ acre of ground selling surplus vegetables to their family. Having had success at this they decided to buy a farm, keeping cows and growing vegetables on the side. BSE hit within a few weeks of them setting up, then TB, then foot and mouth, it became very difficult, very depressing with little income and no chance to move livestock. 3-4 years ago they got out of cows altogether and began to farm woodland. Through a Woodland Scheme they received money to plant trees and they receive money for the logs at the end. At the time of planting the woodland vegetables still provided a good income for them, now the firewood business is their biggest income. One of their sons has gone into forestry and is helping to develop the business. They now have no animals making the majority of their income from firewood, Christmas trees and holiday lets. He is a Director for the county's online food co-operative. She is part of the organising committee for the local food festival, loves cooking and has a real passion for food.</p>	<p>FM is main outlet. They used to do a lot of vegetable boxes but these are now 'drying' up. County's online food co-operative. Expanding to firewood which they advertise locally and will deliver. They've heard horror stories about supermarkets so do not want to trade with them, they also do not want the scale of production required to sell to a supermarket.</p>	<p>They have traded at GFM for 8 years, they were asked by the market manager to attend after she saw their vegetable boxes. They enjoy seeing customers and the social element of the market. They feel they have good quality vegetables that would appeal to the vegetarian shopper at GFM.</p>
-------------------	--	---	---	--

Producer Z	Honey producers. Range of honey, marmalade, mustards and jams containing honey, plus candles made from beeswax sold at GFM.	Couple in their 70s. He retired from the Police around 15 years ago and decided to try his hand at production. Initially he bred turkeys and geese, then branched into eggs, then vegetables but found it was difficult to secure an outlet finding that the supermarkets had too many specifications. He has kept bees for 60 odd years keeping half a dozen hives. He decided to expand this, using the FM at an outlet. Initially sales were slow but they have increased as people have got a taste for honey. She makes the marmalades and jams to sell. They have grown specific crops to produce honey for specific medicinal purposes. He was a market Committee member until last year.	Used to supply National Trust across Wales and the Welsh Assembly shop in Cardiff Bay but they do not want to travel so much now. Supply some local shop outlets but they are concerned at how much the product price gets marked up in these outlets. Sell through Producer M's co-operative getting honey to a variety of small markets across the county.	Have sold at GFM for 12 years. Primarily it is an outlet to sell their product, enhanced by the producer being present and therefore able to answer consumers' questions. By selling at GFM they feel they are buying into the tourist trade of the area as many tourists are seen at the market.
Producer AA	Preserve producers. Range of dips and sauces (including a range of hot chilli	Couple in their late 50s who have recently moved to the county from the East of England. They have long had an association with the county but only recently moved permanently. They were previously involved in running FMs in the East of England.	Food festivals across the UK. Other FMs-trying to re-establish the network they previously had.	12 years at FMs new to GFM. Want the personal contact to the consumer; this is the joy of production.

	<p>sauces) sold at GFM.</p>	<p>Their product range is constantly changing as they like experimenting, it not only keeps customers interested but also keeps them interested in production. They have 3 or 4 sauces that are constant. In the East of England they grew a lot of the produce that went into the sauces but they are not set up to do this yet in the county.</p>		
<p>Producer AB</p>	<p>Vegetable producers with large polytunnels to grow a wider range of 'exotic' vegetables. Range of vegetables, including aubergines and salad leaves sold at GFM.</p>	<p>Owner is a man in his 40s, helped by his mother and his sister who also grazes her horses on land adjacent to the vegetables. His mother and sister run the market stall. He was previously a chef and his passion for good food took him into vegetable production. They grow organically but it is not financially worthwhile for them to become certified organic. Small production area consisting of 4 large polytunnels along with some outdoor crops. They have been suffering recently with a lot of weeds and pests which makes production a challenge. Currently the owner is considering turning over one polytunnel to one specific crop in order to sell to a wholesaler, he feels that increased scale of production will enable him to take the farm forward.</p>	<p>2 FMs. Used to sell a lot to restaurants however Chefs became quite rude when ordering so they withdrew from this market. Sell to a few shops but dried up a lot. Will not supply supermarkets as he does not want to be forced into things. Have been to other markets but now sticking local.</p>	<p>Been selling at GFM for 4 years since the market manager approached them and asked if they would like to sell there. They enjoy seeing people on a market day and feel it is important to educate people about food which is possible at FMs. They are motivated to sell by their good quality product.</p>

<p>Producer AC</p>	<p>Part of a UK wide collective of vegetarian food producers. Range of ready-made vegetarian products (vegan and gluten free) sold at GFM.</p>	<p>Stall holder is part of a collective begun in 2006 by a man in South Wales looking to promote vegetarian food. Producer AC is a female in her early 20s, she has studied for a marketing/business HND and wanted to have a business, this is a stepping stone to this. Her mother owns a coffee shop/café in her local town. As a member of the collective she pays the founder per market she attends in order to receive the recipes, the more markets attended they cheaper they become. She aspires to set up her own FM in her local town.</p>	<p>3 local FM. She would like to supply restaurants but unsure if she could as part of the collective, part of the emphasis of the collective is to change the nature of food consumption and purchasing by selling through direct and local supply chains.</p>	<p>Trading at GFM for just a few months, she has to find a market without a member of the collective already selling at it. Sees FMs as an important part of the community and wants everyone to work together for the benefit of the whole community.</p>
--------------------	--	--	---	--

5.2 Developing Resilience to Specific Shocks and Stresses

In order to explore how resilience is developed by farmers and producers at GFM it is first necessary to detail the shocks and stresses that producers were subject to. This first section of the chapter therefore adopts a descriptive style to explore the specific environmental and economic challenges faced by producers at the market. Through defining these as stresses and shocks and understanding how producers respond to them it provides a stepping stone to explore the development of resilience by producers trading at the market. Sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.3 both begin with ethnographic descriptions of environmental and economic challenges respectively seeking to provide an insight and visualisation of the challenges faced.

5.2.1 Environmental challenges

British people are known for talking about it and when it has such a profound effect on the life of producers at Garrington Farmers' Market there is a need to offer some discussion space to our old friend, 'the weather'. Weather is perhaps the biggest factor to a successful market day. A glorious sunny day and visitors wander the market stalls, trying produce and soaking up the atmosphere; a grey, cold and drizzly day and only the most committed regular customers make it along and a heavy burst of rain early afternoon near enough kills any potential late afternoon trade. Whilst it is the rain that deters potential customers away from this outdoor shopping environment it is the temperature that had the greatest effect on the producers during my time at the farmers' market in 2010.

A very cold snap of weather arrived before Christmas, much earlier than usual and resulted in a host of problems for a whole variety of producers. For some, such as Producers G and U, their animals did not grow quickly enough to sell in time for Christmas or their orders were affected as Christmas parties were cancelled due to snow. Producer AB reported having to use a pick axe to raise parsnips due to the hardness of the frozen ground. Producer L's flowers did not appear in time for the pre-Christmas sale, delaying the start of the growing season and causing great concern as to the extent of the

damage to the plants. The unpredictability and length of the cold weather then affected the arrival time of a new round of flower harvesters. If they arrive too early and there would be nothing to do but wages to pay. If they arrive too late the flowers would pass their prime without being harvested. The annual timetable and routine was thrown out by the unusually early arrival of cold weather. Livestock farmers were also concerned at having to start using their winter feed stock so early and with no certainty as to the length of time the cold weather would last they were having to carefully calculate how long they could continue feeding at the rate they were.

The state of the roads meant that the workers for Producer X could not get to their production site to prepare products in time for the farmers' market whereas others managed to arrive at the market with products but either appeared over an hour late due to driving conditions or packed up early due to phone calls informing them the 'mountain road' they needed to pass to get home was soon to close. Other producers simply lived so remotely that they were snowed in with no opportunity to get out and travel to the market; this was seemingly something that was both expected and accepted as part and parcel of rural, life and whilst they missed a day of sales at the market they predicted their absence and did not prepare products for the market day. Others more used to being able to get out and about regardless of the weather suffered a greater loss as at least one prepared for a pre-Christmas market before realising that it simply was not sensible to set out in the snowy conditions. Producer B ended up meeting new neighbours by taking around produce that should have come to the market and whilst she laughed about it at the time, recounting offering a house of students a load of baked goods, seemingly in a true Christmas spirit, it was obvious that the weather had caused a significant loss of sales. Regardless of what each individual producer grew, cooked, baked or processed not one of them could go through the whole of the year without suffering some effects of the weather. The weekly Countryfile weather forecast helped producers to prepare in the short-term but whilst the weather might have been unpredictable (in terms

of onset and duration) it was not wholly unexpected. It was something that affected producers, this year harsher than recent previous years, but something that was natural, that seemingly producers making a living from the land or selling in outdoor locations just had to expect and cope with when it arrived.- **Vignette 1 –Environmental Challenges**

As can be seen from the writing above perhaps the most widely documented environmental challenge was related to the weather. Taking Leach et al's (2010) differentiation of stresses and shocks based on their short and long term temporality respectively, the challenges associated with weather would be classified as shocks. These shocks impact on the growth of certain products and can also prevent those with product ready for sale physically getting to the farmers' market. Ultimately this environmental shock may not directly ruin or damage products but the effects of a delayed growing season or lack of sales impacts producers economically.

The other documented environmental challenge was that of disease, specifically animal disease amongst the livestock farmers trading at GFM. Defining this challenge as a shock or a stress causes some difficulty. In the event of an outbreak of disease, such as Bovine Tuberculosis or Foot and Mouth Disease (the two most frequently discussed), it would be classified as a shock, something that instantly but theoretically temporarily disrupts production. However, specifically in the case of Bovine Tuberculosis (bTB), where cattle are regularly tested for the disease, there is an almost constant threat of a shock occurring and subsequently a perpetual emotional strain on farmers.

There was more activity in the yard when I came down for breakfast this morning. Breakfast wasn't quite ready and there wasn't the same chirpiness as usual when it was served. When I'd finished I had my usual chit chat with my host before heading to the market and she informed me that they were TB testing the cows this morning. Whilst everything would be tested today they would have to wait a whole week to be sure of the results and then even if they were clear this time it would all happen again in a few months. There was obviously anxiety about it and I almost felt in the way, as if I shouldn't

have given the family even more work by booking to stay-**Extract from field diary, 22nd January 2011, Day at GFM**

Here there may not be a shift or change gradually over time that Leach et al's (2010) definition of a stress requires but the long-term anticipation of a potential shock could see it classified as a stress. Once again, this challenge not only requires specific responses to cope with the shock of animal disease but also a personality that can manage the constant concerns which this very unpredictable shock can cause.

5.2.2 Responding to environmental challenges

It can be seen from the discussion above that many producers were vulnerable to the environmental shocks that were generated through adverse weather conditions. For some this affected their production whereas for others it affected their ability to travel to point of sale. Production levels of many farmers were affected by weather, some directly through the fragile nature of crops grown and their susceptibility to a cold snap of weather whereas for meat producers they had to ensure that their winter feed stocks were not diminished too quickly which would affect their ability to fund food throughout the season for their animals. For many of these producers unless they were to make a dramatic change to items being produced there was little that could be done apart from to wait for the bad weather to pass and to continue production afterwards. Therefore many producers demonstrated one of King's (2008: 122) responses to the shock of extremely cold weather through 'allow[ing] the system to return to a desirable domain on its own'. There is nothing they could physically do to change the weather and hoping that it was a short stay many chose to simply ride it out and wait for the shock to pass.

However, one plant producer had taken action a number of years earlier to control the effect of cold weather through installing heated tables in their polytunnels. What this aimed to do was to 'restore a system to a desirable domain' (King, 2008: 122) seeking, in the eyes of Leach et al (2010), to control the shock and continue producing the same plants at the same production level throughout the cold weather period. This choice of control however, had the consequence of increasing the producer's vulnerability to fuel prices. In the present time the cost of fuel to heat the tables makes them unprofitable to use. This demonstrates Leach et al's (2010) suggestion that controlling a shock to provide stability is perhaps not the most appropriate course

of action over the longer term. Whilst weather conditions are unpredictable it may be assumed that cold weather will return every winter season and therefore a response and adjustment to growing stock would be seen in the suggestions made by Leach et al (2010) to aid robustness and thus resilience. However, in this case controlling the shock to provide stability has resulted in creating a new system which itself is vulnerable to other shocks or stresses.

The second environmental challenge documented by livestock farmers was that of animal disease. Again this is something that any livestock farmer is vulnerable to and comes as a sudden and unexpected shock. The presence of animal disease has economic consequences on farm due to restrictions being placed on animal movements. In many instances animals have to be destroyed and this itself has economic consequences with limited compensation for the destroyed animals and farmers having to restock afterwards. Beyond this economic consequence the destruction of animals places a great emotional strain on producers. Like the challenge of weather conditions, animal disease is a problem known to farmers. Nevertheless it is difficult if not impossible to control and they cannot predict if or when such a shock may occur. Therefore farmers are constantly vulnerable to such a shock and once again it is only if they move completely away from rearing livestock that they can significantly reduce the risk of animal disease. For one particular farmer this response and adaptation had been made, through moving out of primary production to focusing on processing. However, this new production system was then vulnerable to other shocks, such as the price of the primary product that was bought in, rather than produced, that was then processed. Through reducing/eliminating the risk of certain shocks linked to primary production this producer subsequently opened themselves up to the economic pressures associated with food processing. This demonstrates that a delicate balance exists between adapting a production system in response to specific shocks and being aware of 'new' shocks that may be present within the new system.

5.2.3 Economic challenges

Having driven around 25 miles from Producer N's main farm site to the field near St. Davids where more cows were kept I was sat in the back of the pick-up truck with a bucket of feed and strict instructions to make a continuous

and even trail of feed. As we slowly moved uphill I had to master holding on and tipping out the feed evenly and as we sped down hill with rapidly chasing cows I had to have the courage to lean out of the truck regardless of the size of the horns on the impending cows! Whilst I was unsure about my safety amongst these animals Producer N knew his herd and knew that I was safe. He, however, had other, much more uncertain, concerns. He'd expanded his farm around 10 years ago, buying up land to increase production and had branched into direct selling to get the best returns for his meat prior to the outbreak of Foot and Mouth Disease in 2001. The expansion had worked well but now there was another challenge, one that became very obvious as we stopped at the petrol station on the way back to the farm: the rise in the price of fuel. It had made sense to buy the land at the time of purchase but now, with the price of fuel, I'm told it seems like a bad move. With no buildings to house any animals on the land they will carefully consider which animals are placed down there over the coming months to ensure it is utilised efficiently.

This is not the only encounter I have which reveals the effects the UK's current economic situation is having on producers. A new stall appears at the market and through conversation with the stallholder (Producer R) I establish that due to the cost of fuel they've moved their sales more local to production once again. Having expanded the business to travel across the UK to food festivals they are now having to become more selective when it comes to trading location to ensure the expenditure on travel is more than made up for in sales potential and returns. Other producers of 'prime' meat products are constantly assessing their situation at the market. Producer T, for instance, has noticed a drop in sales with the onset of the economic recession in 2008 but refuses to drop the price of their products. They sell a premium item and feel the price should reflect this (as well as being a fair price for the product). Their sales must therefore be adequate to justify the travel to the market and the hours spent out of production, standing behind a market stall. Having begun the study of the market in 2010 well after the

onset of the recession (in 2008) there are changes that I did not see firsthand. Specifically these are reported by meat producers who seem eager to share with me the strains and difficulties they have faced and the changes these have forced. These producers have seen a noticeable change in the cuts of meat purchased, Producer F noting that they sell only one third of the steaks they used to sell on a market day with Producer C selling less expensive cuts of meat both at the market and to restaurant customers. Many producers seem to have accommodated this change and altered their product lines in accordance to demand. Producer E though, informs me during a day working with him that his business will stop trading in a month's time (February 2011). The cost of the primary product he requires and the price of fuel needed to deliver the final product are both increasing whilst the price of the processed item is being squeezed, with local contracts going to other, less reliable producers, who can afford to offer their produce at a lower price. The economic realities of trading at the market are tough and the proposal of another producer to purchase the processing facilities is therefore very attractive. Changes, both large- and small-scale, are evident and reported by many producers, with the economic viability of production and market trading a constantly pressing issues. **Vignette 2 – Economic Challenges**

The main economic challenge facing producers is the economic downturn and recession from 2008 onwards. Farmers' markets may have developed as a move against globalisation but it must be recognised that producers are not detached from the economic trends of the global market. Rises in fuel prices have affected many producers, not just in distribution costs but also in the rise of feed prices and for secondary producers the rise in the cost of their primary ingredients. Coupled with this is the challenge that with prices increasing across all areas of consumption consumers are considering purchases carefully. This requires a producer to keep the final retail price of a product at a level that not only makes it attractive and affordable to the consumer but that also makes the producer an adequate profit in the face of increasing input costs. The long term nature of the economic recession and the changes that it is prompting across many sectors and many geographical areas sees this classed as a stress in terms of Leach et al's (2010) definitions.

5.2.4 Responding to economic challenges

Producers are currently affected by the stress of the economic downturn and recession. As Barnes (2009: 399) suggests, any business will face difficulties building economic resilience due to the ‘connection and dependence on international markets’. Whilst farmers’ markets seek to ensure producers can demand a fair price for their products producers will still be affected by fluctuations in the price of feed stuffs, fuel and primary productions. In addition, their customer base is simultaneously being economically squeezed with the price of household commodities rising and subsequently forcing consumers to make consumption choices based on their available capital. Producers at GFM have had to respond to customer demands, recognising that consumers have less money available to spend on products and are seeking to purchase necessary items rather than ‘luxury’ food items. This demonstrates King’s (2008: 122) third suggested response a system can make when subjected to a shock or stress: ‘adapt[ing] to the changed system because changes are irreversible’. It is seen that producers were, in the distinction made by Leach et al (2010), *responding* to the economic stresses rather than seeking to control them. They are seen both to adjust in the short term, to make subtle changes to protect lines, for example, and to constantly evaluate the economic conditions associated with the production of specific products and trading in specific places in order to make larger changes, or adaptations, as and when required.

Food producers trading at GFM, as with any business owners, are vulnerable to economic pressures and have no way to control the shocks and stresses that occur at national or international levels. However, what the discussion here has shown is that producers need to and do remain aware of these economic pressures. To remain an economically viable business they must respond to these shocks and stresses and in doing so demonstrate their ability to adapt over time. Many make small changes, constantly evaluating their effectiveness and further adapting as conditions demand. Whilst these producers still remain vulnerable to economic challenges their adaptations build their resilience, demonstrating Briguglio et al’s (2008) suggestion that resilience is developed through defined actions even if a system’s underlying characteristics mean that it is vulnerable.

5.3 Models of Resilience

As discussed in Chapter Two, King (2008) suggests three different models of resilience. These models are identified through the extent of change a system experiences following a shock or stress. The first model, engineering resilience, is defined when a system seeks to remain at one stable state, this being seen as the optimal state for the system and any perturbations that move the system away from this state must be countered through moving the system back to the pre-shock state (King, 2008, Martin, 2011). The second model, ecological resilience, is seen when a shock or stress moves a system to a new state where it continues to function. Whilst a perturbation is needed to move the system to a new domain the underlying functionality of the system is maintained and therefore this model of resilience is characterised by a system's ability to function in multiple states/domains (King, 2008, Martin, 2011). The third model, adaptive/adaptive capacity resilience, sees a system continuously modifying, adapting and changing function in response to shocks and stresses, but also in anticipation of future requirements (King, 2008, Martin, 2011). This model stands apart from the first two in that systems do not require a shock or stress to instigate change but instead are constantly adapting, reorganising and changing their functionality in anticipation of potential challenges. Using these definitions and models of resilience provides an idea of the adaptability of systems and the people within them and can be used to help establish how resilience is both perceived and developed when faced with different shocks and stresses.

5.3.1 Identifying models of resilience

Looking at the environmental challenges faced by producers at GFM and their responses to them many producers were seeking to remain on the same production pathway, trading in the same places knowing that difficult weather conditions may return annually or animal disease may strike at any point. Many of the producers made little effort to alter their production and simply rode out any environmental shocks, coping with them and once the shock had passed moving back to production as normal. What is seen here is an optimal state that is required for production, a state that in most instances functions efficiently but when significant shocks occur difficulties with production and distribution are seen. Through identifying that producers continue along the same pathway without alterations after such shocks they would appear to be placed in King's (2008) model of engineering resilience.

However, taking a closer examination of the characteristics and assumptions that underlie King's (2008) models of resilience, the responses to environmental challenges may be seen to represent a combination of engineering and ecological resilience

Engineering resilience is demonstrated through a focus on efficiency and ensuring that a system continues to function efficiently despite stresses and shocks. In the instances demonstrated above producers at GFM do not show efficient functioning when faced with environmental challenges. What they do demonstrate is persistence to maintain the system throughout environmental stresses with persistence being identified as a characteristic of ecological resilience. However, the model of ecological resilience suggests that producers function well in different systems, hence their persistence, but this is not seen in producers at GFM. They appear to have a specific state that they wish to maintain and when faced with environmental challenges seek to move their system back to this one, stable state. This combination of characteristics may be explained by other assumptions made in King's (2008) models of resilience. Engineering resilience is seen to have 'constancy and predictability' (King, 2008: 115) whereas ecological resilience demonstrates persistence despite 'changes and unpredictability' (King, 2008: 115). It is here where the overlap between these two models of resilience may be identified within the environmental stresses faced by producers at GFM. The environmental challenges are, in some ways, predictable. The influence of weather and its consequences are known to producers as are the consequences and challenge of animal disease. These are challenges that can be predicted to affect the producers and would be known to them when starting production or developing production. However, whilst it may be no surprise that these challenges exist, the timing of their occurrence cannot be predicted nor can their severity. This then places the challenges into both the sphere of the engineering model of resilience, where there is an element of predictability and the ecological model of resilience where there is an element of unpredictability. This may provide an explanation as to why producers would be seen to demonstrate persistence but also be seeking to continue along one specific pathway. The challenges can be predicted which means that producers know they can face the challenge and then continue along the same pathway but the sudden unpredictable nature of when challenges will strike mean that they have to persist when they occur,

to maintain an element of functionality, even if it is not keeping the system fully functional. Here then, elements of the engineering model of resilience and the ecological model of resilience can be seen.

The way in which producers develop their resilience against environmental challenges, as discussed in Section 5.1.2, appears to place them into the model of engineering resilience rather than ecological resilience. Those demonstrating engineering resilience are seen to be reactive to challenges whereas those demonstrating ecological resilience are seen to reduce the uncertainty created by potential challenges, so would be seen to reduce their vulnerability (King, 2008). As is seen in Section 5.1.2 producers do not appear to be seeking to reduce their vulnerability but simply to react to environmental stresses as and when they occur. For many this is due to the fact that any clear measures that would reduce vulnerability would have economic consequences that may not be profitable, therefore to remain efficient, which is a key characteristic of engineering resilience, they continue on the same pathway and in the same functioning system. Such an explanation provides evidence that producers have ‘one best management option’ (King, 2008: 113), in this case an option that results in the system remaining vulnerable to environmental stresses but does not open it to other potential economic challenges that a change of functionality may create. This then demonstrates system efficiency which once again places producers into the model of engineering resilience when it comes to coping with environmental stresses.

When investigating the economic stresses faced by producers the discussions in Section 5.1.4 show a different response to economic challenges than environmental ones. The responses of producers to economic challenges demonstrated their ability to adapt to economic stresses. However, once again producers appear to fall somewhere between two models of resilience demonstrating both ecological resilience and adaptive capacity resilience. Producers’ ability to change over time demonstrates that they are dynamic rather than static, a key characteristic of adaptive capacity resilience. Rather than necessarily persisting with functionality as would be seen in ecological resilience they demonstrate at least some form of ‘plasticity’ which King (2008) sees as a key focus of adaptive capacity resilience. This is shown through their ability to change functions and alter products as required by the economic stresses. Unpredictability and changes are seen as key assumptions of both

ecological and adaptive capacity resilience and the economic stress seen at GFM was itself unpredictable as well as its duration and severity being unknown. Having the ability to respond to these unpredictable shocks and stresses therefore demonstrates that these producers fall into either the model of ecological resilience or adaptive capacity resilience.

Through constantly assessing the economic situation, learning from influences around them such as customer demands and evolving to meet demands demonstrates the adaptive capacity of the producers at GFM. These changes appear to be forward moving and thinking, with producers adapting their produce and trading rather than shifting between different stable states. This again places them into the adaptive model of resilience rather than the ecological model. If these producers were moving between stable domains and functioning within these then they would be seen as demonstrating ecological resilience; however, they are adapting and changing due to challenges, taking new opportunities and changing their production and distribution in accordance with challenges. The constant reassessment of situations and small changes demonstrates adaptive resilience rather than ecological resilience. However, the majority of producers at GFM have altered their functionality as a consequence of economic stress, rather than in anticipation of it. To fully demonstrate adaptive capacity resilience producers would demonstrate precautionary changes (King, 2008) rather than reactive or cautionary changes which are suggested to demonstrate engineering and ecological resilience respectively (King, 2008). This is perhaps a key factor that would suggest that these producers are not fully displaying adaptive capacity resilience but instead a combination of the ecological and adaptive capacity models of resilience.

These discussions raise some interesting points that so far appear not to be discussed by those using resilience theory (King, 2008, Martin, 2011). When presented the models appear to be clear cut, that systems would fall into one model or another. Through looking at the challenges faced by producers at GFM and their response to these it is suggested that when faced with environmental or economic challenges producers do not fall definitively into one model or another but appear to show characteristics of different models. Further to this, when faced with different challenges producers show very different models of resilience. When faced with environmental challenges they predominantly display characteristics of engineering

resilience, whereas when faced with economic challenges they predominantly display characteristics of adaptive capacity resilience. Current literature that uses these models of resilience does not appear to acknowledge that a system may demonstrate different models of resilience depending on the particular challenges it faces. This opens a new avenue to begin to explore the potential reasons behind producers' display of different resilience models when faced with different external challenges.

5.3.2 Characterising different models of resilience

As discussed in Section 5.1, due to their temporality environmental challenges faced by producers at GFM would be classified by Leach et al (2010) as shocks, whereas economic challenges would be classified as stresses. Whilst there is little certainty of the length of time difficult weather conditions or diseases would affect producers they would be assumed to be short lived, at most a few months before the specific challenge stopped and producers could begin to rebuild their business. Economic challenges are much less predictable, their severity and fluctuations plus the length of time until recovery begins is very unpredictable and likely to be much longer lived than environmental challenges. It could be suggested that both the predictability and shorter temporality of environmental challenges meant that producers were aware of these and would simply react to them as and when they occurred. Knowing that they were likely to be short term shocks, rather than long term stresses meant producers prepared as best they could, reacted when the shock occurred and carried on as normal afterwards. However, the long-term stress created by the economic challenges was far less predictable and potentially much longer lasting. Many producers were unable to simply carry on as normal to cope with this challenge and for this reason began to adapt and develop their products to be able to continue trading at GFM. Temporality and predictability of specific challenges may therefore provide an insight into how and why producers react to challenges, which models of resilience they display and why the same producer may demonstrate two different models of resilience when faced with different challenges.

Secondly, the cause of the challenges may provide some explanation as to why producers display more than one model of resilience. The models of resilience literature suggests that systems demonstrating engineering resilience believe that 'people are separate from nature' (King, 2008: 114). For farmers who make their livelihoods from the land this may be a strange sentiment to offer agreement with but

when looking at the reactions to environmental challenges faced by producers it may be suggested that there is some concurrence with this sentiment. What the producers demonstrate is a respect for nature and an appreciation that they are unlikely to be able to control the forces of nature. This separates people and nature as producers suffer the consequences of natural processes without seeking to control them. However, when it comes to economic challenges these are created by people, human society not only generates the problems but subsequently suffers the consequences. It is identified here that the cause of the environmental shocks is nature, whereas the cause of the economic stress is human society and this perhaps provides at least some explanation as to the different reactions to these different challenges. Through acknowledging that the natural shocks cannot be controlled by humans places producers into the engineering model of resilience. This provides an appreciation as to why this model of resilience is not one to be strived for. Resilience requires an adjustment within a system (Gallopín, 2006, Hassink, 2010, Leach et al., 2010) and through simply accepting that natural shocks cannot be controlled little or no adjustments are made and producers subsequently lack resilience to environmental challenges. When it comes to the unpredictable and human-induced economic challenges there is a far greater adaptation visible amongst producers, demonstrating not only resilience but at least some form of adaptive resilience.

These discussions raise the issue that the models of resilience may not be as clear cut as they first appear within the literature and it may not be simple to clearly categorise and define systems into one specific model of resilience or another. Here it is suggested that the temporality of shock or stress along with its predictability plus the underlying cause of the stress or shock may provide a way to establish if the reaction to it demonstrates resilience. These models of resilience are perhaps too prescriptive to use across all systems and whilst adaptation may be regarded as the 'best' strategy through which to build resilience this must be placed into context. Here the lack of clarity in defining resilience once again creates difficulties. Is resilience simply maintaining functionality during stresses and shocks (Perrings, 1998, Barnes, 2009, Hudson, 2010) or is it about making 'positive adaptation[s] despite adversity' (Fleming and Ledogar, 2008: 7)? Without a strict definition both reactions to the shocks and stresses discussed above could be regarded as providing resilience. Perhaps more suitable to this situation is the definition provided by Manyena (2006:

436) who suggests resilience allows ‘communities to make appropriate choices within the context of their environments’. The small scale nature of many of the producers at GFM means they do not have suitable provisions to make significant changes to their production techniques to cope with the challenges of weather. They do not therefore seek to control or respond to it but simply to work with the conditions.

5.3.3 Changes, adaptations and innovation

Without a clear definition of resilience it is difficult to examine the extent to which these producers are demonstrating resilience to different challenges. However, it can be suggested that as the majority are not seen to be taking precautionary measures but are adapting as a response to challenges that they are not demonstrating strong adaptive capacity. Strong adaptive capacity would be seen if producers were continuously making changes and adapting rather than these being solely due to pressures and challenges around them. Here King and Powell (2000) recognise that such changes and adaptations are not always positive, there are occasions when bad decisions are made and these can result in serious consequences. This again poses a question as to the definition of resilience, is it demonstrated through being at the forefront of change and adapting or is it making only positive adaptations? Whichever one is seen as most relevant, producers at GFM demonstrate only a mild form of adaptive capacity and therefore may not be leading the way at developing and maintaining resilience. This takes discussions briefly back to the early adopters of multi-functionality that were discussed in Chapter Three.

Farmers’ markets have now been in the UK for over 10 years. When they first began they were a new and innovative way of directly selling food from producer to consumer. Those instigating them, taking steps to process products and to sell directly, developing ‘alternative’ distribution networks and adapting as demands began to change can be seen as leading the way in developing these new networks. It may be suggested that those at the forefront of this development, who adapted and created such distribution networks, demonstrated not only strong multi-functionality but also strong adaptive capacity and thus resilience. As documented in Table 1, the majority of producers at GFM were not original traders, but had developed their production having established that the farmers’ market was a successful place for sales. This is perhaps a demonstration that these producers are not leading the way within adaptations but waiting to adapt once strategies are tried and tested by others.

Original members who had remained trading at the market were of an older generation and this matches suggestions made that developing multi-functionality is more suited to the younger generation (Vernimmen et al., 2003, Wilson, 2007). At the time of branching into direct trading at GFM these producers demonstrated strong multi-functionality but where trading had remained a success and producers had grown nearer to retirement age there was perhaps less reason to further adapt and diversify along potentially risky development strategies.

‘Both Mr and Mrs L say at different times during the day that for them if things go wrong with Asda (currently their biggest and most reliable customer) they can just retire (as they’re both nearly 62). But they feel that’s not the attitude producers should take, especially as many producers are a lot younger’ – **Extract from field diary- 24th February, 2011, Day working at Producer L’s Farm**

Some other younger members of the market were more likely to keep looking to the future, adapting and changing as they felt necessary. This confirms Dimara and Skuras’ (1999) suggestion that riskier options were more likely followed by younger farmers than older ones.

‘Producer U used to do the milking but now his nephews are much more involved in the dairy side of things so he does a lot less there-they’ve both gone to agricultural college so come in with their ideas and plans.....His daughter dreamt up the idea of hosting Christmas sales with mulled wine etc- he felt she had young ideas and he would buy into them if he thought they would work’ – **Extract from field diary-20th January, 2011, Day working at Producer U’s Farm**

A further question raised here is the potential continuation and the adaptations required to take producers beyond direct selling at farmers’ markets. Over a decade ago these were new and innovative spaces that those with strong adaptive capacity were instigating and taking steps into unknown and untested water. If strong resilience is shown through regular adaptations that act in a precautionary manner rather than in a reactive manner it may be asked at this point how those initial adopters have now adapted and the next steps for those directly trading at farmers’

markets. If few of the current producers trading at GFM were present at the opening of the market they can be seen to have less adaptive capacity than those who initially adapted and developed the market. This demonstrates that whilst they have resilience through using such a space their ability to innovate and adapt along untested pathways is lower and thus their overall resilience may be seen to be lower. However, it might be suggested that those who first traded at the market were at the forefront of innovation. If these early adopters are no longer trading within this space how have they adapted and where are they now? Do they show the next steps to adapting this method of trading and the next stages for producers seeking to develop and remain resilient? Whilst this is beyond the scope of this thesis it opens a potential new channel to help establish the long term sustainability of farmers' markets, as will be discussed in more detail in the conclusion.

5.4 Development and Consequences of Images and Scripts

The discussions in the preceding section have highlighted how producers have developed their own resilience, the development pathways taken depending on the challenges faced and the potential differences between short term environmental shocks and longer term economic stresses. In addition to the different strategies taken to cope with these shocks and stresses there also appears to be a differentiation between information sharing about the strain that specific challenges place on producers. Whilst the use of social networks at GFM is discussed in greater detail in Chapter Six this section begins to explore the openness of discussions, the honesty of producers and the trust developed between them. Through exploring the portrayal of resilience to others at the farmers' market producer expectations can be explored. From these expectations stigmas emerge, defining new post-productivist agricultural 'scripts' which ultimately seem to impact on the long term resilience on market producers.

5.4.1 Portraying resilience

Producers appear very honest in their discussions and sympathy/identification with other producers struggles with environmental challenges.

I spent the day on Producer S's stall with the producer's Aunt; it is his Mum who normally mans the stall. Everyone was very intrigued as to who I was,

they thought I was her daughter. Many also asked where the normal stallholder was and many were pleased to hear she was taking a break and had gone on holiday. It was obvious that people appreciated just how hard her and her family worked on the farm as well as helping her son with his business. I was also informed that they'd had TB restrictions on their farm, something that was well known and everyone appeared to have much sympathy for them. It had obviously been a difficult time for Producer S's family and hence people were extremely pleased that they were doing something together and were able to take some time away from the farm –

Extract from field diary-30th April, 2010, Day working with Producer S at GFM

It is perhaps surprising that the producers at GFM are willing to discuss the challenge of animal disease as it is suggested that in past outbreaks of Foot and Mouth Disease and BSE farmers have refrained from talking about their disease problems due to the social stigma seen to be associated with animal disease within the agricultural community (The Health Forum, 2001, Washer, 2006). A question is raised here as to why producers at GFM will discuss problems of animal disease with others yet previous literature demonstrates that the stigma surrounding such issues has prevented such discussions. Consideration here needs to be given to the literature discussed in Chapter Two that highlighted the images, cultures and scripts that have been identified within farming (Shucksmith and Winter, 1990, Silvasti, 2003a, Vanclay et al., 2007). The widely documented scripts that have led to the development of stigma associated with specific farming characteristics are seen to have originated in the productivist era of farming where nurturing ability and farming aptitude are assessed through characteristics such as farm tidiness and yield quantities (Burton, 2004, Burton and Wilson, 2006). With such scripts it is recognisable that the presence of animal disease would seemingly demonstrate a farmer's lack of nurturing ability and capability as a farmer. However, those trading at farmers' markets are seen to have taken a step away from intensive, productivist agriculture to embrace post-productivist strategies that seek to combine agricultural production with quality food production and environmental concerns (Ilbery and Bowler, 1998, Lampkin, 1999, Potter and Tilzey, 2005). The scripts and stigma of productivist agriculture identify

that such producers are ‘agriculturally inept’ (Shucksmith and Winter, 1990: 432) and have ‘failed’ in farming (Burton and Wilson, 2006). Here then it can be suggested that perhaps the farming scripts and stigmas already documented are more applicable to productivist farmers and those trading within the farmers’ market have a different outlook on production, its successes and failures and thus different scripts they work by. The environmental challenges discussed above are seen as unavoidable, naturally occurring challenges and admission of their affect on agricultural production has far from adverse effects on the regard placed on producers by others within GFM. The honesty that is shown through such discussions develops trust between producers which, as discussed in Chapter Three, is frequently identified as a key element of resilience (Hanley, 1998, Levin et al., 1998, Adger, 2000, Gunderson, 2000). Here then admission, openness and honesty may be seen as a basis for farming ‘scripts’ within post-productivist agriculture, once again taking the emphasis away from production as an indicator of a ‘good’ farmer.

However, developing trust to share and discuss environmental problems with other producers does not seem to equate to developing trust to share economic challenges.

A local producer who no longer sold at GFM popped down to the stall to deliver some mustard for Producer T to use at the upcoming farmers’ markets and food festivals. They were obviously good friends and had a good chat. The conversation turned to trade with the mustard producer commenting that they’d had no trade for two months and the other end of the market was looking dead today. He added however that he was about to be rushed off his feet in the run up to Easter. The mustard producer commented that Producer T had not been at the food festival on Mothers’ Day at the Botanical Gardens and Producer T explained that his boss told him about it too late and he’d already arranged to go and visit his Mum. The mustard producer informed him it hadn’t really been worth going, he’d made a whole £9.50 in the whole day and it was awful. Producer T commented that another producer at the market had said it had been a good day when he asked him earlier which received the response of ‘lying bastard’ as he’d

sat there all day and hardly made any sales.-Extract from field diary-19th
March, 2010, Day working with Producer T at GFM

Here producers who are not closely linked and trusting of others want to portray economic success even if this is an untruthful message and this provides an insight into the stigma that surrounds producers displaying economic problems. To make adequate sales producers require a good quality product at a suitable price with the top three considerations when making food purchases being price, taste and sell-by date (Morgan, 2008). Regardless of whether products are sold through conventional lines (such as the supermarket) or alternative lines (such as a farmers' market) these considerations remain important. However, producers at farmers' markets have the chance to develop a relationship directly with consumers, allowing them to share production information and resulting in providing a product that is seen as being 'embedded with information' (Marsden et al., 2000a:425). The communication exchanged with producers along with producer appearance authenticates product quality and therefore whilst physical product characteristics are important producers also require a particular physical and social appearance in order to secure sales at GFM. If sales are struggling producers require the ability to identify the problems and then to make the appropriate changes needed to develop economic resilience. To make changes producers require innovation and flexibility, two key characteristics of resilience (Hanley, 1998, Gunderson, 2000, Bristow, 2010, Hudson, 2010, Simmie and Martin, 2010). Through concealing any economic struggles producers are therefore not identified as lacking these key qualities of resilience.

It may appear here that within post-productivist agriculture, where farmers seek to diversify their incomes away from primary production to processing, direct selling and other forms of income, there is an expectation to continually innovate and remain flexible. These characteristics are judged through continuous economic success and therefore to demonstrate that these characteristics are both possessed and utilised producers need to demonstrate that they are not struggling to make sales. This in some cases may lead to dishonesty when reporting economic struggles even though other producers are likely to be suffering the same challenges. Where competition is noted as a key characteristic to develop resilience through aiding discussions and thus innovations (Hanley, 1998, Levin et al., 1998, Bristow, 2010) the perceived pressure

from other producers at GFM seems to constrict honest discussions between competing producers. Here then there seems to be a ‘script’ developing. A ‘script’ that suggests a post-productivist producer should be able to compete with others, to produce products of an adequate quality and to innovate and diversify in order to ride economic pressures. Conforming to this ‘script’ in the hope that others do not notice economic struggles therefore leads producers to portray an image of economic resilience that in some cases is not a truthful one.

5.4.2 The model of a ‘good’ producer

Stigma and scripts associated with intensive agriculture are well documented but their presence within post-productivist agriculture appears relatively unexplored. There are noticeable parallels between the farming scripts that document the characterisation of ‘good’ productivist farmers and those that are emerging from the discussions above. Perhaps unsurprisingly production ability is a significant parallel between the two scripts although there are subtle differences. Where productivist agricultural success was based on maximising yields and production (Silvasti, 2003, Vanclay et al., 2007) post-productivist agricultural success is based on the production of quality food products. Where appearance and tidiness of farms are seen in productivist scripts to indicate farming ability (Burton, 2004, Burton and Wilson, 2006) the presentation of products and the appearance of the farmer themselves when selling direct is a key indicator of quality in post-productivist agriculture. Here then there is a difference between yield quantity and product quality. Where farming ability and assumptions of farm productivity are observed in productivist farming scripts through farm appearance, product quality in post-productivist scripts is judged through personal appearance. When it comes to physically measuring success, productivist success is quantitatively measured through yield quantity and post-productivist success at farmers’ markets is measured through continuous sales throughout the year.

Another parallel between the scripts is the suggestion that a ‘good’ farmer ‘is decent and moral’ (Vanclay et al., 2007: 13). This becomes particularly important when trading in the same space as other producers such as at a farmers’ market.

Producer C takes me out to see the calves....he is very passionate about his animals but would like to grow more organic vegetables (they already grow some organic potatoes most of which go to Organic Fresh Food in Lampeter

and the County's online food co-operative). He tells me this would be a new avenue to go down on an already big farm and he would have to have a market for them. He wouldn't want to sell vegetables next his neighbouring stall (Producer A) at the farmers' market, he just didn't feel right creating that competition-**Extract from field diary-30th November 2010, Day working with Producer C on organic farm**

'Producer T genuinely felt that another producer regularly spied on their products and this really annoyed them. They felt it was especially obvious when they were trialling something new and then it appeared on the other stall a few weeks later which was just not right. They expressed the fact they were happy to chat, share, advise etc but there had to be some agreements/understandings and respect.' **-Extract from field diary-19th November, 2010, Day working at Producer T's farm**

Here there is a delicate balance between pursuing innovations to withstand economic challenges and appreciating the effect this may have on fellow producers. A good and moral post-productivist producer is regarded as one who considers those around them and makes appropriate decisions accordingly. Such producers are also expected to create changes through their own hard work and their own innovations and changes, rather than taking ideas from others. The decent and moral productivist farmer is one who works hard, making their living through being 'industrious and hard working' (Vanclay et al., 2007: 13) rather than one who makes their money from subsidies and form filling. Whilst there is a difference between the exact characteristics of a decent and moral productivist and post-productivist farmer, both definitions stress the importance of achieving through individual merit rather than through relying on others.

There are some markedly different characteristics that differentiate 'good' producers within more productivist and post-productivist agricultural contexts. A move away from intensive agriculture to diversified and multi-functional farm holdings displays the first steps to being a post-productivist farmer. However, once identified as a post-productivist farmer there is a pressure to continue to innovate, to be flexible and to

adapt as required to remain economically successful without simply increasing agricultural production. There appears the emergence of a pressure to display an image of a ‘good’ producer, one who has continued economic success. When faced with economic challenges, such as the stresses discussed in Section 5.1.3, these are overcome through innovation and diversification. It appears that producers therefore see a need to attempt to convey a ‘good’ producer image through not openly talking about economic struggles with each other that may hint towards the fact that they are experiencing difficulties. The need to be ‘decent and moral’ citizens sees that producers are not only under pressure to innovate as needed but to have their own ability to do this. Here then it is identifiable that innovative ability is a necessary characteristic of a ‘good’ post-productivist farmer.

A final characteristic and significant difference between the ‘script’ that is identified as demonstrating a ‘good’ productivist farmer and a ‘good’ post-productivist farmer is whether the farmer regards farming as a business or a way of life. This is where post-productivist farmers may be seen to be different to productivist farmers. Productivist farmers are seen to concentrate solely on production and yield quantities (Burton and Wilson, 2006; Vanclay et al, 2007) seeking to maximise profit and thus regarding production as a business. Those regarding production as a way of life aim to conserve the land to pass to future generations (Willcock et al., 1999), seemingly farming in a manner which is less intensive and thus less environmentally damaging. Regarding farming as a way of life is seen to demonstrate a ‘good’ producer at GFM.

I’m told you need the right mindset; you need to be able to cope with long days, 7 days a week without a wage. It’s tough and Producer E wouldn’t want his sons going into it-farming is just too hard-**Extract from field diary-24th January, 2011, Day working at Producer E’s processing plant**

A ‘good’ producer must therefore believe in what they are doing and why they are doing it. They must be prepared to cope with the difficulties of production and to look beyond the current situation to innovate and develop to secure future prosperity and enjoyment. If production is not enjoyed, life is not enjoyed and thus change is required to keep a producer inspired. A ‘good’ producer then is one who wholeheartedly believes in what they are doing and why they are doing it. This is shown through their dedication to producing a good quality product which they are eager to

sell and are willing to market direct to consumers due to the pride they have in their products. Their life is dedicated to producing good quality products and where this requires innovation and diversification from specific pathways to improve quality or to ensure that the challenges posed by production do not reduce the enjoyment of production these are well received by other post-productivist producers.

What appears to be emerging here is a new farming 'script' that is seen to define a 'good' post-productivist producer within GFM. Whilst multi-functional agriculture may have moved far beyond the one-time stereotype of being an indication of farmer poverty (van der Ploeg et al., 2002), now being regarded as an 'ideal' model that all societies are striving for' (Wilson, 2007: 235), there appears to be stereo-types and 'scripts' becoming associated with post-productivist agriculture. Post-productivist farmers are seen to be required to see production as a way of life that is not all about maximising profits but about preserving the countryside and producing good quality products. Producers are seemingly expected to have a good innovative capacity in order to cope with challenges, to remain flexible and to make changes as required to cope with the challenges experienced. Their innovation is required to be decent and moral, to respect those around them and therefore to consider how their changes may affect others. Again this sees production as a way of life rather than a business. There is an emotional attachment to others within the system that means that production and its associated innovations become greater than simply business decisions.

Such scripts are important in determining behaviour through 'a process where people are subconsciously and consciously conditioned to follow rules and adapt values and behavioural patterns determined by society' (Silvasti, 2003a: 156). Post-productivist farmers have taken a step away from the 'scripts' and expectations associated with intensive agriculture and through doing this they have enabled diversity, flexibility and innovation in farming. This has created farming styles that suit specific areas and consider aims of production that go beyond simple production quantity. However, it seems that such producers themselves have developed new 'scripts' that classify 'good' farmers who are following post-productivist techniques of production or distribution.

5.4.3 Implications for resilience

These new scripts are seen as new rules and expectations within post-productivist agriculture. As they develop it must be considered how these in turn may affect producers' ability to innovate and diversify and how their initial flexibility and willingness to move away from productivist 'scripts' have now lead to them wishing to follow post-productivist 'scripts' in order to remain highly regarded by others following the same production routes. Whilst such scripts have different characteristics than those identified as demonstrating a 'good' productivist producer they still begin to narrow the acceptance of specific behaviours. In Chapter Two it was suggested that the pressure to conform to productivist 'scripts' resulted in many farmers not wanting to diversify their business as they saw this as failure. Through innovating, diversifying and following multi-functional pathways to production the producers who trade at farmers' markets are perhaps regarded as more innovative and importantly more accepting of difference and change. However, the discussions in this chapter suggest that such 'scripts' are now emerging to define 'good' post-productivist producers. These 'scripts' and the acceptance of specific problems may be reducing the ability and perceived necessity of producers to innovate and thus may well affect their long-term resilience.

Take the environmental challenges discussed above as an example. Through the acceptance that these are uncontrollable the consequences of these are suffered and the producers simply show support and empathy for those affected by them. This acceptance does not prompt producers to seek to innovate or to make changes to prevent them being affected by similar challenges in the future. The support networks for farmers are discussed in greater detail in Chapter Six but through the acceptance of challenges producers appear not to see the need or urgency to innovate, simply coping with the environmental challenges and suffering the consequences. Through a lack of discussion around economic challenges there is again a lack of innovation. As discussed in Chapter Three connections and linkages between a diverse range of actors provides new knowledge offering the opportunity to explore innovations (King, 2008). Seemingly the farmers' market should provide an ideal environment for such knowledge development and thus innovation. However, through establishing a model of a 'good' producer it would seem that many producers do not discuss their economic concerns and struggles. This in turn reduces the interaction between

producers around such issues which ideally require shared knowledge and innovation in order to create new innovations and opportunities that may help to combat the challenges and provide longer term resilience for producers. Here then the standardised view of a 'good' producer is reducing the honesty in discussions between producers. This in turn is reducing the new knowledge available to them and consequently reduces information sharing and innovation. The creation of a standardised view and opinion of how multi-functional producers should behave and how they should be able to cope with certain challenges may be reducing innovative capacity and thus their resilience.

As discussed in Chapter Three to share knowledge that aids innovation there is a need to develop trust. If this is lacking within a competitive environment knowledge is not shared in fear that others may take the knowledge and implement change to their advantage without considering the consequence on others. It can be seen here that whilst competition and a competitive economy is seen to help develop resilience (Hanley, 1998, Levin et al., 1998, Bristow, 2010) a delicate balance exists between competition aiding innovation through information sharing and competition inhibiting information sharing due to a lack of trust. The social networks within the farmers' market that determine the interactions that have potential to aid both coping capacity and knowledge exchange are investigated in greater detail in Chapter Six to explore these differences. However, what is apparent from the discussions in this chapter is that a standardised view of the challenges that producers 'should' be able to cope with and the acceptance of their inability to cope with other specific challenges results in a lack of information sharing to aid innovation and a lack of urgency to innovate and change respectively. Such attitudes and acceptance affect the ability of producers to develop resilience. It must be appreciated then that even if a producer has followed a post-productivist pathway this does not automatically make them resilient over the long-term and sharing information through honest exchanges with others is vitally important for their long-term resilience.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter has explored the resilience both developed and portrayed by individual producers at GFM. Through investigating the environmental shocks and the economic stresses faced by producers and their responses to these it is suggested that

producers demonstrate characteristics of all three of King's (2008) models of resilience. Through categorising the responses of producers into these models their adaptability can be established and it is suggested that the producers currently trading at GFM do not show strong adaptive capacity and thus remain vulnerable to the pressures underlying production. Where these producers may be demonstrating strong multi-functionality (Wilson, 2007, 2008) it would appear that they are not at the forefront of adaptation and change. This opens a new avenue to explore the future potential for such producers, where the initial adopters of multi-functionality are now situated and how those producers who began trading at farmers' markets 10 years ago have subsequently developed their business.

The chapter further explores not only the models of resilience evident but the portrayal of resilience to other producers, including acceptance of environmental challenges and attempts to cope with human-induced economic challenges. It becomes apparent that these post-productivist producers are under pressure to demonstrate certain characteristics that were seen to differentiate them from productivist farmers, notably the ability to diversify and innovate. Where 'scripts' have been used to define 'good' farmers in the productivist era of farming (Silvasti, 2003a, Vanclay et al., 2007) multi-functional producers were seen to have moved away from this, to diversify and therefore to create successful businesses that were suited to specific environments. What is evident in the discussions within this chapter is that new 'scripts' are emerging; scripts that show some similarities to those seen in productivist farming but also require producers to value production as their way of life. The need to demonstrate these characteristics appears to reduce social contact with other producers at the farmers' market in terms of knowledge transfer and thus innovation. The factors affecting the use of the market 'community' are explored in greater detail in Chapter Six but the identification that there is an expectation to demonstrate the existence of specific individual characteristics reduces the capacity of the market to develop producers' individual resilience.

Beyond the description of challenges faced by producers and the consequences of emerging stigma and 'scripts' the chapter also experiences problems when seeking to use and define the resilience concept. Definitions of resilience were discussed in depth in Chapter Three. This chapter has highlighted difficulties in defining actions into specific models of resilience. The chapter identifies that these models of

resilience are not as clear cut as the current literature suggests. Producers do not simply fall into one 'model' of resilience or another. Further the suggestion that adaptive capacity resilience is the 'best' model of resilience should be used with caution. The suggestion made here is that all actions and the subsequent resilience shown must be understood within the context in which they occur. The most appropriate model of resilience to follow is linked to this context. This chapter has sought to offer some suggestions as to when each model of resilience may be observed but the applicability of these models and their individual defining characteristics is an area open for further examination.

Chapter 6: Isolation and Innovation: Market Communities and Resilience Development

Introduction

Chapter Five sought to examine the individual resilience of producers at GFM identifying that they demonstrate different ‘models’ of resilience when faced with differing challenges. It further highlighted the expectations and ‘scripts’ that appear to be emerging within ‘alternative’ food networks, the need to demonstrate or portray resilience to others and the consequence this may have on developing individual resilience. This chapter will now turn to specifically investigate the interactions at farmers’ markets and the market communities that develop to establish whether these help to develop producer’s resilience.

Chapter Three discussed the use of social networks and the communities that develop from these in helping to develop resilience. It must be acknowledged that specific personality traits are seen in resilient individuals and specific traits such as optimism, resourcefulness and energy (Tugade and Fredrickson, 2004, Jackson et al., 2007) are displayed by many of those trading through ‘alternative’ distribution networks thus demonstrating their individual resilience. However, whilst individual traits are important there is an emphasis in much of the resilience literature in the field of psychology that promotes the importance of networks both to provide support in times of adversity and to aid learning to enhance access to new ideas that may lead to innovation (Hegney et al., 2007, Jackson et al., 2007, Fleming and Ledogar, 2008, McLaren and Challis, 2009). This distinction between the use of the networks is highlighted in the two literatures explored in Chapter Three, noting the presence of a community of coping (Korczynski, 2003) and a community of practice (Wenger, 1998). The first of these types of community is developed through sharing similar challenges and using informal interactions between colleagues to aid coping, thus aiding individual resilience. The second type of community is seen when people with a similar interest or aim communicate together, providing information to one another and thus gaining new knowledge informally. This type of community is thought to aid potential innovations and thus to encourage adaptations, with such flexibility and change aiding a business’ long-term resilience. Whilst developing such communities is beneficial to those within them they do not automatically form when people gather

together with similar aims. There are specific factors that are required in order for communication to develop and thus for a gathering of people to evolve into a community. Such factors include sharing an understanding of the community's aim, frequency of contact and trust (Putnam, 1995, Granovetter, 2002, Barton and Tusting, 2005, King et al., 2009). In Chapter Five the expectations and scripts surrounding a 'good' post-productivist farmer were identified and these appear to have an effect on the willingness of producers to share and discuss particular problems. This chapter further explores the factors that impact on the social exchanges between producers at GFM, seeking to determine whether a market community exists and if so what this community, or communities, provides to those within it.

This chapter is split into two sections. The first section explores the elements of a community of coping and the second section explores the elements of a community of practice at GFM. Through exploring the challenges of social isolation experienced by producers the importance of contact to others provided through trading at GFM is clearly identified. However, unlike Korczynski's (2003) example of a community of coping developing due to contact to similar others it is suggested that it is the contact to consumers at GFM that provides producers with self belief and a sense of self worth. These are factors identified by McLaren and Challis (2009) as significant to the development of individual resilience. Through the discussions in Section 6.1 it becomes apparent that the development of individual resilience through contact to others at GFM appears significantly different to that discussed in Korczynski's (2003) example of a community of coping. Rather than seeking comfort and support when faced with adversity or challenges within the workplace, positivity is developed at GFM through learning of the significance producers have to consumers. This emphasis on learning rather than seeking support appears to blur the boundary between a community of coping and a community of practice, suggesting that a community of practice may not only aid innovation but also provide inspiration to continue along specific pathways due to the value this has to others. Section 6.2 seeks to explore the community of practice as defined by Wenger (1998) identifying mutual engagement, a joint enterprise and a shared repertoire between producers at GFM. However, social ties between producers lack strength and through exploring the interactions between producers it is established that little is learnt from one another at the market. The importance of competition and diversity are both examined and it is

suggested that whilst these are seen as important elements to develop resilience they are delicately balanced relying on trust to aid interactions between parties. Emerging from this is the need to understand human actors and the influence they have and thus the problematic nature of using the concept of resilience.

6.1 Coping with Isolation and Developing Social Resilience

Discussions in Chapter Three highlighted Korczynski's (2003) suggestion that informal communities within workplaces provide workers with support in order to cope with the challenges faced within the working environment. In order to form such a community there is a necessity to share similar problems and through bringing people together through such shared experiences mechanisms to support each other and cope with challenges can be developed (Korczynski, 2003). Chapter Five highlighted the problems within production that were shared between producers at GFM and provided an insight into how producers used the contact with other like-minded producers to seek support for environmental challenges. As discussed in Chapter Three, farming is known to be an occupation requiring individuals to work independently for long hours (Malmberg et al., 1997, Gregoire, 2002) and Chapter Five highlighted the recognition amongst producers at GFM that farming and production is a lifestyle choice rather than simply a job. The market day therefore is vitally important for many producers in providing contact to others, both producers who may be experiencing similar challenges and consumers who value the products provided by producers. Through exploring the challenges of social isolation of production and the value placed on meeting others at GFM the role played by the market in developing producers' social resilience can be explored.

6.1.1 Lonely life of production

As we drive around completing the delivery round producer E tells me how he'll miss the morning sights across the county when he stops producing in just a month or so; more than the sights though, he's going to miss the contact with others. We deliver milk to the tractor dealers, the vets, 'to keep them sweet', and a local construction site. Here the deliveries are left and few people seen. As we progress through the round we head to more shops and there's plenty of chatter and conversations as we stock the shelves.

Some of the conversations are in Welsh so I can't always join in but I get introduced everywhere we go. Then there's the first old people's home on the round where the cook is an old school friend of the producer, a hotel, restaurants and cafes, a rugby club. Near the end of the round there's time to stop for the morning cuppa at the second old people's home. We make it ourselves as the hustle and bustle of the kitchen carries on around us, have a chat as we make it and then get back on the road. After the final delivery there's just enough time to stop by some other local producers for the regular Monday morning coffee and a catch up. It's a great morning, even if it's an early start, a long drive and a rush to ensure everyone gets their products on time. There's a certain buzz about seeing others, exchanging pleasantries and being part of supplying a product which is required every day by all those we deliver to.

This experience is unique during my time working with producers. Indeed the afternoon with producer E demonstrates the isolation that is more regularly seen in current farming and production. I'm tasked with helping two of the workers finish their daily production of butter whilst the producer heads off to collect the milk he processes from the neighbouring farmer. He tells me that he always has to make sure he has time for a chat when he goes around. The farmer is an old and traditional farmer; he has a small herd of around 50 cows and still tethers them for milking. They are apparently beautiful cows and cleaned so as they have a great appearance. Where there used to be 20 odd dairy herds across the mountains, in the last 10 years or so this has declined to just 2 herds and the farmer has very little contact with others on a day to day basis. I'm told it's just the way farming has gone now. Collecting milk provides some social contact to others and therefore time is taken to provide this to the farmer.

All the other days I'm based at farms or places of production for near enough the majority of the day. The day with producer Y is interspersed with a trip to deliver products to the warehouse of the local online food co-operative. Producer L has flowers collected by a local wholesaler to supply a

supermarket during the afternoon of my visit and I have a cup of tea with a man delivering chicks to Producer U. I experience many lunchtimes during my volunteering, some I take my own lunch and sit with those employed by the producer, having a chat about my project and their involvement in the production process. Then there are the family lunches, families sitting around altogether enjoying cheeses, breads and salad, turkey casserole or faggots, potatoes and peas to name a few. These lunches, the essential breaks in production, provide a chance to chat to family members, to look over the morning's post and to discuss the schedule for the rest of the day. Whilst at first this seems idyllic it soon becomes apparent that having contact with just family members, living and working with them, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week is a very difficult situation. Producer L informs me that they have some rented land about 30 miles from their main farm and this is a little sanctuary away from the main hub of production that they can escape to. They like to go alone, seemingly a treat and there's a trade on who gets to head off and have some time alone. Many producers look forward to the market day. So many tell me of the hours of preparation work in the couple of days before the market, the early rise on market days to pack vehicles and the exhaustion of having to remain friendly and enthusiastic towards everyone throughout the day itself. However, for many it still remains a highlight of their fortnight. It offers the chance to get away from the site of production, guilt free and see other people, share conversations and be rewarded for hard work through seeing happy, returning customers and through making sales. **Vignette 3 – Social isolation**

The vignette above demonstrates that those trading at GFM are suffering physical and social isolation from others which is widely recognised across farming literature (Malmberg et al., 1997, Raine, 1999, Gregoire, 2002). Spending a considerable length of time alone can have negative consequences as farmers have the chance to dwell and worry about their situation (Raine, 1999). Jackson et al (2007: 6) suggest that 'it is especially important to develop networks with people outside of the immediate work area'. An appreciation of the importance of contact with others, particularly having the opportunity to converse with those not worked with, is

demonstrated in the enjoyment afforded to the market day even if preparations for the day and the day itself are exhausting for many involved.

Alongside this physical isolation of production, Chapter Five discussed the range of shocks and instabilities that farmers and food producers are regularly confronted by. It further highlighted that for those trading at GFM production was far from simply a job but was seen as a way of life demonstrated through the long hours worked often on seven days of the week. This lifestyle is recognisable across farming studies with Gregoire (2002) suggesting that 70% of farmers work longer than 10 hours a day and take few holidays. What is demonstrated here is that much like other farmers and producers already studied, those trading at GFM demonstrate an acute need for social resilience due to the isolated and tough working conditions of farming and food production. The farmers' market provides an environment within which social interaction can take place, an environment in which social networks that may provide social support for the stresses and strains of production and isolation could develop. The following section will explore the aspects of this social interaction with regards to overcoming social isolation and keeping a positive outlook on the difficulties faced during production.

6.1.2 Production problems and personal positivity

It is apparent that simply being given the chance to take a day away from production means that GFM provides a break from the isolation that accompanies small-scale farming and production. Along with the chance to spend a day surrounded by others there are a number of other factors provided by the market day that contribute to the development of individual social and emotional resilience. To begin, the market provides an opportunity for producers to think about their appearance and present themselves well. This results in an uplifting feeling, boosting producers' morale and creating a positive attitude for the day ahead.

The first time I was told that the market day provided the opportunity to 'put on clean clothes' it was said with a smile and I took it as a joke. However, this has been mentioned in various ways by a number of producers throughout my days working both at the market and directly with producers on farms and at sites of production. I'm told by Producer L that the market day provides the chance to put on clean clothes that aren't going to get muddy in

the fields and by employees of Producer A that it's the one day in a fortnight when they 'do' their hair –**Vignette 4-Dressing up**

What is taken from the extract above is that the usual daily routine of producers rarely allows for thought to be given to appearance. Those farming have to be out in all weathers and simply dress for the day ahead. The market day provides an opportunity for producers to think about their appearance, dressing in a manner that they are comfortable with, providing self-confidence and boosting morale through being able to spend a day out of muddy trousers and wellington boots. Ultimately the market provides the opportunity for producers to use appearance as a way to feel positive and good about themselves.

The direct contact with consumers at GFM provides producers with regular access to those who value them due to the food they supply. This direct contact and appreciation from consumers gives the producers an opportunity to see the significance of the goods they are producing. Satisfaction can be taken from this as producers feel a sense of achievement having produced a good quality product which they are proud to sell to consumers.

Over lunch we had the opportunity to really talk about production and the market. Having heard how little Producer L's annual income is from small-scale production and direct selling I was very interested to find out what took them down this line and why they continue. I'm told that direct selling is what it is all about, getting out and selling to people, the enjoyment came from seeing others enjoying the product and getting value for the quality product. –**Extract from field diary-24th February, 2011, Day working at Producer L's Farm**

I ask Producer U what they enjoy about the market day and she chuckles saying the cold and the wet! He laughs saying he loves selling, he has a primary product he is proud of, he has grown it and loves being the businessman. Yesterday he was face-to-face with a buyer who was over the moon with his Christmas turkeys; he'd had customers very happy with their

products and wanted to pass these compliments onto the producer. That's why he does it and why he loves it, getting pleasure out of providing a quality product for others to enjoy. -**Extract from field diary-20th January, 2011, Day working at Producer U's Farm**

These excerpts demonstrate how face-to-face interaction with consumers at GFM gives producers the opportunity to see the significance of the goods they are producing and to appreciate how much they, as individuals, are valued by others due to what they provide. The market environment provides a belief in the value and quality of the goods produced, providing positivity for producers to take back to their place of production. These findings support Kirwan's (2004, 2006) argument that direct contact between producers and consumers provides endorsement of products, instilling producers with 'a sense of pride in what they produce' (Kirwan, 2004: 404). Such positivity provides motivation to continue producing regardless of the difficulties that may be encountered along the way. Having the opportunity to 'dress up' or at least put on clean clothes means that a market day begins with an element of self-confidence and positivity for producers. As sales are made and compliments gathered this self-confidence is confirmed and strengthened. This buzz and appreciation provided through direct contact with consumers provides the motivation for producers to continue investing endless personal time and physical effort into the production process. This direct appreciation therefore provides at least some kind of counter-balance to overcome the challenges of the production process.

Alongside developing confidence in product quality and consequently developing positivity about production despite the challenges faced, the contact with others, specifically consumers, that occurs due to trading at GFM exposes producers to other people's challenges and problems. Many consumers, particularly elderly shoppers, enjoy the social element of the market often due to a lack of contact with other people during the week. Through the regular fortnightly interaction with specific producers they have grown to trust certain friendly faces at the market and seek to share and discuss their problems with specific producers.

Producer U comments how she's the Agony Aunt at the market, some people don't even buy things but come to tell her their woes. She says she doesn't

really want to hear about their ingrowing toe nail or whatever but tries to remember and ask how things are. People love her attention and she tells them she's been praying for them. She comments she could be really depressed but has to carry their burdens too, it makes her laugh. **-Extract from field diary-20th January, 2011, Day working at Producer U's Farm**

Hearing the woes of others often provides producers with a different outlook on their problems. For many it is a realisation of their own good health and the contact they have to others (even if this is just family members that they work with). It is acknowledged that some customers see few other people during the week and producers recognize that they are 'lucky' to have daily contact to others. What is visible here are specific producer characteristics that are seen to define resilient individuals, including energy and optimism (Tugade and Fredrickson, 2004). Through hearing of others issues and concerns producers look positively at their life and the support they have to cope with their own individual challenges. However, without the social contact with others outside of the production sphere, this recognition would largely remain absent from producers social lives. The market provides the ideal opportunity to maintain and enhance producers' confidence and positivity not just about the products they offer but also about their lifestyle, daily social contact to others and their physical health. Producers require an element of a resilient personality to cope with the stresses of production and the burden of others problems but the contact with consumers at GFM provides reason to remain confident and optimistic about life in production demonstrating the importance of this 'alternative' distribution network to producers' social resilience.

Chapter Five highlighted that there were specific problems that producers were willing to share and discuss, specifically around their struggles to produce good quality food when challenged by environmental shocks and stresses. Common problems and experiences are discussed between producers and they take comfort from identifying that other producers are facing similar challenges. This can be particularly important when the challenges are of a personal nature.

Producer I tells me about a delivery driver they had who they worked out had been stealing money since at least last April (2010). It was a cunning method

used in that he would deliver to the usual places, write out the correct number of eggs that a business would want on the duplicate receipts and accept the payment. He then doctored the receipt that went back to Producer I with the money, halving the amount sold and therefore pocketing half the money from the order. It was only uncovered when a business telephoned to check an order and it emerged that the receipts for the last few months did not match between the producer and the business. Whilst the delivery driver has been dismissed and the Police are now dealing with the issue it was obvious that this had been an embarrassment for Producer I. However, as he went around checking details with businesses there were other shops and cafes that identified with the problem, reporting similar employee situations. He expressed the fact that it was really nice to have people to talk to and good to be able to take comfort in the fact that it wasn't just him that had been made a fool of or taken for a ride (as he saw it). Through various conversations with other producers at the market he found out that others had employed problem workers with some also experiencing stealing. This provided no end of comfort to him and confidence that it was not just him or the way he ran his business that was at fault. **–Extract from field diary-26th January, 2011, Day working at Producer I's Farm**

The previous chapter discussed the willingness of producers to discuss specific problems with the production process. Here it is also identified that producers use their contact to others at the market to share specific issues that are felt to be personal attacks. These problems are seen as embarrassing to those involved but through developing a social relationship with others at GFM they are prepared to discuss their problems, taking comfort from similar experiences and stories shared by fellow producers. Due to the embarrassment reported to accompany these problems it is evident that there is an element of trust developed between producers in order to share such experiences and to seek support from each other. GFM provides a vital connection for many of the producers to others in similar situations to themselves. Seemingly it provides contact to producers to seek support, taking comfort in the recognition that problems are not solely being experienced by them as individual producers. For many producers the farmers' market is one of only a handful of places

(at most) where they can meet with and chat to similar producers and therefore provides a vital connection to others to share and discuss personal problems and concerns.

6.1.3 Developing social resilience

It is evident from the discussions above and those in Chapter Five that GFM provides contact between producers who provide support for each other through sharing similar problems. Through informally sharing experiences with others and therefore seeking their support, elements of Korczynski's (2003) community of coping idea can be seen. Producers are seen to use the contact to other producers to create a community, in which they can share problems, identify their similarities to others, taking comfort and support from these shared experiences. It can be identified that producers are seeking to cope with these problems 'communally and socially' (Korczynski, 2003: 58) and that the experiences they share brings them closer together, as seen in Kroczynski's (2003) call centre example. Through identifying with others and sharing experiences GFM therefore provides a vital connection to similar others which is otherwise absent from many of these producers everyday lives of production. GFM therefore plays a significant role in helping producers to cope with the challenges faced during production. Here then, through turning to others to seek support and to discuss and share problems, the individual, social resilience of producers is being developed. However, where Korczynski's (2003) suggestion of the development of communities of coping is focussed around negative actions that are coped with through social support there is little acknowledgement given to the positive attributes of social interaction with others that reduce the consequences of social isolation and build individual positivity.

Much of the resilience literature suggests that in order to display resilience there is a necessity to face adversity (Perrings, 1998, Manyena, 2006, Barnes, 2009). Chapter Five suggested the shocks, stresses and strains experienced by producers but there is not one particular adversity that provides this study with a focus to measure producers' resilience. However, there are certain personality traits and qualities that are seen to demonstrate resilience and are present amongst producers at GFM. Humour is one of these characteristics suggested by Hegney et al (2007) to be both a sign of resilience and a way to build resilience and is observable across the market. The sharing of jokes demonstrates the strength of ties between producers and

highlights the importance of the interaction between both consumers and fellow producers that the social contact at GFM provides. A sense of camaraderie develops and this strengthens the enjoyment of the market day.

Producer P is known for always having a joke up his sleeve. Some old ladies come by just to ask for the weekly joke rather than to buy anything. His jokes backfired just before Christmas when there were a couple of Policemen wandering through the market. They pulled Producer P aside and mentioned that a few producers had suggested that there was a lady who had been exposing herself at his fish stall. This had him for a minute and he was a bit concerned until he realised that the neighbouring stallholders (particularly Producers U and T) were all having a laugh and had set the Policemen up to it. He had a toy model that was a singing 'Mrs Claus' to liven up his stall and when she started singing she gradually opened her cloak to the amusement of everyone around.-**Extract from field diary-10th December, 2010, Day at GFM**

Another characteristic of resilient individuals, as discussed in Chapter Three, is 'a strong sense of self' (Jackson et al., 2007: 3). From the discussions in Section 6.1.2 above it is evident that the contact provided through trading at GFM develops this sense of self. Here it is evident that through 'feel[ing] valued, needed and significant' (McLaren and Challis, 2009: 263) producers are developing this sense of self and a sense of belonging (within the market), another important characteristic in developing individual resilience (McLaren and Challis, 2009). Whilst these may be underlying characteristics of resilient individuals there is a necessity for social interaction in order to develop them and to feel a sense of belonging and self-worth, to maintain positivity and thus, certainly in this instance, to remain inspired about both production and the lifestyle associated with this. Here a distinction becomes apparent between the support provided by similar others, in this instance producers, and that provided by those who require the service provided, in this instance, consumers. The first of these two relationships resembles Korczynski's (2003) community of coping, as identified in her call centre environment. Strong relationships are developed between those sharing similar challenges and experiences, providing support to cope with the stresses and strains of a life in production. The second type of relationship is formed

through much weaker social ties and rather than providing identification and support for the production environment it provides positivity, developing producers feeling of belonging and self worth and thus confirming that the lifestyle and challenges of production provide value to others. This positivity and value provided through social interaction appears absent from the current community of coping literature and indeed within agricultural studies importance is placed on small-scale farmers creating support networks with similar producers (Hegney et al., 2007) rather than any other actors.

It is identifiable that the social interaction most valued by producers at GFM is the positive feedback from consumers rather than the support provided by other producers. Whilst a community of coping as documented by Korczynski (2003) may be apparent at GFM this is definitely not the most valued interaction provided through direct selling. Here it is seen that characteristics of resilient individuals are developed through social contact with others and therefore the importance of social interaction and social networks in developing and maintaining individual resilience is brought to the fore. What needs to be questioned is whether this interaction specifically falls into the community of coping sphere. So far the literature surrounding communities of coping requires a specific adversity to occur that is overcome through emotional support of others in similar situations. This support is seen to be provided by others through repeating experiences with colleagues (Korczynski, 2003) and using stories as 'accumulated wisdom' (Brown and Duguid, 1991: 45) to help solve problems. However, the discussions above demonstrate the importance of social interaction even without a specific, identifiable adversity. Producers are coping with their chosen lifestyle through the positive support of others but this is not done solely through sharing problems but also through producers learning of their value and significance to others. This social interaction is seemingly less about coping emotionally and more about learning of value and importance which provides inspiration to continue pursuing a challenging lifestyle. It can be suggested then that these properties that aid coping are provided through a practice that is learnt and reiterated through contact with others. Through participation in direct selling producers are informally learning and developing tacit knowledge of their value and significance of others. This informal learning is a property of a 'community of practice' (Brown et al., 1989, Barton and Tusting, 2005, Sligo and Massey, 2007, Amin and Roberts, 2008). A

merging of the concepts of a community of practice and a community of coping raises an important question as to whether coping is actually a practice that is learnt. A distinction may be made here between coping as a practice, where no specific adversity is present and coping as emotional support for specific challenges. Through learning of their significance and value to others through direct selling, producers remain positive in their life of production, continuing with their chosen lifestyle. This specific quality of social interaction is otherwise absent for many in their life in production, promoting the importance of direct selling and direct contact to consumers to create a community of practice that aids coping and thus develops individual producers' social resilience.

6.2 Community of Practice

Discussions in Chapter Five explored the lack of urgency amongst producers at GFM to innovate. Some of this was attributed to the acceptance that specific challenges simply occur and do not necessarily need to be tackled. However, there was also the acknowledgement that specific scripts and expectations amongst producers defined challenges that they are expected to overcome and be resilient to. To overcome such challenges producers need access to information and to learn and develop over time in order to change and adapt accordingly. Chapter Three highlighted the importance of learning in informal situations (Wenger, 1998, Barton and Tusting, 2005, Amin and Roberts, 2008, Morgan, 2011), learning which is facilitated through the creation of a community of practice. Such learning is seen to enhance any formal training (Barton and Hamilton, 2005) and provides access to and endorsements of new ideas and innovations (Granovetter, 2002) which for businesses can promote change, adaptability and thus provides potential to develop economic resilience. GFM brings similar producers together to sell local food directly to consumers and using Barton and Tusting's (2005) definition, this assemblage of people (a community) for a specific purpose (a practice) holds the potential to develop a community of practice. Exploring the interactions shared between producers will help to identify if a community of practice has developed between producers at GFM and will establish the barriers to information sharing. This in turn demonstrates the extent that the market is used for informal learning and will provide an insight into if and how GFM currently aids the economic resilience of producers.

6.2.1 Mutual engagement, joint enterprise and shared repertoire

Before exploring the interactions, the social ties and the learning opportunities at GFM it is essential to establish if the grouping of people in this environment has the three elements necessary to develop a community of practice: mutual engagement, joint enterprise and shared repertoire (Wenger, 1998). The first of these is mutual engagement, where people are seen to interact in many ways. The vignette below demonstrates this mutual engagement, from the morning niceties to helping others and exchanging products producers are seen to engage with others at GFM. This was also seen in Chapter Five as producers discussed certain difficulties they faced in production. Whilst mutual engagement is present it is apparent from the vignette below that sharing knowledge is limited within this engagement and it is this learning from social interaction that is a vital element of a community of practice.

Everyone's beginning to arrive at the market. There are cheery hellos from various producers and smiles and waves from others. Whilst some exchange trolleys to transport products from their vehicle to their stall others help push fellow producers' trailers through the market and lend a hand lifting cabinets into place on stalls. A few stallholders deliver eggs and bread rolls to Producer N who duly cooks up bacon and provides breakfast to neighbouring stalls. Rounds of hot drinks are purchased and at one end of the market individual's cups are gathered together as Producer U powers up their small camping stove complete with new whistling kettle. The excitement caused by the new whistling kettle causes great amusement all round!

As the market gets busier there's less time to talk, concentration is on greeting customers, answering questions and making sales. Those lucky enough to have two people working on a stall can utilise this to their advantage, with one popping off to see other similar producers. At the start of the year when cold weather hits there's conversations between vegetable producers about when certain vegetables should be planted, seemingly Producer O wants to ensure he's not too far behind Producer A's similar schedule. Producer U who uses the market as a sideline to their main supply to the catering trade impart what they feel is essential marketing knowledge

to Producer G who is much less established. They suggest the importance of clearly laid out products that are clearly labelled showing exactly where they are from as well as drawing out the use of any ingredients from other local sources. As the day goes on there's a bit of 'business' done between certain stalls, exchanging vegetables for cheese, bread for fish and the like. Some producers love this advantage of the market, others find it difficult, taking the products as an exchange but actually quietly expressing the fact they would prefer the money. Breadcrumbs from Producer X are handed over to either Producer N or T to feed to their animals. There are discussions about the weather, the amount of people (potential customers) at the market each specific day and at least a brief conversation with one or both of the workers from the council who oversee the market. Come the end of the market day tables have to be dismantled and canopies let down, hands are leant where needed often without producers having to ask those nearby. Over time each producer recognises which producer is a bit too short to reach the button that would let down the tent-style canopy or the producer that could do with a hand to carry their table back to the storage container. Whilst interaction might be sparse through the majority of the day there's often help, at least for neighbouring stalls, when 2 o'clock hits and everyone wants to make an escape to get on with their deliveries, harvesting or preparation for a weekend trading somewhere else. **–Vignette 5 – Interactions at the market**

Wenger's (1998) second element of a community of practice is the presence of a joint enterprise which is developed when those within a network have a common endeavour. GFM brings together producers who share a common desire to produce good quality food, to sell this food locally and to sell it directly to consumers. Each producer is 'inspected' before gaining a place at the market to ensure their ingredients are sourced locally and that they are prepared to follow the rules of the market as set out by the FARMA regulations (these are laid out in Chapter Two and are discussed in more depth in Chapter Seven). Through coming together and trading at GFM the producers are therefore sharing a joint enterprise. An enterprise in this context, as discussed in Chapter Five, is a lifestyle choice, with the expectation to produce good quality food and to be prepared to engage with consumers to promote this quality in

order to make sales. Here it is obvious that simply through trading at GFM there is a common mindset for the producers who therefore share a joint enterprise.

The third and final element of a community of practice as suggested by Wenger (1998) is a shared repertoire. The discussions in Chapter Five highlighted the presence of an expectation to be a 'good' producer at GFM; this demonstrates that producers share an expectation within the market. Chapter Seven will discuss further the rules, regulations, expectations and thus identity of the market itself imposed both formally and informally but at this point it is necessary to recognise that this identity exists. Barton and Tusting (2005: 2) stress the importance of 'common resources of language, styles and routines' in providing a shared repertoire for a community to work by. The acknowledgement of expectations around 'good' producers and that a market identity exists demonstrates that there are specific expectations at GFM which then provides a shared repertoire that producers work with.

Chapter Five highlighted the role played by producers' expectations in the ability to use the market space to develop resilience, suggesting that certain information was not shared between producers and it was this that prevented producers from developing and learning from each other. Within the context of a community of practice this is equated to the shared repertoire at GFM limiting and defining the type of mutual engagement that occurs between producers. This impacts the ability to use GFM as an area to meet and learn from similar others and therefore this chapter will now turn to try and unpack different elements that help develop a community of practice to establish why such difficulties are seen at GFM.

6.2.2 The significance of social capital and social ties

The importance of social capital was discussed in Chapter Three with the recognition that social capital is essential if knowledge is to be both produced and transferred to others within informal situations (Putnam, 1995). Social capital develops through the presence of social ties and the strength of these ties can determine the amount of information shared between individuals (Putnam, 1995, King et al., 2009). The amount of information shared equates to the type of social capital between parties, with bonding capital providing the greatest amount of knowledge transfer (High et al., 2005, King et al., 2009). It has already been noted in the section above that knowledge transfer that would aid innovative capacity is somewhat lacking between

producers at GFM suggesting that the social ties between them are weak. Through exploring the reasons behind this the barriers to strengthening social ties can be examined.

Knowledge transfer and innovation require the development of strong social ties between parties (High et al., 2005, King et al., 2009) and to build strong social ties there is a need for both frequent contact and longevity of contact between parties (Granovetter, 2002, King et al., 2009). Many producers at GFM have been present at the market for a number of years (as documented in Table 1), attending every fortnight. This provides at least the longevity of contact but it may be questioned if the frequency (once a fortnight) is adequate to develop strong social ties. Strong social ties are also seen to have ‘emotional intensity’ along with ‘intimacy (mutual confiding)’ (Granovetter, 2002: 61) and from the discussions in Section 6.1 it can be seen that there is not a strong emotional intensity between producers. The discussions in Chapter Five also demonstrated that many producers did not confide in each other when facing economic challenges where innovation and flexibility is required to overcome these. Seemingly many producers know little about others even having traded with them over a number of years.

It was the final market before Christmas and whilst the weather was bad I managed to get to Garrington on the train, attending for research purposes and also to collect all my products that I had ordered from the producers for Christmas dinner. Having spent the morning speaking with producers, supplying cups of tea on such a cold day, buying vegetables and collecting my orders I needed to find somewhere to leave all my purchases before heading out either on foot or on bus to collect my turkey. Producer U (the turkey producers) never attend the final Christmas market as they have so much to do preparing Christmas orders and I had thought that I would easily be able to collect my turkey from the farm but having not been able to drive down due to snow I was facing a 3 mile walk from town if I could not find an appropriate bus to catch. Producer V suggested I could leave everything locked in the market manager’s office but there was no sign of the manager so Producer V asked where Producer U were to work out if he could give me

a lift down. I let him know that the farm was on the main road just three miles out of town. He really wasn't sure if he believed me, surprised that they were quite so close to town and so asked around quite a few producers to see if anyone could provide confirmation. No one was sure where the farm was which really surprised me and demonstrated that whilst producers have opinions of others at the market they only really see them at the market and don't really know the ins and outs of their business, including where they based. **-Extract from field diary-22nd December, 2010, Day at GFM**

Producers ultimately attend a market day to make sales. To do this they are required to provide the necessary attention to consumers, building rapport and trust in order to demonstrate the quality of the product on offer. With this interaction comes the positivity discussed in Section 6.1, seemingly a vital by-product of this direct selling and thus interaction with consumers is of great importance. One disadvantage of dedicating this time and effort into interacting with consumers is that there is less time available to communicate with producers during the market day. Without this interaction strong ties between producers are less likely to develop.

Market day is a busy day for Producer L, not only does she have to prepare for the market she also has to get someone in to cover the jobs on the farm that she would otherwise be doing. Their product (flowers in the spring and soft fruits come the summer) is harvested everyday so she needed someone to manage orders as well as overseeing the workers on the farm. At the market she is always run off her feet and I was a welcome help on the stall. She tells me that she could bring an extra worker to help on the stall but that would take them off the farm where they would probably be needed more and if they employed anyone else for the day it would cost them more money. She commented that her husband often asks her for 'any news' when she gets back from a day at the market and she never has anything to tell him because she never manages to get away from the stall to talk to people. **-Extract from field diary-28th May, 2010, Day working with Producer L at GFM**

Beyond the time available to interact with other producers consideration must also be given to the differences and similarities of the producers trading at GFM and therefore the type of social capital they are likely to be able to develop. In Chapter Three the definitions given of those able to develop specific types of social capital were explored, taking High et al's (2005) definitions based on social class and interpreting this into a manner that could be useful within agricultural research. From this it can be expected that bonding capital is only likely to develop between producers selling similar products, and is thus only likely to develop between specific producers at GFM. It is more likely that bridging capital occurs between producers with similar outlooks but who produce different products.

Producers can discuss innovations such as in the example below due to a mutual understanding that brings them together, but such an innovation will not spread to producers who are unable to use this new technique. For it to be beneficial to a number of producers they must all be producing similar products but producers appear to share limited information with similar others.

Producer P came across to speak to Producer T about a rep who had visited them during the week to tell them about a new humane way of killing crabs. This involved what sounded like a hinged contraption that had a sponge either side that the crabs were put onto. This was closed and the crabs were zapped with a 1 amp shock and this killed them. The rep trying to sell this said that places like Tesco were starting to demand that the crabs they sold were killed in this way due to the fact it was more humane. Producer P had been told that this makes the meat last better and wanted to understand why. He thought as producer T was a well respected butcher and knew a lot about meat products he may be able to offer an explanation. Producer T said that bolting a pig, which he saw as the equivalent to this style of humane killing, gave the meat a better shelf-life due to the lactic acid that formed in the muscles. At this point customers appeared and the conversation had to stop but it carried on at various points in the day.....at this point Producer P came back across to talk about 'that citric acid' again! Producer T explained that in pigs (and he pointed out they were warm blooded animals

and he wasn't sure if cold blooded animals were the same or not) that if they are bolted (i.e. killed with a bolt gun) the lactic acid knits together. This is not the same when it is killed in other ways. In those instances the lactic acid doesn't knit together and therefore the meat goes flabby and isn't as good. It gives pockets where air can get in (i.e. between the lactic acid) and hence the meat will not last as long. Both producers contemplated if this would be the same for crabs and that if there was lactic acid would it join up if the crabs were dropped into boiling water due to the shock provided by this. Producer P thought that the rep that came and spoke to him was an agent for an American company getting a lot of money for what they were doing and didn't want to be fooled or scared into investing in something that wasn't necessary. He was concerned though that the availability of such equipment would make humane killing of crabs more of a buzz and people would begin to ask how the crabs had actually been killed.-Extract from field diary-19th

March, 2010, Day working with Producer T at GFM

The advice seeking shown in the extract above clearly demonstrates the use of social ties to endorse or reject products and opinions that have been introduced by those connected through linking capital, much like O'Kane et al's (2008) study of farmers' decision making. However, the lack of strong social ties throughout GFM means that this endorsement and advice seeking is a rare occurrence and often occurs between producers of different products. Knowledge and innovations are seldom shared between producers and when they are they are rarely applicable to those they are shared with.

6.2.3 Competition and trust

As discussed in Chapter Three and touched upon in Chapter Five competition is seen to be an asset to resilience. It is suggested that through competition businesses have to constantly prove their products are good, requiring the ability to seek out and develop new ideas, in turn demonstrating their adaptability to new innovations in order to remain competitive against other businesses. Through clustering businesses together and thus creating a competitive environment this is seen to develop information sharing through businesses trialling new developments and passing ideas onto others as they do so. Whilst this is not specifically referred to as a community of

practice within the resilience literature the elements of a community of practice are clearly identifiable in this competitive business cluster environment. Ideally bringing producers together at a farmers' market could be equated to such a business cluster but seemingly in this instance the presence of other similar businesses is seen more as detrimental competition than advantageous to business options in the majority of instances. In the instance of GFM there is little evidence to suggest agreement with the statement that 'low-input farmers will utilise social capital as their investment in technology is less' (Sutherland and Burton, 2011: 253) and therefore a community of practice is seemingly not present at GFM.

There's hardly a day that goes by working at the market when I'm not given another insight into the struggles of producers competing for business on a market day. Certain stalls, such as Producer G, wish they had greater competition at the market to see that their products were being purchased against others to provide confidence that the quality of their product was high in comparison to similar others. At least three stalls (Producers A, L and O) had corresponded at the start of the growing season this year about who will be selling broad beans at the market; there simply was not enough demand for them to have three stalls selling them last summer so someone had to stop selling for the benefit of all involved. Others were less willing to share this information and discussions at the annual general meeting highlighted the problems of competition and the delicate balance attempting to be struck at the market. The market manager aimed to create a balance of producers at the market but through doing this she allowed stalls onto the market that were seen in some cases to provide direct competition to those already trading there. Issues here were raised about product marketing and that whilst many stalls sold similar products they each had something that made them different to the other producers. The market manager felt that competition provided the ideal opportunity to display and 'sell' this difference; encouraging producers to raise the profile of their products even to regular market customers who may never have bought products from them before. Suggestions were made that some stalls had it easy with competition from just one or two producers at the market with Producer U

pointing out that they were one of nine meat stalls at the market. Whilst he acknowledged they mainly sold different types of meat he felt that every customer turned up to the market with a specific budget they would be spending on meat and a certain amount of meat they needed to buy for the week/fortnight ahead, therefore he felt there was always a necessity for him to engage with customers and to market his products as he felt once they started to spend money at another meat stall he was unlikely to make sales to them. This he felt was business although this did not appear to be widely accepted around the room with competition being seen as a problem rather than an asset to product and marketing development. **–Vignette 6 – The problem of competition**

An acknowledgement of competition between actors is largely absent from the community of practice literature. What can be drawn from this literature, specifically from the discussions around social ties is the need for ‘intimacy (mutual confiding) and reciprocal services’ (Granovetter, 2002: 61) and these would therefore be in a delicate balance when there is competition between parties. The resilience literature promoting the advantages of competition is based on businesses in hubs which would be closely linked every day due to their location. One stark difference between this cluster of businesses and bringing producers together at GFM therefore is the regularity of contact. The resilience literature implies the possibility for daily contact whereas the market occurs just once every fortnight diminishing the possibilities of regular information sharing to ensure services were reciprocated and importantly impacting on the ability of producers to develop trust between each other. The strength of relationships and the lack of trust is therefore a key element that appears to keep many similar businesses in competition with each other rather than in co-operative and beneficial working relationships at GFM. Through working and learning from each other producers could improve the quality of their products and they could learn new techniques which may aid product development in the long term. These are the essential suggestions made throughout the resilience literature focussed on business hubs. The difference here lies in the size of the businesses involved. At GFM the businesses are small, family businesses, trading to survive and make money. The business clusters emerging from the economic resilience literature are likely to be

bigger businesses seeking to innovate for the sake of the industry as a whole. Such businesses have a far less personal relationship between them than is seen between producers at GFM and it may be that competition is regarded at a far less personal nature between such businesses than it is between producers at GFM.

Producer D brings a small selection of other plants with him, these bring him a lot more money than his main plant products but he seems to have a lot of respect for what he should and shouldn't be selling at the market and does not want to step on other producer's toes by providing competition to what they are selling. He tells me that Producer W sells the same products as him on the county's online food co-operative and undercuts his price by 10 pence. Producer D is not prepared to compete with Producer W's price feeling that the quality of his own products is better. He's confident that customers will learn that his products have a much better guarantee of survival and therefore will pay 10 pence more for them. He comments that Producer W also brings some of these plants to sell at the market 'although he's not licensed to sell them down here'. The idea that there is some licence as to what can and cannot be sold is very interesting. It seems that some people feel there is a definite agreement about what is allowed to be sold by different people who produce the same product.**-Extract from field diary- 25th June, 2010, Day working with Producer D at GFM**

Here we also begin to touch upon the understanding of the shared repertoire amongst all producers at the market. Whilst the formal and informal rules and regulations of GFM are discussed in greater depth in Chapter Seven it is important to briefly explore the understandings and interpretations of these here to understand the development of the shared repertoire that is essential to create a community of practice. What is visible here is that there is a shared repertoire, there are expectations surrounding quality of produce, respect of others and commitment to creating an enjoyable atmosphere at GFM for all involved. Particularly important for some is their 'right' to sell specific items without others offering too much competition. Others claim to be following trends, to be adapting to the economic climate and selling the products that consumers are demanding. Here a confrontation emerges from various producers'

interpretation of the rules and regulations of GFM, demonstrating that whilst there is an underlying shared repertoire different elements of this are interpreted differently by different producers leading to a differentiated view of these underlying conditions. Here it becomes apparent that the lack of a definite shared understanding and therefore a weak shared repertoire amongst producers affects the ability of producers to develop trust, specifically between others they are directly in competition with.

Trust therefore appears to be a key missing element, without which there is a lack of knowledge sharing and thus mutual learning. Trust is lacking where producers of similar products fear others are taking their ideas, their trade and selling products they are not entitled to, in many cases an interpretation of rules and regulations, rather than specific rule-breaking. Assumptions are made about quality, attitudes and producers' opinions and it is these assumptions that are detrimental to the relationships that could develop. Without these relationships, strong social ties are not developed and knowledge is rarely shared between producers. Without the frequency of meetings or the intensity of conversations building such trust will remain a constant struggle. Once assumptions are made they are hard to alter and without a willingness to talk to those that are seen to be breaching standards or unfairly creating competition it is unlikely that trust between producers will develop at least in the short term. If producers had the time and, in some cases the will, to gain more information about other producers, barriers between specific producers may be removed, facilitating greater information sharing.

6.2.4 Interactions and resilience

The discussions above demonstrate that the assemblage of producers at GFM does not result in the formation of a community of practice. There is limited information sharing between producers and therefore little knowledge transferred that may help producers to innovate, a key to building resilience. There are certain other areas where producers may interact with those producing products similar to their own (such as horticultural societies or working groups that producers are members of) with whom they are more likely to share bonding capital due to their similarities. However, weak ties are important to spread innovations through the contact they provide to other networks and sources of information (Granovetter, 2002, O'Kane et al., 2008, King et al., 2009). This draws out the importance not only of contact to similar others who would ultimately provide competition but also to different, diverse

sources of information. Literature focused on resilient systems (both ecological and economic) suggests the necessity of diversity to aid survival. This diversity is thought to ensure that at least some elements of a system will cope with specific stresses and shocks and thus provide a basis on which to rebuild an ecosystem or local economy. Communities of practice literature stresses the importance of diversity in opening opportunities to community members, in providing linking capital to new ideas that may provide the opportunity to adapt and change. This highlights Brown and Duguid's (1991) idea that for a community to succeed they must link working, learning and innovating. Here the two literatures (resilience and community of practice respectively) suggest the necessity for diversity for very similar reasons, the first to provide a platform on which to build on when suffering from a stress or strain and the latter to offer connections to new ideas to aid innovation in order to adapt and to build resilience. However, it is the presence and importance of people, their interactions and the power afforded to them which separates these two ideals.

The community of practice literature would suggest the need to communicate with similar others so as bonding ties develop and thus new ideas provided by a diverse range of actors could be endorsed by those that are trusted and are thought to have specific knowledge. As discussed in Section 6.2.3, this communication requires trust and trust is delicately balanced when actors are in competition with one another. A similarity can be seen here between this competition and struggle for survival and the competition between elements of ecosystems detailed in early resilience literature. Competition in this sense promotes individual adaptation to survive challenges and the threat of other parties or actors within a specific environment. Where human actors may be able to communicate and share ideas to develop and adapt together this will only occur as trust develops and without trust each human actor simply works as a plant in a ecosystem would attempting to survive through their own individual adaptations. Whilst diversity and competition may be regarded as essential elements to develop resilience they are much more useful when trust also develops so as not only networks but communities can form to share ideas and thus reduce the individual strain of seeking out new ideas and taking chances to adapt. This element of trust tips the balance of when each element is useful and when it becomes detrimental to working together to develop resilience. An extra dimension to resilience is therefore

identified when human actors are involved, demonstrating a distinction between resilience in natural systems and resilience in human systems.

The involvement of people also affects the ability to follow particular pathways as the hierarchy that develops between actors can determine the acceptance and rejection of specific ideas. The lack of ability to develop new ideas and ideals within a network or community of people is much like Martin's (2011) 'industrial legacy' which, as discussed in Chapter Three, highlights the lack of opportunities available to some regions due to their limited skills and resources which have developed around one particular industry. Whilst these factors may physically prevent and limit the opportunities of change, within a network of people this is equated to the ability to alter aims and objectives over time; in the case of a community of practice the flexibility of the shared repertoire. Once again a delicate balance emerges. No shared repertoire and a community lacks focus that would bring it together to aid knowledge and information sharing. A very strict shared repertoire will restrict the 'accepted' avenues that innovation could take and thus diminish the opportunities for change and adaptations. Where the current community of practice literature suggests the importance of a 'core' to a community (Granovetter, 2002) that provides strong social ties to others and thus endorsement of new ideas and potential adaptations, the issues of power and hierarchy that subsequently surround this appear relatively unexplored. It is these issues, along with the development of trust that appear to determine whether a gathering of people can develop into a community that if willing and able to share information could aid innovation and adaptability.

It becomes apparent here that once human actors become of prime importance to spread innovations that power, hierarchy and trust become increasingly important in defining the ability of a system to change and innovate. This begins to highlight the delicate balance of the suggested essential elements of a community of practice. To create a joint enterprise and to develop a shared repertoire there must be mutual engagement and in the instance of GFM these are all recognised elements within the community. Without rules and regulations the market would seemingly have no joint enterprise, lacking a definition as to exactly what it is as an 'alternative' distribution network that producers have sought to trade through. With the rules and regulations come enforcements to keep the market strict, to define it for all who use it but alongside these rules and regulations come interpretations and acceptances. These

interpretations and those who are seen or assumed to enforce them, create a spectrum of power within the community which in turn has the consequence of diminishing or preventing the mutual engagement between community members which would then provide information to aid innovation.

6.3 Conclusion

This chapter has examined the use that contact to, and interactions with, others at GFM has in aiding and developing producers' resilience. Through exploring the daily routine and isolation of the life in production it is suggested that producers trading at GFM display the same struggles with social isolation widely recognised in the agriculture literature (Raine, 1999, Gregoire, 2002, Simkin et al., 2003, Stark et al., 2006). Seeing others at GFM provides support to cope with this social isolation and provides contact to similar others who can identify with specific challenges. Such connections help to develop an individual producer's social resilience through contact that is otherwise widely absent from their lives. This interaction, whilst providing this essential social support, does not appear to develop the economic resilience of producers. Where Wenger (1998) promotes the importance of social interaction with similar others to aid learning and provide access to new innovations, in turn thus promoting adaptability, the competition provided by fellow producers appears a disadvantage with producers lacking trust with one another and thus seemingly little 'business' information is shared between producers at GFM.

Interactions that aid social resilience have been explored in this chapter using Korczynski's (2003) idea of a community of coping. This promotes the idea that through seeking support from those experiencing similar challenges people can cope communally with the difficulties faced. However, what is found to be of greatest importance is contact to consumers, those that require and value the services provided by producers trading at GFM. Here social resilience is developed through producers feeling valued and significant and through this their sense of self is strengthened. These are all characteristics recognised as important when developing individual resilience (Jackson et al., 2007, McLaren and Challis, 2009) and contact to consumers at GFM plays a significant role in this individual development of resilience. However, it becomes evident in these discussions that the use of social interactions to develop individual resilience at GFM differs from that detailed in the community of coping

literature. In this instance producers revel in the importance and value afforded to them by consumers and it is this that encourages them to continue in the production lifestyle they have chosen. Rather than seeking comfort, as the community of coping literature suggests, producers at GFM learn of their value to others and it is this value and feeling of self worth that helps to develop and maintain resilience to social isolation and the challenges and hard work associated with production. Here the community of coping and community of practice boundaries are blurred. What is evident in this instance is a community of practice where value is learned to ultimately aid individual coping. This opens a new dimension to the community of practice ideas, which currently focus more specifically on learning to directly aid innovation. Instead, the suggestion here is that rather than learning new ideas from contact to similar others, individual's can learn of their value and significance to those they provide a service to. This learning plays an important role in developing individual resilience and offers a new dimension to the community of practice literature that currently exists, suggesting that learning is not only necessary to expose community members to new ideas to aid innovation but also to ensure they feel valued and significant and thus help them to cope with the lifestyle they have chosen to follow. This opens a new potential avenue in which to explore community relations and the use of interactions in aiding individual, social resilience.

When looking specifically at the gathering of producers at GFM in the context of a community of practice all three of Wenger's (1998) elements are identifiable, with producers mutually engaging, sharing the joint enterprise of producing and trading good quality, local products and sharing a repertoire. The latter element was partly identified in Chapter Five where the presence of expectations and 'scripts' were identified at GFM. However, whilst these factors are present few interactions that would aid innovation are identified at the market, suggesting that trading at the market does not play a significant role in opening opportunities to innovate and develop business ideas. In these terms, GFM does not increase economic resilience (beyond making sales). The time available to communicate on market days and the frequency of contact both play a role in the lack of trust and lack of strong social ties developing between producers at GFM; without this trust it is unsurprising that there is a lack of information sharing. In addition, the differing interpretations of the shared repertoire and joint enterprise demonstrate that power and hierarchy develops within the market,

resulting in unease and distrust between parties. The necessity for a mutual understanding and how this is developed is discussed in greater detail in Chapter Seven. Due to the identification of power relations and the difficulty in developing trust this chapter has sought to examine the applicability of the context of resilience across a spectrum of subject fields. Both competition and diversity are elements of resilience that have passed from its original definitions within ecological systems through to its now widespread use in economic systems. The implications of the presence of human actors within economic systems appears relatively unexplored within the literature and this chapter makes the suggestion that human actors and the development of trust between actors plays an important role in balancing the need and usefulness of diversity and competition in developing resilience. The applicability of resilience as a concept, with the same features and definitions applied across a variety of different subject areas, is open to further exploration. This demonstrates the need to continue to seek an exact definition of resilience to be used in specific contexts.

Chapter 7: Interpretations, Negotiations and Standardisation. Constructing a Resilient Farmers' Market

Introduction

From discussions in Chapter Six it emerged that to develop community relations between producers at GFM there was a need to develop trust. Without trust there is little chance of developing social ties with others and without these social ties information is rarely shared between fellow producers. One reason for a lack of trust between producers emerged through the lack of a definite common goal and thus a lack of shared repertoire between producers at GFM. This lack of a shared understanding between producers is somewhat reflective of the discrepancies within the literature as to the meaning and standard of 'local food'. In Chapter Two the term 'local trap' (Morgan, 2008, Kneafsey, 2010) was explored, this being the positive association made between local food and personal, environmental and societal benefits. Whilst alternative food networks have sought to reconnect producers and consumers following concerns about food traceability and quality (La Trobe, 2001, Miele, 2001, Marsden and Sonnino, 2008) there is nothing to demand that food traded through such networks is produced in an environmentally sustainable manner (see for example, Jones et al., 2004, Ilbery and Maye, 2005). Farmers' markets have provided producers with the opportunity to sell produce direct to consumers, cutting out the middle man and thus hopefully receiving better monetary rewards for their products. However, there is little else that can be guaranteed about the production process or product quality.

From these discussions it may be unsurprising that disputes and mis-understandings occur between those within these networks of food distribution but such problems ultimately affect the ability to connect with similar others and thus the ability to use these networks to increase individual resilience. Creating a common goal or standard within and across these networks may therefore help to connect those within it, improving relations and enhancing social interaction. Section 7.1 explores the generic FARMA standards, how they have been interpreted by those at GFM and the tensions they have created. Section 7.2 then moves on to discuss the positive aspects of these locally negotiated standards and the difficulties to formalise them, (i.e. the balance of

standardisation and flexibility). It appears that it is this delicate balance that can help develop both farmers' individual resilience and the resilience of the farmers' market as a whole.

7.1 Defining a Farmers' Market

As explained in Chapter Four, one reason for selecting GFM as the case study within this research project was that through being certified by the National Farmers' Retail and Market Association (FARMA) it displayed at least some definition as to what a farmers' market is. Production related alternative food networks such as organic production are regulated by external bodies (see Chapter Two), ensuring that all food carrying specific labels adheres to the rules and regulations of the specific production techniques. This regulation is not applied to distribution based alternative food networks but through establishing an accreditation scheme FARMA has sought to provide at least some kind of definition to the term 'farmers' market'. The basic principles or perhaps vital ingredients of a farmers' market are defined through the following six rules as laid out by FARMA (2012):

- 1. Locally produced**
Only produce from the defined area shall be eligible for sale at a farmers' market. Producers from the area defined as **local** must be given preference.
- 2. Principal producer**
The principal producer, a representative directly involved in the production process or a close family member must attend the stall.
- 3. Primary, own produce**
All produce sold must be grown, reared, caught by the stallholder within the defined local area
- 4. Secondary, own produce**
All produce must be brewed, pickled, baked, smoked or processed by the stall holder using at least one ingredient grown or reared within the defined local area. The base product should be substantially altered
- 5. Policy and information**
Information should be available to customers at each market about the rules of the market and the production methods of the goods on offer. The Market should also publicise the availability of this information.
- 6. Other rules**
Markets may establish other criteria in addition to the above provided they do not conflict with the core criteria.

This certification scheme appears to provide a clear definition of who can and can not trade at a farmers' market. It creates a standard for a farmers' market that can be validated and for FARMA signifies the 'first step towards running a true farmers'

market' (National Farmers' Retail and Market Association, 2012). However, as these rules are enforced they will be interpreted. As discussed in Chapter Two, many assumptions are made about 'local food' and interpretations will begin to define these ideas of 'local food' and the meaning of farmers' markets to those involved within them. Much as new scripts emerged in Chapter Five to define post-productivist farmers and producers similar scripts will begin to emerge as these rules are interpreted and enforced. This chapter will therefore turn to examine some of these scripts and the difficulties these create when attempting to define a farmers' market and enforce specific market standards.

7.1.1 A geographical definition of 'local'

Chapter Two identified that farmers' markets are a type of distribution related 'alternative' food network. Through reducing food miles and keeping food distribution 'local' these food systems are seen to be less environmentally damaging than the globalised food system that dominates the mainstream food supply in the UK. GFM promotes this geographical definition of 'local' food through strictly defining the radius in which producers must lie in order to trade at the market. Ilbery and Maye (2006) identify that it is usual to define local food using a specific distance, geographical or political boundary, including county and National Park boundaries. At GFM every producer must fall within a 50 mile radius from the town as the crow flies, meaning that certain producers who fall just outside the county are able to trade within the market although the majority of producers fall within the county boundary. This clearly upholds the first rule imposed by the FARMA certification scheme.

Hinrichs (2003) questions if the distance that defines 'local' food should be uniform or whether it should differ between basic items (e.g. vegetables and meat) and luxury items. In the instance of GFM the definition is strict regardless of the food type and regardless of whether there is anything available from outside the 50 mile radius that is not available within it. The county is fortunate with its varied geography and climate enabling a whole variety of primary production, including meat, fish, vegetables and soft fruits. In an area with less diversity of production it may be necessary to set a radius limit to ensure the balance and availability of products was sufficient to attract consumers. Restricting the production area to 50 miles provides a great variety and balance of products at GFM whilst providing a geographical definition of 'local' that can be identified by market users. Importantly for GFM this

provides a link to the area, felt to be essential at least throughout the summer as tourists flock to this popular destination. Identifying food to a specific local region, in this instance within the county, is thought to increase the quality attributed to products (Loureiro and McCluskey, 2000) and thus creates an image that tourists will purchase. This image reminds them of the county and their holiday experience, allowing them to take home a little piece of the county.

I'm told on many occasions that the county is a prime tourist area and whilst I don't know all the regulars who use the different stalls at the market it is obvious when Easter weekend arrives, and especially during the summer months, that there are different faces at the market, with many new people trying the products on offer and seemingly experiencing the market for the first time. Others come back to buy particular items they enjoyed the year before, remembering the products and stalls around the market from previous visits. I'm told by various producers around the market how they love seeing the tourists in the summer coming to the farmers' market to buy something local. Some producers get frustrated when holidaymakers have just arrived in the county and lack storage facilities to keep something for the week of their stay and won't still be on holiday in a fortnight when the next market is on, certain producers pass on details of other outlets where their products are sold or their farmshop encouraging tourists to call in as they make their way home- **Vignette 7 – The joy of tourists**

Although linking food to the county may promote sales amongst tourist visitors few producers at GFM identify this geographical distance and subsequent definition of 'local' as important in defining what a farmers' market is. Some producers felt there needed to be some flexibility in this ruling, particularly when it came to producers who perhaps fell just a few miles outside the radius but provided a product that was otherwise not available at GFM. Strict regulations can prevent small producers wishing to trial products and develop their business from trading at farmers' markets and here a debate opens as to how strict such rules and regulations should be. Without enforcing a strict definition there could be endless producers 'eligible' to trade at the market, yet a very strict definition with little or no flexibility can impact

the ability of businesses falling just outside defined geographical regions from benefitting from trading through these ‘alternative’ distribution networks.

Producer B tells me how they started their business and have sought to develop it. Initially they were unable to get into Aberystwyth Farmers’ Market due to their being no stall vacancies and it was for that reason that they decided to travel down to Garrington. They did some town markets but they were a disaster. She tells me how there is just such a different feel to a town market that sells anything and everything compared to the focus of a farmers’ market. Their plan, as a business, has been to start doing farmers’ markets with the long term aim being to own a café. They wanted to use the markets to try things out, to see what worked. She tells me with a smile that they had lots of grand ideas and needed to work out which would work. For them the lack of farmers’ markets was a bit of a problem. She notes that there are only a few farmers’ markets in their local area and a number of those have recently closed or are quite small. She comments that they were lucky. They just fall within the radius to allow them to trade at Garrington and she comments that whilst the mileage restrictions are good in a way, particularly for those concerned with food miles, they can be very restrictive. Quite simply if you are outside the mileage then you are ‘buggered’ –**Extract from field diary-22nd November, 2010, Visit to Producer B**

This extract begins to uncover some of the concerns and difficulties of strictly defining ‘local’ in terms of distance; how to keep a focus, create an image and provide a connection between the food and the area it has originated from alongside ensuring the market is beneficial to as many producers as possible and providing a sufficient diversity in products available so as it attracts many consumers. Defining secondary produce as ‘local’ becomes even more problematic with FARMA’s ruling clearly stating that when trading secondary products at a farmers’ market they must include ‘at least one ingredient grown or reared within the defined local area’ (National Farmers’ Retail and Market Association, 2012). However, for many bread and cake producers their flour may be sourced from local, small wholesalers but for most the product is not grown and milled within the 50 mile radius. The same is true of

preserve makers who have to source fruits out of season from beyond the radius to meet the year round demand for products. This highlights the ideal of defining a local radius yet the challenges faced in strictly enforcing it when seeking to provide a service to consumers and a regular outlet for producers. These findings support Feagan's (2007: 34) assertion that defining local in terms of distance alone 'is not neat or easily containable'. It is necessary therefore to begin to investigate other associations made when defining 'local' food. In many ways this is summed up by a quote from a conversation with one specific market producer demonstrating that local food is not simply about place of production but also about consumers having direct contact with producers.

'Okay the mangoes don't grow in the UK but we make all of this' -**Producer AA**

7.1.2 Direct contact between producers and consumers

The second of FARMA's certifying criteria clearly states that produce sold on each stall, whether it is primary or secondary produce, must be produced by the stallholder or someone closely connected to the stallholder. For many producers at GFM it was this restriction on the products allowed to be sold that provided a clear definition of a farmers' market and a clear distinction between a farmers' market and other markets where local produce was sold.

I was invited by Producer J to visit their business on the day of their town's 'local produce' market. She wanted me to see what had been set up to promote local food in their small town but importantly for me to see the difference between their 'local produce' market and the 'farmers' market'. When I arrived she took me around and introduced me to a few stallholders before insisting that I popped into their house for a cup of tea and then took a tour of their water mill. I took the opportunity to chat to her about what she felt the difference was between the local produce market and the farmers' market. She was very quick to answer this question, responding that at the farmers' market the produce was theoretically connected to the producer. She pointedly says 'theoretically' because she has concerns about the appropriateness of some of the stalls at GFM. She continues to tell me

that on their stall at the local produce market they sold local eggs, produced by Producer I at GFM. This saved him having to take another day out of production. He was unlikely to make enough money at the market to justify taking a whole day away from his production site and deliveries but eggs were felt to be an essential product that would otherwise be missing from the local produce market. She felt that as producers who had worked together she knew the product and could provide information about them, providing contact details for the producer should any questions be asked that she was unable to answer. Due to this there was still a good connection to the local area which justified the eggs being sold at the local produce market but importantly this lack of direct contact between consumer and producer stood the 'local produce' market apart from the 'farmers' market'. **–Extract from field diary-9th November, 2010, Day at Local Produce Market and Producer J's Watermill**

Guaranteeing that all produce on offer at GFM is sold directly by the producer provides an even playing field for all those trading at the market. Whilst for some producers it would be obvious if they bought in products that they did not produce themselves, such as one vegetable producer who is regularly asked if he sells bananas and pineapples, other producers could more easily bring in similar products to their own (e.g. beef or lamb) and consumers would be unaware. This clear and direct rule that only products produced by stallholders can be sold by them at GFM thus appears to safeguard producers. Whilst this may be beneficial to the producers at the farmers' market, observations made whilst working on different stalls across GFM appear to demonstrate that this is unrecognised by many market consumers.

I was surprised during my time at the market just how many times consumers would come up to a stall and ask if the produce on offer was all the stallholders own products. Some asked if the produce was local. On occasions this included regular market customers. It would appear that many people did not really know what the market was about. Many stallholders had signs around the stall or chalk boards that implied the products were 'home grown' or 'all their own'. Producer L had started putting her own

labels in her boxes of soft fruits. Each label had a picture of her or her husband on them and gave the location of their farm. Producer L commented that it was only when she started doing this that people seemed to realise that all the produce sold was local.- **Vignette 8 – Consumer understandings**

This begins to demonstrate that through protecting producers and ensuring all are required to sell only their own products a distinct market is created, differentiating a farmers' market from other local markets. It ensures that consumers can glean any information they may require from producers demonstrating that this certifying criteria ensures that consumers and producers are reconnected. Kneafsey (2010) views this as a distinctive feature that sets 'local' food purchasing apart from purchasing food through conventional lines. This demonstrates that the terms 'local' and 'farmers' market' are not necessarily defined by the distance food products travel but are distinctive as 'the product reaches the consumer embedded with information' (Marsden et al., 2000: 425). Consumers have the opportunity to ask questions and to seek information, although production methods are rarely probed once consumers establish the products are local, and more importantly, are being sold directly by the producer. Producers at GFM do work hard to engage with consumers either directly through conversation or through images and signs on their market stalls to provide information and a connection to the production process. This is discussed in greater detail in Section 7.1.3 below.

7.1.3 Demonstrating product quality

Connecting consumers directly with producers does not necessarily guarantee quality and does not result in consumers assuming quality. However, it is felt that consumers use the direct contact with producers to gain trust, as 'some feature of the production process is known, we know where it comes from, what it is made of, who made it' (Pratt, 2008: 64). This trust provides an element of assurance to consumers about product quality, even if questions are not asked directly about products. The direct contact between producers and consumers thus promotes trust. Whilst simply labelling products in supermarkets to provide an element of traceability is thought to have little value to consumers, being able to link traceability and quality assurance at a farmers' market is seen to hold much greater value (Verbeke and Ward, 2006). This

begins to unpack the value of directly linking consumers and producers, uncovering reasons why 'local' food has become synonymous with notions of authenticity and quality. However, this value does not happen without an effort. Producers have to display their credentials, to understand what consumers are seeking from them, to engage with these ideas and expectations and to 'sell' the image that they assume is being sought by those using these alternative food networks.

Just looking around the market any passer-by can glean so much information. Stalls display banners 'shouting' about what they produce and where it's from that can be read from a distance which doesn't then pressurize anyone wandering through the market to engage in conversation should they wish just to 'take in' the market rather than commit to purchases. The banner on Producer U's stall proudly displays the three generations of the family involved in production. Not only does it show the people involved but it has a warmth about it, an image of the family farm with generations living and working together. Producer U feel this personal touch, the personal story of how the farm has developed and continues to thrive, is important at the farmers' market. Producer R displays no photographs instead opting for what could be described as 'funky' labels. The labels they are colourful and fun. They have been developed to catch the customer's eye. Producer R feels the labels represent the playfulness of their animals and this is drawn out through their publicity. It's definitely eye-catching. The look of each animal gives it a different character and in this instance it really brings the food to life. Other stalls rely on their products to 'do the talking' and come late autumn and into the winter one stall displays what could be described as 'the real product'. Alongside their stuffed pheasant breasts and whole pheasant crowns Producer T hangs two brace of pheasants, clearly demonstrating exactly what these products are. It gives the stall a different feel; some people seem to like it, others don't. Producer T tells me how they have to be really careful what they put on their stall; they put a pig's head on the stall one week and were told it was cruel, both by those who did and didn't eat meat. Having displayed pictures of piglets on their publicity

material they discovered that it put people off purchasing meat as the piglets were seen as 'cute'. For this reason they have also chosen not to sell rabbit at the market as consumers think that killing a 'bunny' is cruel - **Vignette 9 – Displaying an 'image'**

Vignette 9 demonstrates that producers seek to provide information they feel will allow consumers to connect to their products. Producers perceive that this connection is sought by consumers and 'play' on what they assume consumers will be comfortable with. For instance, consumers may wish to eat meat but perhaps don't really want to engage with the truth of exactly where it comes from when they are purchasing products. In addition to understanding these consumer tendencies, once a consumer is drawn to look closely at products with the potential to make a purchase producers feel it is essential that the quality of products are both displayed and able to be explained. Even if 'local' food has become synonymous with 'authentic' food (Pratt, 2008) consumers will still use 'quality cues' (Oude Ophius and Van Trijp, 1995) when making food choices. As Morgan (2008) notes, the price and taste of food are still extremely important in food purchases decisions. Whilst product imperfections may be seen as more acceptable by consumers using 'alternative' food networks (Kirwan, 2004) these must be understood by consumers. In order to secure sales producers must ensure consumers understand the products on offer.

Even though quality assumptions are made about 'local' food and therefore the food on offer at GFM, it is apparent from observations that producers are required to demonstrate food quality using the contact to consumers to both physically demonstrate quality and to provide information about products to ensure consumers are convinced of their quality.

Whilst I've never doubted it I'm regularly told that the day at the farmers' market is hard work. Not only has it involved an early rise and for some a good length drive, followed by unpacking a van and setting up a stall whatever the weather, it then involves a day standing behind the stall, acknowledging and smiling at passers-by to welcome anyone to the stall. Many producers recount the story to me of a previous producer who used to sit behind the stall all day reading a paper and then complain at the lack of

sales. Every producer acknowledges that to make sales there is a necessity to engage with people, to welcome consumers regardless of whether they make a purchase or not. Interacting with people provides the personal touch otherwise missing within the shopping environment and adds to the 'market experience'. For some, chatting with consumers and answering questions provides a way to display who they are, displaying their character and sense of humour. Producer E tells me of some of the jokes he has with consumers. If someone asks 'oh no cream today?' he likes to reply with silly answers, such as 'No Daisy my cream cow is having today off'. He comments that many consumers have no idea this is a joke but it provides them with a story they can connect with, the story of Daisy and Mildred the cows.

For other producers the direct connection to consumers helps them to promote their product, to dispel myths and to assure consumers of quality. These are all essential if the products are to sell regularly. During hot weather this can be essential for Producer I, who informs me that when it is hot chickens can often drink too much. This results in a runny white of an egg. To some people a runny white is a sign of an old egg, which as the producer acknowledges it is, but it is also a sign of chickens drinking too much. He wants his customers to be assured of the quality and freshness of his products and being able to let them know of this problem through face-to-face interaction at the farmers' market it assured him that they would continue to appreciate the quality of this product. This knowledge transfer is noted too by Producer AB, who comments they are educating people who didn't know what kale was, what the different coloured tomatoes were or didn't know that aubergines came smaller than the massive ones in the shops. They find making sales a challenge, often having to prove and explain the quality of their product. Many of their products are smaller than those seen in the supermarket due to where and how they are grown. For this reason Producer AB has to persuade consumers they are still good quality products. Once customers try the products this is often acknowledged but making a sale in the first place needs time, patience and interaction.

For other producers there is a necessity not just to educate consumers as to what a product is but to confirm that they can eat it. I'm told by Producer K that their diabetic range of jams and preserves doesn't sell well in local shops but through engaging directly with consumers at the market they have the opportunity to explain their diabetic, no added sugar range of products. Therefore instead of people assuming they cannot have jam as they associate jam with sugar they find that through understanding the specifics of the product it opens new opportunities to consumers. **–Vignette 10 – Proving product quality to consumers**

For some producers in order to make the volume of sales required and attract as many consumers as possible to their market stall it is easier to follow the expectations and standards already set through conventional lines, such as the supermarkets.

We started the day by pulling carrots. The tractor loosened the ground and we followed. We had to break the tops (leaves/stem) off all the carrots, leaving them in the field and any carrots which weren't straight or perfect looking were discarded onto the field. I was surprised by this but I'm told this is what customers want. They want perfect looking, clean vegetables, 'it's what the supermarket has made us used to'. Once we'd pulled enough carrots it was back to the yard to wash them down. I'm told I'm lucky, they've recently had a brand new barn complex installed so the washing is now carried out indoors. Before the barn was built all the washing had to be done outside as there was not a large enough covered area for the washer. Whatever the weather the vegetables had to be washed and it sounded as if it was a welcome relief that they finally had somewhere undercover to work. The carrots are tipped into a big machine that is about half filled with water. This spins around, like a giant washing machine, and gradually feeds the carrots out onto a conveyor belt. I stand on a little platform next to the belt, checking all the carrots that come out. I stand nearest to the washer so as another worker can double check any of the carrots I've checked. We have to ensure they are straight, clean, all the stems have been removed and they are without significant blemishes. Any that don't fit the bill get thrown into

the bucket from the tractor and will be fed to the cows later on. It's fast work. Theoretically the checks in the field should have prevented too many that are not good enough getting through the washer but the conveyor belt has to be slowed a couple of times during the checking process. I'm not as quick as the others normally are and it's essential I don't let a carrot pass that is not good enough for the market. **–Extract from field diary-11th November, 2010, Day working at Producer A's Farm**

It becomes apparent from the extract above that not every producer has the same outlook at GFM. Some businesses may enjoy trading at GFM. They provide a good quality local product but have less of a desire to 'teach' consumers about its quality attributes. Instead they wish to appeal to the 'everyday' consumer who is seeking convenience and both products and quality they can immediately recognise. Whilst such producers uphold the quality of products available at the market they are driven more by sales and economic resilience than by engaging with consumer education and altering consumer expectations. The presence of such producers is questioned by some at GFM with the idea that their approach and outlook limits others ability to enhance consumers' perspectives of food quality. Here there is an interpretation of the market by some producers; in other words, market 'rules' are being interpreted to fit local producer expectations. Assumptions here are made about food quality and authenticity of production methods, an aspect more frequently linked to the size of business by producers at GFM and discussed in the following section.

7.1.4 Local food and business size

From the discussions in Section 7.1.1 above it can be seen that having a geographical boundary to define 'local' food helps to limit the producers who can trade at GFM. However, as Winter (2003: 1) suggests 'most food production is locally based'. For instance, a large cheese making company who sources milk from farmers within a specific county to produce cheese on a large scale in order to supply supermarkets are 'local' in their place of production. Such a company may be seen as a locally based food production company, sourcing their main primary product from one particular geographical location and whilst they may not seek to trade at a farmers' market if they did it would raise the question as to whether such a company has a place at a

farmers' market. Indeed, Hinrichs (2003: 2) states that the term 'localization' is 'often invoked as a counterpoint to globalisation' and if 'alternative' food networks are seeking to move away from 'the standardized, industrialised commodity markets of an increasingly globalised food and agricultural system' (Hinrichs et al., 2004: 31) such large businesses, seeking to trade primarily through mainstream distribution channels, may not have a place to trade at farmers' markets.

Whilst this issue of business size does not appear in the certifying criteria laid out by FARMA it was strongly debated by producers at GFM. As discussed in Chapter Five there was a suggestion amongst many producers that production and trading was a lifestyle choice not just a job. Importantly in the instance of determining who should and should not be allowed to trade at GFM there was a necessity for all producers to be living this life of production rather than simply producing for a hobby. It was felt by many producers that if a stallholder was simply producing for a hobby they had no requirement to succeed, to make sales and to develop economic resilience. The same could be said of a very large producer who does not rely on the market day to make a significant amount of sales but attends through providing a product that is otherwise unavailable at the market. If they did not rely on the market for a necessary income it was felt that they would not work with all the other producers to create a market community and this community is seen as essential to securing trade. All producers are expected to play their part in developing a good atmosphere around the market.

It was reported that the market on Good Friday would have an Easter theme. There would be an Easter egg trail like last year where there were Easter eggs on different stalls and in different places. There was some amusement as producers remembered that one had been hidden in one producer's hat last year. The general feeling was that this was great for the market and as children want to join in they end up taking their parents around the stalls looking for all the eggs. Everyone was encouraged to make an effort on Good Friday by decorating their stalls. There is also to be an Easter bonnet competition on Good Friday with the winners getting a free stall for the day so everyone was strongly encouraged to take part and make the Good Friday market a good day for all involved. **–Extract from field diary-15th March, 2010, Farmers' market committee meeting**

Beyond this choice of lifestyle one of the most important features of a producer at GFM was that every producer should be a small producer without other outlets.

Producer I doesn't really feel the farmers' market is for those who have outlets already. It's for the cottage producers of chutneys and jams and such, not the 'big boys' who already have shops. There was a clear distinction here between producers at GFM who were seen to have 'a couple of shops, a café and an industrial unit' to produce and sell their products and his supply to local shops and the local independent supermarket. **–Extract from field diary-26th January, 2010, Day working at Producer I's Farm**

Producer B told me the market 'should be for those without an outlet' but then was quick to acknowledge that they sold to wholesalers as we'd just been speaking about that. Wholesalers were not the type of outlet that she was referring to; she specifically meant producing at a scale that supported an outlet primarily selling just your produce. She commented that if they established the café that they had set out to when they started producing she would no longer be a suitable producer to trade at a farmers' market.- **Extract from field diary-22nd November, 2010, Visit to Producer B**

As is identified in both of these extracts there is a clear recognition that many producers would be selling through other outlets and whilst at first this seems to contradict the suggestions made above it emerges in the second extract that it is the scale of production which is seen to determine whether a producer should be allowed to trade at GFM. Through seeking to explore this idea further it appears that in the eyes of producers at GFM business size primarily equates to production methods. If producers were large, supplying many outlets or were able to open a shop selling only their own product all day every day the assumption was made that their products were not produced through authentic, traditional methods but based more on modern techniques much like those used by supermarkets. This is another instance where assumptions are made by producers about fellow market stallholders assuming their

production size and scale displays their production techniques, which are more often based on beliefs rather than facts (see Chapter Six).

Producer J felt the bakery would be so large it would use techniques such as cooking using steam and it would not be made by hand. They thought that the shop is sprayed with fragrance, much like the supermarkets do, so it smells nice but it is not actually bread cooking that is creating the smell. As the Producer X had a local shop Producer J presumed they were producing on a larger scale and therefore they felt they must be using non-traditional methods. Producer J did not think this was fair for other stallholders at the market and they definitely did not think the producer had a place to be trading at the farmers' market.-**Extract from field diary, 16th April 2010, Day working with Producer J at GFM**

Regardless of whether the assumptions made between producers at GFM are truthful it is clear that 'local' food comes to represent traditional techniques to many producers at GFM. Producers are expected to engage with their products, valuing what they produce and the resources that allow them to be produced in the manner which they are. This value and the love of production has already been discussed in Chapter Six. The drive by producers to define 'local' food through the production techniques used offers much agreement with the literature in this area. Feagan (2007: 26), for example, suggests that 'local' is perceived as a 'search for authenticity', this being tied to 'tradition, trust and place', with Pratt (2008: 56) concurring that 'the "local" is "authentic"'. For many producers, 'local' can therefore be determined or defined by the size of a business which is equated to the number of outlets it can support. However, such a definition is misleading as in reality it is not necessarily business size that is important but production methods.

7.1.5 Creating a balanced market

Alongside the assumptions and expectations made by producers at GFM the manner in which it is managed demonstrates further expectations as to what a resilient farmers' market should be. Therefore some discussion must be afforded to the management of GFM, the fact that it is managed as a whole entity, as a 'system' that to function effectively needs to co-operate and work together. In essence many

elements of resilience are displayed through this management, although it should be noted that the word resilient did not feature when management and focus were justified by market managers or producers.

A strict balance of market stalls are maintained ensuring GFM provides all the 'basic' foods that customers require every week; this includes meat, vegetables, eggs, bread and milk. In addition to this a selection of 'luxury' products such as jams, cakes and plants are also provided. The aim of this is to provide competition to the supermarket, ensuring consumers can purchase all the fresh products they may need from the market. A constant external 'stress' is provided by the supermarket, especially the pressure of providing everything a consumer may need in one location. It is this stress that the market is attempting at least to be resilient to. Diversity is reported as a key to resilience within ecological and economic systems to ensure that some elements survive when faced with shocks and stresses (Hanley, 1998, Hassink, 2010, Simmie and Martin, 2010), in this instance diversity is a key to maintain a resilient system, one which can challenge the threat of competition from the supermarket. Without this diversity it is assumed that many consumers would have to visit other shops to purchase their weekly shop.

The consistency provided by the supermarket appears to shape presumed expectations and determines product provision and stall allocation at GFM. The market is seen to be seeking stability, providing resilience through the appreciation of 'local needs and peculiarities' (Tobin, 1999: 23). This attention to detail ensures that the market continues to provide for consumers' needs and demands, replacing stalls to keep a balance within the market.

Discussion turned to attempting to seek a new producer to sell honey at the market. The previous stallholder (Producer Z) had decided to retire which didn't come as a big surprise to others due to his age. He'd been at the market for many years, had won the award of best producer as voted for by customers and was generally well regarded at the market. It was acknowledged that he would be missed. In addition to losing someone who was well regarded in the market this also meant there was no honey currently available at the market. It was decided that some other honey

farms would be approached to see if any of them would like a stall as this was something that would definitely be missed at the market.-**Extract from field diary-15th March, 2010, Farmers' market committee meeting**

Whilst maintaining constant availability of products there also appears a necessity to balance the number of producers trading specific items at GFM; this seeks to aid the economic significance the market holds for all producers trading at GFM. Monitoring the number of stalls providing competition to others may ensure that sales for each producer are adequate. Through doing this the market has an element of stability. Stalls remain constant and thus consumers can develop knowledge of specific products and producers. Producers feel this provides the opportunity for consumers to gain trust in them which is thought to be demonstrated through regular custom. This stability provides a regular and constant consumer base for the market and thus provides a constancy that suggests market resilience. However, just as the definition of local and the radius in which producers can attend the market is detrimental to some producers, so too is the balance of produce with unfortunate affects on some new market stallholders. The market manager requests that certain new producers trading at the market do not bring their whole product range if it is felt it will be detrimental to other producers already trading at GFM. For some producers this has a detrimental effect on the income of the market and can affect their ability to make a market day financially worthwhile.

Producer P felt that the standards can be too picky. The stall that used to be next to them wasn't allowed to sell a pies they made because it was felt there were other producers who already sold such products. He'd been invited specifically to sell his primary product and whilst the secondary products contained this primary product he wasn't allowed to sell them. He clearly felt it was too restrictive. Ultimately the market was not profitable enough and hence he stopped trading. Producer P felt that had he been allowed to bring his full product range the market would have been more economically worthwhile. -**Extract from field diary-25th November, 2010, Day working at Producer P's production site**

Identifiable in this case is the idea of competition, seen as a factor of resilience (Hanley, 1998, Levin et al., 1998, Bristow, 2010). The market appears to seek at least some stability through ensuring competition between producers is not too great but ultimately this could be at the detriment to new producers and stallholders. Emerging here is a tension between the adaptability of the market, a trait that would demonstrate its resilience, and the idea that the managers are perhaps caught into at least some kind of distinction that there is a single state, a balance that the market currently has and should be maintained. Whilst new and different producers are welcomed to the market it can be seen that when products are thought to be missing they are sought to fill this perceived gap in the market and where new producers are perceived to represent competition to others that may change the current shape of the market they are requested to limit the range of products they sell. This demonstrates the tensions between creating a resilient market, one which can provide the services required to consumers in a form they recognise each time they visit and the need to ensure that the market aids economic resilience through profitability for every producer. Without allowing for change, adapting and encouraging healthy competition it may be suggested that the market is built on original foundations that once they fail, or once producers decide to move on from the market, the subsequent stress will affect the market as a whole. If the market were able to evolve and change over time such a stress may have a less damaging overall effect. As suggested by Levin et al (1998: 227), the use of ‘simplistic management regimes’ can lead to the loss of long term ‘robustness and resilience’. Resilience requires flexibility (Hanley, 1998, Adger, 2000, Barnes, 2009) and the resilience of GFM may be determined by its ability to change as circumstances and demands change, rather than the management seeking to keep the market at an absolute constant state.

Creating a good balance to the market and managing it as a whole entity may be difficult but through doing this there appears a joint responsibility between producers to work together to create the ‘image’ of the market and to uphold the quality of the products on offer. In Section 7.1.3 the nature of direct sales was discussed demonstrating how interactions promote quality products and that quality often becomes associated with direct sales as producers have regular contact with consumers. Every member of the market is expected to ‘take part’ in the market day,

to greet consumers, to create the market experience and this includes providing good quality products.

There had been a lot of discussions about one stall at the market, what they should be selling and whether the quality of their products is good enough. The market manager has suggested that other similar producers pop along and speak to the new producer, not only to make them feel welcome but also to discuss product range and how to perhaps improve the quality of their products. Producer O lets me know that they had a friend who didn't regularly use the market who asked what had happened to the quality, suggesting that it was 'like a boot fayre'. Producer O had attributed this to the slightly different nature of the new stall. This was critical to them, that the presence of one stall could make such a difference, especially when it was a stall that provided competition to them. They didn't want people to think that all the stalls selling that particular product lacked quality. **–Extract from field diary, 7th December 2010, Day working at Producer O's Nursery**

Once again this demonstrates that whilst unwritten in the official market rules, regulations and standards there are expectations of how to create GFM, the produce that should be on offer and the atmosphere that should be created. Without these expectations the market lacks a true purpose but with such expectations comes a need for management that balances the resilience of the market with the profitability and resilience of producers.

7.2 Negotiating Standards and Expectations

Discussions in Section 7.1 clearly demonstrate the variety of interpretations of the term 'farmers' market' and the expectations and scripts that emerge between producers. The suggestion made by many producers is that the market should set out to support the producer, giving them a space to sell their products on an even platform to all others around them. If the market specifically sets out to benefit producers then their wishes and demands are surely important. Here it can be seen that these 'universal' FARMA standards are being interpreted locally by those within the market to provide what they hope to be the most appropriate and supportive environment in

which to sell their products. However, it is clear to see that there are a wealth of interpretations with different producers having different expectations of GFM. Seemingly it is this divergence of ideas that affected the ability of producers to develop a clear joint enterprise and utilise a shared repertoire as discussed in Chapter Six. Without these the market lacked the essential elements that would help to develop community relations and support the development of individual resilience. Even with the core criteria, as defined by FARMA, GFM appears to lack a clear and accepted definition. To overcome these issues this section explores the need for clear but flexible management to develop both the resilience of farmers' markets and those trading at them.

7.2.1 Creating universal markets with a local flavour

In Chapter Six the lack of a clear joint enterprise and shared repertoire were identified as key features that prevented information sharing between producers at GFM, both essential elements to create a community of practice (Wenger, 1998). Through establishing common themes, understandings and expectations, as explored in Section 7.1, it may be suggested that there is an underlying joint enterprise at GFM with many producers supporting the same defining criteria (i.e. wishing to provide good quality, local food direct to consumers). However, at present this is merely a script, a set of expectations and it is these individual interpretations as partly explored in Chapter Six that prevent trust from building between parties at GFM. Just as the scripts in the productivist regime of agriculture resulted in assumptions being made about production ability through visible attributes of farms (Burton, 2004, Burton and Wilson, 2006), scripts at GFM result in producers' methods of production and thus product quality and authenticity being judged by their perceived production size. Through creating such scripts there becomes an element of inclusion and exclusion of people from this network and due to this building strong ties with others will remain difficult. It is apparent that some kind of standards are required. Without any standards as to who can attend GFM, where they come from and the person who mans the stall during the market day there is seemingly very little that directly connects the producers involved. Without this connection and standard, trust is unlikely to develop, the market atmosphere is not created and its 'alternative' nature would be called into question. Essentially, to develop a system that can seek to be resilient, there is a necessity to have some overarching factors that define the system and those

involved in it, bringing actors together with a common cause who can then work together for the benefit of all involved.

Here then a tension appears. Standardisation can provide an identity for farmers' markets that could develop the resilience of farmers trading at them. It can also create a precedent of the quality of the market itself, indeed a producer who had moved into the region suggests that FARMA certification provides a distinction to markets, regardless of where they are in the UK.

There's a new stall appeared at the market. As they are just finding their feet Producer AA couldn't accommodate me for a day volunteering but they said I should pop across for a chat one market day. I take them up on the offer and establish that they've been trading and organising farmers' markets for around 12 years now, mainly in the East of England. This provides an ideal opportunity for me to probe the differences between markets as they have first-hand experience of trading elsewhere but I'm quickly told that farmers' markets are the same across the UK. After a pause I'm then told that of course the best ones have FARMA certification. This certification provides clear guidelines and rules so people know that it is what it says it is and it is the producer who is selling it. **–Extract from field diary, 21st January 2011, Day at GFM**

However, farmers' markets have emerged from post-productivist agriculture and discussions in Chapter Two detailed that this new era of agriculture allowed for variation and sought to move away from standards, protocols and a set of specific expectations that surrounded the productivist agricultural regime. Indeed Law (2006) suggests that adherence to strict regulations caused the 2001 Foot and Mouth Disease outbreak to become as widespread as it did. The pressure to follow regulations saw the decline in the number of slaughterhouses which ultimately resulted in increased travel for animals and thus the disease had already spread across the UK before it was even detected (Law, 2006). The pressure of such regulations and the methods of production that are seen within productivist agriculture resulted in a call by consumers to increase the traceability of food and from this emerged the demand for 'alternative'

production and distribution food networks. With this in mind and with suggestions that an agriculture ‘less dependent on the aspiration to uniformity’ is ‘less vulnerable’ (Law, 2006: 238) and arguably more resilient, the question is raised as to the necessity of standards and regulations to govern farmers’ markets.

Here then the importance of Timmerman and Berg’s (1997) ‘local universality’ is highlighted. Post-productivist agriculture is still governed by agricultural policies but these are interpreted by differing farmers in differing ways. This has created a diversified agricultural landscape, created to suit local conditions and individual farmer’s needs. This local universality is seen throughout the discussions in Section 7.1, the interpretation of the FARMA standards. The ‘universal’ market standards are being negotiated by those at GFM to make them fit the local conditions and the local expectations. It is such local negotiations that allow for farmers’ markets to have a universal meaning and identity but to also reflect the specifics of the local environment and to support local producers in a manner which is appropriate to them, the local conditions and the specific challenges being faced. It is this flexibility and diversity that will allow for these spaces to potentially provide resilience to those trading within them across the UK.

However, the discussions in Section 7.1 coupled with the ideas of a ‘good’ producer emerging from Chapter Five have demonstrated the complexities and difficulties when standards are locally interpreted but not formalised. Currently at GFM the FARMA standards have been interpreted by local farmers and producers but these interpretations have not been formalised. When so many interpretations exist without formalisation there is seemingly no process through which to guarantee that producers adhere to the expectations held by market traders. Of course, any formalisation of standards would be a tricky process; decisions around the scripts that were to be formalised would throw up issues of power and hierarchy within the market and as already expressed in Chapter Six as human actors become increasingly important in decision making issues of power, hierarchy and trust create difficulties in creating a system that would promote resilience. However, it is this that would bring together the local ideas of the universal FARMA standards to provide a common goal for those within the farmers’ market to work by. This common goal has been shown in Chapter Six to be vitally important in the social production of resilience. Here then, to create a resilient system there is the need for effective governance (Levin et al., 1998) that

seeks to understand the common issues and interpretations of producers, developing effective and suitable standards and criteria based on these. Through this communication a 'greater degree of internal closure' (Hudson, 2008: 174) is more likely to develop and thus would seek to aid collective community working.

7.2.2 Standardisation and flexibility

The discussions in Section 7.2.1 above clearly demonstrate the need for standards, which may be locally interpreted, to provide an identity for each farmers' market, a connection between producers to develop trust between them and thus to provide an environment in which resilience can be socially developed. However, whilst systems may need a definition to bring actors together the discussions in Chapter Three demonstrated the need for adaptability in order to develop resilience, the idea that within resilient systems 'there is no single stable state' (Barnes, 2009: 393). Rigid adherence to standards does not encourage resilience and a flexible system that allows for adaptation is seen to be the key to developing a resilient system. To develop a resilient market there is a necessity for any management regime to remain flexible to demands to allow and support adaptations. Careful management is required to allow for flexibility whilst maintaining the principles of this 'alternative' food network. Adaptive capacity resilience allows for this gradual change over time but in the case of farmers' markets exploring the ability to be flexible and adapt over time highlights the delicate nature of keeping the definition of a system, in this instance the definition of a farmers' market, whilst allowing it to adapt and change in order to cope with challenges.

From the discussions earlier in this chapter the difficulties of flexibility are highlighted. FARMA standards allow each individual market to provide their own definition of the 'local' area, whether this is based on a specific radius or some distinguishable boundary, such as a national park or county boundary. Once set, a 50 mile radius in the case of GFM, how flexible should this standard be? If a producer falls just 50.1 miles away from the market the standard dictates they cannot trade at GFM; but what if they provide a product currently unavailable within the set radius that would add to the product range, should they be allowed to trade at the market? Would this additional product add to the diversity and thus resilience of the market or would accepting the producer diminish the market definition? Is this standard a core element of the market and would flexibility undermine the market system and the

‘alternative’ nature of the system? Perhaps accepting a new producer who supplies something otherwise unavailable from within the set radius is acceptable if they adhere to all other standards. The producer must therefore be the one working the market stall and selling direct to consumers. Indeed this latter standard at GFM was the most important distinction between a farmers’ market and other local food markets. Yet, even if this standard were upheld when would the flexibility stop, how far out of the designated ‘local’ area could traders come from before it completely contradicted the ‘alternative’ nature of producing to supply a ‘local’ market, demonstrating an identity of an area through food provision.

The market should be managed in a manner that allows for change appreciating the notion that change over time can develop resilience (Pike et al., 2010, Simmie and Martin, 2010, Martin, 2011). Stalls can come and go, new products can be offered and perhaps embracing competition can enhance producers’ resilience and thus the resilience of the market altogether. Through allowing a balance of stalls that provide competition to one another it would be hoped that these will all seek to ensure they have an excellent quality product, building the reputation of the market in providing high standard products. It is this change and adaptation that will aid the long-term resilience of the market, bringing in new producers with potentially different ideas, ideas that can be shared amongst others building the resilience of individual producers and additionally the resilience of the farmers’ market.

Here there is a delicate balance between standardisation and flexibility. Section 7.2.1 clearly demonstrates the need to allow any universal standards to be adapted locally but in order for them to aid the development of resilience there must be some formalisation of these adaptations. This definition of standards to aid individual resilience must be balanced with the flexibility to allow for a system’s resilience. In Chapter Five a decent and moral farmer was identified as one who made decisions not just based on how it would affect them but how it would affect others around them. For a farmers’ market to remain resilient this approach must be taken, considering all those involved and seeking the adaptations that would benefit as many people as possible. The essence of a farmers’ market is that it should demonstrate the identity of a specific local area, supporting the local producers within each specific location. This identity and their demands are likely to change over time and it is important that whilst the ‘alternative’ nature of the farmers’ market is maintained there is sufficient

flexibility within market standards allowing them to support the demands of the farmers involved. It is this that will aid the development of farmers' individual resilience which will ultimately affect the resilience of the market as a whole.

7.3 Conclusion

This chapter has sought to explore the definition(s) of a farmers' market and the delicate nature of attempting to draw together individual producer ideas in order to create some kind of standard that would provide a common goal for all market producers. GFM is certified by FARMA meaning that by definition all food comes from within a 50 mile radius (as set by GFM) and is sold by the person who produces it or a close member of their family. The direct contact between producer and consumer was regarded by producers trading at GFM as a vitally important factor when defining a farmers' market and distinguishing it from other markets that may sell 'local' produce. This connection between the two parties is recognised across the literature focused on alternative food networks as being a distinguishing element of local food production (Marsden et al., 2000, Kneafsey, 2010). However, in addition to these easily controllable and regulated rules producers also place importance on the food being of a good quality and produced using traditional techniques.

Through exploring the definition of GFM it becomes apparent that the generic FARMA standards are being negotiated to make them locally specific. This appears hugely important if farmers' markets are to represent the local area in which they are found, demonstrating the diversity that post-productivism has encouraged. Discussions suggest that there is a necessity to attempt to formalise and adopt some of the standards regarded as important by local producers. Through doing this it would be easier for producers to identify with a common goal and thus it would be hoped that they would be able to develop their relationships with those around them, increasing the strength of social ties and thus aiding their potential to develop greater economic resilience. However, parallel to developing individual producer's resilience there is also a need to ensure the system, the market, remains resilient. Here it becomes apparent that there is a need for effective governance, suggested by Levin et al (1998) as an essential element of a resilient system. Having such governance allows specific standards to be enforced and adhered to whilst allowing an element of flexibility, both essential elements of resilience (Gallopín, 2006, King, 2008, Simmie

and Martin, 2010). Importantly to create a shared goal there must be some standards but these standards must be adaptable over time. The market must therefore be allowed to evolve and adapt when faced with differing pressures in order to maintain a resilient system.

From this idealistic model difficulties emerge. There appears a necessity to keep at least some strictness to certain standards and regulations; without certain standards the market would not offer an alternative to other areas of food consumption. Whilst these may need to change with time it would appear that there are some essential elements, such as maintaining some definition of 'local' and importantly maintaining direct contact between producers and consumers. Discussions here agree that 'there is no single stable state' (Barnes, 2009: 393) but consideration must be given when applying the adaptive capacity notion of resilience to the amount of change that is possible before a system evolves into something entirely different to that which it set out to be. The delicate balance emerges between maintenance of specific attributes, in this instance implemented through rules and standards to give the system a common definition and link those within the system, and the need to embrace flexibility in order to maintain the resilience of the system as a whole.

It would seem that through allowing their local interpretation and negotiation common standards to define farmers' markets across the UK could help to develop market resilience. Such standards have the potential to create the identity of farmers' markets, an identity that could be recognised by consumers and set a standard that could help markets and those involved in running and trading at them to learn from others seeking to provide the best possible markets. This in turn would help markets to develop resilience as competition from supermarkets remains. Whilst investigating this element of information sharing and learning is beyond the scope of this study farmers and producers have voiced their experiences of trading at both 'good' and 'bad' farmers' markets. For the benefit of all producers, the ability for markets to learn of 'good practice' from other markets and to implement certain ideas in their local area may enhance the network of 'good' farmers' markets which would ultimately continue to be beneficial to many local producers. Essentially this 'good practice' and its associated standards would seek to provide an overall recipe to produce a farmers' market but each market would add their own local flavour to reflect the local environment.

Chapter 8: Conclusion

Introduction

The aim of this thesis has been to establish the role of farmers' markets in developing producer's resilience. Through a review of current literature it emerged that whilst those trading at farmers' markets have, in many cases, sought to diversify their incomes, adopting the post-productivist agricultural regime and thus seeking to be less vulnerable to specific production pressures, little research has been afforded to understand how these 'spaces' of post-productivism specifically aid farmers' resilience. Through seeking to understand the importance of the social contact and interaction with others provided within farmers' markets their importance to producers can be established and suggestions can be developed that would increase their usefulness in developing producer's individual resilience. Having begun to gather data and seeking to understand the market system it became apparent that separating individual producer's resilience and the market's resilience was tricky if not impossible. Interactions create opinions and these determine the pathway and adaptability of the market itself. Through exploring the market, as well as those within it, the definitions that emerged provided an insight into the difficulties in developing a resilient system and the consequences this has on determining how the system can help develop the resilience of the individual's within it.

This concluding chapter will begin by documenting the research findings, how these have fulfilled the research questions and their wider theoretical contribution. It then moves on to consider the limitations of the study, specifically acknowledging the difficulties of extrapolating these data from one case study to apply more widely to other farmers' markets. Finally, the chapter concludes with suggestions for further research that have emerged from this thesis.

8.1 Research Findings

This thesis set out to answer three research questions and the findings to these have been developed and discussed in Chapters Five, Six and Seven. The key findings are summarised within this section.

1. *-How do farmers display resilience to the differing challenges of production?*

Chapter Five discussed the challenges faced by producers at GFM, identifying that they are susceptible to both environmental and economic challenges but reacted differently depending on the nature of the shock or stress. The environmental challenges were established as short-term shocks that producers were constantly aware could affect their production but that were ultimately uncontrollable without a significant shift in production. However, economic challenges occurred more unexpectedly and were seen as longer term stresses. In order to cope with these external challenges producers required some element of adaptability, altering their products in accordance with demand. Discussions identified that whilst producers who trade within the post-productivist space of a farmers' market may be widely regarded as more adaptable and thus potentially more resilient they are still vulnerable to stresses and shocks and their responses to these do not show strong adaptive capacity and thus strong resilience. However, these discussions also highlighted difficulties of developing adaptive capacity. Farmers who produce a variety of items may have to significantly alter their choice of products if they are to remain resilient. Such adaptation requires time, money and a potential change in identity for the producer and thus there exists a delicate balance between developing and displaying adaptive capacity and remaining a producer of specific products.

2. How is resilience socially produced at farmers' markets?

Chapter Six focused on documenting and discussing the development of social networks and communities at GFM, seeking to establish whether this social interaction aided producer's coping and/or learning. The social contact to others was widely appreciated across the market by producers who were otherwise particularly isolated and not only gave them a chance to interact with others but to 'dress up' which itself provided emotional positivity. Discussions focused on investigating the presence of two particular kinds of community: a community of coping (Korczynski, 2003) and a community of practice (Wenger, 1998). Due partly to time pressures on a market day and partly assumptions, expectations and subsequently the cultural scripts that exist within the market, the market was not widely used to seek emotional support from other similar producers. However, market interactions demonstrated the importance of the market for producers in developing their appreciation of feeling valued. This developed through interaction with consumers, with producers learning of the value placed on their goods by others. It was this producer consumer

interaction that aided positivity, encouraging producers to overcome challenges and to sustain their life in production. Whilst the three elements of a community of practice, joint enterprise, mutual engagement and a shared repertoire (Wenger, 1998), were identifiable between producers at GFM it was apparent that there was little direct information sharing and learning that occurred between producers. This was attributed to a lack of trust, a sense of uneven power relations and thus a lack of strong social ties between producers, without which information was unlikely to be shared. These discussions highlighted the difficulty of applying the concept of resilience across different subject areas and the influence of human actors on the value of diversity and competition in developing resilience.

3. *How does the regulation of farmers' markets affect their resilience and the resilience of those trading at them?*

Chapter Seven sought to document and investigate the delicate balance of defining and perhaps standardising GFM, to give it a clear focus and to develop trusting relationships between those involved. The suggestion is that a resilient system requires flexibility and adaptability. Through the discussions it emerged that the primary feature of a farmers' market for those trading at GFM was that it directly connected producers with consumers and through this connection and interaction the produce on offer was of a good quality. There appears a necessity to allow the structure of the market to change with time and to allow different producers to trade at the market who may provide competition to those already there. This would allow the market to evolve over time but should involve some input from producers to determine the market make-up. However, there are some essential criteria, as suggested above, that require management and potential standardisation so that all producers are placed on a level playing field. It is hoped that such management will not only aid the resilience of the farmers' market but subsequently aid the development of producers' individual resilience through providing a clear joint enterprise and shared repertoire through which a community of practice could emerge.

Through these research questions this thesis has sought to establish the role that farmers' markets play in developing and sustaining producer resilience. From the discussions above it is apparent that certainly within GFM social resilience is developed through interactions with producers and consumers. Of particular

importance is the significance placed on interactions with consumers who value the products provided by producers. However, through a lack of trust, lack of shared definitions of the market, and the emergence of cultural ‘scripts’, strong social bonds are not developed between producers. Consequently, knowledge of innovations and adaptations is rarely passed between parties. This diminishes the role of the market in connecting producers to similar others and thus in developing their long term, economic resilience. It would appear that primarily this is due to the lack of a strict market structure and thus allows individual interpretations of market standards. Whilst this loose structure and thus flexibility may be seen as an element of resilience it appears that a stronger definition of farmers’ markets may provide a more consolidated approach by producers who could then develop trusting relationships with others sharing vital and useful information to strengthen the resilience of all involved.

8.1.1 Wider theoretical contribution

Resilience literature calls for resilience to be understood in an holistic manner (Bristow, 2010) and through taking an ethnographic approach to understand one specific ‘system’ this study has attempted to explore both the resilience within a system and the resilience of the system. Through seeking to understand not just the components of a system but the dynamics within the system this study has identified a number of difficulties in developing individual resilience alongside system resilience.

To be resilient, systems require diversity. This feature is seen across the resilience literature from ecosystems to economic systems. It is likely that in a diverse system at least some components are able to ‘weather’ stresses and strains, allowing a system to continue to function. However, when the resilience of a system relies on human innovation there appears a necessity to balance this diversity with commonality or specialisation. It is through sharing a similarity, a common goal that humans can identify with one another, forming social ties and communities. These social ties are essential if human actors are to learn from one another, to benefit from other’s knowledge, aiding their access to new ideas and innovations. Here then instead of seeing a dichotomy of diversity and specialisation the importance of both should be recognised. Diversity may aid the resilience of a whole system through providing differing elements that withstand specific challenges. However the idea that a diverse system aids resilience through providing access to new ideas from different places and

through different contact only works if there is some form of specialisation that makes this information applicable and accessible to others.

A resilient system also requires competition which is seen to encourage all actors within the system to constantly 'keep up' with others and with the changing and perhaps challenging environment around them. Yet it may be questioned how well such constant pressure from competition really aids individual's resilience? Here there seems a necessity to balance this competition with co-operation; that communal interactions, sharing of information and supporting others can benefit not just individual's resilience but subsequently the resilience of the whole system. Competition therefore should be valued not just due to its existence in a system but should be valued if it really provides the opportunities to communicate with competitors, to co-operate with competitors and thus to mutually develop the resilience of individual actors and subsequently the resilience of whole systems.

Through exploring the human interactions within GFM this study has highlighted the difficulties of the suggestions made above. Adding a human element to the understanding of resilience has uncovered the issues of power, hierarchy and trust. Without trust there is unlikely to be co-operation within systems; the definition of a chosen common goal to draw actors within a system together can produce uneven power relations, a hierarchy within the system and thus a lack of interactions. It is interactions and the access these provide to new knowledge and new ideas that can build resilience. Indeed it is this social capital that Horlings and Marsden (2011) regard as essential if a widespread, sustainable change is to be seen within the current agricultural system. They feel that localised dissemination and interpretation of new agro-ecological principles will lead to the ecological modernisation of agriculture and consequently a more sustainable (at both a global and local level) food system (ibid). So how can such issues be overcome? The suggestion made here is that this could be assisted through the implementation of certain standards.

Introducing standards would normally imply a reduction in flexibility, a key element of resilience. However, this is where local context, local negotiations and local implementation become vitally important. If standards can provide a clear aim, a mutual understanding between actors within systems, defined by those within it to suit their specific needs, this provides a commonality that links them. Through

formalising this definition within some form of standard those within the system can establish that they are following the same pathway, seeking the same common goal and it is hoped this would reduce assumptions made of others, reduce frictions between actors and create a more interactive, trusting and supportive system.

Farmers' markets have great potential to provide social networking opportunities to those trading at them, yet certainly within the case study in this research project this networking did not provide the knowledge exchange and learning that is so critical to support innovation and develop resilience. The pitfall here seems to be the lack of a clear definition of these 'alternative' food networks. Both producers and consumers alike make assumptions about what labels such as 'farmers' market' and 'local food' mean. Without a clear definition and mutual understanding the potential of these farm diversification activities to develop resilience is not exploited. The suggestion made here is that through providing a standard, an overarching guideline of what a farmers' market is, could help those within it to identify with and trust each other. Beyond this there is potential that through providing a 'common standard' a system of farmers' markets could develop, enhancing the networking opportunities between them, helping to share innovations, adaptations and 'good practice'. It must be recognised here that such 'alternative' food networks have emerged through a call to develop a diversified agricultural system. Consequently such standards must be negotiated and formalised at local levels within each specific local context. This is again important in the current widespread call for agricultural change promoting 'sustainable intensification' (Foresight, 2011, Goodman et al., 2012, Kirwan and Maye, 2013). In order to be sustainable, food production must be suited to specific local conditions, but if a significant global change is to be successful there have to be common aims and a clear direction for all the local or regional food systems that together make up the global agricultural system. Whilst this is called for in the academic literature promoting this agricultural change (see, for example, Foresight, 2011, Horlings and Marsden, 2011, Brunori et al, 2013, Hinrichs, 2013), there is much that can be learnt from 'alternative' food networks in how to create and negotiate standards in order to best promote networking and thus enhance resilience.

Such negotiations and formalisations promote the need for good governance within a resilient system. A resilient system is required to be flexible and adaptable. This thesis has grappled with difficulties of the applicability of adaptive capacity

resilience, the idea that systems are constantly changing and adapting. If ‘alternative’ food networks hold specific definitions and through this provide certain opportunities for both producers and consumers how adaptable are these systems? At what point does an adaptation alter something so much that it no longer represents what it set out to represent. Understanding how standards can be both universal and local can demonstrate this ability to adapt whilst keeping a specific focus. A key definition or meaning of a system can provide a system with stability, connecting those within it and the system to similar others but through constant local reassessments and adaptations the system remains constantly useful to those within it. Adaptations and flexibility mean that whilst being connected through a ‘standard’ or ‘goal’, systems can remain focused in specific local contexts, taking into consideration local factors, whilst seeking to aid the resilience of those within a specific system.

This research study has highlighted the importance of understanding the human element of any system, in order to successfully develop resilience. Negotiations, interpretations and expectations all affect the ability of humans to interact which is vitally important to access ideas and innovations needed to develop resilience. Specifically in the case of ‘local’ food and ‘farmers’ markets’ it suggests the importance of providing a clear definition of such labels. Through creating a clear standard or common goal the ambiguities could be dismissed and such environments would then hold greater potential in the social development of resilience. Through understanding elements of the farmers’ market system this study has demonstrated the need for resilient systems to balance diversity and specialisation, competition with co-operation and innovation with stability. These can be provided through good governance, which balances both standardisation with flexibility.

8.2 Research Limitations

This study considered just one case study market and whilst this approach to an ethnographic study is not unusual (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995, O’Reilly, 2005) it does raise concerns as to the applicability of the findings to other farmers’ markets across the UK. There is a necessity to understand the specific case study market selected for this project to offer some suggestion as to similarities and differences of other markets in order to establish whether the findings can be applied to specific markets across the UK. The case study chosen, as discussed in Chapter Four, appears

to fall within Marsden et al's (1993) preserved countryside definition. This specifically relates to farmers and producers preserving the countryside for the tourists that visit the county. Due to this there is a specific image of both the countryside and the county that is being established and maintained. As tourists provide a vital income to farmers and producers, as discussed in Chapter Seven, creating and preserving the image that tourists 'purchase' is of great importance. The image of GFM was discussed in Chapter Seven and it was this identity that created specific standards between producers at the market. This image is linked to the 'type' of countryside that the market sits in and is the driving force behind the type of production undertaken. It is likely that this image will vary between locations and particularly between 'types' of countryside. Furthermore there is likely to be a difference between rural farmers' markets and those established in large urban areas.

Recognising this potential limitation is important when seeking to apply the findings to other farmers' markets. However, the nature of this ethnographic study allowed for a deep understanding of one case study farmers' market. Whilst it may not be possible to generalise the findings across all farmers' markets it is suggested that the ethnographic nature of this study provides meanings to other situations (O'Reilly, 2005). This study sought to understand the use of the market in developing producers' resilience and this required gaining the trust of farmers and producers in order to understand their life of production and the community/ies within the farmers' market. Through dedicating the time to understand these elements the delicate nature of the market, the identities and scripts within it emerged and it is this depth of understanding that has provided a thorough representation of the market studied. Through taking this approach the delicate nature of the market has been unpackaged and therefore whilst the findings may not be able to be generalised across all UK farmers' markets the different elements that have been highlighted through this study can form the focus of further studies that can seek a breadth of understanding of specific features.

Whilst every effort was made throughout the research project to ensure all producers understood the research was independent and defined through literature reviews and through investigations at the market itself, some presumed the research was being lead by the County Council or that the researcher at least had links to the County Council. Any suggestions of this were denied and the nature of the research

explained but it was apparent that for at least some of the research time certain producers were unaware of the independent nature of the research and some were still unsure of this as the research time drew to a close. The concern with this is that certain information may have been withheld from the researcher or that conversations or information shared with the researcher may have been displayed in a specific manner to raise issues to highlight to the market managers. It is necessary to raise this concern and potential limitation of the research especially as this still occurred after a year of research 'in the field', working with producers and seeking to gain their trust. This is not uncommon within ethnographic studies with various authors raising concern at the separation that can exist between research and those within the community being researched (Lofland and Lofland, 1995). There is also an appreciation that a researcher rarely has access to every point of view held by those within the community (Baszanger and Dodier, 1997). Where producers appeared unsure as to the independence of the research this was always clearly recorded within fieldnotes to ensure findings were reflected upon when they came to be analysed. Additionally, through taking an extended period of time within the market environment, the research was regularly discussed with producers and this allowed for greater understanding of the project by producers and also greater information gathering by the researcher. Stories, opinions and discussions with various producers recorded within the fieldnotes could be compared over time as the researcher became more accepted into the market community. This gave opportunities for reflection, seen as vitality important throughout any ethnographic fieldwork (Phillips, 2000). Whilst there is a concern that some producers were still unsure of the research aims and independence by the end of the research, this applied to a very small minority. Others had taken time to develop their trust of the research and the detailed fieldnotes allowed for reflections to be made about this trust. The fieldnotes documented the changing relationships and openness of producers over time, allowing for this to be considered as the findings were analysed.

8.3 Suggestions for Further Research

Throughout this research study the application of the concept of resilience has been challenging. This thesis therefore calls for work to continue in providing a definition or (definitions of resilience) and to seek clarification if the concept is to be applicable

across all subject areas. It also calls for further work to understand the human actors within systems and the specific dynamics these create. Alongside this essential development are a number of other research areas that this study has identified warranting further study. The first of these relates to exploring and expanding the 'community of practice' profile. Investigations within this study pointed to the importance of individuals learning of their importance and value to others. This learning that aids individual social resilience currently does not feature within the community of practice or community of coping literature. This learning appears to fall somewhere between a community of practice and community of coping, combining these two concepts through providing emotional resilience through learning rather than social support from similar others. The application of this concept in aiding individual, social and emotional resilience would seek to expand the community of practice and community of coping literature and the support networks that are sought and developed by these and would in turn provide greater understanding of the development of resilience.

The two other suggestions for further research relate to continuing the investigation of the resilience of individual producers who are following a post-productivist pathway and the resilience that could be created through developing a clear network of farmers' markets across the UK. The first of these topics calls for some investigation into the next step(s) that producers have taken when they have moved away from trading at farmers' markets. Producers trading within these environments are seen to have diversified from the productivist agricultural regime and through doing so have displayed at least some elements of resilience, through adapting to changing conditions and demands. However, as has been discussed throughout this thesis resilience is displayed through continual adaptation and therefore it is may be expected that over time producers would 'move on' from trading at farmers' markets to explore new and different opportunities and pathways. By taking the opportunity to investigate the routes taken by producers once they move away from trading at farmers' markets the opportunities for current traders can be explored. Such research could open dialogue as to potential new and successful pathways that producers could follow and how resilient post-productivist agriculture can be. Once producers have diversified away from the productivist regime of agriculture do they continue to adapt and change over time? Are such producers displaying any greater resilience than

those who have remained within the productivist regime of agriculture? Such research would seek to identify the difference in developing resilience as a productivist and post-productivist producer as well as seeking to establish pathways that post-productivist producers have followed to highlight the potential ‘next steps’ for those already trading at farmers’ markets.

The second topic focuses on the potential to develop some element of universal understanding across the UK when using the term farmers’ market and the potential this has to develop a network or community of markets. Through creating a community of markets it would be hoped that information would be shared, as in a community of practice, to develop the resilience of all markets involved so that they continue to attract producers and consumers. Any research along this line of enquiry would need to develop an understanding of market definitions from a variety of markets to establish the potential universal standards that could be developed. In addition it would need to consider the elements of resilience and the need for variation between markets. It would also need to consider the delicate nature, as discussed throughout this thesis, of competition, power and trust. Through seeking to bring markets together within a network under some overarching standards and expectations it could be hoped that this would aid the resilience of farmers’ market across the UK. However, only through investigating the different markets and the communication channels that do and could exist between them will this element of resilience be established.

Bibliography

ADGER, W. N. (2000) Social and ecological resilience: Are they related? *Progress in Human Geography*, 24, 347-364.

ALKON, A. (2003) Paradise or pavement: The social constructions of the environment in two urban Farmers' Markets and their implications for environmental justice and sustainability. *Local Environment*, 13, 271-289.

ALLEN, P. (2010) Realizing justice in local food systems. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 3, 295-308.

AMIN, A. & ROBERTS, J. (2008) Knowing in action: Beyond communities of practice. *Research Policy*, 37, 353-369.

ANDERSON, M. D. (2008) Rights-based food systems and the goals of food systems reform. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 25.

ATKINSON, P. (1990) *The Ethnographic Imagination: textual constructions of reality*, London, Routledge.

BANKS, J. & BRISTOW, G. (1999) Developing quality in agro-food supply chains: A Welsh perspective. *International Planning Studies*, 4, 317-331.

BARNES, A. P. (2006) Does multi-functionality affect technical efficiency? A non-parametric analysis of the Scottish dairy industry. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 80, 287-294.

BARNES, G. (2009) The evolution and resilience of community-based land tenure in rural Mexico. *Land Use Policy*, 26, 393-400.

BARTON, D. & HAMILTON, M. (2005) Literacy, reification and the dynamics of social interaction. IN BARTON, D. & TUSTING, K. (Eds.) *Beyond communities of practice: language, power and social context*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

BARTON, D. & TUSTING, K. (2005) Introduction. IN BARTON, D. & TUSTING, K. (Eds.) *Beyond communities of practice: language, power and social context*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

BASZANGER, I. & DODIER, N. (1997) Chapter 2: Ethnography. Relating the part to the whole. IN SILVERMAN, D. (Ed.) *Qualitative Research: theory, method and practice*. London, Sage Publications.

BENNETT, K. (2000) Chapter 7: Inter/viewing and inter/subjectives: powerful performances. IN HUGHES. A, MORRIS. C & SEYMOUR. S (Eds.) *Ethnography and Rural Research*. Cheltenham, Countryside and Community Press.

BOHLE, H. G., DOWNING, T. E. & WATTS, M. J. (1994) Climate change and social vulnerability: the sociology and geography of food insecurity. *Global Environmental Change*, 4, 37-48.

BRIGUGLIO, L., CORDINA, G., FARNIGIA, N. & VELLA, S. (2008) Economic vulnerability and resilience concepts and measurements. World Institute for Development Economics Research.

BRISTOW, G. (2010) Resilient regions: re-'place'ing regional competitiveness. *Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 3, 153-167.

BROWN, J. S., COLLINS, A. & DUGUID, P. (1989) Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18, 32-42.

BROWN, J. S. & DUGUID, P. (1991) Organizational learning and communities of practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning and innovation. *Organizational Science*, 2, 40-57.

BRYANT, L. (1999) The detraditionalization of occupational identities in farming in South Australia. *Sociologica Ruralis*, 39, 236-261.

BRUNORI, G., MALANDRIN, V. & ROSSI, A. 2013. Trade-off or convergence? the role of food security in the evolution of food discourse in Italy. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 29, 19-29.

BRUNORI, G., ROSSI, A. & GUIDI, F. 2012. On the new social relations around and beyond food. Analysing consumers' role and action in gruppi di acquisto solidale (solidarity purchasing groups) *Sociologia Ruralis*, 52, 1-30.

- BRYMAN, A. (2001) *Social Research Methods*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- BURTON, R. J. F. (2004) Seeing through the 'good farmer's' eyes: Towards developing an understanding of social symbolic value of 'productivist' behaviour. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 44, 195-215.
- BURTON, R. J. F. & WILSON, G. A. (2006) Injecting social psychology theory into conceptualisations of agricultural agency: Towards a post-productivist farmer self-identity? *Journal of Rural Studies*, 22, 95-115.
- BUSCK, A. G. (2002) Farmers' landscape decisions: relationships between farmers' values and landscape practices. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 42, 233-249.
- CAULLEY, D. N. (2008) Making qualitative research reports less boring. The techniques of writing creative nonfiction. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 14, 424-449.
- CHRISTOPHERSON, S., MICHIE, J. & TYLER, P. (2010) Regional resilience: theoretical and empirical perspectives. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 3, 3-10.
- CLARK, J. K., MUNROE, D. K. & MANSFIELD, B. (2010) What counts as farming: how classification limits regionalization of the food system. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 3, 245-259.
- CLOKE, P., CRANG, P. & GOODWIN, M. (Eds.) (2003) *Introducing Human Geographies*, London, Arnold.
- COFFEY, A. & ATKINSON, P. (1996) *Making sense of qualitative data*, Sage Publications Inc, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- CRANG, M. & COOK, I. (2007) *Doing ethnographies*, London, Sage Publications
- CURRY, D., BROWNING, H., DAVIES, P., FERGUSON, I., HUTTON, D., JULIUS, D., REYNOLDS, F., TINSLEY, M., VARNEY, D. & WYNNE, G. (2002) Farming and Food a sustainable future. *Report of the Policy Commission on the Future of Farming and Food*
- DAVIES, C. A. (2001) *Reflexive Ethnography: a guide to researching selves and others*, Routledge, London.

DE HAEN, H. (2008) Food security strategies: building resilience against natural disasters. *Eurochoices*, 7, 26-33.

DENZIN, N. K. & LINCOLN, Y. S. (Eds.) (1998) *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*, Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE Publications.

DIMARA, E. & SKURAS, D. (1999) Importance and need for rural development investments under the CAP: A survey of farmers' attitudes in marginal areas of Greece. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 50, 304-315.

DUPUIS, E. M. & GOODMAN, D. (2005) Should we go 'home' to eat? Toward a reflexive politics of localism. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 21, 359-371.

ENTICOTT, G. (2012) The local universality of veterinary expertise and the geography of animal disease. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 31, 75-88.

EVANS, N., MORRIS, C. & WINTER, M. (2002) Conceptualizing agriculture: a critique of post-productivism as the new orthodoxy. *Progress in Human Geography*, 26, 313-332.

FEAGAN, R. (2007) The place of food: mapping out the 'local' in the local food systems. *Progress in Human Geography*, 31, 23-42.

FETTERMAN, D. M. (1998) *Ethnography. Step by Step*, Thousand Oaks: CA, Sage Publications.

FIELDING, N. G. & LEE, R. M. (1998) *Computer analysis and qualitative Research*, London, Sage Publications.

FLEMING, J. & LEDOGAR, R. J. (2008) Resilience, an evolving concept: a review of literature relevant to aboriginal research. *Pimatisiwin*, 6, 7-23.

FLESKENS, L., DUARTE, F. & EICHER, I. (2009) A conceptual framework for the assessment of multiple functions of agro-ecosystems: A case study of Tras-os-Montes olive groves. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 25, 141-155.

FONTE, M. 2010. Introduction. In: FONTE, M. & PAPADOPOULOS, A. G. (eds.) *Naming food after places. Food relocalisation and knowledge dynamics in rural development*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

FORESIGHT. 2011. *The Future of Food and Farming: Challenges and choices for global sustainability*. London: The Government Office for Science.

FRIEDMANN, H. & MCNAIR, A. (2008) Whose rules rule? Contested projects to certify 'local production for distant consumers'. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 8, 408-434.

FROUWS, J. & MOL, A. P. J. (1997) Chapter 13: Ecological modernisation theory and agricultural reform. IN DE HAAN, H. & LONG, N. (Eds.) *Images and realities of rural life*. Assen, Van Gorcum.

GALLOPIN, G. C. (2006) Linkages between vulnerability, resilience and adaptive capacity. *Global Environmental Change*, 16, 293-303.

GILG, A. W. (1996) *Countryside Planning*, London, Routledge.

GOODMAN, D., DEPUIS, E. M. & GOODMAN, M. K. 2012. *Alternative Food Networks: Knowledge, practice and politics*, Oxford, Routledge.

GOODMAN, D. & WATTS, M. J. 1997. *Globalising Food. Agrarian questions and global restructuring*. London: Routledge.

GLASER, B. G. & STRAUSS, A. L. (2008) *The discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for qualitative research*, New Brunswick, Aldine Transaction.

GRANKVIST, G., DAHLSTAND, U. & BIEL, A. (2004) The impact of environmental labelling and consumer preference: negative and positive Labels. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 27, 213-230.

GRANOVETTER, M. S. (2002) The strength of weak ties. IN SCOTT, J. (Ed.) *Social Networks. Critical Concepts in Sociology*. London, Routledge.

GREGOIRE, A. (2002) The mental health of farmers. *Occupational Medicine*, 52, 471-476.

GRILLS, S. (Ed.) (1998) *Doing ethnographic research: fieldwork settings*, Thousand Oaks: CA, Sage Publications.

GRUNERT, K. G. (2005) Food quality and safety: consumer perception and demand. *European Review of Agricultural Economics*, 32, 369-391.

GUBRIUM, J. F. & HOLSTEIN, J. A. (Eds.) (2001) *Handbook of interview research-context and method*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications Ltd.

GUNDERSON, L. H. (2000) Ecological resilience-in theory and application. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 31, 425-439.

HAMMERSLEY, M. & ATKINSON, P. (1995) *Ethnography: principles in practice*, New York, Routledge.

HANLEY, N. (1998) Resilience in social and economic systems: a concept that fails the cost-benefit test? *Environment and Development Economics*, 3, 244-249.

HASSINK, R. (2010) Regional resilience: a promising concept to explain differences in regional economic adaptability. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 3, 45-58.

HEGNEY, D. G., BUIKSTRA, E., BAKER, P., ROGERS-CLARK, C., PEARCE, S., ROSS, H., KING, C. A. & WATSON-LUKE, A. (2007) Individual resilience in rural people: a Queensland study, Australia. *Rural and Remote Health*, 7, 620-630.

HENDRICKSON, M. K. & HEFFERNAN, W. D. (2002) Opening spaces through relocalization: locating resistance in the weaknesses of the global food system. *Sociologica Ruralis*, 43, 347-369.

HIGH, C., PELLING, M. & NEMES, G. (2005) Understanding informal institutions: networks and communities in rural development. *Transition in Agriculture*.

HINRICHS, C. C. 2000. Embeddedness and local food systems: notes on two types of direct agricultural market. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 16, 295-303.

HINRICHS, C. (2003) The practice and politics of food system localization. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 19, 33-45.

- HINRICHS, C. C. 2013. Regionalizing food security? Imperatives, intersections and contestations in a post-9/11 world. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 29, 7-18.
- HINRICHS, C. C., GUIESPIE, G. W. & W., F. G. (2004) Social learning and innovation at retail farmers' markets. *Rural Sociology*, 69, 31-58.
- HOLLOWAY, L. & KNEAFSEY, M. (2000) Reading the space of the farmers' market: a preliminary investigation from the UK. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 40, 285-299.
- HOLMES, J. (2006) Impulses towards a multifunctional transition in rural Australia: gaps in the research agenda. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 22, 142-160.
- HORLINGS, L. G. & K., M. T. 2011. Towards a real green revolution? Exploring the conceptual dimensions of a new ecological modernisation of agriculture that could 'feed the world'. *Global Environmental Change*, 21, 441-452.
- HOWARD, P. H. & ALLEN, P. (2006) Beyond organic: consumer interest in new labelling schemes in the Central Coast of California. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 30, 439-451.
- HOWDEN, P., VANCLAY, F., LEMERLE, D. & KENT, J. (1998) Working with the grain: farming styles amongst Australian broadacre croppers. *Rural Society*, 8, 109-125.
- HUDSON, R. (2008) Material matters and the search for resilience: rethinking regional and urban development strategies in the context of global environmental change. *International Journal of Innovation and Sustainable Development*, 3, 166-184.
- HUDSON, R. (2010) Resilient regions in an uncertain world: wishful thinking or a practical reality. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 3, 11-25.
- HUGHES, A., MORRIS, C. & SEYMOUR, S. (2000) Chapter 1: Introduction. IN HUGHES, A., MORRIS, C. & SEYMOUR, S. (Eds.) *Ethnography and rural research*. Cheltenham, The Countryside and Community Press.
- ILBERY, B. & BOWLER, I. (1998) Chapter 4: From agricultural productivism to post-productivism. IN ILBERY, B. (Ed.) *The geography of rural change*. Harlow, Pearson Education Limited.

- ILBERY, B. & KNEAFSEY, M. (2000) Producer constructions of quality in regional speciality food production: a case study from south west England. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 16, 217-230.
- ILBERY, B. & MAYE, D. (2005) Alternative (shorter) food supply chains and specialist livestock products in the Scottish-English borders. *Environment and Planning A*, 37, 823-844.
- ILBERY, B. & MAYE, D. (2006) Retailing local food in the Scottish-English borders: A supply chain perspective. *Geoforum*, 37, 352-367.
- JACKSON, D., FIRTKO, A. & EDERBOROUGH, M. (2007) Personal resilience as a strategy for surviving and thriving in the face of workplace adversity: a literature review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 60, 1-9.
- JACQUES, S. & COLLINS, L. (2003) Community supported agriculture. *Geography Review*, 16, 30-32.
- JONES, P., COMFORT, D. & HILLIER, D. (2004) A case study of local food and its route to market in the UK. *British Food Journal*, 106, 328-335.
- JUNKER, B. H. (1960) *Fieldwork. An Introduction to the Social Sciences*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- KING, C. A. (2008) Community resilience and contemporary agri-ecological systems: reconnecting people and food, and people with people. *Systems Research and Behavioural Science*, 25, 111-124.
- KING, B. J., PAINE, M. S., BEILIN, R. & O'KANE, M. P. (2009) Encounters with knowledge entrepreneurs and 'sticky' knowledge transfer: Case Study Project 3030. *Extension Farming Systems Journal*, 5, 11-22.
- KIRWAN, J. (2004) Alternative strategies in the UK agro-food system: interrogating the alterity of farmers' markets. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 44, 395-415.
- KIRWAN, J. (2006) The interpersonal world of direct marketing: Examining conventions of quality at UK farmers' markets. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 22, 301-312.

- KIRWAN, J. & MAYE, D. 2013. Neo-productivism, sustainable intensification and food security. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 29, 91-100.
- KNEAFSEY, M. (2010) The region of food-important or irrelevant? *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 3, 177-190.
- KORCZYNSKI, M. (2003) Communities of coping: collective emotional labour in service work. *Organisation*, 10, 55-79.
- KUSENBACH, M. (2003) Street Phenomenology: the go along as an ethnographic research tool. *Ethnography*, 4, 455-485.
- LA TROBE, H. (2001) Farmers' markets: consuming local rural produce. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 25, 181-192.
- LAMPKIN, N. (1999) *Organic Farming*, Trowbridge, Farming Press.
- LAW, J. (2006) Disaster in agriculture: or foot and mouth mobilities. *Environment and Planning A*, 38, 227-239.
- LEACH, M., SCOONES, I. & STIRLING, A. (2010) *Dynamic sustainabilities. Technology, environment, social justice*, London, Earthscan.
- LELE, S. (1998) Resilience, sustainability and environmentalism. *Environment and Development Economics*, 3, 249-254.
- LEVIN, S. A., BARRETT, S., ANIYAR, S., BAUMOL, W., BLISS, C., BOLIN, B., DASGUPTA, P., EHRLICH, P., FOLKE, C., GREN, I.-M., HOLLING, C. S., JANSSON, A., JANSSON, B.-O., MALER, K.-G., MARTIN, D., PERRINGS, C. & SHESHINKSI, E. (1998) Resilience in natural and socioeconomic systems. *Environment and Development Economics*, 3, 221-235.
- LIPSKY, M. (1980) *Street-level bureaucracy. Dilemmas of the individual in public services*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation.
- LOCKIE, S. (2006) Capturing the sustainability agenda: organic foods and media discourses on food scares environment, genetic engineering and health. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 23, 313-323.

- LOFLAND, J. & LOFLAND, L. H. (1995) *Analyzing social settings: a guide to qualitative observation and analysis*, Belmont: CA, Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- LOUREIRO, M. L. & MCCLUSKEY, J. J. (2000) Assessing consumer response to protected geographical identification labelling. *Agribusiness*, 16, 309-320.
- MALMBERG, A., HAWTON, K. & SIMKIN, S. (1997) A study of suicide in farmers in England and Wales. *Journal of Psychomatic Research*, 43, 107-111.
- MANYENA, S. B. (2006) The concept of resilience revisited. *Disasters*, 30, 433-450.
- MARSDEN, T. K. (1998) New rural territories: regulating the differentiated rural spaces. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 14, 107-117.
- MARSDEN, T. K. (2007) Chapter 3: Denial and diversity: some reflections on emerging agri-food geographies and rural development in the United Kingdom. IN CLOUT, H. (Ed.) *Contemporary Rural Geographies. Land, property and resources in Britain: essays in honour of Richard Munton*. London, Routledge.
- MARSDEN, T. K. 2013. From post-productionism to reflexive governance: contested transitions in securing more sustainable food futures. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 29, 123-134.
- MARSDEN, T. K., BANKS, J. & BRISTOW, G. (2000a) Food supply chain approaches: exploring their role in rural development. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 40, 424-438.
- MARSDEN, T. K., FLYNN, A. & HARRISON, M. (2000) *Consuming Interests. The social provision of food*, London, UCL Press.
- MARSDEN, T. K., MURDOCH, J., LOWE, P., MUNTON, R. & FLYNN, A. (1993) *Constructing the Countryside*, London, UCL Press Ltd.
- MARSDEN, T. K. & SMITH, E. (2005) Ecological entrepreneurship: sustainable development in local communities through quality food production and local branding. *Geoforum*, 36, 440-451.

- MARSDEN, T. K. & SONNINO, R. (2008) Rural development and the regional state: denying multifunctional agriculture in the UK. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 24, 422-431.
- MARTIN, R. (2011) Regional economic resilience, hysteresis and recessionary shocks. *Annual International Conference of the Regional Studies Association*. Newcastle.
- MASON, J. (2002) *Qualitative researching*, Thousand Oaks: CA, Sage Publications.
- MATHER, A. (1996) Chapter 5: Rural land use in Britain: agency re-structuring and policy adaptation. IN CURRY, N. & OWEN, S. (Eds.) *Changing rural policy in Britain: planning, administration, agriculture and the environment*. Cheltenham, The Countryside and Community Press.
- MAYE, D., HOLLOWAY, L. & KNEAFSEY, M. (Eds.) (2007) *Alternative food geographies: representation and practice*. Oxford, Elsevier.
- MCCARTHY, J. (2005) Rural geography: multifunctional rural geographies-reactionary or radical? *Progress in Human Geography*, 29, 773-782.
- MCEACHERN, M. G., WARNABY, G., CARRIGAN, M. & SZMIGIN, I. (2010) Thinking locally, acting locally? Conscious consumers and farmers' markets. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 26, 395-412.
- MCLAREN, S. & CHALLIS, C. (2009) Resilience among men farmers: protective roles of social support and sense of belonging in the depression-suicidal ideation relation. *Death Studies*, 33, 262-276.
- MIELE, M. (2001) *Creating sustainability-the social construction of the market for organic products*, Wageningen, Circle for Rural European Studies.
- MILLS, J., GIBBON, D., INGRAM, J., REED, M., SHORT, C. & DWYER, J. (2011) Organising collective action for effective environmental management and social learning in Wales. *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension*, 17, 69-83.
- MILLSTONE, E. & LANG, T. (2003) *The atlas of food-who eats what, where and why.*, London, Earthscan Publications Ltd.

MORGAN, K. (2008) Local and green Vs global and fair: the geopolitics of care. *Brass Working Papers*, 50.

MORGAN, S. L. (2011) Social learning among organic farmers and the application of the communities of practice framework. *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension*, 17, 99-112.

MORRIS, C. & YOUNG, C. (2000) Seed to shelf, teat to table, barley to beer and womb to tomb: discourses of food quality and quality assurance schemes in the UK. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 16, 103-115.

MURDOCH, J. (2000) Networks-a new paradigm of rural development? *Journal of Rural Studies*, 16, 407-419.

MURDOCH, J., LOWE, P., WARD, N. & MARSDEN, T. K. (2003) *The Differentiated Countryside*, London, Routledge.

NATIONAL FARMERS' RETAIL AND MARKET ASSOCIATION (FARMA) (2011) Certified Farmers' Markets.

NATIONAL FARMERS' RETAIL AND MARKET ASSOCIATION (2012) Farmers' Market Certification.

NATIONAL FARMERS' RETAIL AND MARKET ASSOCIATION (2012a) Attending farmers' markets.

O'KANE, M. P., PAINE, M. S. & KING, B. J. (2008) Context, participation and discourse: the role of the communities of practice concept in understanding farmer decision-making. *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension*, 14, 187-201.

O'REILLY, K. (2005) *Ethnographic Methods*, Oxford, Routledge.

OUDE OPHIUS, P. A. M. & VAN TRIJP, H. C. M. (1995) Perceived quality: a market driven and consumer orientated approach. *Food Quality and Preference*, 6, 177-183.

PAGE, A. N. & FARGAR, L. J. (2002) Suicide in Australian farming. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 36, 81-85.

PEMBROKESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (2008) Pembrokeshire County Council.

- PENDALL, R., FOSTER, K. A. & COWELL, M. (2010) Resilience and regions: building understanding of the metaphor. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 3, 71-84.
- PERRINGS, C. (1998) Introduction: resilience and sustainability. *Environment and Development Economics*, 3, 221-262.
- PERRINGS, C. (1998a) Resilience in the dynamics of economy-environment systems. *Environment and Resource Economics*, 11, 503-520.
- PHILLIPS, M. (2000) Chapter 2: Theories of positionality and ethnography in the rural. IN HUGHES, A., MORRIS, C. & SEYMOUR, S. (Eds.) *Ethnography and rural research*. Cheltenham, The Countryside and Community Press.
- PICKERNELL, D. G., CHRISTIE, M. J., ROWE, P. A., THOMAS, B. C., PUTTERILL, L. G. & GRIFFITHS, J. L. (2004) Farmers' markets in Wales: making the net work? *British Food Journal*, 106, 194-210.
- PIKE, A., DAWLEY, S. & TOMANEY, J. (2010) Resilience, adaptation and adaptability. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 3, 59-70.
- PINGALI, P., ALINORI, A. & SUTTON, J. (2005) Food security in complex emergencies: enhancing food system resilience. *Disasters*, 29, 55-.
- POTTER, C. & BURNEY, J. (2002) Agricultural multifunctionality in the WTO-legitimate non-trade concern or disguised protectionism? *Journal of Rural Studies*, 18, 35-47.
- POTTER, C. & TILZEY, M. (2005) Agricultural policy discourse in the European post-Fordist transition: neoliberalism, neomercantilism and multifunctionality. *Progress in Human Geography*, 29, 581-600.
- PRATT, J. (2008) Food values: the local and the authentic. *Research in Economic Anthropology*, 53-70.
- PUNCH, K. (2005) *Introduction to social research : quantitative and qualitative approaches*, London, Sage Publications.
- PURVIS, A. (2002) So what's your beef? *The Observer Food Monthly*. London.

- PUTNAM, R. D. (1995) Tuning in, tuning out: the strange disappearance of social capital in America. *Political Science and Politics*, 28, 664-683.
- RAINE, G. (1999) Causes and effects of stress on farmers: a qualitative study. *Health Education Journal*, 58, 259-270.
- RENTING, H., MARSDEN, T. K. & BANKS, J. (2003) Understanding alternative food networks: exploring the role of short food supply chains in rural development. *Environment and Planning A*, 35, 393-411.
- ROBERTS, J. (2006) Limits to communities of practice. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43, 623-639.
- ROBINSON, G. M. (1990) *Conflict and change in the countryside. Rural society, economy and planning in the developed world*, London, Bellhaven Press.
- RUBIN, H. J. & RUBIN, I. S. (1995) *Qualitative Interviewing: the art of hearing data*, Sage Publications, London.
- SHUCKSMITH, M. & WINTER, M. (1990) The politics of pluriactivity in Britain. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 6, 429-435.
- SILVASTI, T. (2003a) Bending borders of gendered labour division of farms: the case of Finland. *Sociologica Ruralis*, 43, 154-166.
- SIMKIN, S., HAWTON, K., YIP, P. S. F. & YAM, C. H. K. (2003) Seasonality in suicide: a study of farming suicides in England and Wales. *Crisis*, 24, 93-97.
- SIMMIE, J. & MARTIN, R. (2010) The economic resilience of regions: towards an evolutionary approach. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 3, 27-43.
- SLEE, B. (1996) Chapter 10: Farm diversification and the environment. IN CURRY, N. & OWEN, S. (Eds.) *Changing rural policy in Britain: planning, administration, agriculture and the environment*. Cheltenham, The Countryside and Community Press.
- SLIGO, F. X. & MASSEY, C. (2007) Risk, trust and knowledge networks in farmers' learning. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 23, 170-182.

- SMITH, E. (2002) Ecological modernization and organic farming in the UK: does it pay to be green? Cardiff, Cardiff University.
- SMITH, E. & MARSDEN, T. K. (2004) Exploring the limits to growth in UK organics: beyond the statistical image. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 20, 345-357.
- SPRADLEY, J. (1980) *Participant observation*, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- STAKE, R. E. (1995) *The art of case study research*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications.
- STARK, C., GIBBS, D., HOPKINS, P., BELBIN, A., HAY, A. & SELVARAJ, S. (2006) Suicide in farmers in Scotland. *Rural and remote health*, 6, 1-9.
- STEPHENS, P., LEACH, A., TAGGART, L. & JONES, H. (1998) *Think sociology*, Cheltenham, Nelson Thornes.
- STRAUSS, A. L. & CORBIN, J. (1998) *Basics of qualitative research. Techniques and procedures for developing Grounded Theory*, Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE Publications.
- SUTHERLAND, L. A. & BURTON, R. J. F. (2011) Good farmers, good neighbours? The role of cultural capital in social capital development in a Scottish farming community. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 51, 238-255.
- SWAGEMAKERS, P. (2003) Chapter 10: Novelty production: new directions for the activities and role of farming. IN VAN HUYLENBROECK, G. & DURAND, G. (Eds.) *Multifunctional agriculture: a new paradigm for European agriculture and rural development*. Aldershot, Ashgate.
- SZMIGIN, I., MADDOCK, S. & CARRIGAN, M. (2003) Conceptualising community consumption. Farmers' markets and the older consumer. *British Food Journal*, 105, 542-550.
- TAYLOR, S. (Ed.) (2002) *Ethnographic research: a reader*, Thousand Oaks: CA, Sage Publications.

- TIMMERMANS, S. & BERG, M. (1997) Standardization in action: achieving local universality through medical protocols. *Social Studies of Science*, 27, 273-305.
- TOBIN, G. A. (1999) Sustainability and community resilience: the Holy Grail of hazards planning? *Environmental Hazards*, 1, 13-25.
- TOL, R. S. J. & YOHE, G. W. (2007) The weakest link hypothesis for adaptive capacity: an empirical test. *Global Environmental Change*, 17, 218-227.
- TUGADE, M. M. & FREDRICKSON, B. L. (2004) Resilient individuals use positive emotions to bounce back from negative emotional experiences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 320-333.
- TURNER, S. (2010) Networks of learning within the English wine industry. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 10, 685-715.
- TUSTING, K. (2005) Language and power in communities of practice. IN BARTON, D. & TUSTING, K. (Eds.) *Beyond communities of practice: language, power and social context*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- UNGAR, M. (2008) Resilience across cultures. *British Journal of Social Work*, 38, 218-235.
- VAN DER PLOEG, J. D., LONG, A. & BANKS, J. (Eds.) (2002) *Living countrysides: rural development processes in Europe: the state of the art*, Doetinchem, NL, Elsevier.
- VAN ITTERSUM, K., MEULENBERY, M. T. G., VAN TRIJP, H. C. M. & CANDEL, M. J. J. M. (2007) Consumers' appreciation of regional certification labels: a pan-European study. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 58, 1-23.
- VAN KOPPEN, C. (1997) Chapter 14: Claims of culture. Social representations of nature and their consequences for agriculture. IN DE HAAN, H. & LONG, N. (Eds.) *Images and realities of rural life*. Assen, Van Gorcum.
- VAN MAANEN, J. (1988) *Tales of the field-On writing ethnography*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

VAN MAANEN, J. (1995) *Representation in ethnography*, Thousand Oaks: CA, Sage Publications.

VANCLAY, F., HOWDEN, P., MESITI, L. & GLYDE, S. (2006) The social and intellectual construction of farming styles. Testing Dutch ideas in Australian agriculture. *Sociologica Ruralis*, 46, 61-82.

VANCLAY, F., MESITI, L. & HOWDEN, P. (1998) Styles of farming and farming subcultures: appropriate concepts for Australian rural sociology? *Rural Society*, 8, 85-107.

VANCLAY, F., SILVASTI, T. & HOWDEN, P. (2007) Styles, parables and scripts: diversity and conformity in Australian and Finnish agriculture. *Rural Society*, 17, 3-18.

VERBEKE, W. & WARD, R. W. (2006) Consumer interest in information cues denoting quality, traceability and origin: an application of ordered probit models to beef labels. *Food Quality and Preference*, 17, 453-467.

VERNIMMEN, T., BOURGEOIS, M., VAN HUYLENBROECK, G., MEERT, H. & VAN HECKE, E. (2003) Chapter 11: Diversification as a survival strategy for marginal farms. IN VAN HUYLENBROECK, G. & DURAND, G. (Eds.) *Multifunctional agriculture: a new paradigm for European agriculture and rural development*. Aldershot, Ashgate.

WALFORD, N. (2003) Productivism is allegedly dead, long live productivism. Evidence of continued productivist attitudes and decision making in south-east England. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 19, 491-502.

WATTS, D. C. H., ILBERY, B. & MAYE, D. (2005) Making reconnections in agro-food geography: alternative systems in food provision. *Progress in Human Geography*, 29, 22-40.

WAUGH, C. E., FREDRICKSON, B. L. & TAYLOR, S. F. (2008) Adapting to life's slings and arrows: individual differences in resilience when recovering from an anticipated threat. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42, 1031-1046.

WEATHERELL, C., TREGEAR, A. & ALLINSON, J. (2003) In search of the concerned consumer: UK public perceptions of food, farming and buying local. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 19, 233-244.

WELSH ASSEMBLY GOVERNMENT (2008) Welsh Agricultural Statistics 2008.

WELSH, E. (2002) Dealing with data: using NVivo in the qualitative data analysis process. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 3.

WENGER, E. (1998) *Communities of Practice. Learning, meaning and identity*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

WHYTE, W. F. (1993) *Street Corner Society. The social structure of an Italian slum*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.

WILCOCK, J., DEARY, I. J., EDWARDS-JONES, G., GIBSON, G. J., MCGREGOR, M. J., SUTHERLAND, A., DENT, J. B., MORGAN, O. & GRIEVE, R. (1999) The role of attitudes and objectives in farmer decision making: business and environmentally-oriented behaviour in Scotland. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 50, 286-303.

WILSON, G. A. (2007) *Multifunctional agriculture: A Transition Theory perspective*, Trowbridge, Cromwell Press.

WILSON, G. A. (2008) From 'weak' to 'strong' multifunctionality: conceptualising farm level multifunctional transitional pathways. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 24, 367-383.

WILSON, G. A. & HART, K. (2001) Farmer participation in agri-environmental schemes: towards conservation oriented thinking. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 41, 254-274.

WINTER, M. (1996) *Rural politics: policies for agriculture, forestry and the environment*, London, Routledge.

WINTER, M. (2003) Embeddedness, the new food economy and defensive localism. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 19, 23-32.

WINTER, M. (2003a) Geographies of food: agro-food geographies making reconnections. *Progress in Human Geography*, 27, 505-513.

WOLFE, D. A. (2010) The strategic management of core cities: path dependence and economic adjustment in resilient systems. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 3, 139-152.

WOLFINGER, N. H. (2002) On writing fieldnotes: collection strategies and background expectancies. *Qualitative Research*, 2, 85-95.

YIN, R. K. (1994) *Case study research. Design and methods*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications Inc.

YOUNGS, J. (2003) Consumer direct initiatives in north-west England farmers' markets. *British Food Journal*, 105, 498-530.

Appendix 1: Information sheet for market manager



The Social Role of Farmers' Markets

Emma Dean, Cardiff University

02920 876562 / deanel@cf.ac.uk



The Centre for Business Relationships
Accountability, Sustainability & Society

What is the purpose of the project?

This PhD project aims to establish exactly what farmers' markets provide to producers who trade at them. It seeks to fully investigate the social networks and support that may be developed and maintained through using the market. The study will also investigate other factors such as the economic and environmental pros and cons of market trading. It aims to gain a full understanding of trading in the market environment with a specific emphasis on the social dimension of the market. The research seeks to understand the social role and function that the farmers' market has for business growth and social resilience.

Why is this being studied now?

There is currently a great public effort to promote and support local food. Since 1997 farmers' markets have developed across the UK as a place to buy locally produced food directly from producers with the hope that this brings people back in touch with their food as well as providing better economic returns for producers. In January 2010 the first Virtual Farmers' Market was launched on the internet and with this comes the question of what exactly the market offers to producers that use them. What else do farmers' markets provide to producers using them apart from a space to sell their products? Understanding this will help establish the type of support producers need and how this can be provided within the spaces where they trade.

What's the programme for the research?

The research will take place in stages. The initial stage is meeting producers in order to introduce myself and my research. Following this I intend to volunteer with specific producers at the market to observe and engage with the social aspect of the market. This will occur over a number of months. Alongside this I will carry out some investigations concerning the social networking at the market by contacting and questioning producers who use the market within a couple of days of them attending it. This stage of the research is intended to occur in the next month or so. Having been part of the market for a number of weeks, potentially after 2 to 3 months of observations the researcher will approach specific producers to ask them to participate in an interview. This will help to clarify, expand and understand observations made.

As well as speaking to producers the researcher aims to interview those who are responsible for the market in order to understand the development process, what the market aims to achieve, how it does this and what the plans are for the future.

Understanding this will allow for any suggestions made within the research conclusions to consider exactly what is achievable for the market.

What about confidentiality?

As information and data is gathered details will be recorded of those providing it. This allows for the researcher to seek further clarification of the data supplied throughout the research process. All data will be kept confidential and all participants will be kept anonymous in the final PhD report. Only the researcher and potentially her two supervisors of the PhD research will know who has supplied the data.

Who is the researcher?

The research is being carried out by Emma Dean who is studying for a PhD at Cardiff University. Emma holds a geography degree from Swansea University and a Masters degree in Social Science Research Methods from Cardiff University. Emma has research interests in farming and food production and during her studies has completed a research project based on the goal of localisation within the production of organic cheese. She has also completed a study concerning the use and consumption of the space of a farmers' market. In addition to these research projects Emma has worked on an organic farm for a short period.

Who can I contact about the project?

Emma Dean:
BRASS Research Centre,
55 Park Place, Cardiff.
CF10 3AT.
deanel@cf.ac.uk
02920876562.

If there are any concerns that do not seem appropriate to take directly to myself as the researcher, or if further clarification is needed please do not hesitate to contact my PhD Supervisors:

Dr. Gareth Enticott:
enticottg@cf.ac.uk
029 208 76243
Dr. Gillian Bristow:
bristowg1@cf.ac.uk
029 208 75388

Appendix 2: Information sheet for producers



The Social Role of Farmers' Markets

Emma Dean, Cardiff University

02920 876562 / deanel@cf.ac.uk

About this project:

This PhD project aims to establish exactly what farmers' markets provide to producers who trade at them. It seeks to fully investigate the social networks and support that may be developed and maintained through using the market. The research aims to understand the social role and function that the farmers' market has for business growth and social resilience.

Why is this being studied now?

There is currently a great public effort to promote and support local food. What else do farmers' markets provide to producers using them apart from a space to sell their products? Understanding this will help establish the type of support producers need and how this can be provided within the spaces where they trade.

What will the research involve?

The research will take place in stages, involving a questionnaire and interviews with market stallholders. I am particularly keen to help out on market days wherever possible so that I can understand first hand what happens during the market.

What about confidentiality?

All of this research will be done confidentially and anonymously.

About me:

The research is being carried out by Emma Dean who is studying for a PhD at Cardiff University. Emma holds a geography degree from Swansea University and a Masters degree in Social Science Research Methods from Cardiff University. Emma has already conducted research on the production of organic cheese and consumption practices at Farmers' Markets. In addition to these research projects Emma has worked on an organic farm for a short period.