

This is a post-print version. Only the published journal version should be referred to.  
Swensen, Grete, Strengthening Subjective Links to Nature: The Psychology of Heritage Places in an Era of Rising Environmental Awareness, in *The Historic Environment Policy & Practice* DOI 10.1080/17567505.2021.1996521 (online: 29.10.2021)

Grete Swensen, ethnologist, senior researcher, NIKU  
grete.swensen@niku.no

## **Strengthening Subjective Links to Nature: The Psychology of Heritage Places in an Era of Rising Environmental Awareness**

In the search for the psychology of heritage places, the tangible and intangible qualities of heritage are closely intertwined. This article sheds light on the sentiments, insights and attitudes that historic environments can evoke in people, by using the characteristics of old summer mountain farming landscapes as a platform to further discuss how the psychology of these heritage places can be linked to the present-day era of public environmental consciousness. These heritage places can be assets to the recreation and tourism industries. Mountain-farming landscapes can provide a rural escape from a commonplace urban lifestyle. The historical buildings on these historical farming properties, sometimes dating to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, can provide experiential value through the senses, such as touch, smell, sound and sight: the tangible and intangible aspects of aged wooden architecture. Such ‘landscapes with atmosphere’ and ‘landscapes of affect’ can fill an emotional need in people searching for a connection to nature, seeking solitude, silence and privacy, away from everyday routines in a crowded urban world. Increased public environmental consciousness and awareness of climate change, including seasonal alterations, also affect people’s views of the importance of safeguarding natural and cultural resources.

**Keywords:** summer mountain farms; atmospheric landscapes; affect; senses; heritage places

### **Introduction**

Inquiring into the psychology of heritage places is, in this article, used to access and shed light on sentiments, insights and attitudes that historical environments can evoke in people. When examining how people perceive their environments and relate to heritage, psychology can bring additional perspectives.

Over time, cultural historians have become set in their approach to studying vernacular buildings, mainly by using well-established and common methods among architectural historians, such as documenting traditional materials and techniques.

Searching for hidden psychological dimensions in heritage places requires a different approach, and a starting point is looking closer at the notion of a ‘heritage place’ and examining its elements.

An important link here is ‘the person-process-place connection,’ which was introduced and described in-depth by Scannell and Gifford as a ‘three-dimensional organizing framework’.<sup>1</sup> The ‘person dimension’ of attachment to a place refers to its individually or collectively determined meanings and can include the social and cultural knowledge that humans associate with these places. The ‘psychological dimension’ includes the affective, cognitive and behavioural components of attachment, such as the emotions associated with people’s memories of or experiences with these places. The ‘place dimension’ emphasises the place characteristics of attachment, which can include characteristics related to location (climate, topography, etc.). Here, the spatial level plays a central role.<sup>2</sup>

In this article, I utilise this three-dimensional framework to contextualise the research questions addressed. The person–process–place dimensions of psychological attachments are examined further by using the heritage places of traditional summer mountain farming as a contextual reference.

In Norway, traditional farming required seasonal movements of cattle to maximise resources. Less than 70 years ago, summer mountain farming was a common practice throughout large parts of Norway. Today, mountain farming has become a marginalised way of life, preserved on a small scale by certain government-implemented measures and tourism activities. While families with roots in rural districts still may have strong memories of regular summer mountain farm visits, a large part of the population has become urbanised. Urbanites may have relationships with these farms coloured by temporary visits to recreational historic landscapes. Temporal visits

to such landscapes can open up new experiences, partly as awareness (and felt presence) of a time long gone when farming communities relied on optimal use of all resources and partly as a different personal sense of time more in accordance with nature's rhythms and a slower pace made possible through leisure time.

Increased mobility combined with a long-founded national interest in outdoor activities are factors that influence the active recreational use of mountainous areas. Mountainous areas within weekend travel distances are popular among urbanites. Traditional mountain-summer-farming landscapes are experiencing negative environmental impacts from neighbouring second-home development projects (i.e., "development" communities, and wealthy urbanites building a "get-away-home" in the rural area), mountain-located hotels and ski slopes.<sup>3</sup> Concern has arisen about the long-term negative impacts that intensified land use will have for vulnerable areas with rich wildlife, biodiversity and cultural-historic landscapes.<sup>4</sup>

Increased environmental consciousness may affect people's psychological perception and experience of heritage places in mountainous regions. Awareness of climate change and any impacts this awareness has on people's views surrounding the importance of safeguarding natural and cultural resources is a major factor to consider in planning for a more sustainable future.

The following research questions are addressed in this article:

- Do historical remains in large natural landscapes have specific effects on modern visitors?
- Can increased public awareness and uncertainty of climate change effects, including seasonal alterations of natural landscapes, influence attitudes that visitors have towards summer mountain-farms?
- If so, how can this awareness be used to benefit heritage conservation?

This study, rather than being based on a unified theoretical framework, was inspired by a phenomenological approach to examining certain aspects of the world. Although phenomenology refers to a movement in twentieth-century philosophy and includes well-recognised philosophers (e.g., Husserl, Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, Sartre and Derrida), it is more appropriate to compare it with a methodological stance than a doctrine. It deals with the qualitative sides of human experiences and places weight on psychological structures such as understanding, personal perception, thinking, memories, feelings, bodily consciousness and social and linguistic activity. It intends to describe particular, concrete phenomena in the ‘lived world’ before any theorising about it.

Fragments of phenomenological thinking from the original movement are still kept alive in new theoretical schools. In recent years, new attention has been given to affect, the senses and embodiment, particularly in geography, museology, critical heritage studies, and a series of works that illustrate various ways these perspectives can add new insights have been published.<sup>5</sup> Classic works by well-established geographers and social scientists have laid a solid foundation for additional works, thus increasing the relevance of the previously mentioned for other societal studies.<sup>6</sup>

To examine the psychological effects of heritage, heritage places should be interpreted as ‘affective landscapes’. Similarly, the term ‘affective atmosphere’, which both Anderson and Edensor<sup>7</sup> drew attention to, is suitable for this purpose. This current article illustrates a study in which a ‘hands-on’, practice-oriented approach to lived experiences is being exerted. It exemplifies how material culture and fieldwork interplay in ‘understanding the affective potentialities of objects’.<sup>8</sup>

These farming landscapes hold a character involving nature and culture playing equally important roles. Drawing a clear line between natural and cultural–historic

landscapes stopped long ago when cultural historians documented that many landscapes seemingly dominated by wilderness have in many ways been affected by human activities.<sup>9</sup> Harrison pointed to some of the new perspectives that have emerged in heritage studies when ‘the dissolutions of the boundaries between natural and cultural heritage is taken as given’<sup>10</sup>

When landscapes are evaluated within the cultural heritage domain, they often fall into two categories of designated landscapes.<sup>11</sup> The first concerns the exceptional, where adjectives like ‘outstanding’, ‘spectacular’ or ‘sublime’ are used. The second category includes ‘vast landscapes, mainly of rural or pastoral character, that are considered “beautiful” and “traditional”’.<sup>12</sup> However, many contemporary discussions about climate must relate to the third category, ‘urbanised, industrialised and fragmented landscapes’, which is the environment amid which a majority of people in densely populated areas live. These ‘ordinary’ and ‘everyday’ urbanised landscapes, however, may hold other qualities that a more inclusive approach allows for. We need different terminology when referring to (and managing) these landscapes. Linking natural landscapes, cultural–historic environments and atmospheres creates an opening for new perspectives.

<Figure 1>

### **Reflections on Affective Landscapes**

To examine the psychological effects of heritage, heritage places should be interpreted as affective landscapes. The term ‘affective atmosphere’, which Anderson and Edensor both drew attention to, is suitable for this purpose.<sup>13</sup> The concept of ‘affective landscapes’ was highlighted in a special issue of the journal *Cultural Politics* and illustrates a turn towards paying more attention to the affect that has taken place within both social sciences and the humanities.<sup>14</sup>

Anderson introduced the term ‘affective atmospheres’ and offered a series of reflections on what affective atmosphere is and does.<sup>15</sup> To Anderson, it is the ambiguity of the concept itself that intrigues him: the fact that it may be present – or (be) absent, and that it may be something purely subjective – but also commonly used in more collective terms.<sup>16</sup> A point that Anderson mentions in passing is that very few places (or things) can be described as not having an atmosphere.<sup>17</sup> If this everyday omnipresence of atmosphere easily slips our attention, the reason may be that more focus – particularly within the heritage discourse – has been directed to aura (as a form of emanation) or authenticity (as genuine and real), which often are addressed as positive signs or sentiments (i.e., values).

Another factor that Anderson refers to concerns the influence atmosphere may have on the way places are perceived: ‘how atmospheres may interrupt, perturb and haunt fixed persons, places or things’.<sup>18</sup> The spatial structure of an atmosphere can influence affect. ‘Atmospheres are interlinked with forms of enclosure’.<sup>19</sup> They tend to surround an entity, whether we are referring to people engaged in activities, landscapes or tangible cultural heritage.

Some of these research works have met with criticism due to a tendency towards over-theorising and obscuring meaning and applicability. By being ‘dense and obtuse’, some recent writings have served to mystify affect, a turn Edensor tried to counteract by deliberately attempting ‘to ground notions of affect’ in his research.<sup>20</sup>

A parallel discussion has evolved about overfocusing on the visual in cultural studies. Rather than engaging with what is going on in the environment, the visual has primarily dealt with the interpretation of images. A similar tendency takes place concerning the senses, and Ingold claims that Howes<sup>21</sup> has fallen into the trap of detaching people from sensing the real world they inhabit to constructing ‘virtual

worlds of senses'.<sup>22</sup> 'To the worlds of images ... they have simply added worlds of sounds, of feelings and of smells'.<sup>23</sup>

I concur with Anderson when he concludes that atmosphere is an interesting concept. He gives several reasons, among them that it 'unsettles the distinction between affect and emotion' that has appeared in recent discussions...Atmospheres do not fit neatly into either an analytical or pragmatic distinction between affect and emotion'.<sup>24</sup>

### **Methods and Materials**

The research design of this current study is based on a combination of various qualitative research methods. It is framed within the structure of case studies, which is a commonly used methodology in various disciplines in the social sciences and humanities and involves the utilisation of a wide range of different data sources and analytic strategies. It is valued due to the concrete, context-dependent knowledge it obtains, its ability to provide ways to falsify the researcher's preconceived notions and its potential to elicit narrative inquiries that develop descriptions and interpretations of this phenomenon.<sup>25</sup> Methodologically, a case study 'calls into consideration the construction, bounding and representation of the case', thereby providing place-specific data often well suited for comparative analysis.<sup>26</sup>

Integrated into the case study methodology are various tools and techniques, of which qualitative interviews with key informants and an examination of a selection of central planning documents played a central role. In-person interviews were carried out as open-ended conversations, but the interview guide prepared in advance was consulted if necessary. Brief telephone interviews were used to clarify specific problems. The interviews were recorded and supplemented by field notes, while the short conversations, telephone interviews and on-site observations, including photo documentation, were recorded in memos.

The effectiveness of qualitative interviewing lies in its ability to provide insight into another person's knowledge, experiences, viewpoints and interpretations connected with particular subjects and events. <sup>27</sup> Nowadays, ethical research guidelines prescribe that written consent must be obtained in advance, both to participate in interviews and for the information gained to be processed and shared with a larger audience.

This current study's source material stems from five evaluation and research projects carried out as environmental impact assessments and vulnerability analyses in different regions of Norway (2001–2011). These five projects can be divided into two main categories: environmental impact assessment/ consultancy work (numbers 1, 2 and 3) and research projects (numbers 4 and 5) (See Appendix for more details). Although their common denominator was the relationship to cultural heritage in mountainous regions, the intentions behind these commissions varied and influenced their designs. They shared several points of resemblance related to the usage of methods and data material, however, by combining initial studies of municipal planning documents with interviews and on-site documentation, including photo documentation. Literature studies have provided supplemental material related to site-specific cultural history and broader research literature related to the interpretation of the findings.

These projects provided input into this current study:

- (1) Field survey of summer mountain-farms in Gråfjell, Åmot in the municipality Rendalen in county Innlandet: This examination included an evaluation of these farms' heritage values and recommendations concerning their future. Onsight documentation of eight summer mountain-farms was included in this study, involving brief interviews with owners.



- (2) Interdisciplinary consultancy work involving an evaluation of the effects of cottage and second-home development in two specific summer mountain-farming regions (the municipalities of Nes and Hemsedal in the region Buskerud in county Viken): A closer examination of municipal plans was supplemented by four telephone interviews (e.g., municipal planners and advisers in heritage management at the municipal and county levels).
- (3) Consultancy work in two municipalities with active summer mountain-farms (Valdres, and Slidre in county Innlandet) with the main objective of preparing a survey among active summer farmers to ensure that valuable cultural heritage summer farms were safeguarded. Focus group interviews were conducted with core informants (e.g., a representative of the main property owner, advisers in heritage management at the municipal and county levels and active summer farmers).
- (4) An interdisciplinary research project that examined the possibilities of revitalising summer mountain-farming regions because of increased interest in eco-tourism, small-scale farming and recreation: Two municipalities were selected for a comparative study. Nine interviews were conducted in the two valleys Budalen and Endalen in county Trøndelag, and 10 interviews were conducted in the mountain region Golsfjellet, the municipality of Gol in county Viken (active farmers, case handlers in the municipal administration and cultural heritage management advisers at the county level).
- (5) An interdisciplinary research project that focused on designated cultural heritage landscapes in which summer mountain-farming landscapes were included alongside other representative cultural heritage landscapes: Two municipalities were selected for a comparative study. Four semi-structured interviews with key

informants (e.g., active farmers, case handlers in the municipal administration and cultural heritage management advisers at the county level) were conducted in the municipality of Leka in county Trøndelag and Nordherad in the municipality Vågå, Innlandet.

The heritage places this article focuses on involves an examination of a former common phenomenon – summer mountain-farming – that during recent years has become marginalised. Although acknowledging that empirical data collected for different purposes and contexts might lack certain commensurability due to time- and place-specific circumstances, one major strength is the wide timeframe the case study data covers (2001–2011). Supported by additional research literature, it provides a rich source for illustrating a general process.

<Figure 2>

### **The Onset of the Recreational Landscape**

The context presented for this present article is a landscape where people visit a summer mountain-farm for recreational vacation, with an emphasis on landscapes perceived as heritage places. To understand the contemporary mountain landscape, it is necessary to consider the major alterations that have taken place. This relates to societal changes in demographic and economic structures – not least to the entire change of contemporary lifestyles in which recreation has become an important aspect of everyday life.

To grasp the larger context in which these summer farms are part, I illustrate the positive roles of mountain experiences for urban dwellers and underline some of the unforeseen negative effects of modern recreational landscapes, of which second-home development has major land-use impacts. To begin, I present the basic facts necessary

to understand the changed role that summer mountain-farms have in present-day agriculture.

### ***Urbanisation and the changed Role of Summer Mountain-farms***

Today, 82 percent of Norway's population is living in urban regions, with a considerable portion now in the south-eastern regions surrounding the capital Oslo (Statistics Norway, 2019).<sup>28</sup> A relatively small portion of Norway's land resources are suitable for agriculture. While 70 percent of Norway's land resources are unproductive, most of the remaining land is used for forestry (20 percent), with approximately 3 percent used for agriculture. The end of WWII saw a sharp decline in agriculture and accelerated after the 1990s.<sup>29</sup> In Norway, only 2.7% of the workforce is employed in the primary agriculture and forestry industries.<sup>30</sup>

The summer mountain-farming landscape has been formed over hundreds of years of building tradition, grazing and haymaking. One hundred fifty years ago, virtually every farm had a supplementary summer mountain-farm, and some even had several (to ensure early and late grazing). Of the basic need to use all available natural resources, a yearly pattern was developed. In summer, the farmer would bring livestock to graze in mountainous areas to produce dairy products and secure fodder for the winter. Summer-farm buildings were erected to shelter people, animals and hay, and the main reason for their continuity has been the need for supplementary animal fodder. In the establishment of a seasonal base (June–September) for resource use in the outlying fields, a summer farm was crucial for securing the production of dairy products for the farm household and providing extra fishing and hunting grounds. Moving into the mountainous region with livestock was part of the yearly working cycle on the farm and was considered a welcome change at the end of a long winter.

The summer mountain-farm was primarily a female domain, where the dairymaid was in charge of most chores during the week, while the men in the family came more occasionally to partake in certain tasks, such as haymaking, building maintenance, etc. People who still remember days spent working there generally refer to this time as particularly happy, despite the strenuous work and unprotected environment the close contact with nature often brought.<sup>31</sup>

The general physical characteristics of the average summer farm can be described as follows: built as functional units and designed to be utilitarian and ornamental details were only sparsely incorporated. Summer farms have traditionally consisted of a cluster of buildings (i.e., combined dwelling and storehouse, cow barn, hay barn and cookhouses), surrounded by fences, paths and grazing land.

Local vernacular building knowledge combined with attention to functions has influenced the tightly knit integration of the buildings and their surrounding landscape and can be perceived by visitors as harmony between the built settlement and the surrounding landscape. In some areas where the summer mountain-farming tradition has remained intact, the oldest buildings originated in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and were built within a vernacular architectural tradition.<sup>32</sup>

The number of summer mountain-farms in active use has reduced dramatically. While approximately 1,300 received operating grants in 2008, the number decreased to 922 in 2017.<sup>33</sup> In a nationwide documentation project carried out between 2009 and 2017, the number of registered summer mountain-farm buildings was 7,090. Of these, 5,226 were still standing in 2017, varying from being in excellent condition to showing varying degrees of decay. The rest had either dilapidated so much that they could not be repaired (579) or were barely recognisable as a former summer mountain-farmstead (1,285).<sup>34</sup> Although many of these summer farms may no longer be used for traditional

purposes, they may have maintained their quality as historic buildings embedded in the surrounding landscape, thus creating a sense of unity, simplicity and balance.<sup>35</sup> Thus, they may appeal to visitors' senses and be perceived as 'atmospheric landscapes'.

<Figure 3>

### ***The Role of simple Outdoor Recreation in Norway***

These remaining cultural–historic environments, whether still in active use as summer farms or left in various stages of decay, still have the potential to play a role in visitors' psychological experiences. Norway has a longstanding tradition of simple outdoor recreation among its citizens. It has developed a form described by researchers as 'a uniquely Scandinavian phenomenon', for which reason the Norwegian term *friluftsliv* is commonly used, a term that directly translates as outdoor living. It is strongly connected to the tradition in Norway of allowing unrestricted access to engaging in simple and self-organised outdoor recreation activities in nature.<sup>36</sup>

This is confirmed in the Outdoor Recreation Act ratified in 1957, which still plays the role of the steppingstone to which additional directives, etc., relate. The Public Right of Access (Allemannsretten), which is embedded in *Friluftsloven*, grants all citizens the right to access most areas in the country whenever they wish. According to Flemsæter and colleagues, there is an outspoken aim to promote simple *friluftsliv* for everybody in their daily life and harmony with nature. At the core of this aim are non-competitive, non-motorised activities that take place in nature-like surroundings, emphasising activities that are environmentally friendly and promote good health.<sup>37</sup> This '*Friluftsliv* the Norwegian way' has been confirmed as a state policy by the Ministry of Environment (2000–2001).<sup>38</sup> One of the prime aims is to ensure that opportunities for outdoor recreation are maintained and promoted as a leisure activity that is healthy, environmentally sound and gives a sense of well-being.<sup>39</sup>

When examining the background on which these outdoor activities are built, two sources are referred to: the first is based on the rural population's necessary use and utilisation of natural resources, and the second is based on the need found in the urban upper class to use nature as an arena for recreation. According to Flemsæter and colleagues, the systematic national focus on nature protection and environmentalism grew out of this motivation found in the urban upper class.<sup>40</sup>

Flemsæter and colleagues have found a set of value-based standards ('normativities') that are closely attached to the Norwegian outdoors. The first is connected to knowledge, skills and socialisation and can be summed up as a postulation 'that participants in the outdoors do not need to know anything to do *friluftsliv*'. The researchers interpret this as a reflection of 'principles of inclusion and democracy'.<sup>41</sup> The second normative concern is engaging with nature; *friluftsliv* is generally expected to be carried out close to nature, entailing cognitive experiences gained by just being in nature combined with an element of physical activity.<sup>42</sup> The third point relates to the assumption that outdoor activities are closely related to strenuous efforts; it is through efforts put into these activities that the participants experience pleasure.<sup>43</sup> As acknowledged in multiple studies, there is a close relationship between parts of the Norwegian *friluftsliv* and eco-philosophy, of which Arne Næss, both well-recognised philosopher and mountain climber, was among the pioneers.<sup>44</sup> As recent years have brought increased public environmental consciousness, this is also likely to affect people's outdoor recreational behaviour, which I will return to in the discussion.

<Figure 4>

### ***Environmental Impacts of Second-home Development***

Next, I reveal some of the more negative environmental effects of Norwegians' 'love of nature' and 'the outdoors'.<sup>45</sup> This relates to the modern usage of buildings in

mountainous regions for recreational purposes. Special attention is paid to using second homes due to conflicting land-use interests in summer mountain-farming landscapes.

There is a rich tradition of Scandinavian second-home research. The special role that secondary homes have in Norwegian society has been studied from a series of perspectives, such as cultural,<sup>46</sup> economic,<sup>47</sup> and environmental impacts, including planning and land use.<sup>48</sup> According to Halfacree, the character of a second home in Scandinavian countries can be explained by the fact that ‘bonds between supposedly urban populations and specific rural places are often much more strongly rooted’.<sup>49</sup>

Most second homes in Norway are located within weekend travelling distances from the owners’ permanent homes, and they are used extensively for leisurely purposes throughout the year.<sup>50</sup> This phenomenon is closely linked to ‘the era of mobilities’, where the use of private cars and extensive global tourism has changed people’s travel patterns.<sup>51</sup> Users of second homes can therefore also be termed ‘part-time amenity migrants’, meaning the term is not solely restricted to those who own or move permanently to a peri-urban location but also includes the use of or access to second homes.<sup>52</sup>

Increasing concern has arisen that the spread of second homes in Norway is becoming environmentally unsustainable.<sup>53</sup> In a study of leisure consumption in private households, Aall found that traditional outdoor recreation and staying in a second home are the second-largest sources of energy consumption.<sup>54</sup>

As early as 2001, the Ministry of the Environment requested an assessment to develop an updated and more environmentally friendly policy regarding recreational homes. It described trends, driving forces and attitudes, and identified conflict dimensions and knowledge gaps concerning energy use, ecological effects *and* aesthetical and cultural values.<sup>55</sup>

The concept of cabins as locations for harmonious retreats to nature is increasingly challenged by that very phenomenon. Adding large numbers of new cabins and their energy-intensive needs in environmentally sensitive locations threatens the natural environment.<sup>56</sup> This has led to a situation in which the original attraction value of landscapes and resources for visitors, is gradually diminishing.<sup>57</sup> Concerns that highland ecologies are under threat are shared with many other Western countries with similar experiences.<sup>58</sup>

<Figure 5>

### ***Countermove to ensure Summer Mountain Farming and Biodiversity***

To counteract processes of landscape deterioration, marginalisation and loss of cultural heritage, an agricultural landscape scheme was implemented in Norway in 2009. The intention of the Selected Agricultural Landscape (SAL) scheme was to ensure the long-term management of a representative group of Norwegian cultural landscapes. It was based on cooperation between the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture.

Safeguarding nature and cultural heritage require active farming, local engagement and public financial funding. Funding is ensured jointly by the agriculture, nature and cultural heritage authorities. The first list of agricultural landscapes (2009) included 22 landscapes with a combination of biological and cultural–historic values, where active long-term management was considered feasible.<sup>59</sup>

Today, 45 such cultural landscapes are included. While at least three of these can be described as primarily summer farming regions (i.e., Stølsvidda, Valdres; Seterdalene i Budalen; Nordmarksplasser, Oslo), many of the others involve larger cultural–historic environments in which active work on summer mountain-farms is included alongside other commercial activities.<sup>60</sup>



## Discussion

This discussion's focal point will be sentiments, insights and attitudes that historic environments are evoking in people. By using the term 'landscapes of affect', synonymous with 'landscapes with atmosphere', drawing a clear line between affect, emotions and senses (whether referring to visual, tactile, smell, taste, etc.) will yield a more nuanced point of departure where psychological sentiments such as 'delight' and 'uncertainty' can also be included in this discussion.

The first research question addresses whether historic remains in cultural historic landscapes with a significant natural component may affect contemporary visitors of such landscapes. Integrated into this discussion are the person–process–place connections that can be identified within these landscapes.<sup>61</sup> Here, concepts introduced earlier, such as 'affective landscapes' and 'landscapes with atmosphere', become useful, and they are related to the emotions or 'affect' these landscapes may arouse.

When examining the way affective connections are made by using the senses to interpret stimuli, researchers have paid the most attention to vision (gaze). Regarding landscapes, aesthetic appeal is important, and the way some of the summer mountain-farms are situated in the landscape is striking – in some areas, clinging onto the hills in a long row; while in others, they are spread out in a rugged landscape like pearls, with narrow strings of tracks that cattle and people have made between the neighbouring summer farms (trails, '*gutú*').<sup>62</sup>

Another particularity that people tend to notice about such buildings is how they become tanned by the weather. Many recognise the way wood changes colours, depending on how the buildings are situated within the landscape. Many of these buildings have been weather-beaten by strong winds, snow and rain, and the smell of the old wood may be more apparent on a sunny day when someone is leaning close to

the wooden wall, alongside the beauty of the surrounding natural summer landscapes of hay and wildflowers growing in the fields. Touching old wood produces a special experience: Letting your hand run along joined logs, your fingers following the large cracks in the wood that mature age brings.

Regarding the sense of taste, the fresh spring water always available plays a main role: cool, refreshing and clear. The location of a stream was an essential part of where the mountain summer farms became situated. It is easy to imagine visitors' appreciation when they finally approach a cluster of summer farms and the stream after making long and strenuous walks in sometimes rather inaccessible terrains.<sup>63</sup>

Temporality is also involved in the personal relationships people make with a historic landscape, and 'time is inevitably an important experiential component'.<sup>64</sup> There is a time-depth in this landscape visible in the clusters of buildings on the summer farms. Primarily as utility buildings, they were built during different periods, and changes that have been made to them are visible in the various uses of material, building techniques and technical installations. This relates to two parallel senses of time, that such landscapes can evoke. The first occurs as awareness (and felt presence) of a time long gone when farming communities relied on maximum use of all available resources. The other is experienced as different from ordinary everyday routines and is felt as being in the present moment more in accordance with nature's rhythms, with a slower pace made possible through leisurely time. A sense of time that 'appears in natural changes between light and dark (...) Time does not merely pass but is felt in bodily rhythms of tiredness, sleep, wakefulness and efforts'.<sup>65</sup>

As a transition from the description above of possible personal sentiments, sensual experiences and affect that visitors may experience when they encounter summer mountain-farms, I will introduce the concept of 'delight'.

These cultural heritage landscapes can appeal to visitors as ‘landscapes with atmosphere’ because they can bring ‘delight’.<sup>66</sup> When landscape architect Ian Thompson wrote about ‘delight’, he referred to qualities that philosophers like Plato and Aristotle associated with beauty: unity, regularity, simplicity, proportion, balance, measure and definiteness.<sup>67</sup> Not surprisingly, several of these qualities are present in many old summer mountain-farming landscapes, such as simplicity and unity, which are commonalities often found in vernacular architecture.<sup>68</sup> Thompson described ‘delight’ as one of the three value fields he associates with landscape architecture, the other two being community and ecology, and through his studies, he found that the three value fields (also called ‘missions of landscape architecture’) partly overlap.<sup>69</sup>

< Figure 6 >

The second question raised concerns about the potential relationship between the psychological impact of summer mountain-farms and increased public uncertainty about climate change, including seasonal changes and their effects on natural landscapes. To approach this topic, it is necessary to return briefly to the practice of Norwegian *friluftsliv*, as described earlier. As pointed out by Flemsæter and colleagues, this is based on a long tradition connected to rural living and is also considered a democratic right that will benefit public health and welfare.

Parallel processes are in motion. On the one hand, there is an increasing awareness of the importance of outdoor living for physical health, as the Latin expression mediates: ‘*Mens sana in corpore sano*’ – a healthy soul in a healthy body. As an illustration, I will refer to the increased popularity that the Norwegian Trekking Association (DNT, established in 1868) has experienced in recent years. In 2016, they referred to the largest increase in membership in a successful period of 18 years, and

that year, the increase was over 20,000 members, with 290,790 members.<sup>70</sup> ‘A crucial aspect of *friluftsliv* is the experiences of it, or the *feeling*’.<sup>71</sup>

Tourism works on various levels, and different attractions have different appeals depending on one’s age, gender, class and ethnicity. Regardless, people are increasingly interested in visiting heritage places, including summer mountain-farming landscapes, as much as in discovering, experiencing, participating in, learning about and being more intimately included in the everyday life of the destinations.<sup>72</sup> Although there is a series of niche tourism products, there is continuity around the essence of tourist experiences, and at the core of tourism, there is a series of subjective, emotional experiences.<sup>73</sup>

The other parallel process in question concerns the development of second homes in vulnerable mountainous regions within a day trip of distance from the largest urban regions. Although municipal planning restrictions have become stricter in recent years, second homes stand out from traditional natural and cultural landscapes and are bringing in different ideals of rural living. Today, a series of factors challenge the ideal of simple and free outdoor living in mountainous areas (e.g., rafting, mountain biking, kiting, freeride and rock climbing).<sup>74</sup>

Kaltenborn shed light on the relationship between ecological awareness (called ecocentrism) and attitudes and expectations towards second-home development. In general, he found that second homeowners who express a strong degree of environmental orientation are consistently less in favour of the development of further infrastructure, services and facilities. ‘Ecocentrism is also positively correlated with sensitivity towards impacts and scepticism towards long-term future changes’.

Sentiments that support a turn towards ecocentrism are statements such as: ‘The balance in nature is delicate and easily upset’; ‘Humans are severely abusing the environment’;

and ‘If things continue on their present course, we will soon experience a major ecological catastrophe’.<sup>75</sup>

A factor looming in the background is the general public ‘uncertainty’ that is spreading, as media and research are bringing more news about rising global temperatures, biodiversity reduction and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Some contemporary societal problems are ‘characterized by a high degree of scientific uncertainty and deep disagreement of values’<sup>76</sup>, and some researchers classify them as ‘wicked problems’.<sup>77</sup> According to Balint and colleagues, ‘the definition of a wicked environmental problem itself is in the eye of the beholder’, which means that there is ‘no single correct formulation of any particular problem’.<sup>78</sup> One such wicked problem relates to the impact that unforeseen demographic changes will have on climate and biodiversity. The ‘uncertainty’ and ecological concern about the future that many citizens share today can bring a sense of ‘restlessness’ and ‘unease’ that people temporarily need to dampen, and friluftsliv, mountain hiking and visits to old summer mountain-farming landscapes may release periods of stress.

The third question raised is whether this relationship can benefit heritage conservation. The premise on which the SAL scheme was based is that vulnerable landscapes threatened by marginalisation must be turned into active agricultural landscapes to ensure their sound management and protection. This ascribed the farmers to the vital role of landscape managers.<sup>79</sup> The more than doubling of cultural landscapes gaining a designated status as SAL since 2009 can be interpreted as a sign of success; the scheme has reached its intended goals and has managed to ensure the integration of active farming, community support and enough financial funding.

The renewed interest in rural traditions in the tourism market has inspired farmers to combine agriculture, landscape management and various forms of farm

tourism. Today, many farmers have an open mind towards new ways of combining farming, tourism and cultural tourism. The uniqueness of such opportunities lies in the interplay between traditional buildings and a landscape that, although dominated by biodiversity, is still in active use.<sup>80</sup> The SAL- scheme can be interpreted as a suitable means of ensuring the continuation of long-established harmony between the built environment and nature.

## **Conclusion**

This article used the characteristics of old summer mountain-farming landscapes as a platform to discuss how the psychology of heritage places can be linked to the present-day era of public environmental consciousness. Through their characterisation as ‘landscapes with atmosphere’, they can provide first-hand experiences of closeness to nature that modern citizens seek nowadays in an increasingly busy and urbanised world. As affective landscapes, these heritage landscapes can inspire moments of delight and temporarily ease the feeling of uncertainty that surrounds questions about society’s future sustainability.

Norwegian conservation policy demonstrates a clear awareness of the essential roles that historic summer mountain-farms play in the mountainous regions. Nature and cultural heritage managers work hand-in-hand to initiate large conservation zones. Challenges generally emerge at the municipal and regional levels regarding the need to weigh short-term economic needs and long-term environmental considerations.

Affective landscapes can motivate people on the individual level to alter habits and practices known to be harmful to the environment. Indirectly, this can also benefit heritage management by creating a better public understanding of the importance of safeguarding these heritage contexts. Heritage landscapes provide links between former

knowledge about natural adaptation and the development of new and more sustainable lifestyles that will be important in the future.

## <APPENDIX>

### Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> Scannell and Gifford, *Defining place attachment*, 1

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Saglie and Swensen, *Reusing the past*.

<sup>4</sup> Taugbøl et al., *Hyttebygging i Norge*.

- 
- <sup>5</sup> See Anderson, *Affective Atmospheres*; Crouch, *Unravelling Space and Landscape in Leisure's Identities*; Hamilakis, *Archeologies of the Senses*; Waterton, *Landscape and Non-Representational Theories*.
- <sup>6</sup> Ingold, *The Perception of the environment*; Mol, *The Body Multiple*; Thrift, *Intensities of feeling, Non-Representational Theory*; Howes, *Sensual relations*.
- <sup>7</sup> Anderson, *Affective*; Edensor, *Illuminated atmospheres*.
- <sup>8</sup> Frykman and Frykman, *Affect and Material Culture*.
- <sup>9</sup> Jones and Daugstad, *Usages of the cultural landscape concept*.
- <sup>10</sup> Harrison, *Beyond Natural and Cultural Heritage*, 24.
- <sup>11</sup> Antrop, *Balancing Heritage and Innovation*, 49
- <sup>12</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>13</sup> Anderson, *Affective*; Edensor, *Illuminated*.
- <sup>14</sup> Berberich et al., *Affective Landscapes*.
- <sup>15</sup> Anderson, *Affective*, 77.
- <sup>16</sup> Ibid., 77, 80.
- <sup>17</sup> Ibid., 78; see also Edensor, *Illuminated*, 1,114
- <sup>18</sup> Anderson, *Affective*, 78.
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid., 80.
- <sup>20</sup> Edensor, *Illuminated*, 1,103.
- <sup>21</sup> Howes, *Sensual*; Howes and Pink, *The future of sensory anthropology*.
- <sup>22</sup> Ingold, *World of sensing and sensing the world*, 314.
- <sup>23</sup> Ibid., 316.
- <sup>24</sup> Anderson, *Affective*, 80.
- <sup>25</sup> Cresswell, *Research Design*; Curran and Perecman, *A Handbook for Social Science*; Flyvbjerg, *Five misunderstandings*.



- 
- <sup>26</sup> Miles, *Complexity, representation and practice*, 310.
- <sup>27</sup> Chase, *Narrative inquiry*; Flyvbjerg.
- <sup>28</sup> *Statistics Norway*
- <sup>29</sup> Almås, *Norges landbrukshistorie*.
- <sup>30</sup> *Store Norske Leksikon*
- <sup>31</sup> Saglie and Swensen, *Reusing*; Swensen, *Setra et gårdsbruk i miniatyr*; Swensen, *Unity, simplicity, and balance*; Swensen, *Rural Tourism*.
- <sup>32</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>33</sup> Stensgaard, *Hvordan står det til på setra*.
- <sup>34</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>35</sup> Saglie and Swensen, *Reusing*; Swensen, *Setra*; Swensen, *Unity, simplicity*; Swensen, *Rural Tourism*.
- <sup>36</sup> Higham et al., *National Parks policy*, 2.
- <sup>37</sup> Flemsæter et al., *Morality, mobility and citizenship*.
- <sup>38</sup> Ministry of Environment, *Friluftsliv. Ein veg til høgare livskvalitet*.
- <sup>39</sup> Flemsæter et al., *Morality*, 7
- <sup>40</sup> Ibid., 8
- <sup>41</sup> Ibid., 9–10.
- <sup>42</sup> Ibid., 12.
- <sup>43</sup> Ibid., 14.
- <sup>44</sup> Crowley, *Climbing mountains, hugging trees*; Henderson and Vikander, *Nature first*; Higham et al. *National Parks*.
- <sup>45</sup> As referred to by both Crowley, *Climbing mountains*, and Flemsæter et al. *Morality*.
- <sup>46</sup> Abram, *The normal cabins revenge*; Abram, *Values of property*; Lien and Abram, *Hytta – fire vegger rundt en drøm*.

- 
- <sup>47</sup> Overvåg, *Second Homes*.
- <sup>48</sup> Ellingsen, *Rural second homes*; Aall, *Energy use and leisure consumption*.
- <sup>49</sup> Halfacree, *Heterolocal identities*.
- <sup>50</sup> Overvåg, *Second Homes*, 4.
- <sup>51</sup> Halfacree, *Heterolocal identities*, 210.
- <sup>52</sup> Qviström et al., *Part-time amenity migrants*, 170.
- <sup>53</sup> Saglie and Swensen, *Reusing*; Swensen, *Setra, Unity, Rural Tourism*; Taugbøl et al., *Hyttebygging*; see also Kaltenborn et al., *Amenity development in the Norwegian mountains*; Aall, *Energy use*.
- <sup>54</sup> Aall, *Energy use*, 738.
- <sup>55</sup> Taugbøl et al. *Hyttebygging*.
- <sup>56</sup> Swensen, *Setra, Unity, Rural Tourism*; Saglie and Swensen, *Reusing*.
- <sup>57</sup> Gansmo et al., *Norske hytter i endring*.
- <sup>58</sup> McIntyre et al., *Multiple dwelling and tourism*; Moss, *The Amenity Migrants*.
- <sup>59</sup> Swensen and Sætren, *Managing historic resources*.
- <sup>60</sup> Norwegian Agriculture Agency, *Selected agricultural landscapes*.
- <sup>61</sup> Scannell and Gifford, *Defining*, 1.
- <sup>62</sup> Saglie and Swensen, *Reusing*; Swensen, *Setra, Unity, Rural*.
- <sup>63</sup> See Poe et al., *Sense of place*, for a grounded analysis of the role of the senses.
- <sup>64</sup> Varley and Sempe, *Nordic slow adventure*, 82.
- <sup>65</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>66</sup> Thompson, *Ecology, community and delight*.
- <sup>67</sup> Ibid., 15.
- <sup>68</sup> Oliver, *Built to meet needs*.
- <sup>69</sup> Thompson, *Ecology*, 7–8.

- 
- <sup>70</sup> Dagens Næringsliv, *Den Norske Turistforening vokser videre*.
- <sup>71</sup> Flemsæter et al., *Morality*, 19.
- <sup>72</sup> Robinson and Novelli, *Niche tourism*.
- <sup>73</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>74</sup> Flemsæter et al., *Morality*, 9.
- <sup>75</sup> Kaltenborn, *Amenity*, 195, 197.
- <sup>76</sup> Balint et al., *Wicked environmental problems*.
- <sup>77</sup> Ibid.; Rauws, *Embracing uncertainty*.
- <sup>78</sup> Balint et al., *Wicked*, 2.
- <sup>79</sup> Swensen and Sætren, *Managing*.
- <sup>80</sup> Saglie and Swensen, *Reusing*; Swensen, *Setra, Unity, Rural*; Swensen and Sætren, *Managing*.

## Bibliography

1. Aall, C. "Energy use and leisure consumption in Norway: an analysis and reduction strategy." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 19, no.6 (2011): 729–745.
2. Abram, S. "'The Normal Cabin's Revenge'. Building Norwegian (Holiday) Home Cultures". *Home Cultures* 9, no.3 (2012): 233-256.
3. Abram, S. "Values of property (Properties of value): capitalization of kinship in Norway." *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change* 12, no. 3 (2014): 253-266.
4. Almås, R. *Norges landbrukshistorie, Bind IV 1920-2000: Frå bondesamfunn til bioindustri*. Oslo: Samlaget, 2002.
5. Anderson, B. "Affective atmospheres." *Emotion, Space and Society* 2 (2009): 77-81.
6. Antrop, M. "Balancing Heritage and Innovation – The Landscape Perspectives." *Bulletin de la Société Géographique de Liège, BSGLG*, 69 (2017): 41-51.

- 
7. Balint, P.J.; Stewart, R.E.; Desai, A. & Walters, L.C. *Wicked Environmental Problems. Managing uncertainty and conflict*. Washington, Covelo, London: Island Press, 2011.
  8. Berberich, C., Campbell, N. & Hudson, R. "Affective Landscapes. An Introduction." *Cultural Politics* 9, no.3 (2013): 313-311.
  9. Chase, S.E. "Narrative inquiry. Multiple lenses, approaches, voices", in *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, eds. N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (London: Sage publications, 2013), 651–679.
  10. Creswell, J. W. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches*. London: Sage publications, 2014.
  11. Crouch D. "Unravelling Space and Landscape in Leisure's Identities", in *Landscapes of Leisure. Leisure Studies in a Global Era*, eds. S. Gammon & S. Elkington (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 8-23.
  12. Crowley, T. "Climbing mountains, hugging trees: A cross-cultural examination of love for nature." *Emotion, Space and Society* 6 (2013): 44-53.
  13. Curran, S.R. & Perecman, E. Eds. *A Handbook for Social Science Field research. Essays and Bibliographic Sources on Research Design and Methods*. London: Sage Publications, 2006.
  14. Dagens Næringsliv (26.10.2016). "Den Norske Turistforening vokser videre.» Available at: <https://www.dn.no/friluftsliv/dnt/reiseliv/den-norske-turistforening-vokser-videre/1-1-5754453>
  15. Edensor, T. "Illuminated atmospheres: anticipating and reproducing the flow of affective experience in Blackpool." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 30 (2012):1103-1122.
  16. Ellingsen, W. "Rural Second Homes: A Narrative of De-Centralisation." *Sociologia Ruralis* 57, no.2 (2017). Doi: 10.1111/soru. 12130
  17. Flemsæter, F., Setten, G. & Brown, K.M. "Morality, mobility and citizenship: Legitimising mobile subjectivities in a contested outdoors." *Geoforum*, 64, (2015): 342-350.
  18. Flyvbjerg, B. "Five misunderstandings of case-study research." *Qualitative Inquiry* 12 (2006): 219–245.
  19. Frykman, J. & Frykman, M.P. "Affect and Material Culture. Perspectives and Strategies", in *Sensitive Objects. Affect and Material Culture*, eds. J. Frykman & M.P. Frykman (Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2016), 9-31.

- 
20. Gansmo, H. J., Berker, T. & Jørgensen, F.A., Eds. *Norske hytter i endring. Om bærekraft og behag* [Norwegian cabins in transition. On sustainability and comfort]. Trondheim: Tapir Academic Press, 2011.
21. Halfacree, K. "Heterolocal Identities? Counter-Urbanisation, Second Homes, and Rural Consumption in the Era of Mobilities." *Population, Space, Place*, 18, (2012): 209–224.
22. Hamilakis, Y. "Archaeologies of the Senses. Chapter 15", in *Oxford handbook of the archaeology of ritual and religion*, ed. T. Insoll (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 208-225.
23. Harrison, R. "Beyond 'Natural' and 'Cultural' Heritage: Toward an Ontological Politics of Heritage in the Age of Anthropocene." *Heritage & Society* 8, no.1 (2015): 24-42.
24. Henderson, B. & Vikander, N. eds. *Nature First: Outdoor Life the Friluftsliv Way*. Toronto: Nature heritage Books, 2007.
25. Higham, J., Haukeland, J.V., Hopkins, D., Vistad, O.I., Lindberg, K. & Daugstad, K. "National Parks policy and planning: A comparative analysis of friluftsliv (Norway) and the dual mandate (New Zealand)." *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events* 8, no.2 (2016): 146-175.
26. Howes, D. *Sensual relations: engaging the senses in culture and social theory*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003.
27. Howes, D. & Pink, S. "The future of sensory anthropology/ the anthropology of the senses." *Social Anthropology* 18, no. 3 (2010): 331-340.
28. Ingold, T. *The Perception of the Environment. Essays in livelihood, dwelling and skill*. London: Routledge, 2000.
29. Ingold, T. "Worlds of sense and sensing the world: a response to Sarah Pink and David Howes." Debate Section, *Social Anthropology* 19, no.3 (2011): 313-317.
30. Jones, M. & Daugstad, K. (1997). "Usages of the "cultural landscape" concept in Norwegian and Nordic landscape administration." *Landscape Research*, 22, no.3, 267-281.
31. Kaltenborn, B. P., Andersen, O. & Nellemann, C. "Amenity development in the Norwegian mountains. Effects of second homeowner environmental attitudes on preferences for alternative development options." *Landscape and Urban Planning* 91, (2009): 195–201.
32. Lien, M. & Abram. S. *Hytta - fire vegger rundt en drøm*. Oslo: Kagge, 2019.

- 
33. McIntyre, N., Williams, D., McHugh, K. *Multiple Dwelling and Tourism: Negotiating Place, Home and Identity*. Wallingford, Cambridge MA: CABI, 2006.
34. Miles, R. "Complexity, representation and practice: Case study as method and methodology." *Issues in Educational Research* 25, no.3 (2015): 309-318.
35. Ministry of Environment *St.meld. nr.39, Friluftsliv. Ein veg til høgare livskvalitet*. Oslo: Miljøverndepartementet, 2001.
36. Mol, A.E. *The Body Multiple. Ontology in medical practice*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2002.
37. Moss, L. A. G. *The Amenity Migrants: Seeking and Sustaining Mountains and Their Cultures*. Oxfordshire, UK, Cambridge, MA: CABI, 2006.
38. Norwegian Agriculture Agency. *Selected Agricultural Landscapes*, 2019 <https://www.landbruksdirektoratet.no/no/miljo-og-okologisk/kulturlandskap/utvalgte-kulturlandskap>
39. Oliver, P. *Built to Meet Needs. Cultural Issues in Vernacular Architecture*. Oxford: Architectural Press, Elsevier, 2006.
40. Overvåg, K. "Second Homes and maximum yield in marginal land. The re-resourcing of rural land in Norway." *European Urban and Regional Studies* 17, no.1 (2010): 3–16.
41. Poe, M. R., Donatuto, J. & Satterfield, T. " 'Sense of Place': Human Wellbeing Considerations for Ecological Restoration in Puget Sound." *Coastal Management*, 44, no.5 (2016): 1-18.
42. Qviström, M., Bengtsson, J. & Vicenzotti, V. "Part-time amenity migrants: Revealing the importance of second homes for senior residents in a transit-oriented development." *Land Use Policy* 56 (2016): 169–178.
43. Rauws, W. "Embracing Uncertainty Without Abandoning Planning." *disP – The Planning Review* 53, no.1 (2017): 32-45.
44. Robinson, M & Novelli, M. (2005). "Niche Tourism; an introduction", in *Niche Tourism: contemporary issues, trends and cases*, ed. M. Novelli) London: Routledge, 2005), 1-14.
45. Saglie, I. L. & Swensen, G. "Reusing the past: Popular architecture in Golsfjellet summer mountain farm area." *Nordisk Arkitekturforskning*, 1-2 (2010): 95-108.
46. Scannell, L. & Gifford, R. "Defining place attachment: A tripartite organizing framework." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 30 (2010): 1–10.
47. *Statistics Norway (2019)*. <https://www.ssb.no/en>

- 
48. Stensgaard, K. *Hvordan står det til på setra? Registrering av setermiljøer i perioden 2009-2015*. Ås: NIBIO Report 3/8, 2017.
49. *Store Norske Leksikon* (2020). <https://snl.no/Norge> [The Encyclopedia of Norway]
50. Swensen, G. (2003). «Setra – et gårdsbruk i miniatyr.», in *På vandring i fortiden. Mennesker og landskap i Gråffjell gjennom 10 000 år*, eds. H.R. Amundsen, O. Risbøl & K. Skare (Oslo: NIKU Tema 7), 88-91 [The summer mountain farm – a farm in miniature].
51. Swensen, G. “Unity, simplicity and balance: Sustainable management of cultural historic environments of mountain summer farming.”, in *Eco-Architecture. Harmonisation between Architecture and Nature*, eds. G. Broadbent & C.A. Brebbia (Southampton: WIT-press, 2006.), 123-133.
52. Swensen, G. “Rural Tourism and Processes of Cultural Heritage Manufacture.” *Sustainable Tourism III*, eds. F.D. Pinda & C.A. Brebbia (Ashurst: WIT Press, 2008), 295-305.
53. Swensen, G. & Sætren, A. “Managing historic resources in active farming landscapes: National priorities and local practices.” *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development* 4, no.1 (2014): 80-94.
54. Taugbøl, T., O.I. Vistad, C. Nellemann, B.P. Kaltenborn, A.C. Flyen, G. Swensen, A. Nybakken, B.C. Horgen, R. Grefsrud, K. Lein, J.B. Sivertsen & L. Gurigard. *Hyttebygging i Norge. En oppsummering og vurdering av ulike miljø- og samfunnsmessige effekter av hyttebygging i fjell- og skogtraktene i Sør-Norge*. Oslo: NINA Oppdragsmelding 709, 2001.
55. Thompson, Ian H. (1999) *Ecology, Community and Delight. Sources of values in landscape architecture*. London, New York: Routledge, 1999.
56. Thrift, N. (2004). “Intensities of feeling: Towards a spatial politics of affect” *Geografiska Annaler* 86B, no.1 (2004): 57-78.
57. Thrift, N. *Non-Representational Theory. Space, politics, affect*. London & New York: Routledge, 2008.
58. Varley, P. & Semple, T. “Nordic Slow Adventure: Explorations in Time and Nature.” *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 15, no.1 (2015): 73-90.
59. Waterton, E. Landscape and Non-Representational Theories. In P. Howard, I. Thompson & E. Waterton, E. (Eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Landscape Studies* (pp. 66-70). London: Routledge, 2013.

