DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 430 RC 013 165

AUTHOR Nicholson, Beryl
TITLE Rural Migration Patterns in Norway: Some Observations concerning Recent Trends.
PUB DATE 9 Aug 81
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the European Congress for Rural Sociology (11th, Helsinki, Finland, August 9-15, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age Groups; Agricultural Occupations; Blue Collar Occupations; *Career Choice; Comparative Analysis; Employment Opportunities; Employment Patterns; Foreign Countries; Migrants; *Migration Patterns; *Occupational Mobility; Population Trends; Public Service Occupations; *Relocation; Rural Areas; *Rural Population; *Urban to Rural Migration; White Collar Occupations
IDENTIFIERS *Norway

ABSTRACT

In Norway, there has been a change from net out-migration from rural areas to net in-migration since about 1970; however, this apparent change is a manifestation of changes in occupational patterns and characteristics of certain age groups. The rise in technical and professional occupations has been dramatic, and a particularly high proportion of this occupational group has been in the relatively mobile early career stages and at mobile ages. Net losses and gains to rural or agricultural areas are equal to only about 10% of the respective gross out- and in-movements. In absolute terms, there is an approximate balance between in- and out-movement which suggests that few of these migrants settle in a commune for any length of time. Migrants consist predominantly of those in the highest and lowest socio-economic strata. The net out-migration of village natives is generally higher than net in-migration of other people. There has been growth in employment opportunities in rural areas in the secondary sector during the 1970's, notably in the public service sector. Although these changes in the occupational structure of rural areas are bringing about conditions considered necessary to stop out-migration, the jobs created are, in principal, open to anyone and not reserved for local inhabitants. (CM)

XI European Congress for Rural Sociology

Helsinki, Finland, 9-15 August 1981

Rural migration patterns in Norway: Some observations concerning recent trends

Beryl Nicholson,
12, Lavender Gardens,
Newcastle upon Tyne NE2 3LE
England.

XI European Congress for Rural Sociology

Helsinki, Finland, 9-15 August 1981

Rural migration patterns in Norway: Some observations concerning recent trends

Deryl Nicholson,
12, Lavender Gardens,
Newcastle upon Tyne NE2 3DE,
England.

As in many other advanced nations, a so-called population turn-around, that is a change from net out-migration from rural areas to net in-migration, was noticed in Norway from about 1970. What I want to argue in this paper is that this apparent change is, in fact, just a stage in an evolution which had already been in progress for some time, but to begin with could not be detected in the migration statistics. I shall attempt to show that the change in migration patterns is just one manifestation of more far-reaching social change of a kind not necessarily confined to Norway, and to suggest some of its implications.

The general pattern of population change to 1970 [1]

In Norway, as indeed in the Nordic countries in general, the degree of urbanisation has consistently been lower than in most other parts of Europe. What is more, a larger proportion of the non-urbanised population lives dispersed, outside villages, than in many other countries. [2] In absolute terms, this dispersed population continued to increase until at least 1950, it was only at the 1960 census that a decline first became apparent. Another trend which appeared at about the same time, and which attracted less attention, was the marked increase over the previous decade of the number of "urban" places in the smallest size category, that is with a population of 200 to 499; the emergence of villages on such a scale was something new in Norway.

Many of these villages were situated in rural areas in which the dispersed population was declining. As a result, the total population of the rural communes in which they were located remained stable, all that had occurred was a net redistribution of population. The interpretation which was placed on this observation, and there was little other evidence, was that a local concentration of population was taking place, that people were moving from rural areas to their local villages.

In regional development circles this trend was looked upon as favourable in a number of respects. For some time there had been concern at the pressure on the major cities which resulted from in-migration. The emergence of alternative migration destinations - intervening opportunities - was welcomed for the potential it seemed to offer for reducing this problem. There were also considered to be social advantages: no longer would it be necessary for the rural dweller to move to a remote and culturally strange city in order to enjoy the benefits of modern society. The growth, and promotion, of local villages would, it was considered, enable rural people to remain in familiar surroundings, and yet to take up "urban" occupations and to have access to an adequate range of services (St. meld. nr.87(1971-72), p.74). It was also widely believed that such moves were more "sensible", that is, more likely to result in successful adjustment than those which involved a greater transition (c.f. Sulvik, 1970, p.345).

For a time during the 1960's a growth centre policy was pursued, and local centralization of services were still being advocated at the beginning of the 1970's as the only alternative to depopulation in some rural areas (NOU 1972: 28, pp.11-12; St.meld. nr.13 (1972-73), pp.14-15). The 1970 census showed a further decline in the overall size of the dispersed rural population, and this was lost

marked in areas which were not within commuting distance of towns. The centralisation policy appeared to be vindicated.

The beginning of a new trend?

However, a number of changes became apparent from about 1970 onwards, and these were seized upon by the energetic critics of the centralisation ideology in particular as showing that alternatives were possible, and desired. One such change was the reversal (in 1973) of the longstanding trend of net out-migration from North Norway (SSB, 1975, p.41), a movement which had been seen as part of the concentration at the national level. This proved to be short lived, but it does appear that rural population levels have stabilised in that region after a period of considerable decline (Brox, Larsen & Pedersen, 1980, pp.246-247, 251).

In the country as a whole, in the mid-1960's rural communes (which include villages) had a net migration loss of 5-7 000 per year (gross out-migration was about 70 000 per year)(SSB, 1968a, p.29). By the late 1970's, this had changed to a situation in which the nearest equivalent, the agricultural and fishing communes (the classification system is no longer the same) had a net migration gain averaging about 3 000 per year, gross in-migration being about 35 000 (SSB, 1977d, pp.80-81; 1978a, pp.78-79; 1979a, pp. 78-79; 1980a, pp.78-79). A slight reversal of urbanisation and centralisation at the national level was also noticeable from the mid 1970's onwards, in that the city of Oslo and its immediate surroundings began to show a net loss of migrants to the rest of the country (Moen, Reisz & Strand, 1979, pp.28ff.).

This apparent reversal of trends has been interpreted as an indication of a change of values, or rather of people acting according to values they already held [3], and resisting pressures to become

urbanised. However, like the earlier assumptions about the pattern of movements which led to centralisation, this conclusion has been drawn on the evidence of net movement and net population change. This is inadequate, as one can only explain movement by considering the actual moves themselves, and this is what I propose to do.

Putting turnaround in perspective

To start with, it is important to get the apparent reversal of migration trends in proportion. The net losses and gains to rural, or agricultural, areas already cited are equal to only about 10% of the respective gross out- and in-movements. We are not, therefore, dealing with a dramatic turnaround of total flows, but with a slight increase or decrease in the number of people moving in one direction relative to the other. Total mobility[4], though it has declined slightly in the latter part of the 1970's (to 43.0 in 1978)[5], is still at the same level as in the mid-1960's (43.8 in 1966)(SSB, 1978a, p.89), when it was higher than at any time since records had been kept.

It is also necessary to bear in mind that the decline in mobility has not been equally great in all areas. The decline in movement in and out of the Oslo area which has been observed (Moen et al., 1979, p.32) would appear to be characteristic of major urban areas in general. These areas showed an above average decline in movement between 1973 and 1979, as did less central industrial, mixed industrial and agricultural, and fishing communes. A below average decline was experienced by central agricultural and industrial, agricultural, central industrial and "other" communes, which means that there will be quite a number in each of these categories in which levels of mobility have been constant or have even increased, contrary to the national trend[6]. All these trends are found among the rural communes which will be used as examples in this paper.

The next thing it is necessary to keep absolutely clear when considering trends in total movement is that in a high proportion of cases, we are not concerned with simple one-way movements of, for example, country people moving to take up "permanent" residence in the town, or town people taking up "permanent" residence in the country. These stereotypes are false and misleading[7]. As often as not the "single" move counted in migration statistics is just one of a series of moves made by the same individual in a lifetime. In the course of that lifetime, the person occupies different roles and positions. Sometimes moving from one to the next will involve a move to a new location, or station (Hägerstrand, 1962, p.61) which might be occupied for many years, or just for a brief phase. No figures are available for Norway to show by how many the number of moves in a given period exceeds the number of persons who move, but in Sweden the excess over a five year period is between 45% and 50% (Geschwind, 1957, p.196; SOU 1974: 2, p.188).

What this means at the level of the locality is that the displacement of population is nowhere near as great as the habitual conception of movement as a simple one-way process suggests. It also implies that a proportion of the residents of an area at any one time will be recent arrivals who will leave again.

In a rural commune I have studied in North Norway (Skjervøy, with about 5 000 inhabitants), the number of registered moves out of the commune from 1961 to 1970 (2327) was more than double the number of people present at the 1960 census who were resident elsewhere at the next one in 1970 (1099); for in-migrants the ratio is three to one (1520:432)(calculated from migration statistics for the years 1961-1970. SSB, 1964b; 1965; 1967; 1968c; 1970; 1971b; 1972b; 1977a, p.41). A portion of the excess movement is due to return movement of out-migrants[8]. About 10% of out-migrants return, and

they account for 35% of in-migration (Nicholson, 1971, pp.103-104; 1975, p.230). However, quite a considerable part of the total movement would appear to be due to turnover of people who come from other districts then leave again later. As a component of migration this group has been largely ignored, and therefore its significance for the localities in which it temporarily resides has never received adequate attention. I would suggest, however, that it offers a key to the understanding both of more recent trends in migration, and to some of the social changes to which they have given rise.

Migrant turnover

During a period of some three and a half years[9] in the early 1960's, non-natives[10] accounted for almost 65% of in-migrants to Skjervøy and about 40% of out-migrants. In absolute terms there is an approximate balance between in- and out-movement. This would suggest that few of these migrants settle in the commune for any length of time. Even allowing for the back and forth moves of natives of the commune, this is quite plausible in the light of the comparison of registration and census data; available birthplace data adds further support to the interpretation. Only 19.6% of the resident population in 1946 had been born elsewhere (SSB, 1951, p.313)[11]. By 1965 the proportion was still only 20.2% (Population Register, Skjervøy), but 12.8% had arrived since 1946, indicating that many of those resident in 1946 had left again (though some would also have died).

Such evidence as exists for other communes and other parts of the country in the early 1960's suggests that Skjervøy was not untypical, indeed turnover appears to have been still higher in other rural areas. For example in 1961-1963 in Lyngdal in South Norway, it was found that 71% of family heads and independent migrants who

moved in and 56% of those who moved out were non-natives. As these had on average more dependents than natives who moved, the proportions of all migrants who were non-natives are likely to be still higher (Hertzberg, 1969, pp.86,88). Lyngdal has also a higher proportion of non-natives in its population than Skjervøy, 31.8% in 1948 (SSB, 1951, p.305) and 38.5%[12] in 1960 (SSB, 1964c. p.145). The smallness of the increase might indicate that the higher proportion of non-natives, compared with Skjervøy reflected a greater number of transients in the population. The net gain of non-natives between 1961 and 1963 equalled only about one sixth of the gross in-movement.

Direct comparisons cannot as yet be made with more recent data, there is, however, evidence that turnover continues to be an important component of migration. In a national survey of migrants in 1972, it was found that 56% of moves were onward, or progressive, moves (Reisz, 1976, p.70), that is they were made by people who had moved previously and were moving on to a commune in which they had never been resident. In some cases these might have been further outward moves of returned migrants, but they account for only 23% of migrants (Reisz, loc. cit.), only a small proportion make further moves (less than 25%, Nicholson, 1971, pp.106-107), and some of these are to former places of residence (Nicholson, unpublished), and would be included in the 12% who were repeating migrants (tilbakevendere. Reisz, loc. cit.). One can therefore conclude that the largest single group of movers (possibly 40% or more of the total) are those who are contributing to migrant turnover (not counting that due to return migration). The remaining 9% were first time movers.

At the local level, the age and sex structure of in- and out-migrants continues to show as remarkable similarity in the 1970's

(see e.g. SSB, 1971a, pp.32-37; 1979c, p44-50; 1979a, p45-51), as it did in the 1960's (Migration notifications, Skjervøy, Nordreisa, Kvænangen 1962-mid 1965). It is also in the age composition that one finds evidence for the assertion that the trends which have given rise to the so-called turnaround in the 1970's were not new. It is still the case that there is a net loss in the 20-24 age group, the one in which mobility is highest, just as in the 1960's. The only change which has taken place in the 1970's is a slight lowering of overall mobility in this age group, with a corresponding reduction in net loss to a still smaller proportion of gross movement.

Net gain is experienced chiefly by just three age groups, 25-29, 30-34 and their children, 0-15[13]. But this is not a new development, the same kind of pattern was already apparent, if on a smaller scale, in the 1960's, even in declining communes such as Kvænangen, adjacent to Skjervøy (Migration notifications, Kvænangen, 1962-1965). Here too there is quite considerable turnover. By 1979 net gain to rural communes was equal to only about 15% of the gross in-movement in the 25-29 age group, for the other two age groups it was a bare 20% (SSB, 1974b, pp.62-63; 1980a, pp.78-79). This latter figure hardly increased during the 1970's, as out-migration from rural areas would now appear to be increasing in the 30-39 age group (ibid.). This observation must strengthen the argument that recent rural population gains are related to migration turnover, and not just to in-migration alone.

A further factor one needs to consider in any attempt to explain current rural population trends is the growth of villages, which are included in rural areas when these are defined on the basis of commune units. Contrary to widespread belief (see above p.2), growth of villages in the post-war period has been due at least as much to in-movement from other areas as to purely local movement within

communes. The experience of the villages in Skjervøy's neighbouring commune, Nordreisa, suggests that it might even be the most important factor in growth. In the main village of Skjervøy, the reverse was the case, local movement accounted for 46.4% of the net growth between 1946 and 1965, but almost half of this was due to very exceptional circumstances[14] of a kind which only occurred in a few well publicised places. In-movement from outside the commune (net) equals 38.7% of the increase. What is noticeable in all the villages it was possible to study, however, is that the net out-migration of natives was generally even higher than net in-migration of people from elsewhere[15]. What is more, the scale of net loss of natives was no less than that experienced in the rest of the respective communes. The difference between the villages and the rest is that it was only in the villages that in-migration from elsewhere came close to compensating for the loss of native out-migrants, but even in the rural areas the net gain of non-natives compensated for almost one third of the net loss of natives. It is, however, necessary at this point to reemphasise that these are just net figures, for the proportion of in-migrants who leave again from elsewhere is far greater than the proportion of the native migrants who return (Migration notifications, Skjervøy, 1962-1965). Thus the turnover associated with migration gain is, in this case at least, proportionally greater than that associated with migration loss.

In terms of the numerical relationship between in- and out-movement, the balance between gains and losses, one might say that villages in the early 1960's appeared to be very close to the situation which was to become characteristic of rural areas as a whole by the 1970's. It is likely there are still further similarities. While data on the origins of migrants in the 1970's are not available, it seems likely that in-migrants to rural communes in the age groups in which there is net gain are preponderantly outsiders. Return migration is

most common among young out-migrants, therefore it occurs at relatively young ages (Nicholson, unpublished). It would therefore seem to be a promising line of enquiry to seek explanations for rural migration trends in the 1970's in the kinds of changes which were taking place at the time when villages grew most markedly, namely so-called "structural rationalisation".

Changes in economic and occupational structure

"Structural rationalisation" is the term used to refer to the freeing of manpower from sectors of the economy with low productivity (essentially the primary sector) by rationalisation, and its transfer to other sectors, manufacturing, and to a growing extent, the service sector. Thus between 1960 and 1970 the primary sector declined from 19.5% to 11.6% of the occupationally active population,[16] and the tertiary sector increased from 43.6% to 50.8%; the corresponding figures for the secondary sector are 36.5% and 37.3%[17] (those who reported no occupation made up the remainder). Overall the economically active population increased by 4% over the same period[18]

To quite a considerable degree the change has come about as the disappearance, or falling out of use, of employment niches in the contracting sectors, and the occupation by new recruits into the labour market of the additional jobs which have come into being in the expanding sectors. Table 1 shows three of the sectors which have been most affected by this process, and the one major sector which has shown least change over the period, manufacturing. Not only has this sector changed little in size in the decade, but the pattern of in- and out-movement approximates to the average for the labour force as a whole.

Some caution should be exercised in interpreting the table, in

Table 1. Movement in or out of selected sectors of industry between 1960 and 1970 as % of total employed in 1970. Nation.

	Agriculture & forestry		Fishing & whaling		Services[1]		Manufacturing	
	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In
Left/entered labour force:	1960 %	1970 %	1960 %	1970 %	1960 %	1970 %	1960 %	1970 %
Retired2)/Entrants3)	36.6	11.9	38.1	19.5	9.6	33.4	13.6	24.5
Housewives 4)	0.6	14.9	0.1	0.3	8.2	12.4	5.4	5.0
Other 5)	0.7	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.2
Absent 1970/1960 6)	17.9	0.4	20.4	0.6	6.3	2.9	9.0	1.9
Left/entered sector	36.3	10.7	76.3	16.5	6.3	19.6	15.7	21.4
Total left/entered	92.1	38.1	135.8	36.9	30.7	68.6	44.1	52.7
Same sector 1960/1970	61.9	61.9	63.1	63.1	31.4	31.4	47.3	47.3
Total 1960/1970	154.0	100.0	198.9	100.0	62.1	100.0	91.4	100.0
In sector 1970 (= n)	(142,606)		(27,413)		(209,824)		(416,103)	

1) Excluding transport and trade.
2) Includes recipients of disability pensions, etc.
3) Classified as dependent in 1960.
4) Some of the in-movement of housewives will be due to the change in definition between censuses. This affects agriculture in particular and services, therefore employment in these sectors in 1960 is underestimated. See note 18.
5) 1960: Dependent (e.g. while in education) in 1970. 1970: recipients of disability pensions etc. in 1960.
6) 1960: Died or emigrated by 1970. 1970: absent abroad in 1960, or among the records not matched or located in the 1960 material (max. 0.9% of the total) (see Byfuglien, 1977, p.161).

Sources: Kaldager 1977, pp.3-4; SSB, 1964a, p.40; 1975b, p.37.

that classification is by the occupation which is the major source of income. Secondary occupations, which are quite common in the primary sector, are not included. This means that a degree of uncertainty must attach to the reported level of movement between sectors in particular. What is important is the difference the table reveals between the sectors in the relative size of recruitment to (Entrants) and departure from the labour force (Retired and Absent 1970, combined), for it is this which shows clearly how the new generation is entering newly created niches, while those the older generation leaves either fall into disuse, or are no longer regarded as viable niches. A corollary of this is that abandonment of farm holdings, which in recent decades has been considerable, has taken

place when a retiring holder has no successor, rather than as a result of a change of occupation out of agriculture (NOU 1974: 26, pp.114-115) 19)

Within the sector which has played a major role in structural rationalisation, the service sector, four areas in particular can be distinguished as having experienced a rapid rate of growth, they are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Employment in public administration, education, health and trade 1952-1977 (000's employed).

	1952	1960	1970	1975 1)	1977 1)
Public administration	52.6	71.8	75.3	85	89
Education	29.0	42.3	73.1	104	120
Health services 2)	29.0	38.6	60.4	108	123
Trade 3)	106.5	134.2	175.8	238	274

1) Note that these figures are based on a sample survey and are not comparable with those of previous years which derive from a complete count. They indicate only the direction of the trend, not the precise magnitude of change (SSB, 1978b, p.71, 1978c, pp.10-11).
2) 1970 and earlier, excludes self-employed persons (approx. 3 000 in 1960. SSB, 1964a, p.232).
3) 1970 and earlier, excludes self-employed persons (approx. 28 000 in 1960. SSB, 1964a, p.233).

Sources: SSB, 1978b, p.80; 1978c, 63.

More important for the present purpose are the changes in the occupational structure which have accompanied this development. In particular, the rise in the numbers engaged in technical and professional occupations can justifiably be described as dramatic. There was an increase of 75.9% between 1960 and 1970 (SSB, 1964a, p.41; 1975b, pp.259-261), and the growth in the following decade appears to be of a similar order (SSB, 1980c, p.22). That this increase has come from new recruitment rather than transfer from other occupations is shown by the age structure of this occupational group. In 1972 a particularly high proportion was aged between 25 and 29, 19.8% as compared with 12.5% of the total labour force (SSB, 1973, p.32). Five years later the peak was less marked (though still high),

but the increase in numbers was by then having an effect on the 30-49 age group (which cannot be disaggregated further), and by 1979 still more so (SSB, 1978c, p.66; 1980c, p.77). Thus during the 1970's a particularly high proportion of this occupational group has been in the relatively mobile early career stages and at mobile ages.

Other new niches created in the same areas of the service sector, though less obvious, can still be discerned in the occupational statistics. For example, though employment in service occupations as a whole declined between 1960 and 1970, the occupational group cleaners, doormen and porters doubled in size over the same period, due largely to the same sectoral growth which gave rise to the increase in sectoral jobs; 40% of this group was accounted for by the health and education sectors in 1970 (SSB, 1964a, p.237; 1975b, p.270). The size of this group has continued to increase during the 1970's, though unlike the high status tertiary employment, apparently at a slower rate (SSB, 1980c, p.72). Apart from their role as a provider of jobs for older sections of the labour force (the proportion aged 50-59 in service occupations is consistently above the average), in service occupations as a whole, and also in trade occupations, a slowly growing proportion of the workforce is aged under 20. These occupational groups combined employ more of this age group, generally young people with little or no training, than any other (e.g. SSB, 1973, p.32; 1980c, p.77)

Structural rationalisation and the rural opportunity structure

The changes which have taken place in the occupational structure have made possible an increasing amount of inter-generational social mobility (at least among men, the position among women is not known). The predominance of upward movement has increased over time, and to an increasing extent has been attributable to structural factors (Rogoff Ramsøy, 1977, p.109). The scale used was one measuring socio-

economic status). There had also taken place an increasing concentration of higher status employment to the more urbanised communes (those with a population of 10 000 or more) and to the south-east of the country (ibid., p.103). This development covered most of the post-war period, at least till the 1960's when the youngest men in the study which provided these findings began their working lives; the oldest respondents in the survey were twenty years older.

A comparison of the percentage change in the main occupational groups between 1960 and 1970 in the nation as a whole with that in a number of rural communes in North and South Norway (seven in all) bears out these findings. It shows that, with just one exception, the increase in the fastest growing occupational group, technical and professional occupations, was only about half the national average. This slow growth would seem to reflect the prevailing (SSB, 1964a, pp.41, 65, 67, 95; 1975b, pp.254-271; NSD, unpublished) centralisation ethos of the time, especially in the public sector.

Yet even if the rural areas' share of these employment opportunities declined, in absolute terms there was still an increase. For one thing, a major school reform increased the number of teachers, especially well-qualified ones, required in all areas (Brox, 1980, p.235). Furthermore, in two other occupational groups the gap between countryside and towns (admittedly a wide one) was narrowed in the 1960's. Employment in administration (except in the southern communes which had undergone amalgamations) and in office work had increased far more than in the nation as a whole. As a consequence of these changes, together with the decline in employment in the primary sector, the composition of occupational niches in each rural commune at the beginning of the 1970's had changed quite considerably compared with the situation at the beginning of the previous decade.

Trends in the 1970's are as yet difficult to assess. A slight

change of emphasis, though barely more than that, could be detected in government thinking and policy on public investment from the beginning of the decade. Instead of a concentration of service provision (and thus employment) to the slightly larger central places as in the 1960s (e.g. St.meld. nr.29 (1963-64), p.9), there was to be a 'decentralisation' to central places in rural areas (St.meld. nr.27 (1971-72), p.74; St.meld. nr.13 (1972-73), pp.21-23), which essentially amounted to the same thing, for the necessity of local centralisation was still insisted upon. It was not until 1977 that the maintenance of a decentralised settlement structure was specifically mentioned as an objective (St.meld. nr.25 (1977-78), p.10).

Elsewhere the term "structural stabilisation" instead of rationalisation has been applied to developments in the 1970's (Otnes, 1978, p.185). Radical programmes such as the one to rationalise dairies have been phased out, if not reversed, and a few rural schools closed when education was centralised to villages have been reopened. The decline in the number of general grocery shops, almost 10% between 1968 and 1973, was actually smaller in rural areas than towns (NOU 1975: 23, p.20), while new, specialised shops have been established in villages. Between 1970 and 1979 there were at least six in Åmli (like the other villages referred to, located in one of the rural communes studied), 12 in Lyngdal, 11 in Størslett (the larger of the two villages in Nordreisa) and fourteen in the main village in Skjervøy (Norges Handelskalender, 1979, pp.684, 713, 714, 1146, 1147).

There has also been growth in employment in rural areas in the secondary sector during the 1970's. Some of the increase derives from mining and manufacturing located there, as far as can be seen from the available statistics (in which there are certain omissions of coverage) this has happened in all the rural communes from which examples are being drawn here (SSB, 1974c, pp.111,112, 118; 1980f,

pp.137-144). But the overall increase in employment in construction, in which work locations are constantly shifting, is also likely to have benefited rural areas most, for they are the source of two-thirds of its work force (SSB, 1975b, pp.264, 268; 1978b, p.81; 1978c, p.62).

The general impression seems to be, however, that it is growth in the public sector which has been most noticeable in rural areas in the 1970's (Moen et al., 1979, p.15). Certainly, in the south Norwegian communes considered here (the situation in North Norway has yet to be investigated), expansion in employment in education, to take one example, was at at least the national rate between 1970 and 1978/79, in the most rural of them more than that (SSB, 1975b, p.260; 1980d, p.38; 1979b, p.45; 1979c, p.61; 1979d, p.69). In the country as a whole the distribution of teaching posts between town and country and between regions remained constant from 1976 to 1979 (though all the major cities showed a very slight relative decline), during which time there was a very slight overall growth (SSB, 1978d, p.43; 1980d, p.38). Similarly, a very slight decentralisation of state employees has taken place over the same period (SSB, 1978e, p.79; 1980e, p.73). It seems likely, therefore, that employment opportunities, especially in the fastest growing occupations, have shown a greater increase in rural areas in the 1970's than in the 1960's, and in some sectors growth has been at the national rate or even higher.

These changes in the occupational structure of rural areas are going some way towards bringing about the conditions which for a long time have been thought necessary if out-migration were to be reduced. The most important requirements, it was argued, were jobs, especially for young people entering employment for the first time. However, there were two schools of thought as to what kinds of jobs

there should be,

The first maintained that geographical mobility could be limited if employment opportunities linked to the local economy, the example was fishing and fish processing, and independent of household economic units were developed, so that as many young people as possible could obtain an income without leaving their home locality (Brox, 1971a, pp.V-44 - V-45; Brox, 1971b, p.87). The second school of thought, associated with those who thought some increase in the level of urbanisation necessary, went further and argued that it was not just the number of jobs that was important, but that a range of choice of occupation and employer should be available (St.meld. nr.87 (1966-67), p.32; St.meld. nr.13 (1972-73), p.22; ED 80, 1968, p.171). This view would appear to be related to the widespread belief that it was the most talented who left, due to the scarcity of opportunities for advancement in rural areas.

Common to both these approaches is a conception of jobs, employment niches, in demographic terms, as a question of numbers, of matching the number of people to the number of jobs, or jobs of a certain type (Wallin, 1974, pp.305-313). An example of this line of thinking was a series of estimates made using Swedish data of how long it would be necessary to wait, on average, until jobs of different types, requiring varying amounts of training and education, became available in different localities. It was found, as expected, that average waiting times were particularly long, even infinite, for the most highly skilled occupations in the most rural areas (Öberg, 1974, pp.388-392).

Both these approaches would appear to stem from implicitly equating net migration loss with total out-movement, but whether or not this is so, a more serious objection can be raised to them. The expansion of opportunities for employment, and most particularly the

change in the overall structure does more than offer new types of work, different working conditions, or even higher incomes. New employment opportunities such as those which have come into being in rural areas in Norway over the past two decades also have different market situations (Kreckel, 1980, p.526; Lockwood, 1958, p.15) from those which they replace. The routes which lead to occupational positions (and beyond them), and the conditions imposed on those seeking entry are no longer the same as those which applied when primary occupations predominated. A new set of closed social relationships (Weber, 1956, p.23) is gradually taking over from the old one. It is even conceivable that net increase in employment opportunities can have the apparently paradoxical consequence that more local residents find it necessary to seek work elsewhere.[20] There is taking place a change in what Shils calls "the allocation of opportunity for access" (Shils, 1975, p.103), and which I shall refer to as the access structure (see Nicholson, 1980, pp.10-11).

The rural access structure

The concept of access structure is related to that of opportunity structure. The structure of objective opportunities in a given locality consists of the opportunities which exist in the locality, together with those which are available to the inhabitants elsewhere (Brox, 1972, pp.58-59). However opportunities *in* a locality are not identical with opportunities *for* the inhabitants of that locality, as the "demographic" approach to increasing opportunities seems to imply. There is no reason why this should be less true in the countryside than in the towns and cities in which rural out-migrants find employment.

The effect of the changing occupational structure in rural areas has been to replace occupational niches, and careers, to which access was gained by virtue of qualifications linked to the locality, not-

ably kinship by newcomers to which entry is regulated by qualifications which are universally obtainable and universally valid.[21] Thus the local opportunity structure is also part of the national opportunity structure, and in principle open to anyone. This is most clearly apparent in the case of professional niches, to which access is usually gained by competition among applicants possessing the appropriate formal qualifications, but similar, if less formal, procedures are used to regulate access to other niches too. There are further examples. Rising prosperity in rural areas has provided opportunities for the creation of new niches in service provision and retail trade, but capital and expertise are required to exploit them. It must not be implied that rural dwellers do not possess these resources, but they are not alone in doing so, therefore the new opportunities are opportunities for outsiders no less than for locals (c.f. Löfgren, 1980, pp.74,76). Rising prosperity in general has made possible the creation of new niches. One such which is frequently associated with rural areas, though by no means confined to them, is the production of craft goods. While in certain instances such a niche might only be accessible to those possessing a traditional skill peculiar to a locality, or confined to a certain group of people, many skills can be practised (and acquired) almost anywhere. They can therefore be transferred to a rural area, and have enabled some, though hardly many, people to live in rural areas (see e.g. Forsythe, 1980, p.294; Lumb, 1980, pp.99-100).

Turnover and access

However, while the creation of new occupational niches might explain why people from outside move into an area, it does not explain why the number who move out again continues to be almost as large. The explanation would seem rather, to lie in certain of the characteristics of the new niches.

Until around 1950 a very large proportion of niches in rural areas were of the kind which, once entered, were occupied for an entire working life, or led to such a niche[22]. One indication is that, in Skjervøy, for example, in 1950, two third of the occupationally active population was either self-employed or worked in some family enterprise; only one third were employees (SSB, 1956, pp.90-93). By 1960 about two thirds were employees (SSB, undated a, p.6) and by 1970 the equivalent proportion, allowing for changes in the classification, was about 80% (SSB, 1975b, p.242). This means that the occupants of these niches can exchange one for another, and still continue in the same occupation or career.

The contrast between declining and growing occupations is clearly shown even by the as yet limited data available at the local level (so far only for Skjervøy and Lyngdal, and classified by industry, not occupation). The number of moves made by those working in the primary sector is very low compared with employment in the sector, the number of moves made by those in the service sector is high in relation to employment; the other sectors lie between these extremes.

Further comparison with the linked census data (which shows the number of people in each sector who were resident in each commune in 1960 who were no longer resident there in 1970 and the occupationally active in 1970 who were resident elsewhere in 1960) makes it clear that, while the low level of movement by those in the primary sector might be due to the small number of movers, the opposite is hardly true of the service sector. There the level of movement is explained by the large number of moves made as compared with the number of niches which had changed occupants between 1960 and 1970, which is to say that some of them had changed occupants several times. Again the remaining sectors take up an intermediate position (SSB, 1975b, p.173; 1977a, p.72; 1977b, pp.60-61, 64; undated a, b, c,

d, e; p.6; Hertzberg, 1969, pp.83,88; Migration notifications, Skjervøy, 1962-1965).

The high level of turnover in the service sector is evidence of the effects of growing numbers of occupational niches in rural areas which form part of a hierarchy of positions in a wider syster (Shils, 1975, p.93), or what White calls vacancy chains (1972, p.17). Local positions are only stages, or stations (see above p.5), which for some, perhaps many, of their occupants will just be stopping places in a career path. The opportunity to pursue an entire career (in the sense of progressing with experience) in one place has become more rare.

However, career moves of this type , though they might account for a considerable proportion of turnover in the service sector and the locality, by no means explain all of it. What is more, the occurrence of non-career moves in other occupational groups should be a warning not to assume too readily that all moves by professionals are career moves either. The evidence from Norway agrees with Wylie's findings that turnover, or flowthrough, consists predominantly of those in the highest and lowest socio-economic strata (Wylie, 1966, p.165). These are the ones which predominate in the service sector, but are less well represented in other sectors.

Migration data for Skjervøy showed that the largest group of occupationally active in-migrants, after professionals, consisted of those in service occupations, and there were almost as many in similar occupations in the trade sector. These moves do not represent stages in careers, except to a very limited extent, but more often the exchange of one niche for a similar one elsewhere. The move is "horizontal" rather than "vertical" within a career hierarchy.[23] However, in spite of this lack of progression, moves,

sometimes of considerable distances, are made to obtain such employment, or change jobs, even when this might seem unnecessary; the occupations of the in-migrants to Skjervøy just referred to were of an identical kind to those held by the largest single group of returning Skjervøy migrants while they were resident outside the commune (Migration notifications, Skjervøy, 1962-1965).

In two respects this evidence contravenes conventional wisdom. The pattern of moves does not conform to that assumed by the "demographic" approach to provision of occupational opportunities. What is more, moves are made even when they do not appear to result in an improvement in status or income, and such moves are not confined to just a few cases (c.f. the assumptions of Brox, 1971a, p.VI-15). There would, however, seem to be parallels here with the patterns of frequent movement found among servants and farm workers in earlier times[24], indeed, in many service occupations the work done is that of servants, albeit in a different social context. Where the present situation might perhaps differ is in the greater degree of segmentation there has developed within this section of the occupational structure (Gordon, 1972, p.134). That is to say, the jobs within it are less interchangeable than formerly, and different access criteria are applied in different segments, and a degree of "horizontal exclusion" (Kreckel, 1980, p.530) is applied between occupations. Thus while the number of openings in any segment is limited, the necessity to move to find one might be increasing.

Recent patterns of movement

This interpretation of patterns of movement in terms of the changing pattern of employment in rural areas as a result of structural rationalisation, is perfectly compatible with the patterns of movement which have been observed in the 1970's. It will be recalled that the highest levels of mobility, and in particular, the highest

levels of in- and out-movement in rural areas, though at the same time relatively small net gains (see above p.8) were accounted for by migrants between the ages of 20 and 29 (net gains appearing first from age 25). Even in the 15-19 age group, previously characterised by high net out-migration, net losses are slight compared with gross movement (some of this change is due to increased participation in education at these ages). Again it will be recalled that a particularly high proportion of those in professional and technical occupations is also found in the 25-29 age group, and between age 20 and 24 the proportion is also relatively high (see above p.12). In other words, it is quite conceivable that it is these same people who account for the high levels of back and forth movement in that age group, for the proportion of occupationally active movers who are in that group is greater than its share of the occupationally active population as a whole (30% compared with 13.6%; SSB, 1974a, pp.259-271). That highly educated people are found to have a high mobility rate in these age groups makes the interpretation still more plausible.

Table 3. Estimated mobility[1] by age and educational level (1972).

	Age				
	20-24	25-29	30-39	40-54	55-74
Persons with higher education[2]	25	58	19	7	2.5
Total population	16	14	5	1.5	1

1) Number of movers as a percentage of the total number in the group.
2) Completed high school plus at least 1½ years specialised education or training.

Source: SSB, 1977c, p.70.

As some of the evidence above has shown, many more people than professionals are moving in and out of rural areas, therefore total mobility is not by any means explained by the moves of high status people in career hierarchies. But the apparent increase in moves of this type, and the corresponding shift in the age structure of

migrants, indicates that relatively, they are becoming increasingly important. Given the net gain which results, this might suggest that this is due to an increase in the number of people in technical and professional occupations resident in rural areas at any one time.

Turnover and rural gain

What has still not been explained by the data and arguments which have been presented is why the patterns of movement which have been analysed result in net migration gain. There are, however, certain indications of what the explanations might be.

Firstly, in the age groups in which there is a net migration gain more of the migrants are likely to have more dependents (children, or more children, and in some cases a spouse not in full-time employment) than in the young adult age groups which have a net migration loss. This could explain the net in-migration of children. Thus a niche which is occupied by an in-migrant aged between 25 and 39 will generally increase the population by more than it will decrease as the result of the departure of a younger person to occupy a niche elsewhere.

A further factor is that the replacement, in numerical terms, of niches in the primary sector may result in in-migration, but this need not be counter-balanced by out-migration of the occupants of those niches which disappear at the time they disappear. The vacation of a niche due to death or retirement, which is how this most commonly occurs in the primary sector (see above p.11), has no effect on migration, though it may obviously affect population size. Such effect as the disappearance of these niches has had on migration happened sooner, when the prospective heir decided to take up some other occupation, if that involved moving elsewhere. It would seem likely that moves of this type were already becoming

fewer by 1970, as by 1969 over half of all farm holders were already aged 50 or more (SSB, 1972, pp.62-63; and see note 19). There is thus as it were a time lag between out-migration due to the disappearance of old occupational niches and in-migration due to their replacement by new ones which does not show in the occupational statistics, but which might have begun to affect migration figures in the 1970's.

There is also the possibility that opportunities in rural areas are increasing, though this has yet to be established, and that the slackening of demand on the labour market means that opportunities which exist are more likely to be exploited than previously. That the increase in in-migrants relative to out-migrants might be explained by preferences for rural living is, however, more doubtful. In order for such preferences to be realised a means must be found to make a living in the countryside. This would suggest rather that preferences influence who seeks out rural opportunities, and only to a lesser extent how many actually move.

Recent movement and the local social system.

Even taking all the possible explanations together, the amount of net in-movement to rural areas they could account for is quite modest. However, as I have shown above, (p.4), this movement is modest, especially when compared with the volume of movement into villages in which commuters have taken up residence. There would also appear to be a greater turnover of residents in the latter (Pahl, 1965, p.14; Brunt, 1974, p.25), compared with more rural areas. On the other hand, in relation to their numbers, incomers to rural areas might be more noticeable in the local society, for unlike commuters (if not their entire households), people who move to remoter rural areas generally also work there. They therefore form part of one of the most important sub-systems in the local

society, and are particularly numerous in a part of it which has recently increased in size. However, the relationship between newcomers and change in this sub-system is not a simple one.

It tends to be assumed that the development of local social systems, and presumably their maintenance, is dependent on the continuity of residence of the majority of the local population (Stacey, 1969, p.141). This would suggest that a continual turnover of migrants could potentially be a source of instability, even disruption. Wylie has argued that there can be an appearance of stability even though there is a continual flowthrough of migrants if there is a "core" population of continuous residents (Wylie, 1963, pp.217, 233) which maintains the essential framework of society. Those who pass through fit into pre-existing positions in this framework for the duration of their residence, and when they leave, they are succeeded by others similar to themselves. Incidental evidence suggests that even the stability of the core is illusory, that it depends not so much on a continuity of individuals as of positions. When an older resident dies another takes on that person's position in the local society (Wylie, 1964, p.343). Also in this respect there is a flow-through or turnover.

This view of movement through sets of positions is in keeping with Nadel's conception of the social structure as consisting of a system, or network, of relationships between roles through which individuals pass, rather than interrelationships within a "concrete population" (Nadel, 1957, pp.11-12). White goes a step further to suggest that the structure is the result of movement, as he hypothesises "a structure of positions emerges as the skeleton deposited by, that is the residue in cultural terms from, repetitive enactment of orderly networks of relations among men" (and, one might add, women)(White, 1970, p.329).

It is precisely this "repetitive enactment" which has been broken by structural rationalisation. Many of the old positions in the local socio-economic sub-system have disappeared, while new ones have come into being. Local society has become more differentiated (Saugestad-Larsen, 1980, p.295), not only in consumption patterns and life styles, but in the ways in which people earn a living within the local society itself. Thus in one very important area the grounds for common interests have been very considerably reduced (c.f. Morin, 1970, p.186, on a similar development in Brittany).

One cannot, however, equate new positions with incomers and transient residents and old, or declining, positions with local people. If, as I have suggested above (p.22), those currently in low status service occupations are the successors of the servants and farm workers of former times, then they might be considered as flow-through which occupies positions in the existing structure which are becoming fewer (service employment is declining). On the other hand, many new positions in office work, and some in administration, are filled by local people. Even the positions at the upper status levels in relatively mobile occupations are by no means the exclusive preserve of outsiders, though they might predominate. Rather, it is the new relationships which have developed due to the changes in the structure of positions which has resulted in increased differentiation, that some of these positions are occupied by incomers and transients might merely be a contributory factor. In commuter villages incomers added new positions to an existing social system. Elsewhere it has been the growth of new positions which has enabled the entry of newcomers at different points within the local society. The part which turnover movement, by migrants as well as that due to age succession, plays in this process is the cementation of the new socio-economic structure which has gradually emerged in recent decades.

Notes

1) This section is based on Nicholson (1981) chapter 2.

2) Defined as living outside a settlement with 200 or more inhabitants.

3) The Housing Survey of 1967 showed that 48% of those interviewed preferred living in rural areas, that is outside villages. However when the 43.5% of the sample living in those areas is excluded, the proportion is only 24% (in Oslo 27%). Similarly 28% preferred to live in villages with no more than 2 000 inhabitants, though only 13% of those not already living there (SSB, 1968b, p.86). Percentages of subdivisions of the sample are recalculations from the published figures.

4) The number of moves per year which cross a commune boundary per 1 000 of population. The figures referred to here are those which have been adjusted to allow for boundary changes during the period under consideration.

5) Calculated from SSB, 1979a, p.29; 1979b, pp.36-37; 1980b, pp.36-37.

6) These statements are based on a comparison of the total moves in and out of each of nine categories of communes in 1973 and 1979 given in published statistics (SSB, 1974b, pp.62-63; 1980a, pp.78-79). It should, however, be noted that there is a certain, possibly cumulative, underregistration of moves, which is updated in census years (see SSB, 1975a, p.29). Comparison of movement in these latter with those immediately preceeding and succeeding for a number of rural communes suggests that out-movement is undercounted to a greater degree than in-movement, and this would tend to exaggerate the scale of the reversal of migration trends.

7) It is also necessary to remember that over 50% of moves from towns are to other towns, and a still higher proportion of moves originating in the countryside also terminate there (SSB, 1974a, p.101; 1968a, p.29).

8) The excess also includes registered out-moves by children born after 1960, and in-movement by people who died before 1970. However some of those resident in 1960 would only recently have arrived, and some of those resident in 1970 would leave again.

9) Rather less for the in-migrants referred to here, see Nicholson, 1971, p.120.

10) This term refers to anyone born outside a given commune.

11) As these figures are for the resident population, they are unlikely to be unduly inflated by the construction workers and others who might have been temporarily resident during the reconstruction period after the Second World War.

12) These figures apply to the three communes which make up all but a small part of the present commune of Lyngdal. In spite of the well-known back and forth movement between this part of Norway and the United States, less than 2% of the population at both dates was born in that country.

13) Unlike some other countries, migration of people of pensionable age (67 and over) is of minor importance, it amounts to less than 4% of movement and only about 5% of the net gain in rural areas, that is less than any other age group with a net gain.

14) The greater part of the population of a small place on the opposite side of the sound, abandoned in the 1960's, moved to the village of Skjervøy.

15) It is estimated that there was a net out-migration of 344 natives from the village of Skjervøy between 1946 and 1965, compared with a net gain of 304 people from elsewhere (Nicholson, 1981, appendix II). Some of those latter would doubtless move out again, probably to be replaced by other outsiders. An estimate based on incomplete tabulations of linked census data indicates a similar discrepancy between those who had moved to the village of Skjervøy from other communes, and those who had moved out between 1960 and 1970 (SSB, unpublished).

16) I have followed conventional Norwegian practice by including mining and quarrying and building and construction in the secondary, and not in the primary and tertiary sectors respectively.

17) According to another source, which is not strictly comparable, the approximate proportions in the primary, secondary and tertiary sectors respectively in 1970 were 8.6%, 30.1% and 61.2% (SSB, 1980c, pp.66-67).

18) Some of the increase is due to the classification of married women working in family businesses as occupationally active in 1970, but not so in 1960 (SSB, 1975b, p.12).

19) A survey in 1969 showed that in one of the communes used as an example here, Åmli in south Norway, on 70% of the farms with a holder aged 50 or over (167 farms, there were 229 farms in all) there was no successor, or succession was doubtful (Robbestad, 1969, p.18).

20) An analogous situation is that of the exclusion of local people from a housing market when demand from outside pushes up prices, and c.f. the effect of incomers on farm prices (Forsythe, 1980, p.293).

21) Regulations governing the allocation of credit and subsidies in the primary industries, see e.g. NOU 1974: 26, p.248.
impose similar criteria on traditional niches.

22) It is important to note here that the vast majority of Norwegian farmers own their land, there are very few tenant farmers.

23) It is necessary to make clear that "horizontal" refers to moves within an entire society, and not merely within a locality, as in Warren's use of the concept (Warren, 1963, p.240). The implication that extra-local, termed vertical, linkages inevitably involve the locality in a subordinate power relationship to the wider society would seem to derive from an over-literal interpretation of Shils' concepts, first published in 1962, of vertical and horizontal integration (Shils, 1975, p.93).

24) The evidence here is from other societies (see Nicholson, 1980, p.4; Wylie, 1966, pp.163-164), however a reference to circular, short-distance movements between rural localities in the early nineteenth century (Koren & Engen, 1973, p.89) suggests that the comparison made here is a valid one.

References

BD 80 (1968), Länsutredning för Norrbottens län, (Luleå)

BROX, OTTAR (1971a), Avfolkning og lokalsamfunnsutvikling i Nord-Norge, (Bergen: Sosialantropologisk institutt).

- (1971b), Folkeflytting - Næringspolitikk eller sosialpolitikk?, in Sosialdepartementet (ed.), Menneske og miljø i Nord-Norge, (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget), 72-87.

- (1972), Komparativ analys av marginella samhällen, in BROX, O., Strukturfascismen och andra essäer, (Stockholm: Prisma), 52-70.

- (1980), Mot et konsolidert busettingsmønster?, Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning 21 (3-4), 227-244.

BROX, OTTAR, HELGE O. LARSEN & HANS PEDERSEN (1980), Befolkningsutviklinga i Nord-Norge. Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning, 21 (3-4), 245-254.

BRUNT, L. (1974), Stedeling op het platteland (Meppel: Boom).

BYFUGLIEN, JAN (1977), Hva forteller folketellingene 1960 og 1970 om befolkningens skifte av bosted i perioden?, Plan & Arbeid 1977 (4), 161-167.

FORSYTHE, DIANA E. (1980), Urban incomers and rural change. The impact of migrants from the city on life in an Orkney community, Sociologia Ruralis XX (4), 287-307.

GESCHWIND, HENRIK (1957), Inrikes omflyttning 1951-1955, Statistisk Tidskrift 6 (11), 607-614.

GORDON, DAVID M. (1972), Theories of Poverty and Unemployment, (Lexington, Mass.: Heath).

HERTZBERG, LUDVIG H. (1969), Lyngdal. Forskyvninger i bosetning og flyttinger, Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift 23 (2), 77-90.

HÄGERSTRAND, TORSTEN, (1962), Geographic Measurement of Migration - Data. Swedish Data, in J. SUTTER (ed.), Entretiens de Monaco en Sciences Humaines, (Monaco).

KALDAGER, ALF TERJE (1977), "Koblet folketellingsmateriale" fra 1960 og 1970. En brukerveiledning. Meddelelser fra Geografisk institutt ved Norges Handelshøyskole og Universitetet i Bergen Nr.42.

KOREN, ELISABETH & ARNFINN ENGEN (1978), Massеutvandringa frå Austlandet etter 1865, in A. ENGEN (ed.), Utvandringa det store oppbrotet, (Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget), 86-107.

KRECKEL, REINHARD (1980), Unequal Opportunity Structure and Labour Market Segmentation, Sociology 14 (4), 525-550.

LOCKWOOD, D. (1958), The Blackcoated Worker: A Study in Class Consciousness (London: Allen & Unwin).

LUMB, ROSEMARY (1980), Migration in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland (Aberdeen: ISSPA).

LÖFGREN, ORVAR (1968), Affärsfolk, småföretagare och industriantällda, in Vad sker i glesbygden? (Luleå: Norrbottens Museum), 69-84.

Migration notifications (1962-mid 1965), Skjervøy, Nordreisa, Kvænangen. Unpublished.

MOEN, BJØRN, BJØRN ANDRESEN REISZ, ARVID STRAND (1979), Flyttemønster i Osloregionen, (Oslo: NIBR rapport 4[illegible]).

MORIN, EDGAR, (1970), The Red and the White, (New York: Pantheon).

NADEL, S.F. (1957), A Theory of Social Structure (London: Cohen & West).

NICHOLSON, BERYL (1971), Tilbakeflytting til et utkantdistrikt, Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning 12 (2), 99-122.

- (1980), Is a migration decision a migration decision?, Paper presented at the 5th World Congress for Rural Sociology, Mexico City.

- (1981), Local migration and the chain migration model. An empirical study of movement within three communes

in North Norway to assess the validity of the model's assumptions, Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
Unpublished tables from the return migration study.
NORGES HANDELSKALENDER 1979, Adressebok for handel, handverk og skipsfart, 1. bind - adresseavdeling, (Oslo: S.M. Bryde).
NOU (NORGES OFFENTLIGE UTREDNINGER) 1972: 33, Om landsdelsplan for Nord-Norge, (Oslo: Miljøverndepartementet).
NOU 1974: 26, Støtteordninger i landbruket, (OSLO: Landbruksdepartementet).
NOU 1975: 23, Dagligvareservice i utkantområder, (Oslo: Departementet for handel og skipsfart)
NSD (NORSK SAMFUNNSVITENSKAPELIG DATATJENESTE) (undated), Kretsfilen 1970, (Bergen), unpublished.
OTNES, PER (1978), Lokalsamfunn i strukturstabilisering: Finnmark 1973-78, Plan og Arbeid 1978 (4), 185-189.
PAHL, R.E. (1965), Class and Community in English Commuter Villages, Sociologia Ruralis 5 (1), 5-24.
POPULATION REGISTER, Skjervøy, (unpublished).
REISZ, BJØRN A. (1976), Flytting og levevilkår, (Oslo: NIBR arbeidsrapport 31/76).
ROBBESTAD, SVEIN (1969), Landbruket i Åmli, (Oslo: NLI).
ROGOFF RAMSØY, NATALIE (1977), Sosialmobilitet i Norge, (Oslo: Tiden).
SAUGESTAD LARSEN, SIDSEL (1980), Omsorgsbonden - et tidsnyttingsperspektiv på yrkeskombinasjon, arbeidsdeling og sosial endring, Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning 21 (3-4), 282-296.
SELVIK, ARNE (1975), Ekteskapsmarked og flyttemønster under en kraftutbygging, Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning 16; 334-349.
SHILS, EDWARD (1975), Center and Periphery. Essays in Macrosociology, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
STACEY, MARGARET (1969) The myth of community studies, British Journal of Sociology 20; 134-147.
SSB (CENTRAL STATISTICAL BUREAU)(1951), Folketellingen i Norge 3. des. 1946, vol. 3, (Oslo: SSB, NOS XI 41).
SSB (1956), Folketellingen i Norge 1. des. 1950, vol. 3, (Oslo: SSB, NOS XI 221).
SSB (1964a), Folketellingen i Norge 1. nov. 1969, vol. III, (Oslo: SSB, NOS XII 189).
SSB (1964b) Folkemengden i herreder og byer 1962 (Oslo: SSB, A 90).
SSB (1965), Folkemengden i herreder og byer 1964 (Oslo: SSB, A 119).
SSB (1964c), Folketellingen i Norge 1. nov. 1960, vol. VIII, (Oslo: SSB, NOS XII 140).
SSB (1967), Folketallet i kommunene, 1965-1967, (Oslo: SSB, A 187).
SSB (1968a), Statistisk Årbok 1968, (Oslo: SSB, NOS XII 235).
SSB (1968b), Boligundersøkelsen, oktober 1967, (Oslo: SSB, Rapport fra kontoret for intervjuundersøkelser No.3).
SSB (1968c), Folketallet i kommunene 1966-1968, (Oslo: SSB, NOS A225).
SSB (1970), Folketallet i kommunene 1969-1970, (Oslo: SSB, NOS A330).
SSB (1971a), Statistisk Fylkeshefte 1971 Aust Agder, (Oslo: SSB, NOS A 449).
SSB (1971b), Folketallet i kommunene 1970-1971, (Oslo: SSB, NOS A437).
SSB (1971c), Undervisningsstatistikk, 1. okt. 1970. Grunnskoler, (Oslo: SSB, NOS A437).
SSB (1972), Alder og yrkeskombinasjoner i jordbruket, (Oslo: SSB, Statistiske Analyser nr.5).
SSB (1972b), Folketallet i kommunene 1971-1972, (Oslo: SSB, NOS A476).
SSB (1973), Arbeidsmarkedstatistikk 1972, (Oslo: SSB, NOS A 562).
SSB (1974a), Flyttemotivundersøkelsen 1972, (Oslo: SSB, NOS A 617).
SSB (1974b), Flyttestatistikk 1973, (Oslo: SSB, NOS A 649).
SSB (1974c), Industristatistikk 1972, (Oslo: SSB, NOS A647).
SSB (1975a), Flyttinger in Norge 1971 og 1949-1973, (Oslo: SSB, Statistiske Analyser Nr.13).

SSB (1975b), Folke- og Boligtelling 1. nov. 1970, vol. II, (Oslo: SSB, NOS A693).
SSB (1977a), Statistisk Fylkeshefte 1977 Troms, (Oslo: SSB, NOS A850).
SSB (1977b), Statistisk Fylkeshefte 1977 Vest Agder, (Oslo: SSB, NOS A 858).
SSB (1977c), Flyttemotivundersøkelsen 1972, (Oslo: SSB, Samfunnsøkonomiske studier 35).
SSB (1977d), Flyttestatistikk 1976, (Oslo: SSB, NOS A898).
SSB (1978a), Flyttestatistikk 1977, (Oslo: SSB, NOS A975).
SSB (1978b), Historisk Statistikk 1978, (Oslo: SSB, NOS XII 291).
SSB (1978c), Arbeidsmarkedstatistikk 1977, (Oslo: SSB, NOS A958).
SSB (1978d), Lønns- og sysselsettingsstatistikk for skoleverket 1. okt. 1977, (Oslo: SSB, NOS A961).
SSB (1978e), Lønns- og sysselsettingsstatistikk for statens embets- og tjenestemenn 1. okt. 1977, (Oslo: SSB, NOS B125).
SSB (1979a), Flyttestatistikk 1978, (Oslo: SSB, NOS B 35).
SSB (1979b), Folketallet i kommunene 1978-1979, (Oslo: SSB, NOS A 966).
SSB (1979c), Statistisk Fylkeshefte 1980 Aust Agder, (Oslo: SSB, NOS B 58).
SSB (1979d), Statistisk Fylkeshefte 1980 Vest Agder, (Oslo: SSB, NOS B 59).
SSB (1980a), Flyttestatistikk 1979, (Oslo: SSB, NOS B 131).
SSB (1980b), Folketallet i kommunene 1979-1980, (Oslo: SSB, NOS B22).
SSB (1980c), Arbeidsmarkedstatistikk 1979, (Oslo: SSB, NOS B 128).
SSB (1980d), Lønns- og sysselsettingsstatistikk for skoleverket 1. okt. 1979, (Oslo: SSB, NOS B 117).
SSB (1980e), Lønns- og sysselsettingsstatistikk for statens embets- og tjenestemenn 1. okt. 1979, (Oslo: SSB, NOS B 125).
SSB (1980f), Industristatistikk 1978, (Oslo: SSB, NOS B 98).
SSB (undated a), Folketellingen i Norge 1. nov. 1960, 1941 Skjervøy, (Oslo: SSB).
SSB (undated b), Folketellingen i Norge 1. nov. 1960, 1030 Spangereid, (Oslo: SSB).
SSB (undated c), Folketellingen i Norge 1. nov. 1960, 1031 Austad, (Oslo: SSB).
SSB (undated d), Folketellingen i Norge 1. nov. 1960, 1032 Lyngdal, (Oslo: SSB).
SSB (undated e), Folketellingen i Norge 1. nov. 1960, 1033 Kvås, (Oslo: SSB).
SSB (unpublished), Koblet folketellings materiale, 1960-1970.
St.meld. (STORTINGSMELDING) nr.29(1963-64) Om virksomheten til Distriktenes utbyggingsfond i 1962, (Oslo: Kommunal- og arb. deptet).
St.meld. nr.87 (1966-67) Om distriktsplanlegging, (Oslo: K. & arb. ,,).
St.meld. nr.27 (1971-72) Om regionalpolitikken og lands- og landsdelsplanleggingen (Oslo: Kommunal- og arbeidsdepartementet).
St.meld. nr.13 (1972-73) Om mål og midler i distriktsutbyggingen (,,).
St.meld. nr.25 (1977-78) Om regionalplanlegging og forvaltning av naturressursene, (Oslo: Miljøverndepartementet).
SOU (STATENS OFFENTLIGA UTREDNINGAR) 1974: 2, Ortsbundna levnadsvillkor, (Stockholm: Arbetsmarknadsdepartementet).
WALLIN, ERIK (1974), Yrkeskarriär och stabilitet i bosättningen, in SOU 1972: 2, 298-322.
WARREN, R.L. (1963), The Community in America, (Chicago: Rand McNally).
WEBER, MAX (1956), Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft, 4th ed. (Tübingen: Mohr).
WHITE, H.C. (1970), Chains of Opportunity, (Cambridge: Harvard U.P.).
WYLIE, L. (1963), Demographic Change in Roussillon, in J. PITT RIVERS, Mediterranean Countrymen, (Paris: Mouton), 215-236.
- (1964), Village in the Vaucluse, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper Row).
- (ed.)(1966), Chanzeaux. Village in Anjou, (Cambridge: Harvard U.P.)
ÖBERG, S. (1974), Arbetslöshet orsakad av tillfälliga jämviktsbrister, in SOU 1974: 2, 377-393.