

The Dream of a Small-holding

Arild Blekesaune, Marit S. Haugen, and Mariann Villa

Paper no 1/07, ISSN 1503-2736

Paper to the XXII ESRS Congress 20-24 August 2007
in Wageningen, The Netherlands.

Arild Blekesaune,
Department of Sociology and Political Science
Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), N-7491 Trondheim Norway
e-mail: arild.blekesaune@svt.ntnu.no

Marit S. Haugen,
Centre for Rural Research
University Centre Dragvoll, N-7491 Trondheim, Norway
e-mail: marit.haugen@rural.no

Mariann Villa,
Centre for Rural Research
University Centre Dragvoll, N-7491 Trondheim, Norway
e-mail: mariann.villa@rural.no

The Dream of a Small-holding

Arild Blekesaune, Marit S. Haugen, and Mariann Villa

Abstract

Rural areas have undergone significant demographic, social and cultural changes throughout the last 50-60 years, and much research and policy interest has focussed upon rural-urban migration trends and the consequences of the urbanisation process for the sustainability of rural areas. In Norway, less attention has been given to the counter-trend, that is, urban people searching for a better quality of life in the countryside. Associating certain values with rural places – like a safe and clean environment, healthy lifestyles and strong community cohesion – might help to strengthen the attractiveness of the countryside for urban dwellers. For instance, in a Norwegian national survey, six out of ten people agreed with the statement that ‘life in the countryside is more fulfilling than urban life’. Further, 27 percent of respondents reported that they are interested in buying a small-holding in the countryside. While the majority of those surveyed expressed a wish to operate and/or live on the holding, a group of people also aspired to buy a small-holding as a second home. This paper explores the characteristics of the different groups who are interested in buying a small-holding and discusses the implications and potential for a future source of revitalisation for rural areas.

The Dream of a Small-holding

Introduction

In a Norwegian national survey, six out of ten agreed with the statement that 'life in the countryside is more fulfilling than urban life' (Norwegian Monitor Value Study 2005). It is seemingly paradoxical that whilst the main migration trend is for rural people to move into cities, the dream of a country life is still vivid in the consciousness of the Norwegian population. Popular constructions of rural Norway seems to perpetuate images of idyllic, problem-free environments. This paper explores these preferences for rural living, as represented by those surveyed who reported that they would like to buy a small-holding.

Important aspects of rural discourses in Norway are related to the revitalisation of small-holdings and their potential to enhance rural development. Given the migration of rural people into urban centres, a number of small-holdings have also become available on the housing market. In fact, this potential for a 'tree change' has been very much promoted in the media, such as magazines and newspapers, which report on the people who have realised their dream lifestyle on a small-holding¹. The choice of settling on a small-holding in the countryside is often explained as a search for a better quality of life, and as such, an aspect of an individual self-fulfilment and achievement.

The public interest in small-holdings is evidently increasing. Local rural communities are taking an active role in promoting small-holdings for sale by mapping available properties in order to encourage in-migration and settlement. For instance, in the year 2000 the web page *gardsbruk.no* was established and became an important arena for selling, buying and renting farms and small-holdings in Norway. This was part of the work of *Norsk Bonde- og Småbrukarlag* (Norwegian Farmers' and Smallholders' Union), the environmentalist youth organisation *Natur og Ungdom* (Nature and Youth) and *Norges Bygdeungdomslag* (Norwegian Rural Youth Association). The website receives approximately 20,000 visits to each month. When visiting this website in July 2007 we found only 148 vacant small-holdings for sale or rent². However, we do not know how many other small-holdings there are for sale throughout Norway which is not registered at this site. The Norwegian law is rather restrictive regarding the transfer of farms. Those who take over a farm are duty-bound to settle down on the property within a year and run the farming enterprise for at least ten years. This is however not the rule on small-holdings of less than two hectares in size³.

Programmes have been established in order to socially and economically revive rural regions by encouraging in-migration based on marketing ‘the good life’ in the countryside. One example is the running of a competition among architects to create modern versions of dwellings for rural small-holdings⁴. This raises the profile of the potential benefits of rural in-migration, and at the same time, enrolls a variety of social actors into the revitalisation strategy.

Representations of rural life

There is well documented research in Norway and abroad that the rural is often represented as a caring, safe, clean and quiet environment. This image especially relates to notions of the ‘ideal’ environment for raising children, and might represent an important element in discourses relating to migration into rural areas (Little and Austin 1996; Jones 1997; Brottveit 1998; Lysgård et al. 2000; Stenbacka 2001; Glendinning et al. 2003; Villa 2005).

In the second half of the 19th century, Norwegian rurality and farmers’ lifestyles were constructed as ‘the’ national culture. As industrialisation proceeded, migration and occupational patterns gradually turned rural areas into less obvious farming communities, and in some cases, less favoured communities. For many decades there has been an ongoing debate among different actors such as community developers, politicians, scientists and journalists about whether or not to encourage settlement in rural Norway. This has occurred alongside another debate regarding the ‘best’ place to live, city, or country. But as Haugen and Lysgård (2006:174) state: “The rural way of living has been and still is more or less regarded as the hegemonic norm for ‘quality of life’ in Norwegian society, and this has had a severe impact on both regional/rural politics and research.” The dichotomy of rural and urban areas and the uniqueness of rural life has been used to motivate and legitimate special policies for these areas (Persson 1992; Almås 1999). Munkejord (2006) argues, however, for the need to analyse everyday life in rural settings in terms of the social production of multiple meanings that consider rurality and urbanity as interrelated, rather than opposed. In line with this, research on migration and constructions of rurality have found that the rural and urban are experienced as both complementary and changing over the life course (Villa 1999; 2000).

Since the 1960s there has been a continuous trend of population decline in Norwegian rural areas. Consequently, the population distribution has for the first time seen more children raised in urban areas than in rural areas (Sørli 2003). Parallel to this trend, the processes of

homogenization, for example, in relation to consumption, place of residence, education and public services across sub-cultures and places have continued (Hompland 1991). Despite these overall homogenisation processes and demographic trends, in Norwegian opinion 'the rural' still seems to hold a strong position. And despite more objective measures of standards of living and the documentation of homogenisation, in popular discourse, the rural is generally associated with more benefits and described as antithetic to the city (e.g. Shucksmith et al. 1996; Ziebarth et al. 1997). This somewhat romanticised notion of the countryside is often given the overarching categorisation of 'idyll' (Cloke 2003). As Cloke puts it:

Somewhere deep down in the early twenty-first century psyche there seems to remain longstanding, handed-down precepts about rural areas, marking them as spaces enabled by nature, offering opportunities for living and lifestyles which are socially cohesive, happy and healthy, and presenting a pace and quality of life that differs from that in the city (Cloke 2003:1).

Rural life often evokes nostalgic feelings and symbolically represents a flight from modernity (Short 1991; Holloway and Hubbard 2001). Bell (2006) argues that the rural idyll is an urban construction, manifested in diverse cultural forms and practices, on television, in poems and novels, music and movies. These strong and enduring rural images might contribute to rural areas becoming marketable commodities with a large demand for rural space and rural amenities (van Dam et al. 2002: 462). In some cases this demand is seen as a gentrification of rural areas (e.g. Phillips 1993), where affluent urban people find rural scenery and houses attractive as places to live.

Living on a small-holding might be seen as the ultimate way of realising rural life. Lønning (2000) claims that rural living in many cases is motivated by establishing a post-modern lifestyle within agriculture, which is supposed to increase the important qualities of life. Though, acquiring a small-holding might be difficult when not inheriting one. A Norwegian study among 650 owners and 205 potential buyers of small-holdings found that most often both owners and interested buyers were living in urban areas (Mæland 2005). The majority of the owners interviewed were not willing to sell their small-holding, and the most important reason for this was to keep the holding as a second home and/or for business reasons, as well as for maintaining family traditions. The strength of family traditions on Norwegian small-

holdings is illustrated when owners explicitly state that selling a vacant holding is unlikely ‘as long as my parents live’ (op. cit.: 25). The potential buyers, identified as ‘lifestyle migrants’, were most commonly young, well educated and financially-sound people with children. Motivations for buying a small-holding were to improve their living environment in general and for their children in particular, getting closer to nature, obtaining a place for business (agriculture or other), as well as an interest in old buildings and nice scenery (Mæland 2005).

The focus of this paper is the orientation towards rural-style living, rather than wholesale migration to rural areas. Norwegian rural research that is inspired by a social constructivist tradition has focused on constructions of rurality and urbanity as important in understanding migration choices (e.g. Berg 2002; Wiborg 2003; Berg and Lysgård 2004; Fosso 2004; Haugen and Villa 2006; Rye 2006). As Boyle *et al.* (1998:142) argue, “the rural idyll may be an urban perspective of the countryside, refracted through various media and not based on direct experience, but it nevertheless can be a strong force guiding migration”. Van Dam *et al.* (2002) address rural images and preferences and conclude that many people living in urban areas do have a wish to live in the countryside, stating a preference for a green, quiet, spacious, orderly and safe residential environment, but that only a small group are in the position to act upon such preferences, and actually move to rural environments.

Others have pointed to the changes in rural areas, rural identities and rural-urban distinctions that occurs parallel to increasing mobility and second home ownership (Flognfeldt 2004; Halfacree 2006; Hidle *et al.* 2006). In other words, counter-urbanisation might also be influenced by the increasing second-home phenomenon. Urban people buy second homes in rural areas with the aim of relaxing and enjoying recreational pursuits (Holloway and Hubbard 2001), and a small-holding might be one option for such people looking for a second home. Second home ownership might also represent a first step towards urban-to-rural migration of a more permanent nature as observed in some Western countries (Halfacree 2004). New flexible labour markets and new communications have facilitated a more mobile lifestyle, as people may alternate between multiple homes, increasing the inter-relationship between urban and rural life.

As the main migration trend in Norway is from rural to urban areas, the fact that more than one quarter of a representative sample of Norwegians responded that they are somewhat interested in buying a small-holding requires further scrutiny. Our question is why this is the

case and for what purpose do these people want to buy a small-holding? Further, the paper discusses the kind of influences these new small-holding owners might have on rural areas.

Data and methods

This paper is based on data from the *Norwegian Monitor Value Study 2005*, carried out by the market research institute MMI in Norway. These data were obtained in a two-stage process. First, a random sample of people were contacted by telephone and asked to participate in a comprehensive survey of values. Then, those who agreed to participate received a self-completion questionnaire by post. The total sample of 3,849 people is representative of the Norwegian population age 15 and above.

We use two different dependent variables in this analysis. First we use a variable based on the question “How interesting is it for you to buy a small-holding in Norway”? The answers received in relation to this question are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. *Interested in buying a small-holding in Norway. Percentages.*

	Numbers	Percentages
Very interested	139	4
Fairly interested	193	5
A little interested	694	18
Not interested	2399	62
Don't know	146	4
Already have a small-holding/not relevant	278	7
Total	3849	100
(N=)	139	(3849)

Table 1 shows that 27 percent are interested in buying a small-holding, varying from 4 percent who are very interested to 18 percent who are a little interested. In the analysis, we have recoded the values numbered 1 to 3 into one group, and named them as ‘interested’. In the questionnaire, the group who answered in the affirmative to being interested in small-holding ownership were then asked, “If you should buy a small-holding in Norway, would you most probably live there and engage in farming, just live there without farming, or would

you use it as a second home?” The answers to these questions are represented below in Table 2. In this table, we have excluded 278 people who answered “Already have a small-holding” or “Not relevant”. In the further analysis the net sample for our analysis consists of 3571 people.

Table 2. *Preferred style of use of small-holding. Percentages.*

	Numbers	Percentages
Reside and farm	379	11
Solely a residence	383	11
Second home	242	7
Not interested	2567	72
Total	3571	101

In order to answer the research questions, we have constructed a regression model, which shows how various independent variables influence people’s interest in buying a small-holding. Generally, a multivariate analysis is preferred where it is possible to ask whether a situational factor has influence on a response variable, and exercise control over all other variables which could have consequences for the same response variable. Based on our presentation of the ongoing discussion on the rural representations and interest in small-holdings, we have selected 14 independent variables which are expected to influence the dependent variable (purpose of buying) in Table 2.

We will also take into account that the interest in a small-holding is dependent on the intentions and plans for this holding. There are supposedly quite different groups that are interested in becoming farmers compared to those who want to buy a small-holding as a second home. In this analysis we use a multi-nominal logistic model, also called polytomous logistic regression, to test whether the independent variables have an effect on the wish to buy a small-holding either: 1) to start farming; (2) as a residence; or (3) as a second home. The reference category consists of those who are not interested in buying a small-holding (see Table 2).

Dependent variables

The original gender variable is recoded into a dummy variable where men are coded 1 and women are coded 0. The age variable is recoded into three dummies, with age 60 years or older used as a reference category. Family income is recoded into two categories of equal size, those in the highest half are coded 1 whilst those in the lowest half of income are coded 0. The dummy “children” is based on the information of number of children living at home. All with one or more children are coded 1, whilst those with no children are coded 0. The education variable is based on self-reported data concerning ‘level of education’, and as many as 46 percent have classified their own education level as high, and these are defined into one group which is coded 1, while the others are coded 0. The domicile variable was originally measured with nine categories, however, we have recoded this variable into three dummy variables where the first one identifies those living in big cities, the second identifies those living in suburbs, and the third identifies those living in towns or small cities. The reference category called ‘rural’ consists of those answering that they live in small towns, villages, or rural areas.

Farm interest

We have also included two dummy variables which measure attitudes on two controversial questions connected to agricultural policy. The first variable is based on the general question: “Below you will see a list of some socio-political aspects. Will you please read this list carefully, and tick off the subjects you think are of certain importance to solve in Norway”. From a list of 32 different political issues, we have selected those who have ticked off the following statement; “Keep up farm structure on contemporary level”, and coded them 1, whilst all others are coded 0. The second variable on agricultural policy is based on the question “Which of these reasons do you think are the most important in order to support Norwegian agriculture”? Here we have constructed a dummy variable which identifies those who have marked “Conserve rural areas” with the code 1, while all others are coded 0. These two variables identify the interest in conserving agriculture and maintaining rural areas.

Outdoor activities

The next variables identify the interest in outdoor rural activities. From a list of various activities, we have created a dummy which identifies those who have engaged in hunting or angling during the last year. Further, we have included a variable measuring interest in

reading magazines about outdoor activities. This is an ordinal variable with the categories: not interested (1); somewhat interested (2); and very interested (3).

Life-style attitudes

In order to understand various attitudes associated with rural life, we have included three variables based on the following statements: “I like to have nice and beautiful environment around me”, “I prefer to live a quiet life”, and “Life in the countryside is more fulfilling than urban life”. These statements are measured with five ordered categories from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree). On these variables we have coded those who answered, “Don’t know” or did not answer at all, into the middle category of 3. In addition, we have added a similar five-category variable measuring a general search for material goods based on the statement; “I miss some material goods making me able to live as I want”.

Findings

Interpreting the findings in Table 3 is complex because the logistic model is nonlinear, and the logistic scale is so abstract that we often use simplified interpretations of the coefficient’s sign character and the p-value which shows the statistical significance of the coefficient. A positive sign coefficient implies that an increased value on the independent variable lead to an increased probability to select this particular choice. If the sign of the coefficient is negative, an increased value on the independent variable implies a lower probability to opt for this alternative. Additionally to the logit coefficients and their standard errors (S.E.), we have marked the coefficient with one asterisk (*) if the causal effect from the independent variable is statistically significant on the 5 percent level, and with two asterisks if the coefficient is statistically significant on the 1 percent level.

Table 3. *Parameter estimates of a multi-nominal logistic model estimating different interests with the buying of a small-holding.*

<i>Variables</i>	Residence and Farming		Residence		Second home	
	Logit coeff.	S.E.	Logit coeff.	S.E.	Logit coeff.	S.E.
Men (man=1/women=0)	-.148	(.139)	.199	(.133)	.332*	(.158)
Keep up farm structure (agree=1/not agree=0)	.450**	(.126)	.043	(.128)	.082	(.156)
Conserve rural areas (agree=1/not agree=0)	.611**	(.145)	-.089	(.124)	-.194	(.146)
Domicile (dummies with rural areas as reference)						
A big city	-.800**	(.228)	-.593**	(.214)	.313	(.234)
Suburbs of a big city	-.864**	(.228)	-.208	(.182)	.310	(.220)
Town or small city	-.405**	(.156)	-.229	(.151)	.302	(.184)
Age dummies (Age 60+ as reference)						
Age 15-25	2.400**	(.276)	1.888**	(.282)	-.293	(.350)
Age 26-39	1.678**	(.239)	2.017**	(.228)	.013	(.235)
Age 40-59	1.252**	(.216)	1.333**	(.214)	.056	(.195)
Search for more material goods (1=quite disagree – 5=quite agree)	.140**	(.043)	.121**	(.041)	.064	(.049)
Interest in reading about outdoor activities (1=not interested – 3=very interested)	.499**	(.099)	.343**	(.098)	.330**	(.114)
Been hunting or angling during the last year (yes=1/no=0)	.433**	(.146)	.087	(.145)	.434**	(.164)
Life in countryside is more fulfilling than urban life (1=quite disagree – 5=quite agree)	.290**	(.058)	.312**	(.053)	.162**	(.059)
Family income in highest half (yes=1/no=0)	-.045	(.128)	-.214	(.124)	.263	(.154)
Children (yes=1/no=0)	.370**	(.140)	.054	(.131)	.301	(.164)
Higher education (yes=1/no=0)	-.217	(.131)	.216	(.123)	.123	(.147)
I like to have it nice and beautiful around me (1=quite disagree – 5=quite agree)	.002	(.064)	-.047	(.060)	.178*	(.081)
I prefer to live a quiet life (1=quite disagree – 5=quite agree)	.040	(.057)	-.021	(.053)	-.120*	(.061)
Constant	-6.071**	(.500)	-4.904**	(.469)	-4.617**	(.548)
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square (df=54) = 656.667						
N = 3571						

* = p<0.05 and ** = p<0.01 in two tailed tests

Table 3 shows that those who want to become farmers are much more engaged in questions concerning agricultural policy than the reference category consisting of those who have no interest in buying a small-holding. The significant positive coefficients on “Keep up farm structure” and “Conserve rural areas” mean that those who agree with these statements are more interested in taking up farming than those who are not interested in buying a small holding. The negative effects on all domicile dummies indicate that people living in big cities, suburbs, or small cities are less interested in starting farming than people in rural areas. Further, Table 3 shows that the interest in farming is more widespread among young people, people with children, among those with interests in hunting and angling, among those who want more material goods, and those who prefer country life. This might indicate that those who want to buy a small-holding in order to start farming are oriented towards a traditional farm lifestyle.

Interest in buying a small-holding as a residence is less common among people in big cities, which is the only domicile group significantly different from people in rural areas. The age dummies show that people less than 60 years old are more interested in a small holding as a residence than older people, but this age effect is not as linear as when compared to those who want to start farming. Further, Table 3 shows that the resident group consists of people who are more interested in outdoor activities, country life, and searching for material goods than the people who are not interested in buying a small-holding. One interesting finding is that children do not have any effect on the wish to buy a small-holding as a residence. This is different from those who want to become farmers, where those who have children are more likely to start farming. The characteristics of those who want to use the small-holding as a residence are not different from the reference category in relation to interests in conserving agriculture and rural areas. This means that they are less interested in conservation compared with those who want to become farmers. The main characteristics of the residence group is that they prefer to live in the countryside, but they are less oriented towards farming or agricultural policy.

Those who want to buy a small-holding in order to use it as a second home are quite different from the other groups. This wish is more common among men than women, among those who prefer rural life, and among people with interests in outdoor activities. The negative significant effect of the variable “I prefer to live a quiet life” implies that this group consist of

active people who prefer an active lifestyle. It is also a significant tendency that this group like to have nice and beautiful surroundings, and this is the only group where this aesthetic factor has an effect. This might imply that those who want to buy a small-holding in order to use it as a second home are mainly interested in having a place for recreation and outdoor activities.

Discussion

Our concern in this paper has been to identify those groups who are interested in buying a small-holding, and to explore which groups prefer to use the small-holding as a farm, residence or second home. A second aim was to discuss what kind of influences these potential 'new' small-holding owners could have on rural areas.

The representation of the small-holding as a symbol of the rural idyll and the ultimate way of realising rural life, is not only an urban construction. Our analysis shows that the dream of a small-holding is as much occurring among rural inhabitants. The fact that the majority of potential small-holders who want to start farming are those already living in rural areas presents another insight to 'the dream of a small-holding', compared to previous findings (Mæland 2005) which report that interested buyers generally live in urban areas. Our analysis differs, by showing that potential buyers of small-holdings have different preferences concerning the use of the holding. Those who live in urban areas are actually less interested in buying a small-holding than those already living in rural areas, and if they are oriented toward a small-holding, they commonly plan to use it as a second home.

Those who want to buy a small-holding could be classified in three main groups based on their aspirations; 'The Aspiring Farmers' want to buy a small holding in order to start farming, 'The Countrylife Lovers' want to use the small-holding as a residence, and 'The Recreation Seekers' want to buy a small holding in order to use it as a second home. In other words the potential buyers consist of people with different ideas and preferences for their small-holdings, and this might represent different outcomes for rural areas. As seen in Table 2 these groups are fairly the same in size, though there is a larger amount that want to farm or just live on the small holding than use it as second home.

The Aspiring Farmers

Aspiring Farmers are more engaged in questions concerning agricultural or rural policy, in hunting and angling, and to live a country life. This indicates more interest in rural questions and an orientation towards a traditional farm lifestyle. As the Aspiring Farmers tend to be younger and have children, the farm lifestyle and environment might be especially attractive. Aspiring Farmers might want to pursue a family farm ideology where the family work together on the holding, but there is hardly possible to make a living just from farming on a small holding. This means that the small holders either need to diversify into additional businesses on the farm (i.e. food processing, direct sale of farm products, farmbased tourism), start a new business or have an off farm job in addition to farming. However, in order to understand more about this, further information about their characteristics and orientations would be needed. Aspiring Farmers consisting of young families with children might represent a renewing of the farming community. In the longer term, by giving children roots on a family small-holding, new generations are presented with the possibility of engaging in farmlife and rural life. Aspiring Farmers might represent an important contribution to maintaining rural societies and the farming society.

The Countrylife Lovers

Those who want to buy a small-holding solely for the purpose of a rural residence are characteristically different from those who want to farm as evidenced by their lower interest in agricultural and rural policy. However, they do have the same preferences for country-style living. Those who want a small-holding for a rural residence are less homogeneous compared with the aspiring farmers. The group of Countrylife Lovers consists of people distributed on all ages and family characteristics. By this they might represent a greater social and cultural diversity. Countrylife Lovers, whether urban or rural, who become new rural dwellers on small holdings, might have some of the characteristics known from previous research on rural gentrification. These are people looking for the 'right' houses in rural areas, and who don't depend exclusively on the local labour market. Even though they represent an important contribution to the rural community, they might be less locally bounded both with respect to social and cultural life.

The Recreation Seekers

To buy a small-holding in order to use it as a second home is – similar to the other groups – of interest among those who prefer an active rural life. The Recreation Seekers are highlighting

the importance of nice and beautiful surroundings. This is consistent with previous findings that suggests urban people buy second homes in rural areas for purposes of relaxation and recreation. The 'urban' view might be more explicitly focused upon the quality of the rural scenery, while this is probably a more taken for granted quality among rural dwellers. An interesting finding is that the Recreation Seekers more often are men. This might indicate that men prefer a small-holding as a place of recreation and outdoor activities. This is in line with popular representations of rural masculinity, of which outdoor activities such as hunting and angling and even maintenance work are important aspects.

Recreation Seekers might represent a group of more ambivalent importance for the rural society. On the one hand, they might be of crucial importance for the local economy, for example, by spending money during their weekend and holiday stays. On the other hand, they might displace others who would like to buy the holding in order to farm or settle down at a permanent basis. In the most popular rural 'second home' areas, conflicts related to duty-bound settlement on the property, agricultural land, local taxes and nature preservation commonly occur. In such conflicts second-homers or Recreation Seekers might represent a cultural and political force of which local population might become somewhat alienated.

Conclusion

Our analysis has identified three groups of potential smallholders – and this might be of importance for the ongoing discussions regarding rural policy. A growing interest in small-holdings evidently holds different consequences dependent upon the buyers' aspirations. As the Aspiring Farmers more likely already live in rural areas, their small-holder orientations might encourage an intra-rural migration. In comparison, Countrylife Lovers and especially Recreation Seekers' orientations might indicate a potential for increased counter-urbanisation.

In future, strong rural images might contribute to rural areas becoming even more marketable commodities, encouraging a larger demand for rural space for living and recreation. In Norway, the availability of rural living is obtainable for most people, and due to general economic growth, more people are now in the position to accomplish their dream of buying a small-holding. Parallel to this, many original owners give up farming and move into urban locations which could be a potential for increasing the numbers of small-holdings for sale. Many owners, however do not want to sell their family small-holding even though they do not use it themselves either as residence or second home. Although active farming no longer is a

relevant option, the strong commitment to keep the property within the family still exist. Our study indicates that the number of potential buyers outnumbers vacant small-holdings.

If rural areas should take advantage of the evident interest in buying small-holdings one should encourage owners to sell their vacant holdings if they themselves do not plan to utilize it. Another option for local authorities would be to plan for heterogeneous settlement, including new building of small-holdings. As the geographical area might influence the supply and demand for small-holdings, there is no clear answer of how to accomplish universal success across Norway's rural areas in relation to small-holdings and the potential influx of newcomers into rural areas. Either way, there are clear policy implications brought about by different types of in-migrants such as Aspiring Farmers, Countrylife Lovers and Recreation Seekers – who all might contribute different aspects of vitality to rural areas.

Endnotes

¹⁾ The monthly magazine *Lev Landlig*; Adresseavisen 09.02.07: "Endelig er gårdsdrømmen oppfylt"; Adresseavisen 03.02.06: "Drømmen om Midt-Norge"; Nationen 06.06.2007: "Småbruk solgt for 5,2 millioner" ; Nationen 30.12.2005: Fikk småbruk og drømmejobb.

²⁾ http://www.gardsbruk.no/om_gardsbruk/slipposstil.html.

³⁾ <http://www.lovdata.no/all/nl-19740628-058.html>: Lov om odelsretten og åsetesretten. LOV 1974-06-28 nr 58. An amendment from 1st of January 2004 implies that agricultural properties less than 10 hectares can be sold without licence if there is less than two hectares arable land.

⁴⁾ www.blilyst.no.

References:

- Almås, R. (1999): *Rural Development – a Norwegian perspective*. Report 9/99. Trondheim: Centre for Rural Research.
- Bell, D. (2006): Variations on the rural idyll. In P. Cloke, T. Marsden and P.H. Mooney (eds.), *Handbook of Rural Studies*, pp 149-160. London: Sage Publications.
- Berg, N.G. (2002): Kjønn på landet og kjønn i byen: om betydningen av ruralitet for urban-rural migrasjon og hverdagsliv. *Kvinneforskning* 1/02:67-82.
- Berg, N. G. og H. K. Lysgård (2004): Ruralitet og urbanitet - bygd og by. In Berg, N. G., B. Dale, H. K. Lysgård and A. Løfgren, eds, *Mennesker, steder og regionale endringer*, pp 61-76. Trondheim: Tapir Akademisk Forlag.
- Bjarnason, T. and T. Thorlindsson (2006): Should I stay or should I go? Migration expectations among youth in Icelandic fishing and farming communities. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 22 (3), 290-300.
- Boyle, P., K. Halfacree og V. Robinson (1998): *Exploring Contemporary Migration*. New York: Longman.
- Brottveit, Å. (1998): Barnevennlige samfunn : en studie av tre bygders sosiale nettverk og oppvekstbetingelser i Rømskog, Marker og Rakkestad. Rapport 1/98 Oslo: Diakonhjemmets høgskolesenter. Forskningsavdelingen.
- Cloke, P. (2003): *Country visions*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Flognfeldt, T. (2004): Second Homes as Part of the New Rural Lifestyles in Norway. In C.Hall and D. Muller (eds.), *Tourism, Mobility and Second Homes: Between Elite Landscape and Common Ground* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Fosso, E. J. (2004): Unges flytting – et spørsmål om identitet og myter om marginale og sentrale steder? In Berg, N. G., B. Dale, H. K. Lysgård and A. Løfgren, eds, *Mennesker, steder og regionale endringer*, pp. 119-135. Trondheim: Tapir Akademisk Forlag.
- Glendinning A., M. Nuttall, L. Hendry, M. Kloep and S. Wood (2003) Rural communities and well-being: a good place to grow up? *Sociological Review* 51 (1): 129-156.
- Halfacree, K. (2004): Rethinking 'rurality'. In T. Champion and G. Hugo (eds.), *New Forms of Urbanization. Beyond the Urban-Rural Dichotomy*, pp 285-304. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Halfacree, K. (2006): Rural space: Constructing a three-fold architecture. In T. Marsden, P. J. Cloke & P. H. Mooney (eds.), *Handbook of Rural Studies*, pp 44-62. London: Sage.
- Haugen, M. S. and H. K. Lysgård (2006): Discourses of rurality in a Norwegian

- context. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift–Norwegian Journal of Geography* Vol. 60 (3): 174-178.
- Haugen, M. S. and M. Villa (2006) Big Brother in rural societies. Youths' discourses on gossip. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift–Norwegian Journal of Geography* Vol. 60 (3):209-216.
- Haugen, M. S. and M. Villa (2006) Rural idylls or boring places? In B. B. Bock and S. Shortall, eds, *Rural Gender Relations: Issues and Case Studies*, pp. 181-195. Oxfordshire: CABI Publishing.
- Hidle, K., J. Cruickshank and L. M. Nesje (2006): Market, commodity, resource, and strenght: Logics of Norwegian rurality. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift–Norwegian Journal of Geography* Vol. 60 (3): 189-198.
- Holloway, L. and P. Hubbard (2001): *People and place: the extraordinary geographies of everyday life*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Hompland, A. (1991): Det store kappeskiftet. In Almås, R., ed, *Åtte perspektiver på bygdeutvikling*, pp 55-74.. NLVF-Publikasjon 3/91, Oslo.
- Jones, O. (1997): Little figures, big shadows. Country childhood stories. In Cloke, P. and J.Little, eds, *Contested Countryside Cultures. Otherness, marginalisation and rurality*, pp 158-179. London: Routledge.
- Little, J. and P. Austin (1996): Women and the rural idyll. *Journal of Rural Studies* 12, 2, 101-111.
- Lysgård, H. K., A. K. Ryntveit and J. Karlsen (2000): *Å bo på landet - et valg av livsstil. En studie av Marnardal og Åseral*. Report 15/00. Kristiansand: Agderforskning.
- Lønning, D. J. (2000): Nye tider, nye utfordringer. In Lønning, D. J., ed, *Bønder i soloppgang?* Ål: Boksmia forlag.
- Norwegian Monitor Value Study (2005): Oslo: Synovate MMI Norway AS
- Munkejord, M.C. (2006): Challenging Discourses on Rurality: Women and Men In-migrants' Constructions of the Good Life in a Rural Town in Northern Norway, *Sociologia Ruralis* 46 (3), 241–257.
- Mæland, H. (2005): *Mange vil ha, men få vil selje! Småbruk som ressurs for busetting*. Rapport nr. 222. Bø: Telemarksforskning.
- Persson, L. O. (1992): Rural Labour Markets Meeting Urbanisation and the Arena Society: New Challenges for Policy Planning in Rural Scandinavia. In Marsden, T., P.Lowe and S. Whatmore, eds, *Labour and Locality: Uneven Development and the Rural*

- Labour Process*, pp.68-94. Critical Perspectives on Rural Change Series IV. London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Rye, J. F. (2006): Geographic and social mobility: Youth's rural-to-urban-migration in Norway. Doctoral thesis at NTNU, 2006:238. Trondheim: Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Short, J. (1991): *Imagined country*. London: Routledge.
- Shucksmith, M., P. Chapmann and G. M. Clark (1996): *Rural Scotland Today. The best of both worlds?* Aldershot: Avebury.
- Phillips, M. (1993): Rural gentrification and the processes of class colonisation. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 9, 123-140.
- Statistics Norway (2006): Statistikk over eksisterende bygningsmasse, 2006.
- Stenbacka, S. (2001): *Landsbygdsboende i innflyttarnas perspektiv. Intention ochhandling i lokalsamhället*. Avhandling. Geografiska regionstudier nr. 42. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.
- Sørli, K. (2003): <http://www.forskning.no/Artikler/2003/april/1049810547.58>
- van Dam, F., S. Heins and B. S. Elbersen (2002): Lay discourses of the rural and stated and revealed preferences for rural living. Some evidence of the existence of a rural idyll in the Netherlands. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 18 (4), 461-476.
- Villa, M. (1999) Bygda – sosial konstruksjon av ”trygt og godt”. *Sosiologi i dag*, 4, 31-52.
- Villa, M. (2000) Rural Life Courses in Norway: Living within the Rural-Urban Complementarity. *The History of the Family: An International Quarterly*, 5 (4), 473-490.
- Villa, M. (2005) *Bygda som bustad*. Doctoral thesis. Report 1/05. Trondheim: Centre for Rural Research.
- Wiborg, A. (2003): *En ambivalent reise i et flertydig landskap. Unge fra distriktene i høyere utdanning*. Dr. Polit.- thesis, Institutt for sosialantropologi, Tromsø: University of Tromsø.
- Ziebarth, A., K., Prochaska-Cue and B. Shrewsbury (1997): ”Growth and Locational Impacts for Housing in Small Communities.” *Rural Sociology* 62 (1), s. 111 – 125.