Post-print version of the paper by Villa (2019) in Sociologia Ruralis 59 (4) 701-717
https://doi.org/10.1111/soru.12263

Local Ambivalence to Diverse Mobilities – The Case of a Norwegian Rural Village

Mariann Villa

Abstract

In Norway, immigration and tourism have become important drivers of diversity in rural communities. While rural migration mostly has been studied from the migrants' perspective, this article examines how long-term residents in a Norwegian rural mountain resort characterised by seasonal tourism and labour immigration experience the flux of diverse migrants and how this affects them and the local community. The article is based on 12 interviews with men and women who are long-term community residents. A major narrative of the locals is that of the village and its inhabitants as accustomed to mobility, a local knowledge acquired through decades of tourism and in-migration. But there are also narratives of ambivalence and contradictions and of the place as saturated by mobilities. The paper explores how locals adjust to and avoid these mobilities.

Keywords: rural village, seasonal in-migration, tourism, local ambivalence

22 ## Introduction

23 The rural village I call Inland is widely known as a popular mountain ski resort in Norway,
24 serving affluent tourists in general and those from the capital region in particular.
25 According to the media, it has some difficulties with 'party tourism' in peak seasons. When
26 I visited Inland to conduct fieldwork, I was struck by two contrasting characteristics.
27 Physically, the centre village resembled other ski resorts, densely structured around
28 expensive shops, food stores, hotels, restaurants and holiday apartments. But, as Theodori
29 (2003) quoted in Avery (2013, p. 29) argues, 'When you've seen one rural community,
30 you've seen one rural community. Every rural community has certain social, economic,
31 and/or environmental issues that are unique to that particular community and contribute to
32 its diversity'. What was most striking about the people on the streets of Inland was the
33 diversity of their languages. Everywhere individuals were speaking, not in traditional local
34 dialects, but in languages other than Norwegian. Internationality was an audible presence,
35 even though people looked like 'ordinary locals'.

36 In Norway, immigration and tourism have recently become important drivers of
37 diversity in rural communities. Increasing labour migration has brought population growth
38 to some rural regions for the first time in several decades (Søholt, Tronstad and Bjørnsen
39 2014). Second home owners also contribute to population growth (Farstad 2015). Indeed,
40 Inland's population is characterised not by stasis but by mobility and turnover. This diverse
41 mobility has marked the locality and its surrounding areas both historically and seasonally,
42 from those who built the railway over a century ago to today's tourists, immigrant workers,
43 and second home owners. When these groups are present in the winter time, they actually

44 outnumber the permanent, year-round residents. Paradoxically, part of Inland's
45 attractiveness is its rootedness in a traditional Norwegian highland culture, which contains
46 elements associated with classic romantic nationalism (Berg-Nordlie 2018). Within this
47 mix of mobilities and ideas of rootedness and traditional authenticity (Søholt, Stenbacka
48 and Nørgaard 2018), tourists, in-migrants, and permanent residents of Inland live side-by-
49 side on an everyday or seasonal basis.

50 Research on rural mobility often focuses on the migrants (Halfacree and Rivera
51 2012; Scott, Murphy and Gkartzios 2017). This paper examines how long-term residents in
52 and around the rural village experience tourists and seasonal in-migrants and how the flux
53 of diverse migrants affects them and the local community. It explores mobility from the
54 perspective of those being 'moved through' (Aure, Førde and Magnussen 2018) and the
55 changes and challenges they see arising from the presence of newcomers.

56 The study is part of a larger research project on the exclusion and inclusion of
57 immigrants in multi-ethnic rural and peripheral communities in Norway. As such, it adds to
58 studies which look into media representations of rural immigration (Berg-Nordlie 2018),
59 place attachment among internal and international labour migrants (Lynnebakke
60 forthcoming), and perceptions of immigrants and immigration among local rural elites,
61 defined as persons who hold leading positions in policy making bodies, the economy, or
62 civil society (Søholt *et al.* 2018).

63 The study seeks to correct what Halfacree and Rivera (2012, p. 92) describe as an
64 imbalance, a 'bias in favour of studying distinctive actions, such as migration, at the
65 expense of non-actions, such as staying put'. It also responds to Benson and O'Reilly's

(2009, p. 621) call for research on the impact that diverse and relatively affluent migrants moving either part-time or full-time, permanently or temporarily may have on receiving communities.

Mobility and migration in rural areas

A mobilities perspective shapes the study's overall approach, illuminating how turnover and migration affect permanent residents and produce parallel and ambiguous narratives of rural place. While 'the urban' is constructed as the archetypal space of hyper-mobility in demographic work, less attention has been paid to mobilities in rural spaces (Milbourne and Kitchen 2014, p. 326). Yet mobility is a continuous feature of rural areas. As Milbourne and Kitchen point out, it has long been a significant driver of change in rural areas through the out-migration of young people, the incoming flows of tourists, holiday home owners, and people seeking to adopt rural lifestyles, and by people moving in and out at different phases of the life course (Villa 2000). Coastal fishery–based communities have always been distinguished by mobility, whether in fish stocks, markets, fishermen, or on-shore workers (Gerrard 2016; Aure *et al*. 2018). More recently, rural areas have experienced rising international in-migration, e.g., to fishery-based economies (Rye 2018), agriculture (Andrzejewska and Rye 2012), and tourist destinations (Henningsen, Jordhus-Lier and Underthun 2015). During the first years after the EU enlargement, Norway received more labour migrants than the other four Nordic countries combined, and immigration has become a major source of population increase in rural areas (Søholt *et al.* 2014, 2018).

Rural places with long-term local residents and diverse in-migrants as well as places with substantial seasonal fluctuations in population make good sites for the study of complex processes of mobility. Studies of labour migration reveal the interrelations between mobility and stability, as well as the differential processes of inclusion and exclusion at work in a place over time. Labour migrants maintain stability and consolidate in rural communities at the same time that they experience exclusion (Aure *et al*. 2018; Søholt *et al*. 2018). Others have pointed to the paradox that tourism and labour migration are crucial to the stability of local economies and the sustainability of rural places, while the same mobilities have the power to destroy what is distinctive to those very places (Milbourne and Kitchen 2014).

New migration streams to rural areas have been analysed within the frame of rural gentrification. People seeking a certain quality of life in specific rural destinations and rural restructuring for residential or tourism purposes might induce social tensions and displacement of local populations (Nelson and Hines 2018). Studies have found that the increased local presence of new social groups can lead to nostalgia or a sense of alienation among long-time residents (May 1996; Gustafson 2014 cited in Lynnebakke 2018, p. 13). Donaldson (2018) refers to rural gentrification as more subtle processes, which impose changes on local populations without physically displacing them. But according to Nelson, Lilley and van Gemeren (2019) little attention has been given to the 'temporal signatures' left by gentrification and how this transforms the ways people use and experience space.

Building on studies of the transformative impact of international migration on rural communities and of interactions between in-migrants and established rural residents, rural studies have begun to draw on the concept of cosmopolitanism (Woods 2018, p. 164).

While discursively cosmopolitanism has been attributed to transnationally mobile elites and urban and global societies, cosmopolitanism recently has been discussed in terms of ideas, agencies, dispositions and practices within rural villages (Woods 2018), among immigrants and Indigenous in rural areas (Krivokapic-Skoko, Reid and Collins 2018), and in strategies related to farm development (Stenbacka and Bygdell 2018). In a review of the literature on rural cosmopolitanism, Woods (2018) refers to cosmopolitan dispositions among individuals who bridge rural and non-rural places and transfer external experiences, skills and tastes into rural society, or who produce a cosmopolitan atmosphere for those who travel to rural places (Notar 2008 cited in Woods 2018). Among the cosmopolitan properties of rural communities are collective practices of hospitality toward others and openness to difference and diversity (Woods 2018, pp. 166). But review of cosmopolitanism in rural areas also finds contrast and variety (Krivokapic-Skoko *et al.* 2018). In his own study, Woods (2018) examines the dynamics and relationships that shape migrants' engagement with long-term residents in rural small towns. He argues that cosmopolitanism is both facilitated and restricted by the rural setting and posits a 'precarious rural cosmopolitanism'. The cosmopolitanism identified in new rural immigrant destinations is partial, contingent, incomplete and reversible (p. 165).

This conclusion has some parallels with Søholt *et al.*'s (2018) study, which speaks of a conditional receptiveness toward immigration in rural areas. Receptiveness here corresponds to being open-minded, able to receive new signals, and interested in new people. Søholt *et al.* (2018) found that rural elites in multicultural communities with long-standing settlement regard immigration as promoting rural resilience, but their attitudes towards immigrants are also conditioned by this benefit.

Local communities are contested places; even when they are relatively stable and homogenous, they are seldom unanimous on a range of issues. Different interests, norms, and identities coexist in local communities, which can generate individual and collective tensions (Barrett 2015). Barrett refers to normativity as embodied standards of conduct propagated through long-standing everyday interactions. These are governed by civility and sociability, respect, contempt or deference, superiority or subservience, neighbourliness, service, and conflict avoidance or codes of silence, which facilitate smooth interactions (Barrett 2015, p. 189). In homogeneous communities with long-standing settlement, Barrett (2015) argues, people are likely to be backward-looking and invoke a sense of nostalgia for lost traditions, while heterogeneous communities (exemplified by in-migration into established neighbourhoods or villages and new multicultural communities) are likely to invoke pluralistic sources of identity.

Forsberg (1998; Forsberg and Stenbacka 2017, pp. 4-6) has identified 'local contracts' as informal agreements on what behaviour is expected in specific contexts. Similarly, Cresswell (1996, p. 8) discusses how place and ideology intersect and 'the way in which space and place are used to structure a normative landscape'. This normativity is comprised of ideas and understandings of appropriate and inappropriate uses of a particular space or place. Contemporary research on second home owners reveals such place contestations as tensions between rural 'locals' and propertied 'visitors', referring to differences in their demographic composition, value orientation, way of life, location in the rural economy, socioeconomic status, and relation to the rural landscapes (Farstad and Rye 2013). Rural spaces may be contested as places for the consumption of a rural idyll or as

places to live and work (Flø 2013), and power relations may shift between 'local' and 'non local' groups, across classes and other identities (Scott *et al*. 2017, p. 601).

Mobility entails both cultural and class diversity (Farstad 2015; Henningsen *et al*. 2015). And while migration and tourism have been viewed as ways of countering demographic and economic decline in rural communities, the presence of newcomers also raises concerns about their impact on their hosts (Rye 2018). This study explores how long-term residents experience the mobility of a diverse group of tourists, seasonal and labour in-migrants and perceive its effects on them and the local community. The challenges they see arising from the presence of newcomers illuminate the complex ways in which mobility affects host communities and permanent residents. These meanings are expressed in parallel and contradictory stories.

Data and Method

The case study

Inland is a pseudonym for a rural village located in a mountain region of Norway. It is a ski sport centre surrounded by farming areas and second homes, which is very crowded during the tourist season and seemingly empty at other times. While agriculture represents the region's traditional culture, tourism and winter sports are the main industries today. There are more second homes than year-round inhabitants in the municipality, and during the most crowded seasons the population of Inland more than doubles.

The prosperous tourism sector has attracted increasing numbers of immigrants and seasonal labourers over the last decades. In 2018 the employment rate among immigrants

aged 20–66 was slightly lower (78.2 %) than among natives (81.7 %), but considerably higher than among immigrants on the national level (66.6 %) (Statistics Norway 2018). Today international in-migrants comprise about one fifth of the municipality's inhabitants, representing a wide range of nationalities, the majority of whom come from Eastern European EU countries and the Nordic countries (Statistics Norway 2018).

Data collection

Semi-structured interview guides were designed in the main project for a cross-case Norwegian and Nordic study and adjusted for interviewing informants of different statuses: elites (defined as persons holding a position in local policy making bodies, the economy and civil society and having power to influence the local community's response to immigration), ordinary local residents, internal migrants, and international migrants, including labour migrants, refugees, and family reunification migrants. My study encompassed several of these categories, exploring locals' and internal migrants' experiences of mobility and settlement in the community. Residents who had grown up in the community were initially of special interest, as they could illuminate mobility from a local as well as retrospective perspective. Internal migrants turned out to be valuable contributors, as in-migrants who were settled and well integrated into local society or as residents of neighbouring rural communities that belonged to the same school district as the village. The local and long term inhabitants then had not all strictly 'stayed put' throughout their lives. Some also had moved away temporarily but returned and settled in or near the village more permanently.

200 I stayed in the community for five days in March 2014, together with others on the
201 larger project's research team. This was my first visit to Inland, but I had arranged
202 beforehand to interview people in local NGOs, the cultural sector, and the municipal
203 administration to gain an overview. At the same time, I interviewed people whom I initially
204 encountered in the streets, shops, and public offices. Some interviews were conducted
205 together with colleagues exploring other topics in the main project, which contributed to
206 broadening the conversations and to gaining insights across the different sub-studies.
207 Finally, we incidentally had informal conversations with a few other people during our stay
208 in the village. Although these are not counted as interviews, they helped to form an overall
209 impression of the local community.

210 In total, five men and seven women who lived in Inland or adjacent rural areas were
211 interviewed for my study. They worked for the municipality, in service centres, at schools,
212 in commercial business, farming and tourism, or they were housewife or retired. Being
213 'local' means being settled on a permanent basis in the village or neighbouring rural areas.
214 Seven of the informants had grown up in Inland or elsewhere in the municipality. Others
215 had in-migrated through marriage, employment, or business. Only one of the informants
216 was not a native Norwegian, and all but one had worked in Inland. The interviewees were
217 recruited so that they represented different voices within the long-term resident population.
218 They were not representative in terms of age: most were in their 40s and 50s.

219 The interviews were conducted in cafes, at interviewees' workplaces, or in their
220 homes and lasted between one and two and a half hours. In a few cases, two persons were
221 interviewed together. They might have felt restricted by each other's presence, but they
222 seemed to feel comfortable together and expanded on topics in a way that enrichened our

223 data. All interviews were recorded and transcribed. The main themes across the interviews
224 that are explored in this paper are individuals' relationships with the local community, in-
225 migrants, and other visitors, and their perceptions of mobility in and out of the rural village
226 and the challenges it poses to them and the community.

227

228 Approaches to data analysis

229

230 The overarching question of this study was "How do locals experience the mobility and
231 turnover that characterises this place?" This was also a guiding question when approaching
232 local inhabitants, and much of our conversation revolved around this theme. The
233 interviewees reflected and elaborated on the topic by talking about their own relations to
234 the place, their migration history, and the history of the locality. From this material,
235 dominant narratives of how population flows affect local residents and the community
236 emerged.

237 The process of analysis could be described as 'tracing connections' (Follo 2008:
238 52). Follo was inspired by Strathern's (1992) mapping of a range of phenomena, sources,
239 and parallel arguments in order to expose hidden connections among them. While
240 following Follo's method, I had more limited ambitions: to illuminate some of the factors
241 that shape local residents' perceptions and experiences of mobilities. I explore people's
242 stories and how they resonate with concepts that help to map the case, particularly those
243 developed in mobility studies and in studies of culture, identity and social norms related to
244 place.

245 # Findings

246 ## Mobility as generic to the local community

247

248 This study explores locals' experiences with and understandings of the mobilities of
249 tourists and visitors, including many Norwegians with second homes in the area and
250 seasonal labourers and work in-migrants, such as Scandinavians and Europeans working in
251 the service sector and in construction. A man who had grown up and was living in the rural
252 area close to the village described Inland's tourism as 'very distinguished by people from
253 the upper social stratum, with a lot of money. And this has added colour to the local
254 community for years and years.' This statement epitomises the widely shared narrative of
255 the rural village as a place of mobility.

256 In contrast to prevalent characterisations of rural communities as stable and
257 homogenous, the inhabitants of Inland constructed their understanding of the local
258 community and themselves in explicit relation to mobility. The reiterated narrative is that
259 for centuries the region and the mountain resort have been accustomed to migration and
260 were built on mobility and tourism. The railway through the region, which was constructed
261 largely by workers from Sweden and Finland, made tourism key to the regional and local
262 economy and is still a potent symbol of its identity. Seasonal visits from upper-class
263 Norwegians have recently been complemented by labourers from Sweden and Eastern
264 Europe who work in the service sector and in construction. This story presents the local
265 community and its inhabitants as accustomed to mobility, the sights and sounds of guests
266 and foreigners, and characterised by a sophisticated local habitus. This understanding of

mobility as essential to the community has broadened and enriched local residents' cultural preferences and substantially strengthened the local economy.

The story of a former scrubber boy who succeeded in the flourishing tourism and service sector exemplifies the idea that those who come to the locality create new and exciting possibilities for its permanent residents.

> In old days (…) I worked as a scrubber boy at the hotels; washed boilers, peeled potatoes, was a slave in the kitchen, and thought it was real fun. I thought it was an enrichment, enjoyable and exotic. I worked with chefs from Norway, France, personnel from Denmark and Sweden. I thought it was a great pleasure, and fun to speak English (…) That paid off in school, as I got a lot of English practice.

To local youth, the multicultural community and labour market offered opportunities for paid work during and after their formal education and represented not only income and work experience but also adventure and excitement. Living in a place that was changing through immigration and tourism allowed locals to feel that 'the world is coming to them' (Stenbacka and Bygdell 2018). This has some resemblance with cosmopolitan orientations expressed as hospitality and openness towards difference and diversity and interest in the lives of international in-migrants in rural areas (Stenbacka and Bygdell 2018; Woods 2018).

The former 'scrubber boy' described today's local youth as spoiled and not interested in the low paid, unskilled work that is available in the local tourism industry and contrasted them with international labour migrants, whom he saw as more industrious. He said he was 'pretty sure there are very few with Norwegian passports making the beds at

the hotels today.' While there are ardent and skilled skiers among the local youth in winter sport destinations (Vestby and Ruud 2008; Lynnebakke forthcoming), most jobs in tourist services are held by labour migrants. Over the years, migration and educational trends have changed rural populations' skills and aspirations. Rural youth aspire to higher education, and the school system encourages 'learning to leave' (Corbett 2007). Moreover, with greater affluence local youth are not forced to earn their own money while they are in school.

At the same time, local residents express ambivalence toward and contest the dominant narrative that Inland is accustomed to mobility. While being enriched by the mobilities of people and cultures, their ambivalences resonate with the tenacious discourse of rural communities as narrow (Haugen and Villa 2006), as well as the messiness of rural in-migration (Stockdale 2016) when seen from the perspective of long-term rural residents.

Locals' embodied hospitability

Within the local community, some regard tourists and second home owners as affluent and self-centred visitors from the upper classes. This portrait contrasts with the local culture's norm of modesty, rather than self-promotion. But this awareness is contradictory. Local people who experience being subordinated and treated as if they are of lesser value in encounters with tourists and second home owners are also conscious of their economic dependency on visitors and thus enact a 'business'-oriented hospitability.

Long-term residents have been socialised to behave in ways that favour tourism. One interviewee saw this disposition as marking their personality:

> We are a municipality of tourism. So, kind of genetically, you have learnt that it pays off to be polite to people you don't know, because that's part of the package of being in a service business. (…) You understand what's useful. That's a consequence of living here, in a way … and … if we see a well-known celebrity … it is in a way in the genes to let him alone – you don't boast of seeing him, because that's supposed to be ordinary to us, it's the way it is here. We are not supposed to make any fuss about such a thing.

The internalised acceptance of the community's dependence on tourism shapes the local reception of visitors and newcomers, with politeness and a refined, worldly-wise sense of confidentiality.

Local residents support local entrepreneurs and industries that rely on national and international visitors and labour migrants. To feel such responsibilities and behave accordingly assumes a certain integration within and commitment to the community and their fellow inhabitants (see also Stenbacka and Bygdell 2018). By these actions and attitudes local people are supportive of and co-responsible for keeping the world continuously coming to them.

Inland residents' polite performances toward visitors could be regarded as cosmopolitan, as the locals express and enact hospitality toward diverse groups of visitors and contribute to the production of a cosmopolitan atmosphere, as Notar (2008 cited in Woods 2018, p. 166) finds among the owners of rural cafés and pubs. Alternatively, it could be interpreted as a blasé state of mind, strategically developed to cope with local development and as such exemplifying what Goffman (1970) called impression

management and strategic interaction. This behaviour literally 'pays off' and is 'part of the package of being in service'.

While the locals' delicate balance of openness and restraint facilitates tourism, locals appear reserved in relation to newcomers and in-migrants, as found in Lynnebakke's (forthcoming 2) study. They are well aware that labour migrants are essential to the local economy, but they are reluctant to become socially involved with newcomers. The complexities of the situation are underlined by Søholt *et al*. (2018, p. 226), who found a conditioned receptiveness and instrumental openness towards in-migrants and immigrants among local elites, 'a tradition of impersonal friendliness and a cosmopolitan attitude including taking mobility for granted'.

Locals' reluctance to connect with newcomers

The mobility that characterises the locality contributes to long-term residents' reluctance to engage in social interactions with in-migrants. Today some locals are rather unimpressed by visitors and migrants.

> We are friendly as part of tourism, but we don't allow you to be closer than that. (…) My wife (…) found it difficult to get to know people here. Because … I believe an indigenous person is a bit difficult to get to know. Because … they have been disappointed a lot of times as people just disappear. You might be here for a season or two, three, four, and then you disappear. So her simple analysis is that people

353 have a bit higher guard. You don't bother to invest your soul in a relationship; when
354 you know that a person is going to leave in few years, then you hold back.

355 One in-migrant, who later married a local woman, had a family, and settled down on a long
356 term basis, verified this observation on the basis of his own experience: 'It was pretty
357 difficult to get to know people, in tourism, because everyone knew that "he is going to stay
358 for two years and then he leaves"'.

359 Parallel to a local internalised knowledge and understanding of 'what is useful' in
360 encounters with visitors and newcomers, rural inhabitants have themselves become
361 increasingly mobile. They have gained experience not only by having the world come to
362 them but also through global travel and communication. The thrill of being visited by
363 people from other countries and cultures may have become somewhat diluted.

364 The high rate of transience in Inland has exhausting effects on long-term
365 inhabitants. As they have learned that these are not long-lasting relationships, locals have
366 developed reasonable ways of economising on social investments. Social investments are
367 made primarily when there is some prospect of long-lasting gains through friendships or
368 local economic developments.

369

370 Local residents' identity struggles

371 While interviewees accept the fact that tourism fuels the local economy, other factors make
372 tourism contested, particularly overcrowding in public spaces and the respondents'
373 experiences of inferiority in interactions with tourists and second home owners. Rural hosts

374 who are subordinated to and dependent on the urban and affluent guests at the hotels and in
375 their second homes relate with discourses of both class and rural-urban differences. The
376 interviewees themselves point at identity struggles in the wake of high mobility. As a long-
377 term inhabitant of the neighbouring rural area put it:

378 For a long time, the municipality has experienced a lot of in- and out-migration.
379 Very changeable [population]. The problems that follow concern local identity.
380 What is our cultural heritage, and who am I and where do I come from? These are
381 the challenges we have today as well.

382 A woman who also lived in a neighbouring rural area said that both rural culture and local
383 dialects were vanishing. 'Some feel they have lost their identity. Due to tourism and all the
384 in-migration, which has taken over the place. (…) New people come and go, and who am I
385 in all this?'

386 Mobility and migration, which are framed within a longer history that continues into
387 the present, contribute to a narrative that Inland is 'accustomed to mobility'. But that entails
388 its own costs. This interviewee thought that residents had lost their local dialect. This
389 comment connects to decades of sociocultural friction in the local community due to
390 population turnover, as well as a severe and perhaps servile socialisation in the service
391 sector. 'We are raised and trained to 'speak so people understand'. We had to take off our
392 caps when someone from the capital city area came here. It was not the opposite way,' a
393 local man said. He described a courtesy in social encounters with visitors that was not
394 explicit supposed to be reciprocal.

The interviewees' concerns about challenges to their local identity and the disappearance of their local dialect resonate with 'the movements implicit in identifications, grammars, economies, intensities, and orientations' as people, capital, and things move and re-form (Sheller and Urry 2006, p. 216). Local inhabitants' responses to affluent visitors and transient in-migration also pertain how seasonal changes in rural landscapes affect people's sense of identity (Milbourne and Kitchen 2014). These are societal-level processes, and when they accumulate, as they do in Inland, the question of 'who am I in all this' expresses anxiety about identity and belonging in the diverse and multicultural rural area.

Locals rearranging and adjusting their activities

Long-term residents have rearranged their everyday lives in order to adjust to the consequences of mobility as tourists, second home owners, and migrants move about, apparently without regard to their presence.

A local man described his mother's shopping routines during the tourist season: She

> drives out of the local community for shopping. (…) In order to avoid crashing into crowds … Or finds a time of the day when you suppose people are skiing. So, for sure, being a tourist municipality has its costs.

Affluent tourists cause local prices to rise. A woman who lives in a nearby rural area recounted:

415 We almost never buy clothes in the local community, as it is too expensive. We
416 shop in neighbouring municipalities or in the city when we go there. Any city. Here
417 the prices are three or four times higher than normal prices, because they are meant
418 for the second home owners, and they shop without hesitating.

419 Finally, long-time residents had left the village and moved to the surrounding rural areas to
420 avoid what they considered undesirable changes in Inland. The adjacent rural area was
421 inhabited by more traditional or original populations and, as some interviewees explained,
422 was preferable because it was free from the pressures of overcrowding and turnover that
423 affected the village.

424 A woman from Inland and her friend from a neighbouring rural area discussed how
425 tourism affects the village:

426 Interviewer: The chaos that you describe—what is that? Is it just a lot of people,
427 or…?
428 Local woman: It is SUVs—those huge vehicles—parking everywhere they are not
429 allowed to park, blocking everything and driving into tiny parking garages. They
430 force their way forward and are impatient and park in all directions in the centre.
431 They park so no one can pass if you try to drive through.
432 Friend: The bus drivers almost went insane—they cannot drive through anywhere,
433 neither back nor forth. You cannot go anywhere. 'I have parked here, and here am I
434 going to park' (laughing).

435 Local woman: They park in all directions … they don't bother to care. And then it's
436 allowed to walk in the middle of the road.… They are in the countryside, you know,
437 so they can do as they like (laughing).

438 These views express local's feelings of being trespassed on by visitors who are unconscious
439 of and negligent toward the local community, which are framed by class and cultural
440 distinctions as well as perceptions of rurality. Urban residents who treat rural areas as
441 places of refuge for themselves, rather than as others' home, might well provoke anger
442 among natives, especially if they disrespectfully violate local ways of doing things.

443 Tourists were 'taking over' the community in the winter season, creating mobility
444 problems for local residents going about their everyday lives (Milbourne and Kitchen 2014,
445 p. 331). The seasonal flows of people through Inland affect residents' sense of identity and
446 daily routines. The locals' delicate personal restraint and their everyday rearrangements are
447 all performances that help accommodate the influx of outsiders. This situation may be
448 comparable to the 'silent bargain' in communities where newly settled groups and
449 established residents accept or appreciate each other on given conditions and circumstances
450 (Torres, Popke and Hapke 2006; Schech 2014 cited in Woods 2018, p. 166). Or, perhaps,
451 locals express silent agitation by simply avoiding places and times when tourists overflow
452 the streets.

453

Locals' expectations of community

Seasonal and migrant workers in the service and construction industries relate to long-term residents differently than tourists and second home owners do. They may blend in or even become invisible within the local community. In addition, migrants' economic and cultural statuses might not compromise local residents' economy or culture in the same way, if at all.

Locals described Inland as a 'class society', where an upper socioeconomic class has access to land, owns industrial companies, and can trace long lines of ancestors in the community. In contrast to tourists and holiday home owners, international in-migrants and seasonal labourers represent the lower classes. In-migrants are to a certain degree expected to enter into community life, although such expectations seem to have faded over the years. According to the interviewees, integration into the local community was to a large degree the responsibility of the newcomers themselves. Above all, they were expected to learn the language. A woman echoed the village elites' opinion (Søholt *et al.* 2018) that 'you have to do something yourself to be integrated'.

In the eyes of long-term residents, some Eastern Europeans contradicted this norm by apparently being 'not interested in learning the language at all'. These in-migrants seemed determined to 'stay together, build their own houses, have children in school', but were not interested in becoming involved in community affairs. Labour migrants, according to one interviewee, 'will work but not participate', and have priorities and interests that make them appear indifferent to the local community (see also Henningsen *et al.* 2015). Despite their strong orientation to work and family, they are given little credit when they do

477 not meet long-time residents' expectations that they learn the language, participate in
478 community events, and take their turn as volunteers in supervising children's activities. At
479 the same time, however, locals acknowledged their own reluctance to invite newcomers
480 into their private lives, which they explained by saying that they were too busy with their
481 own families and did not expect in-migrants to stay.

482

483 Discussion and conclusion

484 Long-term residents of this rural village told parallel and contradictory stories of mobility
485 as familiar and embodied in polite interactions and of mobility as excessive and challenging
486 local identities and configurations of place. While the earlier phase of tourism and
487 international labour migration was characterised as having enriched local community life,
488 today's tourism was described as leading to overcrowding. The turnover of labour migrants
489 was regarded as a hindrance to satisfactory social involvement. The interviewees'
490 awareness of the economic significance of tourism and labour migrants' work in the service
491 sector resonates with the public and elite discourse of the place. A hegemonic discourse on
492 the economic gains brought by immigration and the hospitality industry's reliance on
493 immigrant labour (Berg-Nordlie 2018; Søholt *et al*. 2018) might, however, frame locals'
494 experiences as a 'double-bind': residents of a community that is dependent on tourism and
495 mobility present themselves as suffering from this very dependency.

496 The potential individual and collective tensions (Barrett 2015) implicit in this
497 situation are illustrated by local inhabitants' attitude of resignation toward the local

498 authorities' chronic disregard of their own interests. They say, 'it's no use' to try and claim
499 our rights; 'we are not listened to'. The transience of second home owners and seasonal
500 labourers makes some experiences vary between the tourist and non-tourist seasons. Other
501 issues relate to local policies. The year-round residents regard the authorities as prioritising
502 the financial benefits of tourism, while overlooking the needs of indigenous inhabitants and
503 their complaints about the undesirable effects of tourism.

504 In locals' stories and experiences, mobility was not only a social fact but also a
505 matter of 'local knowledge', a generated habitus of managing constant comings and goings
506 and sensibility toward local economic interests. To the extent that this knowledge was
507 historical, it did not express a nostalgic longing for a lost past (Barrett 2015) but, rather, a
508 sense of pride in the tradition of labour migration that made this place into the vital tourist
509 centre it remains today.

510 Situational and temporal tensions between long-time residents and newcomers could
511 be interpreted in terms of gentrification, which marginalises locals culturally, socially,
512 economically and politically (Hines 2010: 514 note 5). There are different groups of
513 newcomers to Inland. Unlike second home owners, international labour in-migrants might
514 not be interpreted as gentrifiers. Second home owners and seasonal tourism were by locals
515 experienced to have some impact on themselves that resemble tensions described in rural
516 gentrification literature (cf. Nelson *et al*. 2019). But the fact that the various newcomers
517 and second home owners were all temporary may mean that they affect the local
518 community in different ways and even transform the ways *local people* use and experience
519 space. These are both temporary adjustments and enduring influences. Settling down in the
520 outskirts, rearranging their daily routines to avoid tangling with discourteous drivers,

521 changing their dialect, and showing deference toward outsiders could be explored as local
522 and permanent residents' experiences of being out of place (Cresswell 1996) in their own
523 place.

524 Søholt *et al*. (2018) found few narratives among rural elites about 'place-changing'
525 due to immigration in Inland, since mobility was perceived as normal. The ordinary locals
526 interviewed in this study also regarded mobility as normal. But unpacking their narratives
527 reveals other, partly contradictory experiences of mobility involving changes in the place
528 and in individuals' daily lives. The locals deplore overcrowding and transience while
529 asserting their own cosmopolitanism or worldly-wise mastering of the same mobilities.
530 Although tourism and in-migration sustain the municipality's prosperity and increase its
531 self-esteem, they also raise fundamental questions about identity. The range of encounters
532 in the rural village reveals ambiguities regarding who belongs and who is out of place.
533 While this dynamic often is delineated geographically (Cresswell 1996), it is also
534 delineated through the seasonal round of demographic change in Inland.

535 The everyday adjustments that residents make during the tourist season range from
536 rearranging to restricting their own mobilities. While being careful to treat tourists politely,
537 they also avoid them. Some even move from the village to surrounding rural areas—a form
538 of mobility that resembles displacement as it entails some loss of the year-round village
539 population and its replacement by seasonal residents and transients.

540 Multiple and contradictory as well as mutually reinforcing processes of mobility are
541 visible in this study. Locals express both a pragmatic economic understanding of in-
542 migration and tourism and an acute awareness of the annoyances and alienation that arise

543 from them. This ambivalent response contributes to the complexity of the coexistence
544 between locals and in-migrants (see also Lynnebakke 2018).

545 The rural village in many respects exemplifies recent public policies of diversifying
546 rural socioeconomic landscapes (Flø 2013; Almstedt *et al*. 2014). The locals' experiences
547 of being subordinated and swamped by the mobility that supports the locality contradicts
548 municipal policy but adheres to traditional discourses of rural communities as reluctant to
549 welcome newcomers. However, the local residents' objections or resistance are due to the
550 palpable effects of others' mobilities. Their feeling of being worn out by the mobilities
551 affecting their community coexists with their sense of being 'accustomed to mobility' and
552 able to navigate its consequences. Although their hospitable performances might resemble
553 cosmopolitan dispositions, the ambivalence arising from their experience of new and
554 challenging configurations of the place make such dispositions precarious (Woods 2018).

555 A parallel story, then, to the 'accustomed to mobility' narrative is that of being
556 saturated by mobility. In this story in-migration and tourism are flows of mobilities which
557 the local community does not absorb but, instead, press upon local identities and norms of
558 behaviour in the village. This condition is wearing out long-term residents, who conduct
559 their lives at a polite distance from guests and newcomers. The indigenous inhabitants
560 present themselves as guarded, protective, and reserved, refusing to invest personal time
561 and emotions in relationships with migrants whom they expect to leave. In the saturated
562 community, mobility becomes intrusive and contributes to different groups appearing
563 indifferent to each other.

The locals' compensatory practices and immobility or displacement reinforce the idea that 'mobility' is an umbrella term that covers a wide range of experiences. Baas and Yeoh (2019, p. 161) suggest that the recent focus on time and temporality amounts to a shift toward understanding migration and non-migration as 'umbilically conjoined phenomena'. This framework, they contend, enlarges the awareness that migration itself is never always about trans/national mobility but often also about not moving at all, recognising the temporal as well as spatial complexity of mobility (Sheller 2019). While these scholars discuss mobilities from the perspective of a migrant trajectory, this study shows how dimensions of time, temporality, migration and 'non-migration' conjoin in the experiences of mobilities among sedentary populations in host communities.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the comments and suggestions of two anonymous reviewers and the editor on earlier drafts of the manuscript. Thanks also to colleagues for discussing ideas in the manuscript at the Department of Sociology and Political Science's seminar on migration and mobility at Brekstad December 12-13 2018 and at the 6th International Rural Workshop in Trondheim March 13-15 2019. Thanks to Grey Osterud for English language editing, and for comments and suggestions to improve the text. Thanks to Brit Lynnebakke and Susanne Søholt, NIBR, Oslo Metropolitan University, for participating in data sampling during the week of field work.

586 This work was part of the research project "The multiethnic rural community: Exclusion or
587 inclusion of immigrants?" at NIBR, Oslo Metropolitan University, and was supported by
588 the Research Council of Norway's VAM program, Grant 217149.

589

590 ## References

591 Almstedt, Å., P. Brouder, S. Karlsson and L. Lundmark (2014) Beyond post-productivism:
592 From rural policy discourse to rural diversity. *European Countryside* 6 (4) pp. 297–
593 306

594 Andrzejewska, J. and J.F. Rye (2012) Lost in Transnational Space? Migrant Farm Workers
595 in Rural Districts. *Mobilities* 7 (2) pp. 247-268

596 Aure, M., A. Førde and T. Magnussen (2018) Will migrant workers rescue rural regions?
597 Challenges of creating stability through mobility. *Journal of Rural Studies* 60 (May)
598 pp. 52–59

599 Avery, L.M. (2013) Rural science education: Valuing local knowledge. *Theory Into*
600 *Practice* 52 (1) pp. 28–35

601 Baas, M. and B. SA Yeoh (2019) Introduction: Migration studies and critical temporalities.
602 *Current Sociology Monograph* 67 (2) pp. 161–168

603 Barrett, G. (2015) Deconstructing community. *Sociologia Ruralis* 55 (2) pp. 182–204

604 Berg-Nordlie, M. (2018) New in town. Small-town media discourses on immigrants and
605 immigration. J*ournal of Rural Studies* 64 (November) pp. 210-219

606 Benson, M. and K. O'Reilly (2009) Migration and the search for a better way of life: A
607 critical exploration of lifestyle migration. *Sociological Review* 57 (4) pp. 608–625

608 Corbett, M.J. (2007) *Learning to leave. The irony of schooling in a coastal community*
609 (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing)

610 Cresswell, T. (1996) *In place/out of place: Geography, ideology, and transgression*
611 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press)

612 Donaldson, R. (2018) *Small town tourism in South Africa* (Cham: Springer International
613 Publishing)

614 Farstad, M. (2015) Worthy of recognition? How second home owners understand their own
615 group's moral worth in rural host communities. *Sociologia Ruralis* 56 (3) pp. 408–
616 426

617 Farstad, M. and J.F. Rye (2013) Second home owners, locals and their perspectives on rural
618 development. *Journal of Rural Studies* 30 (April) pp. 41-51

619 Flø, B.E. (2013) Me og dei andre: Om lindukar, Framstegspartiet og bygda som sosial
620 konstruksjon. *Sosiologisk tidsskrift* 21 (2) pp. 152–168

621 Follo, G. (2008) *Det norske familieskogbruket, dets kvinnelige og mannlige skogeiere,*
622 *forvaltningsaktivitet – og metaforiske forbindelser*. Doctoral Thesis 2008: 173,
623 Department of Anthropology, Faculty of Social Sciences and Technology
624 Management (Trondheim: NTNU)

625 Forsberg, G. (1998) Regional variations in the gender contract: Gendered relations in
626 labour market, local politics and everyday life in Swedish regions. *Innovation: The*
627 *European Journal of Social Science Research* 11 (2) pp. 191–209

628 Forsberg, G. and S. Stenbacka (2017) Creating and challenging gendered spatialities: How
629 space affects gender contracts. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*
630 99 (3) pp. 223–237

631 Gerrard, S. (2016) Fiskeværet – Et åpent og foranderlig lokalsamfunn. Pp. 72–94 in M.
632 Villa and M.S. Haugen eds., *Lokalsamfunn* (Oslo: Cappelen Damm Academic
633 Publisher)

634 Gustafson, P. (2014) Place attachment in an age of mobility. Pp. 37-48 in L.C. Manzo and
635 P. Devine-Wright eds., *In place attachment: Advances in theory, methods and*
636 *applications* (Abingdon and Oxfordshire: Routledge)

637 Goffman, E. (1970) *Strategic interaction* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press)

638 Haugen, M.S. and M. Villa (2006) Big Brother in rural societies: Youths' discourses on
639 gossip. *Norwegian Journal of Geography* 60 (3) pp. 209-216

640 Halfacree, K.H. and M.J. Rivera (2012) Moving to the countryside ... and staying: Lives
641 beyond representations. *Sociologia Ruralis* 52 (1) pp. 92–114

642 Henningsen, E., D. Jordhus-Lier and A. Underthun (2015) The resort as a workplace:
643 Seasonal workers in a Norwegian mountain municipality. Pp. 121–136 in D.
644 Jordhus-Lier and A. Underthun eds., *A hospitable world? Organising work and*
645 *workers in hotels and tourist resorts* (London and New York: Routledge)

646 Hines, J.D. (2010) Rural gentrification as permanent tourism: The creation of the `New'
647 West Archipelago as postindustrial cultural space. *Environment and Planning D:*
648 *Society and Space* 28 (3) pp. 509–525

649 Krivokapic-Skoko, B., C. Reid and J. Collins (2018) Rural cosmopolitism in Australia.
650 *Journal of Rural Studies* 64 (February) pp. 153–163

651 Lynnebakke, B. (2018) Dealing with borderland complexity. The multisided views of local
652 individuals in the Norwegian–Russian borderland. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*
653 DOI: 10.1080/08865655.2018.1436002

654 Lynnebakke, B. (forthcoming) The art of socialising. The role of children's organised
655 leisure in social cohesion and migrant inclusion in a rural Western Norwegian
656 municipality. In: Belonging, inclusion and local identity. A study on internal and
657 international in-migration in three Norwegian rural municipalities, PhD submitted
658 June 2019, Department of Sociology and Human Geography, Faculty of Social
659 Sciences, University of Oslo, Norway

660 Lynnebakke, B. (forthcoming 2) 'I felt like the mountains were coming for me.' The role of
661 place attachment and local lifestyle opportunities for labour migrants' staying
662 aspirations in two rural Norwegian municipalities. PhD submitted June 2019,
663 Department of Sociology and Human Geography, Faculty of Social Sciences,
664 University of Oslo, NorwayMay, J. (1996) Globalization and the politics of place:
665 Place and identity in an inner London neighbourhood. *Transactions of the Institute*
666 *of British Geographers* 21 (1) pp. 194–215

667 Milbourne, P. and L. Kitchen (2014) Rural mobilities: Connecting movement and fixity in
668 rural places. *Journal of Rural Studies* 34 (April) pp. 326–336

669 Nelson, P.B. and J.D. Hines (2018) Rural gentrification and networks of capital
670 accumulation—A case study of Jackson, Wyoming. *Environment and Planning A:*
671 *Economy and Space* 50 (7) pp. 1473–1495

672 Nelson, P.B., C. Lilley and M. van Gemeren (2019) Geographies of rural gentrification in
673 time and space. Paper presented to the 6th International Rural Workshop,
674 Trondheim March 13–15, 2019

675 Notar, B.E. (2008) Producing cosmopolitanism at the borderlands: Lonely planeteers and
676 'local' cosmopolitans in southwest China. *Anthropological Quarterly* 81 (3) 615-
677 650

678 Rye, J.F. (2018) Labour migrants and rural change: The "mobility transformation" of
679 Hitra/Frøya, Norway, 2005–2015. *Journal of Rural Studies* 64 (november) pp. 189–
680 199

681 Schech, S. (2014) Silent bargain or rural cosmopolitanism? Refugee settlement in regional
682 Australia. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 40 (4) pp. 601–618

683 Scott, M., E. Murphy and M. Gkartzios (2017) Placing 'Home' and 'Family' in rural
684 residential mobilities. *Sociologia Ruralis* 57 (S1) pp. 598-621

685 Sheller, M. (2019) Afterword: Time is of the essence. *Current Sociology Monograph* 67 (2)
686 pp. 334–344

687 Sheller, M. and J. Urry (2006) The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A:*
688 *Economy and Space* 38 (2) pp. 207–226

689 Statistics Norway (2018) Employment among immigrants, register-based.
690 https://www.ssb.no/en/arbeid-og-lonn/statistikker/innvregsys

691 Stenbacka, S. and C. Bygdell (2018) The cosmopolitan farmer: Ideas and practices beyond
692 travel and internationalization. *Journal of Rural Studies* 61 (July) pp. 63–72

693 Stockdale, A. (2016) Contemporary and 'messy' rural in-migration processes: Comparing
694 counterurban and lateral rural migration. *Population, Space and Place* 22 (6) pp.
695 599–616

696 Strathern, M. (1992) *After nature. English kinship in the late twentieth century* (Cambridge:
697 Cambridge University Press)

698 Søholt, S., K.R. Tronstad and H.M. Bjørnsen (2014) *Innvandrere og sysselsetting i et*
699 *regionalt perspektiv. En kunnskapsoppsummering*. NIBR-report 2014:25 (Oslo:
700 Norsk institutt for by- og regionforskning)

701 Søholt, S., S. Stenbacka and H. Nørgaard (2018) Conditioned receptiveness: Nordic rural
702 elite perceptions of immigrant contributions to local resilience. *Journal of Rural*
703 *Studies* 64 (November 2018) pp. 220–229

704 Theodori, G. (2003) The community activeness–consciousness matrix. *Journal of*
705 *Extension* 41 (5) pp. 1–3

706 Torres, R.M., E.J. Popke and H.M. Hapke (2006) The South's silent bargain: Rural re-
707 structuring, Latino labor and the ambiguities of migrant experience. Pp. 37–68 in

708 H.A. Smith and O.J. Furuseth eds., *Latinos in the New South: Transformations of*
709 *place* (Aldershot: Ashgate)

710 Vestby, G.M. and M.E. Ruud (2008) *Attraktive turistdestinasjoner - gode oppvekstmiljøer?*
711 *Geilo og Hemsedal for lokal ungdom*. NIBR-report 2008:17 (Oslo: Norsk institutt
712 for by- og regionforskning)

713 Villa, M. (2000) Rural life courses in Norway: Living within the rural–urban
714 complementarity. *The History of the Family* 5 (4) pp. 473-490

715 Woods, M. (2018) Precarious rural cosmopolitanism: Negotiating globalization, migration
716 and diversity in Irish small towns. *Journal of Rural Studies* 64 (November 2018) pp.
717 164–176