Family theme parks, happiness and children's consumption

From roller-coasters to Pippi Longstocking

David Cardell

Linköping Studies in Arts and Science No. 654
Department of Thematic Studies – Child Studies
Linköping 2015

Linköping Studies in Arts and Science ● No. 654

At the Faculty of Arts and Science at Linköping University, research and doctoral studies are carried out within broad problem areas. Research is organized in interdisciplinary research environments and doctoral studies mainly in graduate schools. Jointly, they publish the series Linköping Studies in Arts and Science. This thesis comes from the Department of Thematic Studies – Child Studies.

Distributed by:

Department of Thematic Studies – Child Studies

Linköping University

SE-581 83 Linköping

Sweden

David Cardell

Family theme parks, happiness and children's consumption

From roller-coasters to Pippi Longstocking

Edition 1:1

ISBN 978-91-7685-979-7

ISSN 0282-9800

©David Cardell, 2015

Department of Thematic Studies – Child Studies

Printed in Sweden by LiU-Tryck, Linköping, Sweden, 2015

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	iii
<i>List of figures</i>	v
1. <u>Children and happiness: introduction</u>	1
Consumption	3
A background to the theme parks	6
Aims of study	21
Structure of the thesis	23
2. <u>Models of happiness: previous research</u>	25
Happiness in English and Swedish	26
Luck and chance	26
The happy masses	27
Happy times	35
Ways forward	46
3. <u>A meshwork of happiness: a theoretical approach</u>	51
Interdisciplinary practices	51
Practices of happiness	55
4. <u>Ethnographizing happiness</u>	61
Finding theme parks and children	62
Getting in contact with children	65
Getting to know the children and their families	69
Mobile ethnography	73
Returning to (and leaving) children	81
Making sense of happiness	83
5. <u>Thingography: material intimacy</u>	91
Material things at home	92
The rabbit at Liseberg	95
The rabbit in the bedroom	97
The rabbit in the living room	104
Between nowhere and everywhere	110
Concluding discussion	116

6. <u>Valuography: money</u>	119
Happy money	120
Approaching values	122
Is it worth it?	123
Cash(in') the bank	129
Being fortunate	139
Concluding discussion	146
7. <u>Co-ordiography: park visits</u>	149
A family of glue	149
Modes of ordering and coordination	150
In the service of children	153
In the service of parents	160
Part-time company	164
Concluding discussion	172
8. <u>Chronography: time and childhood</u>	175
Chronography and happiness	176
Chronology	178
Timely opportunities	188
Concluding discussion	202
9. <u>Happy-faring: concluding discussion</u>	205
<i>References</i>	211

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Listening to friends and colleagues, I have learnt that there are some things which are supposed to make you happy: handing in the dissertation, having defended it successfully, and enjoying the celebrations that follow. At this moment these events are (hopefully) still to come. What is certain at this time is that the wise and generous assistance of numerous people has been invaluable for finishing this dissertation, so that expected and unexpected things can take place.

First, my supervisor Professor Anna Sparrman has been central to the entire work. Being more than a supervisor, Anna has always made space around the dinner table. Your knowledge, generous support and friendship will always be valued and recalled. Professor Tom O'Dell, my second supervisor, has been inspiring in encouraging me to develop my thinking in new directions. Your friendly and critical approach has been fulfilling and I hope to continue our dialog. Thank you, both Anna and Tom!

In the project *Culture for and by children* (2009-2384), funded by the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet), Kajsa Ellegård, Anne-Li Lindgren and Tobias Samuelsson engaged in research along with Anna and myself. Your ideas and critical reflections about childhood and knowledge associated with different methodologies have been eye-opening for me. Thanks for your companionship and informal pointers, stretching from sociological to philosophical and geographical matters of inquiry.

The Department of Thematic Studies – Tema – at Linköping University is a place where my interdisciplinary approach to culture, consumption, happiness and childhood has developed thanks to seminars and the continuous presence of groups of PhD students and faculty. At the unit of Child Studies, my group of PhD students (D09) has worked as intellectual sparring partners and friends: Zulmir Becevic, Mathilda Hallberg, Sofia Kvist Lindholm and Mehek Muftee. Thank you! Earlier generations of students have made the corridors into a welcoming place, offering insights into the opportunities and problems encountered during the production of a dissertation. Special thanks go to Johanna Sjöberg, Paul Horton and Åsa Pettersson. I hope that we will now have time for some drinks during more than a “happy hour”. Among the later additions to Child Studies, I would like to thank Jonathan Josefsson especially. Your committed comments on

my early work led me to provide further clarification about what happiness “is”.

I would like to acknowledge the importance of Asta Cekaite, Bengt Sandin and Karin Zetterqvist Nelson. As professors in Child Studies you represent curiosity and rigor in research, acting as helpful supporters and providing valuable advice regarding the more formal aspects of life at University. The group of teachers, including Anette Wickström, Karin Osvaldsson Cromdal, Cecilia Lindgren, Disa Bergnéhr, Gunilla Tegern, Judith Lind, Johanna Sköld, Haris Agic, and Kjerstin Andersson, make interdisciplinary endeavors an exciting matter. Mikael Brandt, Eva Danielsson, Ian Dickson, and Christina Lärkner ensured that writing this thesis was possible – replacing broken computers, and managing practicalities in all their width and depth. Thanks!

Lars Kaijser was appointed as reader of an early draft. Malene Gram entered the process as a reader at a later stage. You contributed with valuable advice through insightful discussions and suggestions. Kajsa Ellegård, Lucas Gottzén and Sarah Holst Kjaer read a late draft – far from “final”, but on the way towards this book. Your proposals were thoughtful in a clear and forward-looking way.

Additional funding, enabling me to travel from Linköping to conferences in Japan and the USA, was granted by Kungl. Gustav Adolfs Akademien för svensk folkkultur. Thanks!

At Liseberg, Pelle Johannisson and Annika Palm provided assistance that is much appreciated. At Astrid Lindgren’s World, Mikael Ahlerup and Martina Bergqvist engaged to make an ethnographic study possible. Thank you! To all the children and their parents who contributed to this study: *Tack för Er hjälp!* From your participation comes knowledge about the exciting ways in which happiness turns into a part of life in different ways.

My family – Jörgen, Gunilla, Jakob, Johanna – cannot receive enough credit for their different contributions and support. You were there during hard times and good times. I hope it will be possible to return your encouragement and support. Kati – my dear – without you, writing about happiness would have been a burden exceeding my capacity. Your support and care has been energizing and made life into a meaningful time: involving purpose and pleasure – and that is what happiness, according to some current research, is all about.

Norrköping, September 2015, *David Cardell*

LIST OF FIGURES

1:1: Liseberg main gate	9
1:2: Entrance to ALW	9
1:3: Pippi Longstocking's house	11
1:4: Ad for Liseberg	19
2:1: Faces Scale	33
4:1: Honorary guest, Liseberg	64
4:2: Devices	79
4:3: Flumeride	81
4:4: Flumeride queue	81
5:1: Sign outside the rabbit shop	95
5:2: Shop window	95
5:3: Rabbit topiary	96
5:4: Mascots	96
5:5: Kim's drawing	105
6:1: Balder	125
6:2: "Good Luck"	134
6:3: Money	141
6:4: Lucky dip	144
7:1: Runaway children	152
7:2: Bracelet	152
7:3: Queue, Liseberg	169
7:4: Attractions, Liseberg	171
8:1: Ruler	179
8:2: Bracelets	181
8:3: Small houses	184
8:4: Barrel	188
8:5: Machine	188
8:6: Small Frogs	198

CHAPTER 1

CHILDREN AND HAPPINESS: INTRODUCTION

Happiness. One word with different meanings, stretching from happy events to an eternal life of happiness. Happiness seems to be everywhere: from religious practice, Pharrell Williams' song "Happy", Swedish cheese advertisements, "happy"-branded coffee and cigarettes, and on to a management philosophy of the happy employee. Happiness is an important ingredient in best-selling books on popular psychology. It is a topic frequently discussed on television and social media. It is a theme that runs through the corporate world and that one can buy "into" via an assortment of products, but it is also more than this.

The United Nations (UN) suggests that: "The pursuit of happiness is a fundamental human goal." This goal is part of policy in a wide sense, and for the UN: "The twin concepts of happiness and well-being increasingly feature in international discussions of sustainable development and the future we want."¹ The UN also takes part in a celebration of happy achievements, with the annual "International Day of Happiness" on the 20th of March. The UN is not alone in emphasizing happiness as a fundamental goal of humanity. The Global Happiness Organization works to increase happiness, and their Swedish branch works on policy development based on scientific happiness studies. They also provide an annual prize for one Swedish citizen or company that has contributed to increased well-being, encouraged good acts or made happiness a lasting impression.²

An array of ideas, accounts and products involve the notion of happiness and give it universal reach. At the same time, it is a disputed matter. Are we really happy? Are others happier than us? And who is this happy "we", is it "us"? At the national level, Sweden and several other European countries are identified at the top of the international list – scoring high numbers in survey studies regarding well-being and happiness.

---

¹ 'International Day of Happiness, Secretary-General's Message for 2014', <http://www.un.org/en/events/happinessday/sgmessage.shtml>; 'International Day of Happiness 20 March', <http://www.un.org/en/events/happinessday/> (accessed 21/01/15).

² 'Årets Lyckofrämjare', <http://www.globalhappiness.com/sv/arets-lyckoframjare> (accessed 30/03/15).

There is a storyline – accessible through statistics, research and articles in the press – that Sweden is a country where people enjoy their lives in one of the happiest societies in the world. Such claims of happiness have always intrigued me. On the one hand, happiness is measured in great numbers, and on the other there are simultaneously current challenges to the well-being of children and youth, including depression and medical conditions. Are children happy, and in that case what is happiness?

Happiness has fascinated philosophers, researchers, and religious practitioners, as well as policy-makers and political writers. For centuries it has been a matter of concern that has to do with ideas of the good life, what is enjoyable, meaningful and pleasurable. It is a concept that captures individual orientations as well as collective ambitions of creating a better, or even utopian, society.

This book does not provide a comprehensive history of happiness – for such an approach there are alternatives (e.g. Bok 2012; McMahon 2006). I do, however, begin with detailed accounts of historical meanings and measurements associated with happiness. If there is a quantity of happiness, what are its qualities? Or, to phrase it in different and more detailed terms: how does happiness become a part of the everyday lives of children and their families? Concrete questions like this one have guided my thinking – and my curiosity when it comes to all-things-happy. However, a thesis does require some further focus than investigating happiness as a universal totality. This consideration leads me to a place that, according to marketing claims and observations available in research, promises the greatest happiness: the theme park.

One of the few places in Sweden that actually guarantees happiness is a theme park called Liseberg. It is perhaps illustrative of our times, in which practices of consumption interweave economics and emotions (Illouz 2007). What is interesting about theme parks is that a visit makes up an almost mandatory experience of childhood. In Sweden alone, there are millions of annual visitors to theme parks. Going to a theme park is associated with positive values and expectations of happiness and a happy childhood – which will be discussed in detail in this and the next chapter. Visiting a theme park is an activity that in principle is voluntary, but it poses questions about the requirements and challenges of a happy and good life for children and families today.

Some people find theme park visits to be a trivial activity. It can be considered something spectacular that takes place during a summer day and then is easily forgotten. Is it really happiness that comes out of a visit to an artificial place like a theme park? Throughout this book, I will highlight the different ways in which theme park visits become an important part of life: money is saved for these trips, they come with social and emotional expectations, and the time of everyday life is organized around them. Is happiness being created or not in and through these practices?

In previous research, several qualities of happiness have been identified that become relevant in relation to family visits to a theme park: experiences, emotions, social life, family relations, movement and aspirations, along with challenges and disputable activities of consumption and services provided by commercial companies. These matters make family theme park visits into a particularly fruitful opportunity for exploring happiness along with children. Are children actually happy, in a place where one can expect them to be?

At first glance, theme park visits simultaneously open a window of opportunity for understanding happiness, while at the same time closing others: not all kinds of happiness seem to go with it. What kind of happiness becomes possible in a popular place like the theme park today, in one of the happiest countries on the planet? Is it the particular pleasures offered by corporations within current capitalism, or a “natural” genuine and meaningful happiness of childhood that transcends historical epochs?

CONSUMPTION

Whether happiness is relevant in relation to consumption is a contested matter. Here, I briefly outline how consumption is approached – in order to avoid the risk of confusion about the arguments that will follow in the book, which is important when it comes to such a contested notion.

One of the most influential sociologists of our time, Zygmunt Bauman (2006: 6), suggests that happiness in consumer society involves a desire to consume commodities that promise satisfaction, but that dissatisfaction is in fact key for marketing practitioners in stimulating children’s “desire for the new and redefining what preceded it as useless junk” (ibid.: 8f). In Bauman’s view, children do not act as capable individuals, but are the victims of corporate culture (ibid.: 9). Bauman’s argument is not unique (Cieslik 2015: 428). It is similar to those suggesting that individuals believe

they are happy but are in fact being deceived as part of a wider order of profit-making corporations, defined as consumer culture or capitalism (see chapter 2 in this book).

Erling Bjurström (2004: 8) argues that consumption is often approached in terms of passivity and that there is an idea that consumer society ruins the ability to spontaneously play, and reduces creativity and happiness in exploring the world. These ideas reflect what Bjurström calls strong societal interests of protection that surround children and consumption. Bjurström writes about the idea that children learn to consume as they grow, that they are socialized to be consumers. How children become consumers involves parenting and influential values, of what are and are not appropriate objects of consumption, and what is tasteful, natural or artificial (Lupton 2013).³

In a wider sense, the notion of consumption has always had negative connotations in its reference to destruction, in opposition to the constructiveness of production (Löfgren 1996: 116; see also Williams 1983: 78f). The meaning of the term consumption does not highlight productivity. At the same time, however, there is a relation between consumption and production – the two are interrelated, as shown by Karl Marx, and outlined by Yiannis Gabriel and Tim Lang (2008: 326) in that: “Every form of production involves the consumption of resources and every type of consumption results in some production, even if only waste.” During the course of the 20th century, consumption turned into an arena of moral lessons in the social sciences: “For sociology, consumption is the product of social decay; for psychologists, the pathology of a malformed persona; and for anthropologists, the loss of authentic culture” (Wilk 2001: 246f; see also Miller 2001b).

While these observations concern material and interrelated aspects of consumption and production, there are also productive symbolic or cultural meanings associated with consumption. Even if material things are destroyed, broken down, through practices of consumption, there might be outcomes that nonetheless are generative: emotions, meanings, identities, and discourses, to provide a few examples.

---

³ Lydia Martens et al. (2004) suggest that there has been little research regarding consumption conducted with children and parents. The authors highlight the potential in sociology for conducting such research.

Much of the concern regarding children and consumption has to do with what corporations distribute in terms of products for consumption. This highlights the interrelatedness of production and consumption within capitalism as a system where profit-oriented companies are highly influential in constituting the lives of children. The childhood of today is described as a consumer capitalist childhood (Langer 2005). According to Beryl Langer (2004: 256), childhood is now “constituted *through* the market. The two are inseparable” (italics in original). It has been argued that the expansion of capitalism occurs to a great extent “in childhood and, more generally, by the means of play” (Ojajärvi 2001: 483). Childhood is commodified (McKendrick et al. 2000: 296f; see also Katz 2008), and there is an increasingly extensive cultural industry directed at children, including theme parks and toys (Tyler 2009: 58). Toys are part of the “commodity orientation” that children encounter in consumer societies (McAllister 2007: 256), and are significant for the “increasing expansion of capitalism” (Kapur 2005b: 239). Gaile Sloan Cannella and Radhika Viruru (2004: 117f) note that childhood has been colonized by capital and a belief in money and power, excluding the potential for children to have a democratic voice. Consumption, in the above observations, becomes an influential part of the constitution of the lives of children, which is directed or strongly influenced by corporations within a powerful order of capitalism.

This thesis is an exploration which recognizes that children are already involved in consumption (Williams 2006: 138). Turning to happiness, I investigate the ways in which consumption involves material things, and how it makes sense as part of social relations, rather than ascribing to explanations of “social decay” (Wilk 2001: 246f) or “moral decline” (Hookway 2013) in general. In this thesis I approach consumption as a productive part of children’s everyday lives and childhood (Arnould & Thompson 2005; Heidegren 1995: 38f; Sparrman & Sandin 2012).⁴

---

⁴ Consumption is consequently part of a dialectical relationship. Researchers drawing on Science and Technology Studies (STS) have highlighted the importance of relationships between children and material things (e.g. Brembeck 2007; Ruckenstein 2010a; Sparrman & Sandin 2012; Woolgar 2012). Allison James and Alan Prout (1997: xii) talk about an “unproductive counterposition of the ‘material’ and the ‘social’.” Nick Lee (2008: 7) suggests that “‘drawing the line’ between humans and non-humans is sometimes the least informative analytic strategy.”

A BACKGROUND TO THE THEME PARKS

This part provides an introduction to the Swedish theme parks Astrid Lindgren's World (ALW) and Liseberg – the two venues which are explored throughout this thesis. Starting with a brief overview of the history of the parks, how they are operated, where they are located and who owns them, I then move on inside of the entrances. I address similarities and differences between ALW and Liseberg, by discussing attractions, stores, and ticketing at the two parks. Based on these observations, I then elaborate upon the notion of *the family theme park*. In the section that follows, the children and their families are introduced, along with conceptualizations of “their” parks – emphasizing the social importance of family as well as the emotional role of the parks. Finally, I will focus on how children and parents associate the parks with positive emotions and happiness.

The history of Liseberg begins with a jubilee exhibition in 1923, when the city of Gothenburg celebrated 300 years since its founding (Öhnander 1998: 16). From the start, Liseberg included a funfair, an exhibition of flower arrangements and performances by international artists (ibid.: 16).⁵ Liseberg was popular and profitable, and became a permanent institution.

Liseberg is located in the city of Gothenburg, which is the second largest city in Sweden, with about one million inhabitants in the greater urban area. It is one of the most popular theme parks in Europe, with about three million visitors annually (Clavé 2007: 54; *Liseberg 2011* 2012). Liseberg is now marketed as an amusement park. It tops the list of tourist destinations in Sweden (*Fakta om svensk turism 2010* 2011: 40).

Gothenburg and its surroundings attract many tourists during the summer months. It is a city on the west coast of Sweden, with rural coastal areas close to the urban center. Most people come to visit Liseberg during the summer. Visitors also come to Gothenburg for other reasons. In July, the world-famous football tournament, the *Gothia Cup*, attracts thousands of young people as participants. Besides taking part in this event, the footballers are also offered a visit to the park as part of their time in Gothenburg. There are other similar major events and conferences, where people who go to Gothenburg include a visit to Liseberg as part of their time in the city.

---

⁵ See also: ‘1923 – Lisipedia’, <http://www.lisepedia.se/1923> (accessed 18/06/15).

The Gothenburg municipality operates companies and supports events which attract people to the city. In fact, the municipality is the sole owner of Liseberg, and has been since the start (Öhnander 1998: 16, 22). Liseberg is managed as a commercial enterprise with a board constituted of local political representatives. The argument for involving politicians in the park is that Liseberg belongs to the people of Gothenburg, from which political representation follows.⁶

The aim and vision of Liseberg is to be the most loved meeting place in Gothenburg and the most desirable destination in Sweden.⁷ On the Liseberg park website, following this statement, there are five keywords, or words expressing Liseberg's key values: safety, care, quality, joy, and creativity. These values are intended to run through the organization as well as being expressed in how employees approach "the guests" who come to Liseberg.⁸

Astrid Lindgren's World welcomes large numbers of consumers as "guests" to the park, even though it is a smaller operation than Liseberg.⁹ ALW attracts about half a million visitors annually and is the most popular theme park focused on stage performances in Sweden. This theme park is located in the rural town of Vimmerby in south-east Sweden, 250 kilometers due east of Gothenburg. Vimmerby is the birthplace of the famous author Astrid Lindgren (1907–2002), upon whose work the park is founded.¹⁰ A former CEO of ALW, Joakim Karlén (2004: 96), writes that Astrid Lindgren's stories have given the park a gift to satisfy and please hundreds of thousands of children each year.

---

⁶ 'Liseberg – Ägare och ägardirektiv', <http://liseberg.se/sv/hem/Sidfot/Om-Liseberg/Agare-och-agardirektiv/> (accessed 18/06/15).

⁷ 'Liseberg – Strategiskt ramverk', <http://liseberg.se/sv/hem/Sidfot/Om-Liseberg/Strategiskt-ramverk/> (accessed 03/06/15).

⁸ Similar observations were made inside the park. In 2011, I found myself looking at a notice board in one of the employee areas at Liseberg. Next to images of smiling children, framed by an iconic-looking skyline of Liseberg, different qualities of the organization are presented: joy, harmony, cooperation, open climate and community.

⁹ When employees begin their appointment at ALW they are informed about the importance of seeing the visitors and seeing them as "guests". Field notes (07/05/11).

¹⁰ She is the famous author of stories about *Pippi Longstocking*, *Karlsson-on-the-Roof*, and the *Six Bullerby Children* (US: *Children of Noisy Village*). In Sweden there have been repeated calls to award Lindgren the Nobel Prize in Literature. This reflects her great popularity as an author, and her importance to Swedish literature.

ALW was founded by three families in 1981 as a small village of stories.¹¹ Initially it was a non-profit operation. Following its growth, the park was sold to a company in 1989 to develop into a professional and commercial business-oriented theme park during the 1990s. During the last few decades, ALW has turned into an increasingly popular and important tourist destination. Some days 10 000 people come to visit ALW (Jonsson 2010: 19). Many of these travel to the park, and their numbers add noticeably to the 8 000 people who reside in Vimmerby. ALW is now an important part of the regional economy (Jonsson 2010: 12; Sjöholm 2009: 59).

From the beginning, various actors had a stake in the park, such as the three families that set up and developed the play area, the municipality of Vimmerby and several companies (Althén 2010). ALW is now a commercial company with two stakeholders. The Vimmerby municipality is a minority owner, with 12 percent of the shares. The remaining 88 percent of the shares are controlled by the current majority owner Saltkråkan AB, the company that possesses and manages the estate of the late Astrid Lindgren. Saltkråkan AB aims to encourage a love of Lindgren's stories.¹²

Accordingly, Astrid Lindgren's World and Liseberg approach their "guests" through positive cultural values and emotions. These notions can be compared with how the Disney theme parks similarly use notions of guests and even emphasize happiness (Sorkin 1992a: xv; Wing Yee Choi 2007).¹³ So, this raises the question: what do the guests meet as they arrive at ALW and Liseberg?

Entering the parks

Cars, buses, trams and trains stop close to Liseberg. The park is located in an area of Gothenburg where many people are on the move. Some visit the large conference center across the street, others go to the hotels, museums, or parking spaces outside. People live in apartment houses nearby, and others are in the area to visit the shops and restaurants. Liseberg is not an open space within the surrounding area, through which one can pass freely. Entering the park requires people to pass through one of the two park entrances. And to do that one needs a ticket. Fences, walls, and buildings

---

¹¹ In Swedish: "sagoby".

¹² 'Lär känna Saltkråkan', <http://www.saltkrakan.se/lar-kanna-saltkrakan/> (accessed 03/06/15).

¹³ Another similarity is that ALW and Liseberg were inspired by the layout of the Disney theme parks (Karlén 2004; Strömberg 2007).

surround and protect the entirety of the park. From outside of the park, looking into it, one sees bright colors and large ride attractions constructed out of steel and wood mixed in with buildings and green spaces.

Figure 1:1: Liseberg main gate. With the rabbit on the visual display.

Figure 1:2: Entrance to ALW.

Tickets for different purposes can be purchased on site when visiting Liseberg. Some are just the entrance fee while others also include rides, like the “golden” season ticket, which offers unlimited time in the attractions throughout the year. By purchasing only an entrance ticket it is possible to stroll around. At Liseberg, adults are allowed to ride some of the smaller attractions without further payment when accompanying children for whom the full cost of ride tickets has been paid. Liseberg has no particular family tickets, but the pricing system encourages visitors to come in groups of children and adults (Sparrman 2011).

Astrid Lindgren’s World promotes individual and family tickets. As at Liseberg, there are daily tickets and those that include extensive periods of time, from several days to an entire season. Some visitors bring printed tickets, which they have bought online in advance, while others buy them on location. This is the case at both ALW and Liseberg, where advance purchase reduces the cost of tickets. At ALW, tens of euros, or several hundred Swedish Krona (SEK) can be saved by buying a family ticket or season tickets instead of single individual tickets for each child and adult.

ALW is surrounded by roads, parking spaces, a campsite, light industry and green areas. There is a seasonal train station for theme park visitors within walking distance of the entrance. A large sign featuring Pippi Longstocking, the logo of ALW, marks the entrance. People who cross the gate into the park pay for the entire content of the park. It is not possible to only visit parts of ALW at a lower cost. This is similar to the Disney parks and theme

parks where the totality of the experience is emphasized (Gottdiener 1997: 109).

Before getting inside ALW and Liseberg, people are required to pass through entrance areas, where tickets can be purchased and must be validated. Having scanned their tickets, children and parents enter the parks. Some then make the attractions and theatrical performances their first stop, while others visit stores, buy additional tickets for games and attractions, or go to the restaurants. Entering the parks means arriving at places where different activities are available that can be simultaneously fun and challenging.

Avoiding losing track of accompanying visitors can be a challenge at both ALW and Liseberg. Just inside the entrances to the parks, it is possible to get bracelets from employees. On these, parents can write the names of their children along with their own cell phone numbers so that lost children can be identified and returned. These bracelets suggest that the parks are used to adults and children losing one another. Running children, exhausted parents, and different ways of moving through the parks require attention and communication about where to meet or how to find one another in such cases.

Neither ALW nor Liseberg are cut off from ordinary practicalities: people need to visit bathrooms, eat, change diapers, purchase drinks, and monitor their energy levels, if a visit is to last. ALW and Liseberg have set up such facilities (lavatories, restaurants and shops) all over the parks. Being large operations that attract vast numbers of people during the high season in the summer months means that people are spread out through the park. On some occasions – during the midsummer celebration at ALW, and concerts at Liseberg – people gather in larger numbers where the action is, sometimes in the smallest parts of the park. In both of the parks visitors move between different areas, and this involves leaving one attraction or theatrical environment where stories are performed for the next. “Guests” walking around also find in-between areas dominated by trees or concrete where it is sometimes somewhat unclear what is taking place.

Both parks consist of large areas that are primarily open air. At Liseberg there are buildings such as arcade halls and at ALW there are small-scale houses. Both ALW and Liseberg stage theatrical performances. Liseberg has a theatre stage where the famous brand character – the rabbit – performs for a seated audience.

1:3: Pippi Longstocking's house at ALW, with a sitting audience.

Astrid Lindgren's World incorporates the stories of Astrid Lindgren. These stories have been described as focusing on a trouble-free and nostalgic childhood, going beyond the current concerns of everyday life (Janson 2007: 60–92). These stories are connected through the author Astrid Lindgren and physically separated, spatially, in the park. Their separation is visible in the way in which different areas are used for each story within the park as a totality. Within each area there are theatrical environments where performers take part in scripted plays by Astrid Lindgren as well as more spontaneous actions together with children and adults. These activities are central to what happens at ALW.

In contrast to Liseberg, there are no ride attractions like the Ferris wheel or roller-coasters at ALW. There is also a reduction in the visibility of brands at ALW, where soft drink producers, for example, not are allowed to display as extensively as within Liseberg (see Strömberg 2007: 219). According to the former park CEO, Mikael Ahlerup, it is possible to focus on and display

the stories in the park, without reducing sales.¹⁴ At Liseberg there are many stores that display brands and attractions where the logos of (financially) supporting companies are highly visible. Despite the difference in visibility, both parks generate revenue from selling commodities of various kinds, such as well-known soft drinks, candy, ice-cream, toys, clothes, printed photos, etc. The food is different, however; Liseberg offers fast food like hamburgers, while ALW focuses on traditional Swedish cuisine.

During the mid-1980s, Liseberg initiated a process focused on theming (Strömberg 2007: 199). Following the investment in theming, inspired by the design of the Disney parks, Liseberg now includes an area reminiscent of small-city environments in Sweden during the 19th century (ibid.). Recently (2013), a new themed area for children was established, in which Liseberg's own brand character, called "the rabbit" has its "home". Everything within this part of the park relates to stories about rabbits, and there are visual elements such as carrots accompanying images, mascots and other involvement of rabbits. Regardless of Liseberg's incorporation of themes and stories, the central attraction is still the rides, which are similar to the ones that existed during the opening of the funfair in 1923, including roller-coasters and merry-go-rounds.

The contents of ALW and Liseberg are diverse and have been constantly changing over the years, at the same time as there is also a sense of tradition. This is expressed in the way in which similar attractions and stories retain their place in the parks over the years. While children and parents go to both parks, there is generally an emphasis on younger visitors at ALW, where the focus is mainly on children under the age of ten, according to the former CEO Mikael Ahlerup (Sparman 2011).

At Liseberg there are areas in the park where ride attractions are primarily for younger/smaller children. There is now also a "happy child guarantee" at Liseberg, introduced in 2013. This makes park visits a matter of happiness, and especially so for children who are not yet taller than 140 cm. Children who leave the park unhappy are not only a failure for visiting families, but also for the park. An unsuccessful visit means the park offers a new chance of happiness in the form of a second visit free of charge. Is

---

¹⁴ In the chapter *Thingography*, I return to this topic in discussing Pippi Longstocking's relation to brands and consumption. Drawing on this account, it can be argued that ALW in its entirety is the location of a brand: Astrid Lindgren and Pippi Longstocking.

every child who does not make a complaint about their visit then by definition happy?¹⁵ Are children the only ones who might be unhappy with Liseberg?

Before getting into how children and their parents discuss and conceptualize the parks in their own emotional terms, and how they relate ALW and Liseberg to happiness, I will turn to how ALW and Liseberg can be understood as family theme parks, drawing on the notions of amusement park and theme park.

Family theme parks

Modern amusement parks, where one pays admission to ride roller-coasters and attractions, and postmodern theme parks that offer a full experience, have been approached as different kinds of places in previous research. It is suggested that they are different in terms of content and experiences. Amusement parks focus on attractions such as roller-coasters that affect the body, while theme parks emphasize environments and more mindful experiences, including various entertaining activities (Clavé 2007: 25; Davis 1997: 22; Lukas 2008: 37, 133; Mitrašinović 2006: 27f; Nasaw 1999: 254; Yoshimoto 1994: 185f).¹⁶

Liseberg diverges from these previous notions in that it incorporates themed environments in what is marketed as an amusement park (Cardell 2013b; Strömberg 2007). What is relevant here is that both Astrid Lindgren's World and Liseberg relate to the notion of theme park in terms of content. Both ALW and Liseberg include theatrical characters, and environments that build on stories where visitors experience interaction with characters.

What does theming mean here, in the context of the theme park? My conceptualization of *theme* and *theming* draws on Mark Paterson's (2006: 72) discussion of and distinction between amusement parks and theme parks. The former is a collection of loosely related components of entertainment, while theme parks are about a thematic environment in

---

¹⁵ Early in the summer season of 2013, in late May, only eight children had been involved in applications to receive the guarantee – getting the chance of a new visit. This is according to Annika Palm, the Liseberg quality director (30/05/13).

¹⁶ It is rare to find concepts that bring these parks together, and to do so in an extended way. Malene Gram (2005a) speaks of Fun Parks, but does not develop the concept further, leaving the question of fun for further consideration.

which parts of the park are integrated with each other. At Astrid Lindgren's World and Liseberg there are different themes running through areas of the parks: the authorship of Astrid Lindgren throughout ALW, and the rabbit as part of various attractions and areas at Liseberg. Liseberg integrates its brand character – the rabbit – into various parts of the park: it is displayed on signs, on ride attractions, on trash bins and flags. Consequently, Liseberg is not only a modern amusement park.¹⁷ Its roller-coasters, alongside the incorporation of stories and characters, makes it possible to use different terms such as amusement park, theme park and a themed amusement park to describe the place (cf. Cardell 2013b; Wong & Cheung 1999: 320). There are no roller-coasters in the stories of Astrid Lindgren, and this becomes important at ALW, where the content follows the authorship and stories.

The mix of people at Liseberg includes a wide spectrum: families, groups of young people, concert audiences, groups of senior citizens taking part in dancing lessons, and adults who are there to drink a beer after work, as well as lone adults strolling around. Astrid Lindgren's World is more visibly centered on families in the sense that people move around in small groups consisting of children and adults/parents.

The wide meaning of the notion of theme park makes it relevant as an umbrella term for both ALW and Liseberg. However, the parks have something more in common. Both parks attract families. They include attractions and stories that are directed towards both children and adults. In this study, children and their parents visit ALW and Liseberg as “families”. Liseberg presented itself as “the family park” in the early 1980s.¹⁸ Within this study, this notion makes sense. By adding *family* as a prefix to *theme park* it is possible to capture the ambitions among children and their parents in this study to visit ALW and Liseberg as a family group.¹⁹

---

¹⁷ At times, ALW has also used the notion of theater park. This has to do both with the content of the park, which is centered on theatrical environments, and the possibility of reducing costs by navigating the different rates of the Swedish taxation system (Cardell 2013b). How a park is defined can thus be of financial importance, with consequences for income and profits.

¹⁸ See park map, 1982, available in the collections of photos on the Liseberg Facebook page. Jonas Persson (1996: 111) describes Liseberg in terms of popular family entertainment.

¹⁹ The family has been identified as the target group of theme parks, in discussions of Disney (Forgacs 1992). Here it is not target groups that are the main concern, but actual visits.

This book is not a study that points to the idea that adults chase the greatest thrills on their own, or where children are supposed to be alone. The importance assigned to “family” during visits to both parks is an observation that I will return to throughout the book. How do children and parents conceptualize the parks that they visit? How do they do family?

Children, families, and their parks

The notions of amusement park and theme park are not necessarily used by the children or parents who are part of this study. They speak about the parks using their names: Astrid Lindgren’s World and Liseberg. In addition to these familiar names, children provide their own concepts and meanings that identify who the park is for, making the places relevant to themselves and their families.

Talking about ALW, Eric (age 6) and Jacob (age 4) and their parents Tony and Gill refer to “Pippiland”, the land of Pippi Longstocking. While several stories by Astrid Lindgren are available in the park, one is more important to them than the others, namely Pippi Longstocking. Their renaming of ALW as Pippiland does not mean that they are not interested in the other parts, but that Pippi Longstocking is the main focus for the family as they discuss the park and prepare and plan their summer activities.

Felicia (age 11) describes Liseberg as “a real park”, after having listed its ingredients, including ride attractions, stages and the theater. Her father, Björn, uses the notion of Liseberg as Felicia and Emma’s (age 15) “backyard”, speaking about how it has been an important place for his two daughters over the years. Felicia tells me that she and her sister find their way around in the park better than they do at home, in their own rooms.

Björn and his wife Lisa speak of the commercial side of Liseberg as something that is “too much”. They are not talking about the costs as such, for their family, but about the inclusion of more and more spectacular attractions in the park that are there to attract customers. The problems involved with Liseberg have not stopped their family from visiting the park over several years, however. They invest money in entrance tickets and unlimited rides through a “golden ticket” to get the full experience of roller-coasters, stage shows and concerts, as well as the environment of the park.

Tove (age 9), just like Felicia and Emma’s father, also speaks of Liseberg as her “backyard”. She knows it as well as her hip pocket. She visits the

park about once a month during the summer, and according to Tove and her parents it is an extension of their family living room. Liseberg functions as their garden and a fun backyard for Tove. Tove tells me that Liseberg is for everyone, regardless of age. This does not necessarily mean that the family enjoys everything together in the park. Karin, Tove's mother, tells me that she enjoys walking around and watching people while Tove's father Johan is not very interested in the park or its attractions. "It was so boring before the iPhone," Johan tells me, describing how he spends time surfing the web when he accompanies Tove to Liseberg.

Anne, mother of Rebecca (age 11), speaks of Astrid Lindgren's World as "really being a family park", which is not only about children but also offers things that are "fun" for the parents. That ALW is for everyone is also the opinion of Frank, the father of Emil (age 6). He does not use the notion of family park, but says that ALW is relevant regardless of age, and for their family. The same goes for Liseberg. Frida, the mother of Robin (age 4) and Jimmy (age 9 months), tells me that there is something for everyone at Liseberg. Mårten, the family's father, says that they will visit the park more often as their children get older.

From a visitor's perspective, the parks are established under the names "Pippiland", "real park", "backyard", as places that can be "boring" and "too much". These notions suggest that parks are reviewed in their totality and in parts, in relation to the different visitors within families. While a park can be appreciated by children, it can be less interesting to parents. This, however, does not stop repeated visits to the parks that include children and their parents. Regardless of how the parks are given names, described in positive and/or negative terms, the role of the family is emphasized in relation to the visits. Children visit ALW and/or Liseberg with their families. And parents put money and effort into the visits, by paying for tickets and by preparing for the visits in a practical way.

Tickets, money, and cell phones are brought to the parks, along with additional clothing that can be handy during sudden rainfalls. Parents keep cameras ready for the park visits, charging batteries at home, ensuring that the time with their children can be documented. Parents pack bags with food for lunch and cookies and drinks for "fika", which is a relaxing time of indulging in coffee or soft drinks with a snack. For some, like Björn and his family, it has become a tradition to make their picnic food for Liseberg.

The preparation of food and “fika” at home has a possible benefit: reducing time spent queuing at the food outlets, if people prefer a meal during lunch or dinner hours. It also reduces costs in the parks. Families who travel to the parks by car or train, staying at a hotel, and purchasing food and souvenirs (toys and clothes) in the parks count their expenses in hundreds of euros. Several parents – like Sven and Mathilda, and Lena – make budget calculations before going to the parks. Parents highlight that it is expensive to go to Astrid Lindgren’s World and Liseberg, mentioning sums between 150 and 400 €. For Sven, the estimated sum of 150 € includes tickets and the park visit but not the hotel stay. The 400 € that Lena estimates as the total cost of the visit to Gothenburg includes shopping besides Liseberg. In retrospect, however, none of the parents is able to specify costs in exact numbers, only to provide estimates.

Families living closer to the parks spend smaller amounts during visits, but go there more frequently. Families holding annual tickets do not necessarily spend more than 10 € on a visit. This might include, for example, some lottery tickets and a drink, on top of the “fika” they have brought along from home. This is the case for Ulrika, the mother of Christopher (age 9) and John (age 7). The boys hold season tickets and frequently visit ALW. Ulrika tells me that the visits are expensive and “would not be possible” if she had to pay for each visit separately.

These examples show that ALW and Liseberg are important for children and have a personal relevance to them. Parents either find the parks equally interesting or suggest that they are important places for their children. Visits imply a commitment by parents, including preparations, planning their finances and providing money for visits. A lot of effort is put into accomplishing these visits why it is in place to ask what a visit does imply to children and parents, in terms of happiness and desirable emotions.

Happy accounts

Happiness was *not* my initial focus; I began by looking at children and popular places of consumption. Positive accounts among children and parents during my fieldwork, however, made it evident that happiness runs through the consumption of theme parks. And this generates thought-provoking questions about happiness – from practice to theory. A turn to practice opens up space for explorations of these differences and the multiplicity of happiness, during park visits and the everyday lives of children.

Happiness is widely emphasized in studies of theme parks, suggesting that Disney parks are associated with “positive values” of family and innocence (Best & Lowney 2009: 443), “the good old days” (Philips 2002: 35), fun, happiness, fantasy, childhood and nostalgia, and that they relate their offerings to “the needs of middle-class America” (Cross & Walton 2005: 201). These observations primarily concern happiness as a matter for corporations and their employees, rather than children, families and consumers.

Emotional management has been a topic in studies of organizations, including Disney. This type of management concerns how corporations develop strategies for their employees, and how to approach consumers in positive ways. Smiling has become important (Hochschild 2003:128) and theme park research shows that emotional management among employees to ensure that they appear happy is central (Raz 2002a: 184; Van Maanen 1992; see also Gram 2005b). So what is the deal with happiness here? Is it possible to find similarities with how children and parents are involved with happiness?

People of different ages, living in different parts of the country, emphasize the positive emotional significance of Astrid Lindgren’s World and Liseberg. The father Björn is one of the more verbal parents in this study, and he has put a great deal of thought into the visits to Liseberg. In describing the park, he speaks about its atmosphere, and that it is a place of gladness, happiness and dreams; a place where “everyone is happy”. Björn’s daughter Felicia (11) tells me that the atmosphere of Liseberg makes her glad and bouncy, “from the moment you enter the gate”. Four-year-old Jacob, when he is asked about ALW and what his previous impressions are, explains to me and his mother Gill that “it felt very nice” to be in the park.

1:4: Ad for Liseberg, outside ALW – suggesting that those interested in fun activities will enjoy Liseberg. The Liseberg rabbit is at the bottom of the ad.

Happiness and positive emotions turn into a *natural* matter that is beyond the need or possibility of explanation or elaboration: one simply is, or becomes, happy by going to ALW and Liseberg. And this is good enough for the families. There is no fuss over meanings or definitions.

How to make sense of happiness or the meaning of positive or great feelings is not something that bothers the children and parents who spend time at ALW and Liseberg. There are no references to dictionary definitions or other explanations available in theoretical texts. Children speak about being there, feeling good and being instantly happy. This highlights happiness as natural and *contagious*, something one catches by being in the right place. It is as though the entire park – ALW or Liseberg – naturally offers positive emotions.

A tricky challenge posed by the notion of happiness and related terms of positive emotions is definition. The debate about the concept of happiness has a history stretching back over many centuries (McMahon 2006). Are there any challenges to the idea of happiness as natural and contagious here? There are episodes from my fieldwork which suggest that happiness

involves work and that it does not necessarily come easily – as a guarantee when entering the parks.

During one of my visits to Astrid Lindgren's World, I overhear a man saying to a girl who is perhaps five years old: "Come on Moa, some happy expressions"²⁰. It is as though she is being asked by the adult man accompanying her to manage happiness, individually, so as to satisfy him. Whether the young girl becomes happy, expresses happiness, or ignores the call for emotional change is undocumented, and unclear to me.

The example above is of theoretical interest because it concerns the issue of what happiness might look like. Is it observable? Is it visible on the bodily surfaces of people, through the face perhaps? Or is happiness hidden under the skin, found inside individuals? Regardless, the man who calls for happy expressions seems convinced that emotions are subjects to be managed and that they can be observed. Thus they become a plastic matter that individuals are able to work on. It is about moving towards something desirable, away from the undesirable. It involves emotions as a matter of appearance: to look (happy) is to be (happy).

According to such an approach, where happiness is a readable surface, it can both be observed and accomplished visually. This emphasizes the *social* character of happiness, making it a matter of control and *emotional management*. This is what the unknown man is pointing to in suggesting that (un)happiness can be observed socially and visually, and managed individually.

In reviewing park visits, children do not only speak about positive experiences and things that concern happiness. They also point out attractions that are boring. Also, there is fear involved in the visits. Henrik (age 9) finds an attraction at Liseberg boring and tells me about friends who have left the park scared of the rabbit mascots after being chased by them. Thea (age 5), the sister of Leo (age 9), tells me that she became scared of the rabbits' big teeth when she met them in the park. Still, she went on hugging them. Casper (age 6) tells me that he felt a bit sad when another boat in the water attraction at Liseberg crashed into his. Tina (age 6) and her brother Pierre (age 4) speak about what is fun and cool, and what is

---

²⁰ Park visit: 22/06/11.

scary at ALW. Losing sight of his parents is a problem for Pierre, and Tina tells me that Pierre was crying and required comfort from his mother.

Children are positive about the totality of their visits to ALW and Liseberg. They focus on what was good in the park – fun, exciting, and scary in a challenging and positive way. While there are challenges and problems, none of the children or parents tell me that they would not go again. Many are already looking forward to future visits, recalling their past experiences.

In the accounts of positive emotions and happiness presented and discussed here, there are different *ideas* about happiness at play. There are those that focus on ALW and Liseberg as places of happiness, giving it a natural and contagious character. Others call for happiness by making verbal demands. This suggests a social and manageable take on happiness. Together, it suggests that there is no all-encompassing paradigm of happiness. Instead, there are connections with several and different ideas about happiness in theoretical accounts and in how the parks are operated by emotional management among employees.

It is not time to outline the aims and questions of this study.

AIMS OF STUDY

The principal aim of this study is to critically examine and challenge prevalent ideas about happiness and childhood through an exploration of practices. The study provides an understanding of happiness that is attuned to its nitty-gritty existence in a social and material world. By carrying out an ethnographic study that focuses on children's practices and family visits to theme parks, I consider happiness and childhood.

My principal aim benefits from the exploratory approach, which focuses on practices, and it creates the foundations for advancing the understanding of happiness. This will be evident when I engage in thinking about enactments of happiness along with notions of complexity and multiplicity. One characteristic of happiness in previous accounts is that there are non-compatible and co-existing notions. These, I argue, can work as a resource rather than an obstacle in approaching enactments of happiness.

The aim of this thesis is also to develop an understanding of what theme park visits are about, in a wide sense. Why do children go there? How do they use theme parks? Why do they visit theme parks with their families?

Childhood, consumption and the leisure time of children and families is currently a matter that concerns researchers, policy-makers and political activists world-wide. Happiness and well-being are on the agenda, to say the least. It is a matter that engages many people and about which many have an opinion.

To connect children's practices and park visits with the topic of happiness, I pose questions that help in exploring issues that are both intimately associated with, and contested in terms of, happiness: material things, consumption, time, childhood, and family life. These guiding questions provide a challenge to existing studies on theme parks that either appraise or deny happiness as part of consumption and consumer society. They also add to the limited literature on children, childhood and family life, with regards to happiness *in practice*.

- ☺ How and why do material things from theme parks interest children? How do they become interwoven with children's everyday lives at home? Do commercial products and brands enact intimacy and happiness?
- ☺ How can notions of happiness be enacted through money? What do notions of happiness tell us about the value of money in the consumption of theme parks?
- ☺ In what ways is family life involved with happiness in theme parks? By whom, when and where is it enacted?
- ☺ In what ways are time and age important? Does childhood have a role in the enactment of happiness?

The questions above have in common that they are attentive to what children and their families do, and thereby offer insight into issues of happiness and beyond. In the end, I hope that this book will provide thought-provoking insights on happiness, in ways that lead to a greater focus on the challenges of happiness, are attentive to the complexities of practice, and that do not depart from the everyday lives of children and their families. It might – I suggest – open up the possibility of a turn away from moralism and some of the currently influential political arguments regarding happiness, to the possibility of an empirically and theoretically informed politics that takes children seriously.

The above questions are addressed in the analytical chapters and lead to more general questions that will be addressed at the end of this book: Do

children really become happy when they visit a park for a couple of hours or days? Does happiness exist in theme parks? Does happiness exist at all?

In the next section I outline structure of the thesis.

STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS

In total, this book includes nine chapters, of which this introduction is the first. The following gives a brief overview of what awaits the reader in each of the chapters to come:

Chapter 2 – *Models of happiness* – explores previous research on happiness, which includes theoretical writing, survey studies, and observations in relation to childhood, family and theme parks. I offer insights into models of happiness that involve children and adults in different ways: as individuals, as part of relationships, and as groups; suggesting also that happiness is conceptualized in ways that create a division between desirable qualities and undesirable illusions.

Chapter 3 – *A meshwork of happiness* – lays out the theoretical approach. I outline the problems associated with previous models in terms of linear movement and leap-frogging to happiness in which nitty-gritty matters of happiness have been set aside. The notions of enactment, wayfaring and meshwork emphasize entanglement and, I argue, provides an approach for exploring happiness as multiplicity, in a social and material world that is marked by complexity.

Chapter 4 – *Ethnographizing happiness* – outlines the methodology. There is a discussion of how I recruited children and families, the selection of two parks for fieldwork and the challenges of conducting ethnographic work and analytical procedures. There is a presentation of themes in the chapters to come. In the last part I point to how multiplicity can be presented and explored through snapshot-stories, which provide insights into theme park visits and everyday life.

Chapter 5 – *Thingography: material intimacy* – is about the consumption of material things, and how brands become involved at home in the everyday lives of children. I address how children and their families make theme parks into more than just tourist destinations, as vivid and intimate components of their lives in a wide sense. This chapter draws attention to political issues of consumption and its consequences in terms of emotions.

Chapter 6 – *Valuography: money* – focuses on children’s access to money and how money is associated with different values. I explore how money is interrelated with values, in a wide sense, to develop a contribution that is relevant to the study of children and consumption as well as happiness studies. There have been calls for further research on children and money and this chapter contributes to developing such knowledge.

Chapter 7 – *Co-ordiography: park visits* – focuses on Astrid Lindgren’s World and Liseberg in exploring the importance of family during park visits. I investigate what visiting theme parks with a family implies and develop new concepts that capture the shifting and dynamic role of togetherness, which adds to tourism and theme park studies, and family research.

Chapter 8 – *Chronography: time and childhood* – explores time and happiness and focuses on what takes place in the parks, but also includes childhood-related accounts of upcoming park visits. The chapter contributes to childhood studies with a critical treatise on heterogeneous time.

Chapter 9 – *Happy-faring* – is the final chapter, which focuses on happiness and consumption. In hindsight, and looking back on previous analyses, I argue that the concepts of “mess” and practice help in thinking further about capitalism, politics, childhood, and family life, and their entanglements with happiness.

It is now time to move on to previous accounts of happiness, mapping out its shifting meanings through a review of the available research.

CHAPTER 2

MODELS OF HAPPINESS: PREVIOUS RESEARCH

In this chapter, I explore ideas and approaches to happiness in various fields of research, including psychology, economics, sociology, anthropology, critical theory, and philosophy as well as in childhood studies, research on family life and theme parks. Contributions to these fields of inquiry provide a basis for what I call *models of happiness*. Based on the notion of a “model”, I outline: a descriptive summary that points to patterns of happiness in research on the subject, “that is put forward as a basis for calculations, predictions, or further investigation,” and that recognizes that last year’s model might be replaced by a new one – i.e. history counts.²¹

This chapter introduces accounts of happiness, including those that outline opportunities for achieving it as a state of life, as an emotion, and approaches that highlight the social and contested roles of happiness – that involve oppression and power and issues that run counter to notions of a good life. The point here is to offer a palette of different notions that will be useful for further explorations in the upcoming chapters rather than to suggest that one model, and one model only, is superior. I will therefore highlight similarities and differences between models and introduce key references along the way, from scholarly arguments to a few clear-cut self-help books that are informative in their definitions of happiness.

I am interested in happiness that is relevant to people in the present, who contribute ethnographically to this study as participants. This means that I focus on models of happiness that are relevant for children who consume theme parks and do so with their families.

Initially, I briefly discuss notions of happiness in English and Swedish. I then consider notions of happiness as luck and chance. I then move on to how happiness has been approached as a rational project that involves individuals in a mass of happiness – a wide body of people, of societies and also ideologies. The second part concerns the ways in which happiness is located in times of childhood and family life as well as in theme park visits. Finally, there is a discussion of how to move forward, taking previous

---

²¹ *OED*, second edition, www.oed.com (accessed 16/08/15).

contributions and the problems with previous approaches to happiness into account.

HAPPINESS IN ENGLISH AND SWEDISH

This first part aims to provide insight into various notions which are useful for grasping happiness at large and the wide scope of this concept. I am not presenting a model of happiness here; this is rather an introductory discussion that provides a basis for the models to come.

Reading books and articles on happiness it is clear that there are many notions that circulate in conversations and theoretical reasoning – with more than 15 available in English alone (Stearns 2012a: 15f). In English, the notion of happiness is also associated with other notions, including: “joy, elation, enthusiasm, effervescence—in contrast to disappointment, dreariness, and depression” (Collins 2004: 107). The concept of happiness further relates to cheerfulness, warmth, and vitality; it involves light, and stands in opposition to darkness and sadness (Kövecses 1991). In the Swedish language, happiness translates to “lycka” and also goes with similar notions such as “glädje, välbefinnande, framgång, medgång, sällhet” and “eufori” (Jacquemot 2009: 45). In Sweden, the English words “happy” and “happiness” are observable in the marketing of products and services and are also used in social media. In research, happiness is accompanied by notions of life satisfaction (Francis 2011), subjective well-being (Diener 2000), well-being and quality of life (Ben-Arieh et al. 2014; Nordenfelt 1993: 7).

These notions, in two different languages, suggest that happiness is relevant as an emotion and as a matter of greater meaning throughout extensive periods of life, or life in its totality. As such, happiness is associated with arousal, having a good life, being successful, and feeling well. Some of these positive meanings of happiness contradict the previously outlined notion of consumption. As will be shown, consumption has a recurring presence in discussions of happiness and in theme park research, and is also central to the practices of children and their families in this study.

LUCK AND CHANCE

The first happiness model I want to present is the luck and chance model. This model builds on the etymology of happiness, and its Old Norse root

happ. Happ emphasizes fortune, luck, and also an uncertainty that is visible in the term *perhaps* (McMahon 2006: 10f; Norberg 2009: 34). In several languages there is a relation between happiness and luck and to be lucky (Bok 2011: 22f). Etymologically, *happ* is not necessarily good (Duncan 2013: 4). Happiness here is beyond the control of the individual or people in a wider sense. To formulate it differently: there are no recipes or guarantees for happiness. It is something that can turn up, unexpectedly, and which comes to humans from outside.

Sigmund Freud emphasizes the brief and haphazard character of happiness (Bok 2011: 53), which contrasts with current models of happiness that emphasize rational individual strategies as a path towards happiness. This model of happiness is therefore likely to disappoint people in search of recipes, with the intention of mapping out a way towards happiness. Happiness is beyond human control and is a matter of uncertain circumstances.

Sara Ahmed (2011: 162) suggests that happiness today is commonly approached as “a reward for hard work, rather than being ‘simply’ what happens to you” (see also Thin 2012: 37). This observation suggests that the etymological significance of *happ* has been downplayed.

In current research, there are few accounts that go with this model of happiness as chance. This might have to do with aspirations of finding explanations and understanding systems, excluding chance as something irrational, or calling for more rational explanations than the idea that humans live under circumstances of luck, being lucky or unlucky. One example of where luck appears is Allison J. Pugh’s (2004) study of low-income families in the USA, for whom money is associated with luck rather than being something that one earns. The ability to access money is consequently not a reward for work but rather a matter of being lucky.

THE HAPPY MASSES

In the three models that are outlined below it is suggested that happiness involves individual efforts and responsibilities, rather than what happens by chance (Ahmed 2010a: 10; Burnett 2012). In this part I approach research and writing on happiness through models of happiness that can be summarized as *the mass*. The concept of the mass was developed during the 20th century, and has been used as a prefix for culture, the media and in politics and discussions of aesthetics (e.g. Bolin 2014; Cook 1996). It

highlights that people in great numbers – in society as a totality, or in groups – belong to an order that is either desirable and positive or flawed by ideology and in need of change (Reeh 2005: 94f). The point here is that even models of happiness that focus on the individual make sense in terms of the mass – offering recipes of happiness to people, universally, in great numbers: “The few are *individuals*; the many are the *mass*” (Bauman 2001: 102, italics in original). The concept of the mass might seem abstract at first. My argument, however, is that it summarizes many approaches to happiness: stretching from a focus on subjective well-being to political approaches to collective change.

Throughout this part of the chapter, I outline how happiness has been approached as a mass-matter: something to be controlled among individuals and groups in societies, and also as offering a different quality of life that is associated with knowledge and freedom.

Artificial vs. authentic

In this section I turn to the division of the artificial versus the authentic that for a long time has been symptomatic of approaches to happiness. Much writing on happiness today provides dual conceptions: one of superficial happiness, and one of true happiness (Cederström & Spicer 2015: 67f). The former provides the background to the latter in self-help books, as well as in influential scholarly works, when it is time to introduce new and proper ideas about what happiness is and what it should be. In this way of thinking about happiness, humans buy into artificial happiness, and miss the goal of true or authentic happiness, which is available if one makes the right choices and chooses the right path.

The artificial vs. authentic model of happiness is possible to observe in titles which suggest that there are types of happiness that contrast with each other, being either natural and authentic or artificial and superficial. The influential book *Authentic Happiness* by Martin Seligman (2002) captures this focus on various alternatives, where the authentic is seen as preferable.²² It is central in assumptions of a distance between science and what people believe, as exemplified in the question: “if money doesn’t buy happiness, why do people act as though it does?” (Ahuvia 2008: 492).

---

²² Since its publication, positive psychology has gained increased funding in research (Binkley 2014: 24f).

Grant Duncan (2013: 7f) notes that there is an anti-materialist discourse of happiness, suggesting that there is an unsustainable pursuit of happiness within capitalism; involving arguments traceable back to “the roots of Romanticism”. Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno (1997[1944]: 153, 158), in their highly influential mid-20th century critique of the development of the culture industry, argue that consumers are provided with an increasing amount of entertainment, which offers them an escape from everyday life, but at the cost of spontaneity, fantasy and happiness. The consumption of entertainment is thus related to effects, spectacular matters and control, rather than providing freedom, reasoning and free thinking – central reference points and aspirational goals in the critical theory of Adorno and Horkheimer. According to these authors, the culture industry and entertainments work to dominate or control the people as a mass, leaving them with mechanical happiness (ibid.: 154, 179). The robot-like character of happiness has been further criticized during the 20th century by other scholars, including C. Wright Mills (Binkley 2014). Horkheimer and Adorno (1997[1944]) emphasize contemplation and thought as paths toward true happiness (for more on happiness and effort, see Adorno & Horkheimer 2011).

Today, there is no shortage of arguments about the problems of materialism and consumption, in work where scholars and commentators suggest desirable alternative routes to happiness – focused on activities and the mind rather than material possessions. In a book critical of extensive consumption, Ed Mayo and Agnes Nairn (2009: 122) argue that it “is not hard to work out that children are happier and healthier when they have opportunities for free and unstructured play anywhere outdoors.” In contrast, the authors claim that the selling of happiness as part of commercial culture is “programmed to ultimately disappoint” (ibid.: 209). According to Sue Palmer (2006: 231), consumption only provides a brief and irrelevant moment of happiness. This is also exemplified in Frank Furedi’s (2006) argument that “happiness cannot be manufactured and standardized like Happy Meals.” The same goes for Susan Linn (2008: 4, 15), who adds that there is no correlation between purchases and happiness. Similar arguments can be found in the public campaigns of the group *Action for Happiness*, proposing that it is time to “reclaim happiness”, and that

commercial happiness is not authentic – but that there are alternatives to this in how people live their lives.²³

Accordingly, certain matters create the illusion of happiness, like consumption and religious belief (Bok 2011: 171; McMahon 2006: 391). In a socialist view of happiness: “The capitalist mode of production and its social relations distort and alienate human life, setting up false expectations of happiness, and causing unhappiness – while a genuine happiness-to-come awaits us in a more democratic socialist order” (Duncan 2007: 89). The socialist approach has parallels with current liberal approaches in its formulations of happiness – but their targets differ. A socialist solution is to change society for the sake of happiness.

To summarize, happiness in the model outlined above is a matter and a goal that is achievable through knowledge, effort and undertaking the right activities within many available alternatives. The idea is that knowledge and action make happiness possible; suggesting that *happiness can deceive but is desirable*. Real or authentic happiness here contrasts with artificial happiness (Duncan 2007: 89). In the next part I go into details about approaches that focus on individual solutions – available in much current research and many self-help books. As noted above, these also provide (at least) two alternatives: authentic happiness versus distractions.

Individual orientations

Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi (2002: 24), an influential professor of positive psychology, argues that: “A person can make himself happy, or miserable, regardless of what is actually happening ‘outside,’ just by changing the contents of consciousness.” Paul Dolan (2015: 101), another leading scholar of happiness in behavioral science, suggests that individuals can increase their happiness by: “deciding to pay attention to what makes you happy.”

Much writing on happiness includes the path outlined above toward happiness as an endpoint (Ahmed 2010a), illustrated in book titles that outline routes toward happiness (Bok 2011: 14). This is exemplified in the subtitle of Csikszentmihalyi’s (2002) book *Flow: The classic work on how to achieve happiness*. Dolan (2015: 46f) outlines this movement toward happiness as a production process with inputs that convert into happiness.

---

²³ ‘International Day of Happiness’, <http://www.dayofhappiness.net/about/> (accessed 20/03/15).

The possibility of happiness is often emphasized in popular psychology – in books by researchers, journalists, and professionals as well as in popular culture (Binkley 2014; Hyman 2014b). These widely available accounts suggest that there are individual opportunities for happiness. There are texts that are reminiscent of recipes – do “this” and “that” and increase your happiness; proposing that *happiness is an achievable matter*. It is also quite a democratic approach in the sense that it is widely available – for everyone who follows the right way (ibid.).²⁴ As an individualistic model, it focuses on the ways in which individuals can become happy. Society is less of a concern.

Many current arguments follow a line of thought in which happiness is desirable and can be possessed by individuals (Binkley 2014). Here, happiness turns into what has been called a matter of *possessive individualism*, where feelings and capacities “have nothing to do with society or context” but are under the ownership of individuals (Morgan 2014: 228). In this scenario, happiness is crafted by an autonomous individual, captured in the Swedish expression “sin egen lyckas smed” – you are the creator of your own happiness.

This is the most scaled-down model, in terms of involving only linear movement toward happiness as a desirable goal for individuals. The individual in this case becomes an entity, a universal figure that is unaffected by material, social or cultural aspects. This is compatible with the suggestion that happiness today: “has acquired a private subjective meaning, [that] largely [has] to do with good feelings” (Duncan 2007: 87). According to Laura Hyman (2014a: 1), happiness is traditionally viewed as a matter for the individual, being private, rather than part of sociological domains. Recently, however, the individual approach to happiness has faced critique.

Neil Thin (2012: 69) suggests that the focus on happiness has been too much about individuals. Scholars with an interest in reigning approaches to happiness have critically examined the background and motives of current happiness and its location within commercial culture and governance (e.g. Binkley 2014; Cederström & Spicer 2015; Davies 2015). Providing an analysis of politics in Europe and the USA, Simon Burnett (2012) argues that an individual utilitarianism of happiness has become influential,

---

²⁴ Critical commentators, however, suggest that “trying to be happy is a recipe for unhappiness” (Blackshaw 2013: 358; see also Ehrenreich 2011).

meaning that people are made individually responsible for their pursuit of happiness, and for maximizing it. The importance of society and its institutions is consequently limited, and unhappy people have only themselves to blame (ibid.: 73f). The realization of the happy subject, *Homo happicus*, is “becoming inculcated in nigh on every facet of our cultural reality” (ibid.: 44). *Homo happicus*, according to Burnett, is part of the aspirations of politicians, organizations and individuals, while responsibility is associated with the individual – within a neoliberal order of governmentality (see also Binkley 2014). This suggests that the individual becomes responsible for happiness as a consequence of politics and of how society is organized.

To summarize, happiness, in this somewhat contested model, is desirable and a modifiable property of individuals. If one subscribes to this approach – exemplified by Csikszentmihalyi (2002) – where the individual possesses happiness, with little or no influence from culture or society, there is no point in investigating happiness further beyond asking the people who possess smaller or larger amounts of it where they are on a scale, measuring its quantity among a mass of individuals (Binkley 2014: 40).

Aggregated values

This model involves quantitative studies, which have been influential in a field that has grown during the last decade within the social sciences, and is now called the “science of happiness” (Fors 2012b: 29f), or “happiness studies” (Brülde 2007: 17). It is concerned with the value of happiness and economics – sometimes described as “happinomics”, the economics of happiness. The benefit of an approach that views happiness as measurable is emphasized by some researchers. In *The World Happiness Report* (Sachs 2012: 6) it is argued that:

A generation of studies by psychologists, economists, pollsters, sociologists, and others has shown that happiness, though indeed a subjective experience, can be objectively measured, assessed, correlated with observable brain functions, and related to the characteristics of an individual and the society. Asking people whether they are happy, or satisfied with their lives, offers important information about the society. It can signal underlying crises or hidden strengths. It can suggest the need for change.

This quotation neatly summarizes the approach to happiness as aggregated values, in its focus on measurements, using different methods but with a common orientation to the relation of happiness as a numerical matter to

different bodies – individuals, groups, and societies. As exemplified in this quote, aggregated values provide a model that assists in making arguments for what a happy society is.

Happiness is explored statistically and involves individual responses as well as information about demographic factors, including income and age. Measuring happiness and pleasure is not a new idea. The aspiration to measure has a long history, stretching back over centuries, to Bentham and his idea of calculating happiness (Bok 2011: 96; see also Davies 2015). Today there are various techniques for measuring individual happiness. There are brain scans and survey methods, which according to leading happiness economist Richard Layard (2011: 13–20) provide similar results. In recent studies of happiness and well-being, there has been a focus on individuals who provide answers in survey studies (Duncan 2013; Kingfisher 2013: 69; Thin 2012: 69f). These approaches to happiness involve individuals who are subject to measurements along the scale of unhappy–happy.

Researchers estimate happiness using different scales. One of these is the “Faces Scale” that children fill in, to take part in measurements of happiness (Holder 2012: 20). An example of this is found in the work of Richard Layard and Judy Dunn (2009), focusing on possibilities of increasing the happiness of children.

Figure 2:1: Faces Scale, in Layard and Dunn (2009: 8)

Survey studies provide the foundation for the values of happiness-in-numbers (Binkley 2014: 40). By repeatedly measuring happiness among different groups, categorized by nationality, age, and social characteristics, researchers generate observations of historical changes, of changes in happiness over the life course and differences between social categories.

Combining statistics, researchers make observations about how happiness relates (or not) to measurable factors such as income and living standards, freedom, religious belief etc. The numerical value of happiness is related to other values and issues. Happiness is, for example, associated with egalitarian and democratic liberal societies, which have higher levels of happiness than authoritarian societies, and people who benefit from an income are happier than those challenged by material hardship.

Aggregated happiness is a model that follows that of individual orientations and does so in order to determine levels of happiness, expressed in numbers, which are captured among quantities of individuals – a mass of more or less happy humans. This model is used for making comparisons between nations and now provides a foundation for discussing happiness globally.²⁵ It is argued that *happiness can and indeed ought to be measured*.

The World Database of Happiness presents a large number of studies on the topic, and provides international comparisons. This database offers a ranking of happiness, based on national values of happiness that have been obtained through survey studies. It offers the possibility of making comparisons between countries and documenting changes over time. Using this database, it is possible to compare a country such as Sweden with others, making visible, among other things, average values of happiness and the average number of happy life years in different countries.²⁶

One current debate about happiness concerns its relation to the economy; and whether economic development is increasing happiness. Some argue that it is more relevant to strive for happiness than economic growth. This is exemplified in how happiness is a value that provides an alternative to GDP for politicians in several countries (Binkley 2014; Fors 2012b). Under such circumstances, measurement becomes important.

There are those who claim that happiness follows financial prosperity, while others observe non-correlations, making the increases in numbers into a matter of little relevance to happiness; money does not measure happiness, it is an illusion that money can buy happiness (e.g. Roberts 2011). Others

---

²⁵ In older philosophical accounts there are also notions of degrees of happiness, covering the partial and the full or total (for examples, see Bok 2011: 81, 172f), covering short moments to extensive periods of time (Blom & Hammarkrantz 2014: 45).

²⁶ Available online: Ruut Veenhoven, *Happiness in Sweden* (SE), World Database of Happiness, Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands. Viewed on 28/01/15 at <http://worlddatabaseofhappiness.eur.nl>.

observe correlations between increased consumption and increased happiness, and that low levels of consumption relate to low levels of well-being (Roos 2012: 9, 2013). There are consequently different ways of associating happiness with consumption, economics and money.

It has been noted that people living in European countries value their life satisfaction very differently, despite similar levels of social and economic development (Fors 2012a: 149). Expectations about what constitutes a good life are important in this case and differ between countries, involving for example different ideas about the role of waged work – not only the matter of income (*ibid.*: 36).

One problem with the use of survey studies and the focus on happiness as measurement is the risk of a narrow focus on individuals, without providing any significant understanding of the social and cultural influences under which children and others respond to surveys (Ben-Arieh & Frønes 2011: 462, 470; Kingfisher 2013; Morrow & Mayall 2009: 227). This is especially problematic as measurements do not concern cultural tendencies: “People living in societies where personal modesty is valued over individualism may understate their levels of happiness, whereas happiness may be overstated by those living in societies that encourage individuals to ‘stand out from the crowd’” (Ballas & Dorling 2013: 465). Another problem is addressed by William Davies (2015: 21), who argues that the single scale of unhappy–happy, which involves pleasure to pain, is a monism that aligns different conditions of humans along the line of a universal measurement. Davies (*ibid.*: 241f) suggests that happiness is not really one universal measure, but is presented as such through the scale of monism which reduces the matter into simplicity rather than casting light on what the notion means.

To summarize, happiness in this model is about the production of numbers. Even if the focus is on wider masses of happy people, it is the measurement of individuals that is central to this widespread and universal model of happiness. It is, to follow Slavoj Žižek (2008a: 44f), the dominant approach to happiness today, being a quantitative approach that focuses on large numbers of individuals.

HAPPY TIMES

In this part of the chapter, I consider approaches to happiness that make it into a matter of time. As such, happiness is associated with childhood, family, and theme parks. These models of happiness are not total in the

sense of suggesting that happiness is equally available or present among individuals. Instead, the approaches below involve differences and particular moments – e.g. of tourism – where cultural ideals of happiness are realized.

Childhood

Notions of happiness and childhood stretch back to Rousseau’s claim that all children want to be happy (Nussbaum 2008: 97), and his influence in making happiness into a target for education to produce productive citizens (Söderfeldt & Verstraete 2013: 254f). In the following, I turn to some recent studies concerning the history and current state of happiness and childhood. Following the initial observation, I suggest that it is not only children who are involved in ideals and practices of a happy childhood, but also writers, political writers, parents and policy-makers.

Within the field of childhood studies, there has been comparatively little attention given to ideals of happiness, in relation to concerns about what Neil Thin (2012: 10) calls pathologies and problems.²⁷ Peter N. Stearns (2012b: 109) writes of the “unhappy childhood” as a “modern scourge.” Perhaps the previous focus on problems in research also makes sense in relation to happiness – as a way of solving problems and providing ways toward a better life?

Neil Thin (2012: 149) argues that: “The happy childhood is one of the bolder promises of modernity – the aspirational belief that we may at last have found the ability to offer most of the world’s children an extended period of safety and enjoyment.” Scholars of childhood have historicized the happy state of childhood (Stephens 1995: 14). The notion of a happy childhood is a recent historical construct, as shown by Peter N. Stearns (2010, 2012a) and is associated with the development of industrial capitalism (Kapur 2005a: 50). Jyotsna Kapur (2005a: 50) argues that, as industrial capitalism developed, childhood turned into an illusion of a “blissful, happy state.” “Happy childhood” was also made a slogan in the Soviet Union from the 1920s onwards (Kelly 2009: 6). Hugh Cunningham (2007: 19) observes that childhood associations with happiness were of little

---

²⁷ During the 20th century, the social sciences were more concerned with oppression, power and death than with issues of the good life and happiness (Hylland Eriksen 2008: 10). This is less the case today, which has seen a “positive” turn in psychology, and the developing interdisciplinary field of happiness studies.

relevance before the 18th century. Gill Valentine (1997: 66) describes the development of childhood along with happiness, during the 20th century, as being about segregating childhood from adulthood, related to ideals of a free time of innocence.

Berry Mayall (1998: 139) observes that innocence is associated with childhood and comes with expectations that children should be happy, committed to play, in the company of toys, rather than being with adults. Happiness is a requirement and, according to Mayall, this consequently makes adults protective and encourages them to withhold knowledge from children that might sadden them. Ideally, then, the happy childhood is a temporality in which children are offered a quality of life, where, according to Stearns (2010), parents keep troubles away. Stearns shows that the increased value of children, greater expertise, a greater emphasis on schooling and cheerfulness within a changing economy are all related to the development of the happy childhood at the beginning of the 20th century.

Sara Ahmed (2008, 2010a) highlights the cultural and social pressures of becoming happy in particular ways and that happiness for some might generate unhappiness for others. The expectation of childhood happiness becomes, in the view of feminist theorists, a burden on women, as the realization of happy children involves the work of women (Baader 2012: 495f). There might consequently be costs for happy children that are paid by others. It has also been observed that a happy childhood is not only a concern that is for the benefit of children, but also works as a way for adults and societies at large to manifest prosperity and harmony, as well as a way of making adults happy (Shanahan 2007: 415). Clearly, childhood and happiness extend beyond children.

It has been argued that the imperative of happiness is widespread: it is not about choice, but forceful demands that are imposed upon people as an imperative of our times (Ahmed 2010a; Berardi 2009: 90f; Burnett 2012; Žižek 2008a). These imperatives are distributed to children and throughout the family (Ahmed 2010a; Bruckner 2010: 2), as well as in working life (Cederström & Spicer 2015: 4, 21, 73f; Dahlgren & Starrin 2004: 46).²⁸ The

---

²⁸ Observations about the imperative of happiness are not anything new. It is distributed in the work of Adorno (1986[1954]: 74) throughout various settings – from family to the management of the entertainment industry – making it into a matter of control, situating the inner life of individuals within mechanisms of power, in which the powerful culture

argument in these studies is that people live under conditions where the imperative to *be happy!* is strong. This has effects not only on individuals, but also on family life, in which parents are expected to serve and provide for the happiness of their children.

Happiness is commonly associated with positive matters, but writings on happiness also concern domination and suffering (Cieslik 2015: 426). While the development of ideals and practices of the happy childhood have been noticed by some scholars, there are also those who note that childhood for most children is about other things. For example, childhood goes on too long, and involves pain rather than happiness (Holt 1975: 23). Researchers and childhood activists are currently focusing on finding solutions, or answers, for how to avoid problems and achieve happiness. Activists like Susan Linn (2008) and Sue Palmer (2006), as well as researchers including Richard Layard and Judy Dunn (2009), are worried about the current state of childhood and argue that extensive commerce threatens the lives of children today. Their arguments fit well with a view of childhood in which children should learn to wait and postpone pleasures, for the sake of increasing the happiness of life in a wider sense (Binkley 2014: 59ff; see also Brusdal & Frønes 2014: 1440).

A key concern for Linn (2008: 3f) is fantasy and happiness, an aspect which in her view is under threat as play becomes commercialized and consequently restricted. Limited market engagement is seen as a way towards creating a happy childhood: children should consequently not be involved in extensive consumption, at least if childhood is to be genuinely happy. A goal – for activists and politically engaged scholars – is to make children happier beings through the development of a happy childhood that provides space for certain qualities: offering freedom, play, creativity, children-being-children, but not intense or stressful numbers of experiences offered within commercial culture (Linn 2008; Palmer 2006).²⁹ Building on survey studies, Juliet B. Schor (2005: 160) asks how “children’s involvement in consumer culture affects their well-being,” suggesting that

---

industry has a key role – the inner life of individuals thus becomes part of a capitalist domination, for which culture accordingly plays a key role. The imperative on individuals to be happy was observed by C. Wright Mills (2002: 235) in the 1950s, in discussing how human relations management works to make employees happy, co-operative and efficient.

²⁹ For a critique of these arguments, from childhood scholars, see Buckingham (2011: 28–30) and Clarke (2008: 253f).

“less involvement in consumer culture leads to healthier kids, and more involvement leads kids’ psychological well-being to deteriorate” (ibid.: 167). Materialism in general, according to Schor, is related to many problems, including poor quality of life, vandalism, not performing well at school, etc. (ibid.: 174). A similar argument is made by Agnes Nairn (2010: 111), who suggests that there are “strong correlations between materialism and negative wellbeing,” but also calls for ethnographic research to gain a developed understanding of how brands are involved in children’s everyday lives.

Disney and McDonald’s are frequently portrayed as businesses that lure children, making them associate commercial products with desirable emotions and what feels good. These observations take a broad approach to childhood, and claim that children “learn” or are made to “believe” that consumption equals happiness (e.g. Pecora 1998: 153; Zornado 2001: 157). There are arguments that children ought to be trained in activities which benefit happiness (Fors 2012a: 174ff), separating the learning children from adults who have already learnt previously. Some critical scholars argue that consumer culture is making childhood a “saleable commodity” (Giroux 2009) and that it can “undermine the ideals of a secure and happy childhood” (Giroux & Pollock 2011: 73f).

A focus on childhood as problematic in terms of happiness with a focus on the ill-doings of consumer capitalism suggests that there is today too much concern about commercial matters, and too little focus on play and creativity. These latter qualities seem to be natural properties of childhood, in an ideal sense. Curiously, this contrasts with observations of how a happy childhood is re-enacted in nostalgic ways by adults who engage in the pleasurable consumption of material things (Hamilton 2007: 69; Wickstrom 2006: 70).

In the claims that a happy childhood is distanced from capitalism and consumption, there are calls for making childhood into an isolated island (Gillis 2008), cut off from what is part of a commercial adulthood, so as to ensure happiness. Notions associated with happiness – fantasy, play, creativity – resonate with what are sometimes described as images of a good childhood, involving nature, learning, creativity and friendship (e.g. Eckert 2001: 107–112; Halldén 2011: 23). These seemingly authentic qualities contrast with notions of artificial happiness in the previous model, which become part of discussions about childhood.

The point of this model, to summarize, is that *childhood is a construct which ideally involves happiness, overcoming various external threats*.

Family

Bertrand Russell (1996: 152), in discussing happiness almost a century ago, writes that one makes happiness possible for oneself through becoming a parent. The idea that happiness stems from having children is also observable in the writings of ancient Greek philosophers who viewed children as external goods of happiness (McMahon 2006: 47). According to a leading Swedish thinker of the 20th century, Alva Myrdal, it is necessary to give life to several children, as “miniature” families cannot expect much happiness (Bok 2011: 7).

Does happiness come with children? This is a question that continues to concern scholars as well as authors of self-help books. Scholars – exploring social and cultural ideals – argue that marriage and having children are associated with happiness (Hochschild 2012), and so is the family in a wider sense (Ahmed 2008; see also Casey 2008).

In writings about measurements of happiness and life satisfaction, it has been argued that becoming a parent involves a reduction in happiness – as shown in quantitative studies (Blanchflower & Oswald 2008; Blom & Hammarkrantz 2014: 190f; Frijters & Beaton 2012; Jacquemot 2009: 102f). Statistically, people follow a U-shape of happiness during their life course, where young and old people are the happiest, with a dip during middle age (Hyman 2014a: 7). Is it being a parent or being middle-aged that makes people less happy? This thesis is not the place to answer this far-reaching question. And in this part I am more interested in ideals of happiness and family.

Love is an ideal that has become intimately associated with happiness (Illouz 1997), with notions that relationships are healthy and constitute a happy life (Illouz 2007: 46, 68; see also Binkley 2014: 143–146). In Sweden, and certainly in other countries, there are particular times which serve the purposes of fulfilling ideals of family. Orvar Löfgren (1993: 219) argues that Christmas involves “the dream of the good person and the happy family,” being “a utopia of togetherness, generosity, warmth and caring.” Christmas is a time of celebrating the virtues of family – and trying to make positive values a reality.

Tourism is a tool for fulfilling ideals of the “happy family”, and securing the happiness of the family is a responsibility of parents (Carr 2011: 16, 21). Ivar Frønes (2011: 282) argues that amusement park visits and holidays make up “rituals of a good family” and are constituents of it. In a wider sense, happiness, during a limited time, is a central goal of companies in the tourism business (Schough & Tesfahuney 2010: 23).

Maureen Harrington (2013: 236, 239) argues that parents “hope that their actions will give their children happy memories of family leisure,” but warns against normalizing the happy family, rather than deconstructing it. It is consequently important to ask questions about what makes the happy family into an achievable ideal, and how it is enacted – rather than assuming that it exists, as such. Bonnie C. Hallman and S. Mary P. Benbow (2010: 15) suggest that “good parenting, by mothers and fathers, increasingly is defined by time spent in recreational family activities that parents undertake in order to willingly fulfill what is understood as a duty to promote positive family functioning (communication, togetherness, closeness, cohesion) and well-being.”

Regardless of the statements about ideals and practices, above, family holidays are “a relatively under-researched issue” (Gram 2005b: 8). This is also the case for what Marjorie L. DeVault (2000, 2011) calls “family outings”, such as the zoo visits investigated in her work, which have been given little attention in previous research.³⁰ Tourism and leisure do not necessarily involve parents and children in activities equally, and the notion of family in tourism calls for further scrutiny (Obrador 2012). Only rarely are the different interests of children and adults investigated during vacations, highlighting different interests in family tourism (Hartl & Gram 2008: 232). It is important to discuss these issues, taking into consideration the fact that research on children and money has shown that there are tensions and negotiations (Davidson 2012; Lawlor & Prothero 2011; Sparman 2009) as well as “happy” aspects of negotiations between parents and children about making purchases (Lawlor & Prothero 2011).

---

³⁰ Calls for developments in tourism studies also include investigations of how everyday life and tourism are interrelated (Edensor 2001; O’Dell 2007), focusing, for example, on post-travel narratives (Morgan & Pritchard 2005: 47) and materialities (Haldrup & Larsen 2006).

The point of this model is that *happiness comes with family life*, through intimate relations and togetherness.

Theme parks

It is now time to move on to a consideration of research into a place where families are expected to encounter opportunities for happiness: the theme park.

Theme parks are marketed as sites for a family day out (Clavé 2007: 28f, 246; Philips 2012: 28f). Research has highlighted that theme parks sell happy experiences and happiness (Gram 2005a; Van Maanen 1992) and are sites that offer visitors experiences of happiness and pleasure (Lukas 2010: 144). “Fun” is a theme of advertising, from Sea World in the USA to theme parks in Europe (Davis 2005). The famous Disney theme parks are frequently marketed as the happiest place(s) on Earth (Wing Yee Choi 2007). It has even been stated that the “perfect world of Disney has replaced the biblical Garden of Eden as the American vision of paradise” (Adams 1991: 156).

The point of this model is that *there are places where a time of happiness is available*.

It is common to focus on Disney in studies of theme parks, and to relate these parks to wider tendencies in society and capitalism at large.³¹ Many scholars stick with a story of control when it comes to descriptions of theme parks. It is suggested that the Disney parks offer a “happy regulated vision of pleasure” (Sorkin 1992a: xv), where the focus of research is on ideology and on the regulated mass of consumers (e.g. Arnal 2001; Gottdiener 1982; Marin 1984). Umberto Eco (1986), in his writing on Disneyland, argues that visitors need to act like robots within the park. This observation of control, where a company manages people, is quite a common description in structuralist contributions. Disneyland is, accordingly, an ode to capitalism (Arnal 2001: 17), it is about belief and “offers a nostalgic, unreal reality that confirms the ‘real’ reality outside of the park” (Zornado 2001: 154). It is a

---

³¹ In the historical account of Judith Adams (1991) and the work of Stephen Fjellman (1992), Disney plays the leading role. Discussing these theme parks as sites for enjoyment and control, both authors emphasize how the Disney business influences American culture. Children are mentioned, but not included in any exhaustive discussion. Occasionally they are brought in, for example when describing how parks arrange their attractions (Fjellman 1992: 272).

place that offers an opportunity to escape everyday life (Lukas 2008: 7, 235). The theme park has been described as a typical example of current times (Gilfoyle 1998: 191) and “a manifestation of post-modern cultural production” (Symes 1995: 11).

In studies of theme parks these places are presented as being delimited, where public disorder and social problems are “left outside the gates” (Archer 1997: 333; see also Harrington 1979; Hunt & Frankenberg 1997: 116f).³² A matter of concern for researchers who discuss theme parks is emotions, or, to be more precise, how park managers/employers socially direct co-workers to invest happy and emotional expressions into their jobs (e.g. Lainsbury 2000; Newcomb 2003; Raz 2002a; Reyers & Matusitz 2012; Van Maanen 1992; Wing Yee Choi 2007). Employees, it is suggested, are subject to emotional work and drawn into strategies of smiling and acting according to corporate scripts.

Miodrag Mitrašinović (2006) and Scott Lukas (1998) discuss the role played by theme parks in terms of aesthetics and control, at book length. In their treatments one gets a sense of how corporations direct consumers, getting them involved in experiences and environments according to plans made up before the visitors arrive. Visitors, it is suggested by several observers, are offered particular and specific choices within a fully controlled structure (see also Johnson 1981: 162; Wright 2006). Some research focuses on the management of theme parks and highlights that there are in fact problems and disorder in the Disney parks, beyond corporate ideals of happiness (Boje 1995; Smith & Eisenberg 1987).

Stjepan G. Mestrovic (1997) argues that rationality, rather than emotions, has been the concern in previous research about theme parks. Mestrovic’s observation suggests that emotions are secondary in studies that highlight the control and rational management of corporations such as Disney. The rationality of theme parks – to control visitors and employees and to make money – is well documented, but actual visits are less so.

---

³² Historical explorations account for how purity and safety became important in the early-modern amusement park, with ambitions of controlling the thrills offered rather than letting these be matters of chance, or risk (Millhauser 1993). How theme parks ought to control their audiences, e.g. managing queues, is an example of the applied research available within this field (Heung et al. 2009). Researchers also study how global corporations such as Disney adapt to local circumstances, in different parts of the world – adjusting their contents and the prices of consumables (Matusitz 2010).

According to Yi-Fu Tuan (1998: xii), “well-educated people [...] are taught to dismiss the theme park as an unreal, fantasy world” (see also Davis 1997: 6f). Is this perhaps why there has been so little concern with the details of theme park visits in research? Thin rather than thick descriptions are common, and they move hastily and without further discussion.

Alan Bryman (1995: 185) argues that the Disney parks are used as “illustrations of pet ideas, but do not proceed much further,” suggesting that there is a limited discussion about how parks are used in practice and how they are received (see also Billig 1994; Buckingham 1997: 288; Raz 2002b: 294). The problem with studies of theme parks is that they are “depopulated,” i.e. they rarely concern what visitors actually do (Billig 1994; see also Cardell 2013a).

During the 1980s, there were calls for research involving park consumers (Moore 1980: 216; Thompson 1983: 154). During the 1990s, studies “from below” were conducted (Raz 1999), and more were called for (Paterson 2006: 170). Pettigrew argues that “empirical studies involving actual park visitors appear to be virtually non-existent” (2011: 146). Despite different calls to involve consumers and claims about having done so, there are very few presentations of findings that involve or focus on people.

In rare studies, scholars have joined children in theme parks to figure out primarily what the *parks* are about. Kirsti Mathiesen Hjemdahl (2003a: 38f) suggests that theme park visits live up to ideals of family life, where there is no stress. It has been argued that “happy children” are the aim of such visits (Gram 2005a). This is also why visitors come to theme parks (Hunt & Frankenberg 1997: 121f). Nick Johns and Szilvia Gyimóthy (2002) show that children are at the center of theme park visits to Legoland, in Denmark, and that some adults “felt that the primary goal of holidaying was to provide a great time for the children” (ibid.: 325f). Some parents were suffering for the benefit of their children, and others said they were happy as long as their children were happy (ibid.: 326). Bodil Stilling Blichfeldt (2008: 297f) makes similar observations in a study where it is shown that the fun enjoyed by children at Legoland came at the cost of parents sacrificing themselves. According to parents, going to a theme park like Legoland is about providing children with experiences and what is considered fun (Blichfeldt 2008: 297f). Susan Willis (1995: 49) suggests that theme park visits can also work as a way of confirming family, to “concretize the experience of family”; where they achieve togetherness that is rare elsewhere (ibid.: 51).

Kimburley Wing Yee Choi (2007) interviewed six children. Simone Pettigrew (2011), Anthony Fung and Micky Lee (2009), and William Van Wert (1995) include their own children, who provide meaning to and comments about theme parks. There are differences regarding how children are involved in these studies, from those where children are part of the research but are not made into any major concern in the analysis (Wing Yee Choi 2007) to those that discuss children's practices and make them visible (Hjemdahl 2003a), and those in between, where children are quoted and involved to a small extent (Van Wert 1995).

In her dissertation about Scandinavian theme parks, Hjemdahl (2003a) invited one six-year-old boy as her assistant. Hjemdahl discusses how parks are used in ways that are not intended to be understood in terms of resistance. Being in theme parks, observing what happens there, Hjemdahl is able to challenge the arguments of theorists who state that consumers act as predictably as robots (see Eco 1986), doing what they are asked to do.³³ In Hjemdahl's (2003a) study, it is more uncertain what theme parks are about for visitors, than in other previously discussed studies. In my view, this is an outcome of her approach that is inspired by cultural studies and its attention to power and resistance. Hjemdahl calls for further empirical investigations highlighting practices.

An important note for this study is made by Wing Yee Choi (2007: 316), who argues that "Disneyland sells happiness, but happiness needs cooperation from customers to make the sale work. Visitors' behavior is the most difficult park-related aspect for HKDL [Hong Kong Disneyland] management to tame and control." Drawing on this approach, it makes sense not to fall into the trap of easily accepting marketing slogans of happiness in tourism and theme parks as a simple answer to what happens there, inside the gates.

Visits by children and their families are spoken of in previous research but scholars rarely include children or families in any detailed accounts. Taking numbers into consideration, children's involvement in the studies is truly

---

³³ Hjemdahl (2003a) is critical of previous studies which focus on structures and power, whilst ignoring practices occurring in the parks. They are one-sided, focusing on the control and intentions of management rather than what is taking place during visits to the parks. By focusing on structures and park organizations, primarily Disneyland and Disney World in the USA, studies of theme parks have failed to account in detail for *how* and *when* visitors make use and sense of such settings and if they do so in different ways (Hjemdahl 2003b).

limited – to one or a couple of children. Sweeping observations about happiness and fun do not build on any extensive material that is subject to analysis. So, it makes sense here to draw on the ethnographic approach that is advocated by Hjemdahl (2003a) in her study on theme park visits, which offers an opportunity to develop insights into happiness and poses challenges to previous sweeping accounts that provide little detail about why theme parks are happy places. Conducting a study “from below”, to focus on lived and social practice, rather than the parks per se (Säävälä 2006: 397f), means that happiness is approached through what people do, and how they get involved with theme parks in different ways.³⁴

WAYS FORWARD

As has been pointed out in this chapter, promises of happiness are grandiose in their universal reach. Happiness is often associated with a linear route – through which it becomes present as different criteria are fulfilled. This notion of movement towards happiness is accompanied by an ideal of expectations that are set within a given order. Happiness has been described in terms of a culture of happiness, or as part of consumer society, capitalism and childhood. Such descriptions give a rather static role to societal structures, as already existing. In this sense, society, culture or corporate childhood distribute happiness on pre-defined terms from above. This suggests that people are aligned in a “mass” in a way that is similar to an “aggregate of atoms with little mutual attraction”, i.e. many people constitute a mass by relying on a “false individuality” (Bauman 2001: 105).

What is happiness? This question should perhaps more correctly be phrased: what *are* happinesses? Sam Binkley (2014: 105) suggests that there are two “happinesses”, one collective and one individual. In this chapter I have gone beyond these two kinds of happiness to suggest that, in addition, there are qualities and different extents of collectives, in outlining seven models that besides *luck and chance* are grouped into two parts:

- ☺ The happy masses: Artificial vs. authentic; Individual orientations; Aggregated values
- ☺ Happy times: Childhood; Family; Theme parks

---

³⁴ “From below” is a problematic term in the sense that it suggests that there is an opposing “top”; thus dividing the world into different levels. It does, however, describe my ambition of being on the ground with children rather than focusing on abstract notions of structure and order from a distance.

These models are not necessarily distinct. For the sake of illustration, the happy place of the theme park in practice requires visitors – be it a family striving for happiness or people having individual responses to it, or having another agenda. Another example is that the model of childhood might involve a division between artificial and authentic happiness.

The benefit of outlining models of happiness is that it becomes possible to navigate different notions of happiness through a balance between detail and summary. The models are not exhaustive or necessarily the only ones that are relevant when exploring happiness, but they provide a starting point for further explorations. The models, taken together, assist in acknowledging happiness as a “slippery concept” (Cieslik 2015: 426), which is a multiple phenomenon in existing research. In the forthcoming chapters I draw on the accounts presented above, to discuss, in further detail, how practice is associated with the ideals and ideas that are put forth in the above models.

In his review of previous childhood research, Thin (2012) emphasizes that happiness is a field of inquiry that calls for further scrutiny (see also Ben-Arieh et al. 2014: 18f). It is possible to approach happiness through different notions and theories. What happiness means today, in practice, remains to be investigated as there is a lack of research regarding children and vacations, leaving space for further explorations (Carr 2011: 10, 117; see also Blichfeldt et al. 2010).

It has been argued that happiness “nowadays comes to us as a self-evident, ahistorical and acultural good” (Söderfeldt & Verstraete 2013: 251). Happiness is a notion that has developed historically, whereby previous meanings might seem distant today (Colebrook 2007: 90).³⁵ In observing its different meanings, researchers have described happiness as heterogeneous (Morgan 2014: 221), and a far from straightforward concept (Hyman 2014b: 29). Happiness is described as an enigma (Bruckner 2010: 3), as mythical (Blom & Hammarkrantz 2014: 19). This might explain why happiness has become a matter of intense dispute (Bok 2011: 13). The same problems with

---

³⁵ For some ancient philosophers, happiness is a matter of consideration in retrospect; suggesting that it is most properly associated with humans who are, or will be, diseased – judgments about the quality of a life that now lies in the past, whether it was good and happy (see Bok 2011: 52ff, McMahon 2006: 7). In this approach, happiness turns into a review matter, and a concern of others, at the very end. Aristotle suggested that “we could call no man happy until he is dead” (Colebrook 2007: 87). For some, like Immanuel Kant, happiness was located in a life to come after death (Bok 2011: 59).

meaning arise with well-being (Morrow & Mayall 2009: 221, 227), a notion that is used synonymously with happiness by scholars (Costley et al. 2011: 210). Well-being has puzzled researchers and practitioners (Wood & Smith 2004: 544). The diversity of studies that make use of the concepts of happiness and well-being makes it quite challenging to summarize research in any unified way – but the models tackle this challenge by presenting happiness in its multiplicity.

Recently, there has been a critique of approaches to happiness which make it into a universal matter, recognizing that “cultural variations on happiness are considerable” (Stearns 2012b: 104; see also Levisen 2014; Wierzbicka 2010). Ashley Frawley (2015: 63f) suggests that any universal idea of happiness is troublesome, as it involves a kind of unchanging essence, rather than being a relational and changing matter. C. Kingfisher (2013: 74) argues that we need to pay attention to happiness and well-being as cultural matters, calling for ethnographic studies that focus on the ways in which practices and experiences differ between contexts. There has, however, been little focus on happiness in anthropology or sociology, in comparison with other disciplines such as psychology or economics (Hyman 2014: 3; Miles-Watson 2010: 125f).

It is rare to pose questions about what happiness means for children when it comes to theme park visits. On the contrary, it is common for researchers to take notions of “happiness” in marketing (of Disney theme parks) as accounting in a full sense for the activities of visitors without even analyzing visits. Several available theories of happiness provide dichotomies – e.g. real/authentic, available/unavailable – or offer neat answers to how a phenomenon like the theme park visit should be understood.

My argument is that happiness calls for more complex and detailed explorations than those that are available in much of the research. A critical starting point for this thesis is the recognition of the multiplicity of happiness. Here, Annemarie Mol (2002) and John Law (1994, 2004) are inspirational sources for thinking about happiness through practice, avoiding the assumption that there is *one* all-encompassing and universal happiness. Instead of thinking of happiness as passive and an unproductive part of an already-established order, I consider practices as central to the accomplishment of happiness. This approach differs from observations in which people make up a stable mass of happy or unhappy people, and requires empirical explorations that are attuned to what people do and to

their world, where things happen. In the next chapter I will outline the approach to happiness that is taken in this thesis in greater detail.

CHAPTER 3

A MESHWORK OF HAPPINESS: A THEORETICAL APPROACH

This chapter outlines the theoretical approach of the study. In the first part I suggest that an interdisciplinary approach is fruitful for theorizing happiness through *wayfaring*. It will be argued that wayfaring provides an opportunity for exploration that avoids falling into what I consider to be a *trap of happiness*: the lure of making happiness into a “bulldozer concept” (Binkley 2014: 9), which makes it universal and reduces its complexity. Following this first part, I discuss how the notions of *practice* and *enactment* assist in grasping happiness in its multiplicity. At the end, I point to how explorations of happiness through nitty-gritty practices allow for a critical understanding that is of political relevance.

INTERDISCIPLINARY PRACTICES

It should be noted from the outset that happiness does not easily fit within the confines of one, and only one, discipline. Happiness is a topic that calls for interdisciplinary engagements. Inspired by Annemarie Mol (2002: ix), I draw on research from different traditions in ways that blur disciplinary boundaries. Here, this means that there will be an involvement and dialog with several disciplines and interdisciplinary fields of scholarship. In the next section, I outline an approach to happiness that is attentive to description, beginning with the notion of sociology as a site that is in dialog and debate with other disciplines (Urry 2005).

Slowciology

Mark Cieslik (2015: 423) calls for sociological studies that take happiness seriously, that do not distract us from investigating the complex accounts of ordinary people and “of what happiness means to them in everyday life.” Cieslik is right in my view, since there is plenty of research addressing happiness without a thick contextual understanding. What is needed, I believe, is a “*slowing down* [of] the activity of doing social research,” (Gad & Jensen 2010: 63, italics in original). This implies a commitment to description, which could even be termed *slowciology* as an alternative to sociology, which has moved fast in its ambition to make vast claims about the world (Latour 2005: 122, 150, 171). This approach requires us to avoid

shortcuts where matters of concern are explained away too easily. Also, it offers a critical distance in the sense that practices and stories in a wider sense are treated as relevant, which avoids turning one and only one into the point of reference, and others into distractions (Law 1994: 39). Practically speaking, this means not buying into *one* of the previously outlined models, but investigating the relevance of a range of models for children and their families by turning to explorations conducted via fieldwork.

I argue that description becomes a critical instrument to turn against simplistic, universal and general claims (Latour 2005: 115, 135–137). In contrast to some critical work, this book involves a great deal of description in order to explore happiness as changing and related to different circumstances. Description here means staying close to children and their families, observing what they say and do, and not doing violence to their accounts for the purpose of appraising one general story (Lee 2001; Sparrman & Sandin 2012: 16f) – of which there are many when it comes to happiness.

I believe that calls for slowing research down and providing detailed accounts are productive in adding to and questioning grand theories of happiness. In my view, this allows a greater exchange between various practices and different ideas of happiness. With the possibilities of *slowciology* in mind, I move on to address the possibilities of wayfaring for exploring happiness and its entanglements.

Wayfaring and meshwork

In the previous models of happiness, individual and collective orientations provide a path toward a goal, where a current moment is expected to lead on to a happy future if the right actions – visiting a theme park, becoming a parent, engaging in relationships – are carried out: happiness is the goal. This gives the impression that happiness is achieved by following straight lines and that it is a journey offering one tangible goal. In this case, happiness is thought of as a kind of movement that can be described as *transport*. In this section I discuss the notions of *wayfaring* and *the meshwork* and their usefulness.

Following Ingold (2009a: 35, 38), transport is destination-oriented (the goal is key), and leads from one place to the next: it is about connecting the dots of departure and arrival via straight-line movements. Exploration and journeys that surprise are set aside if transport is the guiding metaphor for

the course of action. The notion of transport highlights the ways in which happiness has been approached – from one dot to the goal, as a kind of leap-frogging.

Ingold (2009a) argues that we can acquire a different kind of knowledge through being attentive to movement, through meaningful *wayfaring*. Wayfaring is about continuous movement through which one does not follow an already-established route of certainties, with a goal in mind. It is more attuned to the exploration of occurrences through movement, pointing to entanglements, rather than being attentive to destinations in isolation (ibid.: 41–43). There is consequently not *one* already established reference point for what and where happiness is.

An attentiveness to wayfaring, in contrast to transport, challenges models of happiness that suggest a straight line model of how it is, or should, be achieved. Wayfaring suggests that the world is indeed messier than providing paths of transport – where there are straight lines towards tangible goals.

Ingold (2007a: 4, 155; 2015: 3) pays attention to what he calls the hegemony of the straight line, suggesting that thinking and acting through the straight connection between two dots or *blobs* has been influential for modernity. In relation to the previously outlined models of happiness, it is noticeable that the straight line is maintained as a predictable and overview-able movement: by doing this or that people are expected to be rewarded, to become happy (see also Ahmed 2011: 162). Blobs remind me of the atoms that make up a mass – aligned next to each other, rather than entangled. Following Ingold, I want to consider entanglements to suggest that nothing is complete in itself. Rather than having a pure presence that is observable in isolation, as a “blob” (Ingold 2015: 3, 6) happiness becomes a messy matter – of relative disorder and vagueness (Law 2004: 2).

To highlight how people and various matters are entangled, Ingold uses the metaphor of *meshwork*.³⁶ Meshwork suggests that nothing is complete in itself. To provide some further clarity, the meshwork suggests a world that

---

³⁶ See Ingold (2007a, 2008, 2009a, 2010, 2015). Ingold (2010: 11) recognizes the critical French sociologist and philosopher Henri Lefebvre as inspirational for his thinking on meshwork – from whom he borrows this notion. Meshwork also has some similarities with time-geography and the work of Torsten Hägerstrand, to be discussed elsewhere (see also Ingold 2009b: 150f).

is social, material, and changing, in which entanglements are crucial. The meshwork is ever-changing, rather than being static (Ingold 2008, 2015: 6, 10).³⁷ Meshwork is a theoretical metaphor (Czarniawska 2013: 15f). Do we need more metaphors to consider happiness? I argue that it depends on the metaphors, and those involving meshwork contribute to understanding happiness in a way that recognizes multiplicity and entanglements.

The attentiveness to entanglements of the material and the social in Ingold's work suggests that research should not be bounded by a preconception of what happiness might involve. This offers an approach in which one (definition or model of) happiness has not already triumphed over the others at the outset of the study. It means that happiness is part of changing conditions, in a social and material world, that it involve various matters and conditions to exist. The meshwork offers an approach that opposes simplification and limiting happiness into blobs. And happiness, in my view, involves some of the concerns to which Ingold is attentive: conditions of life that make the topic of happiness into an issue in the first place – air, water, and energizing materials, a world to act in and that offers surprises.³⁸ This is not the place for mapping out the general conditions of life that make happiness a matter of concern.

Wayfaring offers a possibility of exploration within the meshwork. Ingold do not provide a guide to how to approach happiness. Some translation is consequently necessary. Wayfaring the meshwork of happiness suggests a non-hierarchical approach. In principle, to draw upon wayfaring and the meshwork is to advocate an open approach, which does not, however, ignore the possibility that there might also be aspirations of happiness as blobs and getting there through transport. While the approach is non-hierarchical, it might turn out that there is a deployment of hierarchies (Czarniawska 2013: 15f; Linstead & Pullen 2007: 1489). But this is not assumed at the outset. Similar to the ambitions of Science and Technology Studies (STS) scholars, this means staying with the mess of reality as it develops, considering hierarchies or order as an achievement of ordering

---

³⁷ Nick Lee (1998: 477) suggests that “sociological theory privileges the mature and the complete over the immature and the unfinished.” He suggests an immature sociology, which is attuned to the incomplete (ibid.: 465). This is similar to the attentiveness to the emerging in Ingold.

³⁸ The notion of meshwork has recently been developed as an alternative to the network. Ingold (2008, 2012) suggests that networks stick with blobs and leaves the conditions of life, matters such as air and water, unnoticed. Also, networks assume hierarchy and a center, and this is the concern (Linstead & Thanem 2007: 1489).

(cf. Law 2004; Mol 2002). By approaching happiness through wayfaring, we experience encounters with happiness in practice when, for example, people conduct theme park visits. In the next part I connect wayfaring and meshwork to the notions of practice and enactment.

PRACTICES OF HAPPINESS

In this part, I suggest that the notions of enactment and practice provide a way toward understanding *happinesses* (Binkley 2014: 105) – coexistences of happiness in a plural sense, which assist in recognizing it as “a more complex phenomenon” than has been suggested by previous research (Hyman 2014b: 29). Following this, there is no one pure and already existing substance of happiness, but possible outcomes of several, which might mix or not work together.

Practice and enactment

Enactment suggests that happiness can be approached as a crafted matter, rather than being located inside individuals, as medicine or popular psychology might suggest (cf. Mol & Law 2004: 46). Annemarie Mol (2002: vii, 32–42) uses the notion of enactment to describe the achievement of a medical diagnosis, in practice. By connecting ethnographic observations of practices to philosophical reasoning and medicine, Mol (2002: 83) outlines a novel way of recognizing disease:

If we no longer presume “disease” to be a universal object hidden under the body’s skin, but make the praxiographic shift to studying bodies and diseases while they are being enacted in daily hospital practices, multiplication follows. In practice a disease, atherosclerosis, is no longer one. Followed while being enacted atherosclerosis multiplies—for practices are many.

Enactment provides a relevant approach to happiness, since it captures multiplicity. Multiplicity makes disease, or happiness for that matter, into quite a complex thing. Mol argues that the way in which disease is enacted in one hospital department differs from another. While the same term is used in different wards of a hospital there are *coexistences* of atherosclerosis (cf. Mol & Law 2002: 8). Atherosclerosis and happiness have similarities in that they involve different notions and *sites*, various material things, and

humans.³⁹ Drawing on Mol's arguments, happiness is crafted into different matters and this allows the analysis to travel in different directions to investigate the multiple meanings of happiness. Following Mol (2002), happiness is considered in terms of enactment.⁴⁰ A consequence is that there is no longer *one* happiness to be uncovered. And this means that happiness turns into *happinesses* (Binkley 2014: 105).

Both atherosclerosis and happiness involve movement, and possibilities of change. In order to address multiplicity and how coexistences are managed, Mol speaks of *coordination* (2002, chapter 3). This suggests that different approaches to atherosclerosis – or happiness – might be in conversation, clash, or remain at a distance from each other. There simply is no one given way in which enactments at different sites relate, and if or how these are coordinated. It is a matter that calls for exploration.

Mol's (2002) attention to practice and enactment allows me to emphasize multiplicity. Existing models of happiness might be enacted in ways that coexist with others, or they may be coordinated so that there is distance between them. The focus on practice and enactment means that the presence of some of the models presented in the above research review will possibly be recognized, and related to each other in ways that point to coexistences and coordination. With enactment, it becomes possible to ask questions about what happiness does through investigating practices, rather than what it "is" (Mol 2002; see also Ahmed 2007: 7).

Enactment suggests, for example, that happiness does not just exist "out there" but that it is being generated through relational, social and material entanglements in practice. That is, enactment makes it possible to study the ways in which happiness is made and done in and through practices.

Looking at practice, it is unlikely that we will end up finding a time and place where there is *only* the enactment of happiness, since happiness does not stand alone. Enactment involves an entanglement with other matters as

---

³⁹ Both are subject to medical research, body scans, scientific inquiries through questions and answers, and involve exchanges of meaning between experts and lay people. While atherosclerosis is subject to clinical treatment, happiness is not. It is rather conceived of as a desirable opposite to depression, and is a state towards which psychology and scholars of happiness studies strive.

⁴⁰ The object – atherosclerosis – studied by Mol could have been a different one, as she observes that there is nothing special about it in comparison with other diseases (Mol 1999: 88, note 10, 2012: 196, note 11).

well. This is particularly relevant for this thesis, where it is likely that there is no “pure” presence of happiness; this differs from the priority of identification in the hospital wards explored by Mol. It is therefore relevant to return to the entanglements of the meshwork, with a reminder of that there are no objects, or things “by themselves”, everything is part of “relations, relations which (sometimes) make things” (Callon & Law 1995: 485).

It is hard to even imagine a time and place where happiness exists in a pure and isolated state. This is why the emphasis on entanglement in the above section on wayfaring and meshwork makes sense here, and why the isolation of happiness has little relevance. Happiness runs into other matters, and other matters run into happiness. I assume that everyday life and theme park visits involve practices that can be generative in, for example, enactments of family and childhood. What practice would focus on happiness and only happiness? This is a question to which it is hard to imagine an answer. And leaving out the various things that entangle with happiness as it is enacted would reduce the nitty-gritty character of ethnographic fieldwork that is illustrative of what children do along with their families.

Impure critique and happiness

Mol’s approach has been associated with a “risk of conservatism”, because it comes along with a focus on existing practices (Harbers 2005: 582).⁴¹ What speaks against this limitation of conservatism in this study is, initially, that various alternative stories related to happiness are highlighted. In offering these, and in addressing coexistences and coordination, I create the possibility of mapping current alternatives. From an argument about the multiplicity of happiness comes the opportunity to navigate the currently very important political terrain of this subject. For the purpose of clarity, I now turn to the notion of the “critical” and its relevance in political terms for this thesis.

I find critical approaches to happiness to be not only relevant but also essential for understanding how a notion acquires meaning in ways that give the impression of being universal or neutral. Some readers will perhaps be disappointed by the fact that this thesis does not provide numbers and the

---

⁴¹ The approach of STS has been discussed as involving a “political quietism” (Söderberg & Netzén 2010: 101; see also McFall 2009).

persuasive precision that is the aim of much research in happiness studies. Being educated in cultural studies and a critical tradition of sociological thinking, I have learnt less about the art of counting than about posing questions that examine what numbers are used for – different interests, power relations and ideological usefulness.

Today one can find concepts like: critical management studies, critical child(hood) studies, critical pedagogy, critical race studies, critical masculinity studies, critical happiness studies and a critical turn in tourism studies.⁴² In critical studies with a focus on children and childhood there is one approach that is explicitly politically oriented and one that is less so. By discussing these, I hope to outline my approach in relation to empirical explorations and politics.

Leena Alanen (2011: 147) notes that childhood studies involves a critical dimension, as its focus on children has contributed to making a “difference in the world”. Emancipation and reflexivity about research practices are central in Alanen’s outline of the critical engagements of childhood studies. Included in her proposal of what Critical Childhood Studies should be is an explicitness about what a good life is and the things that are considered to be problematic. Taken altogether, Alanen’s concept of critical is about making changes, not only describing or understanding the world of children and childhood. I propose that Alanen’s framework should be read as a *critical-political* one.

In contrast to Alanen’s concept, Anna Sparrman and Pål Aarsand (2009) define Critical Child Studies as an interdisciplinary research field that avoids making claims about what is good or bad, suggesting that researchers should focus on analyzing empirical stuff related to how children live their lives; for example, in relation to social, cultural and material networks. The approach is critical in the sense that it is “questioning taken-for-granted notions”, including childhood and power for example (ibid.: 304). The authors further note that research within this field is, and should be, analytically distanced from various interests, such as professional and political ones. Sparrman and Aarsand sign up to a critical distance that is in agreement with John Law (1994: 39) in focusing on multiplicity, which

---

⁴² Different notions of what is or can be critical generate grounds for confusion. Heinz Steinert (2003: 160) argues that “The term [critical] has been trivialized, and it is no longer clear exactly what it describes.” Scholars prefer the critical, if being uncritical is the alternative – and it is now the goal of most research (Schweppenhäuser 2009: 12).

challenges uniformity through involving different stories (Sparrman & Aarsand 2009: 304; see also Lindgren 2009: 188). It is in my view a *critical-empirical* way of approaching the topic of inquiry. It avoids defining notions of good and bad at the outset.

When we use these labels, it becomes manifest that there are different branches of critical child(hood) studies. How can we navigate the possibilities available here? The differences between the two approaches outlined above have consequences for how research is conducted. The similar – critical – labels of these dissimilar frameworks can lead to confusion. To highlight my empirical interests and the multiplicity of happiness, I turn to a more detailed account of critique.

Eva Illouz (2003, 2007) argues that scholars have been involved in what she calls *pure critique*. The purity of critique has privileged certain stories and therefore been ignorant of alternative ones. Drawing on Bruno Latour's insights (2004: 248), we can say that critique has been associated with subtraction rather than multiplication. Illouz (2003) suggests an alternative to pure critique, which is *impure*, being empirically informed and politically related rather than dogmatic. Illouz (2007: 95) argues for the importance of empirical explorations of multiplicity and differences, providing a “thick contextual understanding” rather than making in-advance judgments about what is emancipatory or repressive. This is important, since exploration and an ethnographic understanding at the outset might challenge notions that we – as individuals, people in a general sense, or as collectives of researchers – have previously taken for granted.

The promising alternative, following Illouz' (2003) notion of impure critique, is to engage in a dialog about what is desirable and what is not, at the end. This opportunity becomes attainable with a thick contextual understanding. This is a way of developing a critical contribution, which involves the two critical approaches regarding children and childhood above: starting with multiplicity, challenging taken-for-granted notions, and ending up with a critique that involves a critical-political dimension (Alanen 2011; Sparrman & Aarsand 2009).

CHAPTER 4

ETHNOGRAPHIZING HAPPINESS

In this chapter I outline the methodological approach: ethnographizing happiness. In the sections that follow, I describe and discuss: how the two theme parks were selected, ways in which children and families were recruited, their involvement as participants in ethnographic interviews, mobile ethnography, and finally my collection of notes and the additional materials supporting my analyses. Then, I turn to the final set of interviews at the end of the study with children and their families. Finally, I discuss the ways in which I analyze theme park visits and interviews, through an understanding of happiness that is attentive to complexity and multiplicity.

Ethnographizing happiness means that fieldwork and interviews provide answers about what this concept means in practice. The approach draws on Science and Technology Studies (STS), and is inspired by the work of Annemarie Mol (2002) and John Law (2004). Building on their work, I address multiple meanings of happiness, in practice.

I subscribe to the empirical agenda in STS, ethnographizing target concepts (Woolgar 2012: 36), where concepts become subject to analytical exploration: the study of scale turns into scalography (Woolgar 2012), ontology into ontography (Lynch 2013; see also Bogost 2012: 36), and value into valuography (Dussauge et al. 2015). Adding “-ography” turns concepts into matters of concern, to be approached as part of practices rather than facts, or seen as having one meaning.

Ethnographizing happiness is an approach that connects my fieldwork and the diverse materials I collected to analyses drawing on STS and the notion of meshwork in anthropology. Ethnographizing means making sense of happiness by studying park visits and the accounts and actions of children and their parents at home. This means that happiness is somewhere: in the notes and supporting images, or in the video-recorded interviews – stretching from short experiences of everyday life at home to park visits. What takes place, in a wide sense, at ALW and Liseberg and in the homes of children, provides an understanding of happiness, as well as what might come along with and be beyond happiness.

The analyses focus on how happiness becomes involved with practices in different ways. In the *Thingography* chapter (chapter 5) in this thesis, material things in the homes of children are the concern, and how these are involved with happiness, in practice and in relation to wider theories. The following *Valuography* (chapter 6) concerns how the value of money and happiness becomes involved in practice, and challenges accounts in which the meaning of money is fixed. I then undertake a *Co-ordiography* (chapter 7), in which the coordination of families during visits is the focus, which is telling for orientations towards happiness but also for understanding the concept of family in new ways. Finally, the *Chronography* chapter (chapter 8) concerns time, happiness and childhood.⁴³

FINDING THEME PARKS AND CHILDREN

At the outset of this project I engaged in two parallel tasks. These were: to find suitable parks that children visit, and to determine whether it was possible to carry out a study in selected parks. I carried out one pilot study each in two of the most popular parks in Sweden, Astrid Lindgren's World (ALW) and Liseberg. Accompanying two 12-year-old boys to Liseberg, and a family with a daughter aged 2 to ALW, I learned that there are differences between how the parks are experienced. The 2-year-old girl stayed close to her parents. The two boys moved quickly, at times leaving me and my colleague behind (see Cardell & Sparrman 2012).

The pilot studies worked well in terms of discovering the possibilities of joining children during visits to the parks. Children provided valuable insights into differences between park visits, including matters of age, family, intensity and independence.

Liseberg, in Gothenburg, and ALW, in Vimmerby, attract the largest numbers of visitors in the country. Selecting these parks as settings for my fieldwork gave me the opportunity to reach possible participants, widely, which is important, as Kirsti Mathiesen Hjemdahl (2003a: 78) suggests that

---

⁴³ I have elaborated upon possible, alternative, themes for the analytical chapters, such as: gender and parenthood, disabilities and materiality, contested spaces and objects (e.g. cigarettes), undesirable emotions, and working children. However, these themes are not primarily about the participating children in this study, but focus on other issues. Did I pick the right ones? This uncertainty – that it really is hard to tell – is a concern of ethnography in a wider sense. John Law (1994: 43), for example, states that ethnography involves worries about whether one has done things properly, in relation both to other ethnographers and to ideals.

people who visit theme parks do not want to be accompanied by a researcher during the few days they spend in the park. This was an initial worry for me. It did not turn out to be a problem, as becomes evident in the following sections of this chapter.

Support from the parks

I approached ALW and Liseberg right at the start to receive approval for the research. Representatives of each park were contacted and meetings set up. During these occasions the project was introduced, and I emphasized an interest in joining children during park visits and in learning more about the places where children spend their leisure time. Both ALW and Liseberg accepted the research without promises of any particular pay-offs for them. We agreed that the park representatives would be provided with information about our conclusions.⁴⁴ The representatives were interested in the research and curious to learn more about our ideas and thoughts about children as park consumers. They were supportive in several ways and provided guidance and information about park operations when requested, putting me in contact with employees who showed me around at ALW and Liseberg.

During the initial meetings it was decided that the parks would not charge the researcher for entrance or tickets to the park attractions. This was important for us to be able to conduct the study within the available budget. At Liseberg I became an “honorary guest”. In the letter that was sent to me with the ticket there is a text signed by the CEO inviting me to bring a friend without charge, using this card, with the motivation that “shared happiness is, as you know, twice the happiness.” I did not use this benefit due to ethical reasons.

---

⁴⁴ Meetings with senior management took place on four occasions, lasting for between an hour and a couple of hours. The meetings include two occasions with Mikael Ahlerup, CEO, ALW, and two meetings with Pelle Johannison and Annika Palm of the Liseberg senior management. I was guided by Anders, a senior employee, during a day at Liseberg. At ALW I took part in portions of an educational event for newly recruited staff.

Och det vill vi fira med att höja dig till skyarna

Som nytilkommen Lisebergare är jag extra glad över att få välkomna dig till ett nytt år i vår fantastiskt fina nöjespark. Det är första gången som jag är med och slår upp grindarna och jag är stolt över att få vara delaktig i detta efterlängtrade värtecken.

Du är vår hedersgäst och därför hoppas alla vi Lisebergare att du vill besöka oss ofta. Här finns så mycket att uppleva, såväl på sommaren som under Jul på Liseberg. Kom och strosa runt i blomsterprakten, åt gott på någon av våra många restauranger, lyssna på en konsert och känn dig som hemma i Nordens största nöjespark. Och skulle andan falla på och modet infinna sig väntar en riktig utmaning då vi i år har premiär för AtmosFear – Europas högsta fritt fall! Vågar du? I så fall ses vi kanske på toppen.

Jag ser fram emot glädjen och den magiska stämningen som man upplever i Lisebergsparken. Hoppas att du känner samma längtan. Med ditt hedersgästkort är du välkommen hit alla öppettidagar hela året. Du får också ta med en vän, för delad glädje är ju som bekant dubbel glädje.

På gensyn!

Andreas Andersen
Lisebergare

Figure 4.1: Honorary guest, Liseberg.

At ALW I received an ID card for employees. It offered me park entrance and the opportunity to display my authorized involvement in the park. The CEO of ALW recognized that my presence – at times being a lone adult – might create suspicion among the dominant group of family visitors. This has also been noted elsewhere, where male ethnographers in places close to children have been discussed in relation to suspicion (Aarsand & Forsberg 2009: 162f; Hendry 2000: 207; Pole 2007; see also Blackford 2004: 232; Lukas 1998: 289f). There was however no need to show the ID card, and I experienced no suspicion about my whereabouts.

Inviting children and their families

In the invitation to participate in the research project published on the Linköping University website, it is stated that children aged 4–12 years old,

in any kind of family constellation, are welcome to take part in the study.⁴⁵ In the information that was provided via the web page of the research project, it was stated that research funds had been obtained from the Swedish Research Council – emphasizing the independent character of this research, which is not being carried out with any commercial or corporate interests in mind, but with an interest in children’s everyday practices and places. ALW and Liseberg supported the recruitment of children and families as participants in this study by distributing information about the project through social media and their websites, linking to the official invitation.⁴⁶ Families did not enter ALW or Liseberg for free, all paid for their visits.

GETTING IN CONTACT WITH CHILDREN

The call for children and families to participate in the research attracted many responses. In total there were 43 answers to the call.⁴⁷ In the communication about the research and the upcoming visits it was primarily women, mothers, who took the role of describing the interest of their children and family in contributing to the research and it was they who provided details about their plans for park visits. Several of the applicants pulled out as their summer plans changed, or because of problems in setting up dates for when we could meet. Most applicants were overwhelmingly positive about the project.⁴⁸

---

⁴⁵ Children of this age are the focus in the approved application for research funds to Vetenskapsrådet, the Swedish National Research Council (by Sparrman). In addition to the application, Wing Yee Choi (2007: 37f) and Hjemdahl (2003a) have successfully – in limited numbers – approached children of that age, 4 and above.

⁴⁶ The assistance of ALW and Liseberg in inviting children could perhaps give the impression that the project is part of the business of each park. This was not an issue in the sense that children and parents did not question the research as “commercial” or driven by business.

⁴⁷ All replies but one turned out to be from parents – received primarily by e-mail, and also by phone. It is not very surprising that it was parents who contacted me, considering the age of the children who are part of the project.

⁴⁸ One non-participating parent did, however, make the effort to tell me she was *not* interested in her children participating in the research, and it is stated in the mail that parenting would be affected if a researcher came along (parents would not feel able to become angry), and children in the family would, accordingly, not follow the ordinary family pattern of a visit.

From applicants to participants

The written applications from the parents make it clear that several of the families visit one or several parks frequently. Some have done so for several years. All applicants planned to spend time at ALW or Liseberg during the summer of 2011.⁴⁹ In some applications it is mentioned that the family, or some of its members, have or will buy annual passes. An engagement in and positive attitude towards the parks is expressed in several of the applications. In one of the applications I read about a “need” to go to Liseberg at least once a year. One family describe themselves as committed fans of ALW. One mother – Anne – presents her family as very knowledgeable: “what we don’t know about the park [ALW] is hardly worth knowing.”

Children and their families who let me take part in their park visits, and take the time for asking questions, do possibly make sacrifices. One father asked for compensation for his children to take part in the project.⁵⁰ This was an exception. Those sending in applications were willing to participate and did not ask for compensation in terms of money or valuable items. As a sign of gratitude, children were promised a diploma, and the family a visual documentation of the visit.⁵¹

Focus children

Out of 43 applicants, I had the opportunity to meet 13 children along with their parents and siblings. Nine focus children contributed to the project in full and took part in three research occasions or more (two interviews and one visit).⁵² The total number of informants, including siblings and parents, was 44, counting those who were interviewed and visited the parks. The

---

⁴⁹ Early on, many of the applicants provide information about when they were going to the parks, which was valuable in terms of planning fieldwork. It also revealed that preparations and planning are part of family leisure and allocated spots in calendars.

⁵⁰ When this one request for compensation was turned down the father showed no further interest in the study.

⁵¹ Drawing on Pink (2007a: 57), I consider images to be a sign of recognition for the children and parents for their collaborative involvement. The images also include myself, to some extent, as participants occasionally took photos of me – using my camera.

⁵² The observant reader will note a difference in numbers for the included families: 43 applicants in total, 13 who are part of the study, of which one ended their participation after the first meeting and two did not inform me about forthcoming park visits – they continually responded positively to my questions but could not provide details about when they were to visit ALW or Liseberg.

focus children belong to family constellations that differ in numbers: 1–3 child(ren) and 1–2 adult(s).

There are differences in frequency of visits and time spent at the parks. Some go to ALW or Liseberg for a few hours, while others stay for days or even weeks. For a few of the children the parks are part of their everyday lives; they live close to the parks and visit ALW or Liseberg frequently. Those families living close do not need to make advance arrangements for transportation for a visit. The remaining families were tourists, making trips with overnight stays on the occasion when they visited ALW or Liseberg.

Before going into further details here is an overview of the participating children, using pseudonyms, and information about park visits and where their families live:

Child in focus (age)	Sibling(s) (age)	Parents / present adults	Home Community-Park	Park	Day(s): observed visits	Interview(s)
Christopher (9)	John (7)	Ulrika	Near park Small city	ALW	1	#1
Tove (9)		Karin, Johan	Near park City	Liseberg	1	#1 and #2
Kim (5)	Mary (3)	Lotta, Fred	Near park City	Liseberg	1	#1 and #2
Felicia (11)	Emma (15)	Lisa, Björn	Hours away City	Liseberg	-	#1
Eric (6)	Jacob (4)	Gill, Tony	Hours away Small community	ALW	2	#1 and #2
Leo (9)	Thea (5)	Mathilda, Sven	Hours away City	Liseberg	2	#1 and #2
Rebecca (11)		Anne, Lars	Hours away City	ALW	2	#1 and #2
Rick (5)	Josef (4), Thomas (2)	Evelina, Billy	Hours away Small community	ALW	4	#1 and #2
Robin (4)	Jimmy (0.5)	Frida, Mårten	Hours away Small community	Liseberg	-	#1
Tina (6)	Pierre (4)	Helene, Robert	Hours away City	ALW	1	#1 and #2
Henrik (9)		Lovisa, Stellan	Hours away City	Liseberg	1	#1 and #2
Emil (6)		Åsa, Frank	Hours away City	ALW	-	#1
Casper (6)		Lena and Dan (friend)	Hours away City	Liseberg	1	#1 and #2
					<u>Total</u> Visits/days: 11/16	<u>Total</u> Interview #1: 13 Interview #2: 9

The children in focus live in different communities, from small villages to larger cities. Living in rental apartments, small houses, and large houses with several levels, the living conditions of the children differ. Nowhere, however, is there a shortage of space, as children and parents have their own rooms. For example, Casper (age 6) lives with his mother in a small

apartment on the outskirts of a smaller town, and Tina (age 6) lives with her family in an expensively decorated large villa in the central part of a larger city. Children's rooms and differences in where they live provide an opportunity to understand the presence of theme parks in everyday life; through material culture, and ways in which park visits become a part of everyday life, or as part of vacations and tourism.

The everyday lives of the children involve going to school or kindergarten. Some are involved in leisure activities throughout the year, playing instruments or having an interest in theatre. Others do sports. Their parents spend their everyday lives working, being students, engineers, or employed as manual laborers. They spend their leisure time doing sports, watching movies and listening to music, outdoor activities, and planning vacations with their children.

Regardless of the differences in the employments of parents, and different incomes, all are supportive of visits to and consumption of Liseberg and ALW. Some talk about saving money so that trips to the parks will be possible and many parents spend time planning when and where a park visit will take place.

GETTING TO KNOW THE CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES

My first meeting with the children and their families included an opportunity to get to know each other. The children, their parents and I spoke about the parks they were going to visit and also shared our interests. These meetings took place in the homes of each family.⁵³ Visiting children where they live enabled me to learn about the above-mentioned similarities and differences between families, homes, and about their plans for park visits.

Consent

Meeting with the children and their families in advance provided an occasion to talk about the research project. I wanted to ensure that the children and their parents received information about the research and what

---

⁵³ A lot of travelling was required to meet the children and their families before the park visits – a distance covering almost 1 000 kilometers when measured between locations in the north and south.

it involved, in terms of the effort required from the participants and what the outcome of the research might be. I mentioned that taking part in the research is voluntary, and that the anonymity of participants is ensured through the use of pseudonyms and avoidance of publication of images of children. The possibility of ending their research involvement at any time, without consequences, was also mentioned. Children and parents were told that questions about the research could be discussed at any time. Following this, I asked for written consent, handing out consent forms, which were signed individually by the children as well as their parents on the same copy. Signing these forms ended the formal part of our meeting. Rose Wiles et al. (2011) comment that parents need to give permission to include their children in research, but that positive answers from such a formal authority are not necessarily enough. Thus, asking children themselves about their willingness to take part in the research and in the visual documentation is ethically reasonable. I followed this advice, listening to children as well as adults about their willingness to take part in the research. Both children and parents signed the consent forms for taking part in this study.

The first interview

After I had given them the necessary information and they had signed the consent form, there was a more extensive discussion about what children and parents think about theme parks, what they like to do there, and what their interests are in a more general sense. I brought questions with me which supported discussions about: interest in the park, making plans for a visit, which park to visit, and plans while being there. I also wanted to talk about previous visits to these parks and other leisure locations, about expectations and plans as well as why families decided to go to a particular park and not another place. At most we were five people sitting down together for the interview. Two was the minimum number of participants in the interview, not counting myself.

The interviews lasted between 40 and 120 minutes. What differentiated the shorter from the longer is whether children and parents provided extensive verbal accounts, or shorter ones. In the latter case, similar topics were covered as in the extensive interviews, but the accounts had the character of answers rather than of a discussion. Interviews where discussions were brief – with the character of question and answer – were more challenging, working against my stated ambition of making conversation in an open way about themes of interest.

Friendly conversations

The methodological approach during our first meeting was the *ethnographic interview* as a type of “friendly conversation”, where the aim is to make conversation in order to get to know the informants and to learn more about their lives (Spradley 1979: 25, 55). The notion of friendly conversation makes sense in two ways here. Firstly, the interviews were open rather than directed occasions, where children, parents and I were equally involved. Secondly, they took place in the home environment, in kitchens or living rooms, where a common gesture from each family was to offer “fika” – indulging in coffee, soft drinks, cookies, etc. This gave the interviews an informal character – feeling relaxed, cozy and fun on many occasions. Often, smiles and laughter were part of sharing accounts and previous memories of ALW and Liseberg.

Children initiated displays of their rooms, showing me images and souvenirs from previous park visits. Parents also took part, showing me images on their computers. I was also introduced to a pet bearing the name of a famous character from a story by Astrid Lindgren and ALW, “Pippi” as in Pippi Longstocking (the word *pippi* means dicky-bird in Swedish). The bird was placed on my shoulder during the interview and it became a way of initiating conversation about the stories of Astrid Lindgren and ALW as an upcoming place to visit.

Especially during this early phase of the research, I avoided provocative questions that might challenge the participants’ views. I did not want to upset expectations about forthcoming visits, for which families save money and make plans. I encouraged children to speak, as I wanted to avoid the risk of a dominance of accounts from parents. I tried to be a present researcher, who listens to and gets involved with what children and parents say about ALW and Liseberg. These efforts could be seen as friendly gestures. They also involve awareness and some degree of self-interest in the sense that provocation possibly makes the participants less keen on being part of the research.

Several interviews seemed almost “natural”, as if the participants were familiar with making conversation about a topic such as Liseberg, ALW or theme parks in general. Children and parents asked questions and made conversation with each other and me, where there was little need to guide the discussions. Some were keen to say a lot, while others said less. Older

children, especially those aged 9 and above, provided extensive verbal accounts.

The interviews involve biographical narratives and are “topical” in the sense that I orientated the discussions around leisure and theme parks (Madison 2012: 28). This ensures that ethnographic interviews include both individual and collective accounts and actions (ibid.). At times, the statements of children and their parents run into each other, as they present collective experiences through shared involvement in the dialogue; at other times there are accounts which “belong” to one individual, as part of his/her life and experiences, or expectations about the future. There are accounts which unite children and parents, and those that are subject to different opinions. Some researchers claim that interviews involving groups of people provide “more accurate accounts” since the “participants must defend their statements to their peers” (Eder & Fingerson 2001: 183). The ethnographic interviews in this study do not involve an orientation towards one “accurate” account, which clashes with other statements, or positions. In this study, children and parents do occasionally work out, at length, which statement is the most correct. But there are different opinions.

On a few occasions, children were uninterested in the interview. For example, Kim (age 5) preferred to play, read cartoons, and to find a place on my lap.⁵⁴ The adults present – myself and parents – went to considerable efforts to involve children in the discussions, and to “focus”. We spoke about appreciated experiences at theme parks and we tried to emphasize that the uninterested child is interested in the topic. At times, parents promised candy later, or watching a film, which made it clear that the interview situation might have consequences for children after its end. My impression is that it was about encouragement rather than having more negative consequences. Sarah Elwood and Deborah Martin (2000: 650) note that the interview site is part of constituting relations and involves power. Uninterested children highlight the issue of power, and demonstrate that their material belongings can be preferable to talk and interviews, while adults try to convince them and negotiate what is the appropriate focus at a given time. Altogether, adults get involved in negotiations; there is not one person in charge, directing the children or the interviews.

---

⁵⁴ This is not a situation unique to this study; it has been previously recognized by scholars who note that children appropriate researchers, including their bodies and tools for their own benefit (Gallacher & Gallagher 2008: 508f; Sparrman 2002).

Video recording

I carried out 22 ethnographic interviews, before and after the park visits, which altogether generated 21 hours of recorded material. It has been noted that ethnographic interviews provide detailed accounts of consumption and everyday life (Fuentes 2011: 44). In recording the interviews, using a video camera, I included talk and also images and things, such as souvenirs and toys. The camera helps in recalling and accounting for gestures, nonverbal interaction and visual and material matters during interviews (Danby et al. 2011: 82; Pink 2009: 85; Sparrman 2005).

The fact that several people are involved in this research on each occasion provides opportunities as well as challenges – in guiding the discussion and recording it. In general, the camera was fixed in one place to provide an overview of the interview situation, so that all participants were visible. A 360 degree microphone attached to the camera recorded what was said around the tables and on the sofas where we were sitting. A small portable video camera proved to work well for this ethnographic approach (see also Aspers 2007: 107; Sparrman 2005). It not only allowed the recording of participants sitting on sofas or around kitchen tables, but also made it possible to move around and record what was shown to me by children and parents.

MOBILE ETHNOGRAPHY

Scholars investigating the lives of children have used mobile methods that pay attention to place, movement, experiences and ways of making meaning (Cele 2006; Högdahl 2003). Similar mobile methods in which the researcher joins an individual or a group have been called different things. The methods include: the go-along and walk-along (Carpiano 2009; Degen & Rose 2012; Kusenbach 2003), talking whilst walking (Anderson 2004), walking with (Lee & Ingold 2006: 67; Pink 2007b, 2011), shadowing (Czarniawska 2007), follow an/the actor(s) (Callon 1999: 68; Latour 2005: 12) and following the object (Lash & Lury 2007: 19). Using these methods, the researcher joins people and material things that are on the move, and this suggests that movement matters. Mobile methods within ethnography involve a more or less active role for the researcher, either shadowing from a distance, or actively going along or walking with participants.

The interest in methods that focus on, or incorporate, movement in ethnography is part of a turn to mobility, and is captured in the term *mobile*

ethnography (Gottschalk & Salvaggio 2015). As outlined by Laura Watts and John Urry (2008: 867), “a *mobile ethnography* involves travelling *with* people and things, participating in their continual shift through time, place and relations with others” (italics in original). *With* is crucial here, for how I spent time alongside focus children in the parks.

Experiencing the parks in tandem

My ambition is to experience the parks with children. This entails an involvement in their actions rather than observing, as a shadow, from a distance. Such an ambition, however, provokes questions regarding methods and what takes place in practice: where is it possible to move as a researcher, how are children and adults divided spatially, and are all movements along with children desirable? These questions are in one sense specific to ALW and Liseberg, but they are also more general, regarding access and exclusion, as research ambitions are confronted by the realities of children and adults.

Mobile ethnography and walking with was a method of choice during the pilot studies at ALW and Liseberg. Putting it to work in the parks made me aware that this method calls for flexibility. Did the park visit involve *walking* with? Yes, but not only that. It also involved speedy steps as well as ride attractions (see Cardell & Sparrman 2012). As the boys in the pilot study at Liseberg moved at speed, I felt that at times I was running after, rather than walking with (ibid.). Changes in speed, variations in being alone or together, as well as being involved or not are symptomatic of the entire study. There is more than “walking” and there are times when the ambitions of being “with” are challenged.

I was able to join 10 of the 13 children during their time at ALW (5) and Liseberg (5). There were 11 visits to ALW and Liseberg, carried out during 16 days. Some children who travelled to the parks were spending one or several nights at campsites, in hotels or were being accommodated at their friends’ houses. They conducted visits lasting long hours on one day, or over several days. In line with Sarah Pink et al. (2010: 3), I argue that “the experiences the ethnographer is trying to understand” do not always call for long-term engagement, which is telling for my interest in visits (rather than the parks as such). The timespan for ethnography and fieldwork differs depending on disciplinary traditions and the aims of the research (Jeffrey & Troman 2004). The time for my fieldwork, travelling between the parks and

the homes of children, made up a total of over four months in 2011 – from late April to early September.⁵⁵

The shortest visits observed at ALW and Liseberg lasted a few hours, and the longest went on for days – two at Liseberg, and four at ALW. The shorter visits involved children who live close to one of the parks, have annual tickets, and go there often.⁵⁶ Other children spent hours in the park, using tickets bought for the duration of the day. The longest day during fieldwork lasted for 12 hours at Liseberg. It was exhausting. It involved plenty of attractions, and a family contest where games of chance and skill took place – in which I was one of the contestants. I was challenged to join by Lovisa, the mother of Henrik (age 9). That I took part is telling for the fieldwork, and for experiencing the parks together with children and also, frequently, with their parents. Children and parents invited me – more or less eagerly – to take part in their visits.

Generally I met children and their family members outside the parks next to the entrance or in a café. Some had made plans of what to do, and others navigated spontaneously when entering the park. I adapted to the situation, depending on the plans of the children and their parents. By having a specific child in each family as my focus during the duration of each visit, it was more or less manageable to stay on route along with the children who walk, run and experience attractions.

Tours, exploration, distance

What did the visits look like? The different knowledge among children turned out to make hours or days spent at ALW and Liseberg into quite varied experiences. Some days had the character of guided park visits, where children showed me around and pointed out what they found interesting. Such visits share similarities with Sarah Pink's (2007b, 2008) "tours" in which she is guided by people with local knowledge through their

---

⁵⁵ In addition to this focused period of fieldwork there were also the park visits that I conducted as pilot studies during two days, one in 2009 (Liseberg) and the other in 2010 (ALW), a day with a school class in 2013 (Liseberg), and brief visits without children from 2009 until 2013. Between 2009 and 2015, I collected hundreds of articles, documented marketing and made casual observations. This has been a way to develop an understanding of theme parks. Such ongoing involvement makes it hard for me as an ethnographer to state when the fieldwork began and ended (see also Wilk 2011).

⁵⁶ I visited ALW twice with Rebecca (age 11) during 2011, as she visited the park frequently during that summer.

homes and urban settings. Children who have visited the parks many times exemplify this in the clearest way: guiding me through *their* parks, telling me about their favorite things. Other children with less previous experience of the parks learn what is available when they arrive at ALW or Liseberg.

What was common to all the visits is that the children asked me what I wanted to do, or they took for granted that I wanted to join them. At times I was the only accompanying adult, while parents were doing something else. Being an adult (researcher) in a theme park can be challenging when it comes to joining children inside the attractions. Adults of my size, 185 centimeters tall, have problems in entering the small-scale houses at ALW.

My involvement during the visits to ALW and Liseberg went without much comment, and there was no explicit source of great conflict. Interactions with children and parents were generally easygoing and friendly in the parks. Children shifted between guiding me, involving me and ignoring me. One noticeable switch from close involvement to distance came when Rebecca (age 11) changed her focus from guiding me around the park to playing with a few friends, suddenly shooing me away: “schas”. No longer feeling welcome, I decided to leave Rebecca. This illustrates that my presence along with the children was not necessarily appreciated at all times.

I have thought about the ways in which my research and my presence might affect children and parents in negative as well as positive ways, acting and reflecting on ethics in practice (Phelan & Kinsella 2013; Sparrman 2014; see also Lee 1998: 474). This means that issues of ethical concern are addressed in the following chapters, being part of the practice in a broad sense.

To do things *in tandem* does not mean that everything is done, or can be done, in the same way. Spending several hours or even days at ALW and Liseberg meant that there were times when children, parents, or I needed or wanted to do things in privacy. I spent time away from the children and their families on some occasions. Generally I went away for just a few minutes or in exceptional cases up to an hour. At these times I was committed to writing field notes, or purchasing drinks or a snack. I was also sometimes

drawn to parents, who actively looked for my attention, challenging my presence with their children, as they moved on.⁵⁷

My presence as an adult who was accompanying children and parents became a practical resource at times. Evelina, the mother of Rick (age 5) and his two brothers (age 4 and 2), asked me to assist in toilet visits and care of her children, being on her own with three young children at ALW. My contribution to these visits might be considered as a form of benefits or “paying back” and assisting in the parental challenges. After our visit to ALW, Evelina thanked me and said that it would not have been possible to be in the park without me. I am willing to agree. Assisting children during toilet visits was a situation to which I had given no or little thought, perhaps thinking that it was only a parental concern (cf. Samuelsson et al. accepted). I have, however, tried to be a person in whom the children and parents as participants can have confidence and who is available to help.

Mobile ethnography and my ambition to join children during fieldwork have required flexibility, with no single “blueprint” to follow (Pink 2007a: 5). Different visits created different challenges. Approaching children provides different and rather messy routes to knowledge (Law 2004). Unexpected things happened as family members called for attention and challenged my presence with the focus children. Ambitions of experiencing the parks *in tandem* with children; learning from each focus child, by talking with them as well as observing, makes ethnography a matter of flexible adaptation: moving between presence and occasional distance. As the focus child disappears or creates distance, momentarily, the siblings or the parents become involved instead. This suggests that the children (and their parents) affect the methods – methods are not put to work by the researcher alone (ibid.).

Each family – primarily the parents – set the frame for the visit. They decided when it was time to say goodbye. Usually this meant that I left the park at the same time as they did, to meet other participants. On one occasion I accepted an invitation to meet outside the park, as Tony, the father of Eric (age 6) wanted to show me their caravan during what he called an “after work”. This highlights the changing roles of both parents and myself: from supporting the children, to working, to a time of relaxation.

---

⁵⁷ They talked about different matters like business and making money, racism, religion and sport.

My role during fieldwork shifted, and included explicit definitions by the children, who have called me the researcher, spoken of me as an adult, “father”, a “shadow”, as “David”, or “Daniel”. These labels and names describe who I am or expected to be. Someone with a name, someone with a family, someone with a profession. They also relate to expectations that might go with a man in his 30s: being a father. These ways of assigning responsibilities and character to me tell us that the researcher is embedded in the study. It suggests the relevance not only of an ethnographic inclusion of the “I” in this thesis, but also discussions about my role in some situations, as a springboard toward matters of wider concern (Beckman 2009: 48).

Taking notes and collecting images

I took a few things with me during the fieldwork, which enabled me to document each day and visit but would not limit the possibilities of riding attractions and moving through narrow spaces.

Like many other adult park visitors, I used cameras – one small digital camera and the one in my smart phone – quite intensively. Hundreds of images were snapped during each day at ALW and Liseberg. These are helpful for focusing on details that are hard to capture efficiently in words whilst accompanying children in the parks. As I got used to the practice of snapping still images, there was an increasing number of photos taken each day. During the park visits I used cameras to collect, in total, 2 108 images. These added to my note taking, allowing the possibility to be present with the children instead of withdrawing elsewhere to write.⁵⁸

---

⁵⁸ The use of a digital camera and a cell phone, in parallel, helped me to save battery time. The quality of images from the camera that I could use was also better than those from the cell phone. Another positive side-effect of using separate devices is the risk of losing material; if one device had been lost or damaged I could still have taken the other back home with me. All the devices used offer opportunities to record moving images and stills.

Figure 4:2: Devices. The image illustrates some of the different things that were required for carrying out a mobile ethnography and ethnographic interviews. Cords, microphone, backpack, water and a digital camera were also useful, in addition to the objects shown above. I usually took a rain jacket and an umbrella, being prepared for wet attractions at Liseberg and the sudden rainfalls during the Swedish summer.

I used the camera frequently but tried to be relaxed, not trying to document “everything”. This serves the purpose of conserving energy and focus during long and sometimes intense days, avoiding the risk of looking so intensively that in the end you see nothing (Ehn & Löfgren 2007: 231). I was not very concerned about the quality of the photos; the important thing was to document what took place during the visit.⁵⁹

---

⁵⁹ I have no artistic ambitions with my photography, like scholars with a background in photography (Sparrman 2005; Yi’En 2014).

Visits to theme parks involve children's bodies in attractions where visitors experience the parks visually and emotionally. They involve talk. Looking at things, and interacting with others. Using a camera for visual documentation, along with notes, makes it possible to capture both words and things that go beyond words, which it is possible to observe visually.⁶⁰ The use of a camera and notes together allows chronological accounts of each day: what happened and what followed subsequently.

Barbara Czarniawska's (2007: 57) suggestion to write out field notes after carrying out a session of mobile ethnography inspired me to spend time after each day in the park to create a document of each visit. With little time between visits and writing (Aspers 2007: 121), and support from initial notes/"jottings" and the photos, I was able to produce a collection of extensive notes – 254 pages A4-size. I wrote wide-ranging reports about each day, including details about what took place during parts of the visits, capturing events chronologically.

Supporting images

As part of this study, a team of researchers, including myself, conducted a visual documentation of Liseberg and ALW. This included systematic documentation of both parks in terms of the built environment, when no visitors were around.⁶¹ It comprises an extensive body of material: close to 1 000 images of ALW and some 2 600 images of Liseberg.

Visiting ALW and Liseberg when there are no visitors provides a contrast to being there among visitors with children and their families. People populate the theme parks, and bring them alive (Billig 1994). Our visual documentation of the built environments of Liseberg and ALW makes the places seem "dead" (Thrift & Dewsbury 2000: 427). Two contrasting images below, of one attraction at Liseberg, illustrate this difference.

---

⁶⁰ Previous research using mobile methods have included video (Pink 2007b) and audio-recordings (Carpiano 2009; Kusenbach 2003), which are relevant in interview-like situations where the go-along has been used for walking and talking.

⁶¹ The visual documentation was conducted within a wider research project, led by Professor Anna Sparrman. We used several digital cameras and took notes, inspired by museum documentation, that include descriptions of what is present in the parks. ALW was documented during the summer of 2011 and Liseberg in the spring of 2012. It includes a one-day visit to ALW, by four researchers, and a two-day visit to Liseberg, consisting of five researchers. The reason for the documentation was to visually preserve places for children.

Figure 4:3: Flumeride.
Without visitors during
visual documentation.

Figure 4:4: Flumeride
queue. During a
crowded day.

Figure 4:3 provides insight into how theme parks are structured so that visitors will queue up, and follow the line to the attraction in a controlled way. It illustrates how theme parks like Liseberg organize space. But it does not tell us much about what people do. In Figure 4:4, there are people anticipating the attraction, talking about what will happen, interacting with each other, having fun, being bored, laughing about people who get wet in this water attraction. Many things happen. And it is Figure 4:4 and what it indicates in terms of practices in the park that I am primarily interested in.

The visual documentation is important for visualizing the parks since I do not include images of participating families, to guarantee their anonymity.

RETURNING TO (AND LEAVING) CHILDREN

Before I went to meet the children and their families for the final interview, I looked through the pictures of the relevant visit, to pick out images for printing. This reminded me of the specific visit, and also offered a chance to make visible to the children what they did during their day at ALW or Liseberg. Images worked as points of departure for our discussions.⁶² Some visits took place months before the final interview. For some it was probably hard to recall the specific visit – especially for visitors like Tove (age 9) and

---

⁶² These were not the focus of any longer conversations. Inspired by previous research, I took a handful of still images, as prints, to each interview (Heisley & Levy 1991: 269), which worked as facilitators when initializing discussions (Grady 2007: 65f), to stimulate and make the interview a creative process (Trell & van Hoven 2010: 94).

Rebecca (age 11) who spend many days during the summer at Liseberg and ALW. The photos that I chose included images of situations that I was curious about and images that I expected to evoke memories as well as provoke discussion.

My experiences of the first interviews, where children such as the sisters Kim (age 5) and Mary (age 3) did not want to talk or did not have much to say about theme parks, made me think that there could be benefits from visual input as well. I brought blank paper and pens of different colors, to offer children a chance to draw things, including ALW and Liseberg. Drawing was relevant in a few cases when there was little focus on verbal accounts. My ambition here, as with the printed images, was to navigate to topics in ways that children might find inspiring.⁶³ Similar to images and ambitions within photo-elicitation research, the goal was to open up avenues for covering knowledge among children regarding these settings (Packard 2008: 65).

The second ethnographic interview also built on the approach of “friendly conversation” (Spradley 1979: 25, 55). These interviews included the same number of family members (2–5), and took equal amounts of time (40–120 minutes). Meeting the children and their families again, I wanted to learn about their experiences, gather reflections about what took place in the park that we visited together and discuss whether they had any special memories.

Positive challenges

The second interview involved a common reference – our park visit. During this second interview I tried to unearth possibilities of problems during visits and with the parks. Most accounts of visits to ALW and Liseberg were positive. I wanted, however, to discuss any possible problems during visits and related to the parks more widely to avoid the risk of reproducing images of theme parks as purely happy places.

---

⁶³ I received a few drawings from the children participating in this study, with no intention of collecting a mass of drawings. For example, Kim and Mary made drawings of Liseberg during the second interview, which they handed to me as a gift when I was leaving. Similar to other drawings, as observed by scholars in geography, these portray parts and details, making drawings into visual products that involve selection among different elements, which might be challenging to understand or interpret (Cele 2003; Travlou et al. 2008).

The following themes were addressed during the discussions: the previous visit and the possibility of future visits, memories, images, and the limitations of what one could do in the park. The interviews included discussions about what was appreciated and what was not, about what could have been different as well as whether theme park visits involved any disturbing elements.

The second interview marked the end of research participation for the children and their families. Parents appreciated that I brought them collections of photos on a DVD from the visit. Several parents showed an interest in reading the thesis, and some asked me to send the completed work as a book. Children did not ask for any further information. Several of them were proud of the diplomas that I had brought, documenting their participation in the project. I left the children and their families with the impression that there was a sense of pride among the participants in having contributed to the research, as well as having had a chance to talk about places that mean so much to them.

MAKING SENSE OF HAPPINESS

In the following parts of the chapter I go into details about the process of developing an understanding of the collected material and building the analyses in the coming chapters.

Initial steps

While watching the video-recorded interviews, I transcribed the majority in brief for the purpose of achieving an overview. Selected parts were transcribed in detail, focusing on consumption, children and family along with happy accounts. I watched the interviews between two and four times, with additional focus on parts of the recorded material. The transcriptions include spoken accounts about emotions and longing relating to the parks, bodily gestures – smiling, making faces, laughter – and also how material things play a role. These included soft toys and souvenirs, to give two examples, which children have collected – as park consumers and as gifts. The reason for watching and transcribing the material was to learn more about what theme park visits in a wide sense imply, and to develop a focus on recurring matters. During this process of learning more about the material, I noted that happiness could work as a point of departure and provide a focus for discussing different accounts and practices.

I catalogued images from the visits in folders, giving a chronological overview of each visit and day and the activities that took place at ALW and Liseberg. I also looked at images from the visual documentation of the parks, and observed similarities and differences in content: souvenirs in the parks, mascots and characters in the parks, and facilities such as toilets (cf. Sparman 2011). This allowed me to see similarities and differences between the visits and between ALW and Liseberg. I returned frequently to the images to make sense of the places in which the children and parents spent their time in the parks.

Reading the entirety of my field notes, several times, organizing images and looking at the video recordings, along with their transcriptions, I created an index to enable me to browse the material. The index was produced without any pre-determined categories, and I elaborated on connections between parts of the material with each other (Emerson et al. 1995: 150–156). It has been helpful for navigating the material and for gaining an overview of the visits – noticing similarities and differences. The index includes children’s activities in the parks: social interaction and distance between family members, the use of attractions, practical matters around eating, and the involvement of material things such as cell phones, pacifiers, souvenirs, games, measurement devices, playthings, maps, and money.

In creating this index, I was sorting out parts of the material into overarching categories, which have developed over time. This process makes this analytical stage of ethnography into an elaboration of its parts and into a composition of “bits and pieces” (O’Dell & Willim 2011b: 29–31). It is a task that can be compared with simultaneously “creating and solving a puzzle” (Emerson et al. 1995: 144) where the possibilities for putting different pieces together are explored (Atkinson et al. 2008). I have considered how different pieces of the materials relate, whether they are complementary (Hammersley & Atkinson 2007: 149f), but also whether there is incommensurability between parts of the materials (Mol 2002). What are practices and accounts about emotions, happiness and experiences pointing towards?

The initial empirical focus on children means that it cannot be guaranteed that happiness is experienced. Children and parents talk about and state the relevance of happy emotions and places. They express happiness as being part of places, practices and people. Only small parts of the material explicitly and directly concern happiness, verbally, but these accounts

consider the parks in their totality and involve strong arguments about the need to go to ALW and Liseberg.

Snapshot-stories

Another methodological and analytical approach is to create so called *snapshot-stories* (Mol 2002: viii, 145f). These stories from the field are empirically composed and provide the starting point for analysis in most chapters. These stories include fieldwork encounters, experiences in the homes of children and at the parks, making issues of happiness part of practices. My ambition here is primarily to offer introductions to the analytical parts of the chapters where the words and actions of children and parents are opened up for further exploration.

An example of a snapshot-story looks like this:

Tove (age 9), smilingly tells me that she knows Liseberg like the back of her hand, that it is an extension of the family living room, working as their garden and a fun backyard. It has become a tradition that Tove receives an annual pass as a Christmas gift, which includes free admittance to all the park's attractions throughout the year. Tove calls herself "a speed maniac" and is into the park attractions. Her parents, Karin and Johan, say that the park is part of their everyday life. They have the right connections, and receive VIP tickets – as "honorary guests" – so that they can enter the park without paying any admission. Karin and Johan tell me that they stroll around to see what food is available. They surf the web or engage in work tasks at a distance, using laptops and smart phones, sitting in the cafés. Karin and Johan consider themselves to be a "service team", meaning that they are there for Tove when or if she needs them.⁶⁴

This example will be analyzed in chapter 7, and it is composed of accounts during one of the interviews with Tove – the focus child – and her parents. It presents a story of their use of the park. I am interested in relations between people, material things, meanings and the implications of what is presented through the stories. This means that I discuss, for example, how children and parents divide up during visits for the sake of achieving different goals, answering to different ideals and work tasks.

I include examples that provide contrasts, rather than being evidence for proving a point (Emerson et al. 1995: 176ff), offering a story in the sense

---

⁶⁴ Interview 1: Tove's family.

that I am attentive to different practices. John Law (1994: 39) suggests that ethnography should focus on different stories, and “not to buy into any of them by turning the others into distractions.” This further suggests that contrasts are important, and Mol (2002: 38) even states that they are what marks good observation. The snapshot-story is a strategy of simplification towards the understanding of happiness in its complexity, without committing violence against ambiguities.

It becomes relevant to include snapshot-stories where happiness is ambiguous, and not to include one distinct type of example that fits scientific ambitions of purity. Following Mol and Law (2002: 3), a first step is to avoid fitting and reducing reality into simple schemes that make violence and repress complexity, and then use the notion of complexity to recognize that things might “relate but don’t add up”.

Mol (2011: 33) describes analysis as a procedure similar to filtration within chemistry, where mixed liquids are separated into their components, for pointing out what is central within messy practices. Using Mol’s (2011) vocabulary, I work with filtration to offer snapshot-stories which involve happiness, recognizable and identified as such – by children, parents, and me. However, I also move beyond happiness. I do not want to filter away too much of the practice into unwanted surrounding noise that is disturbing happiness (Ingold 2009a: 42). This would risk reproducing an image of happiness as an entity or blob in itself, which is pure and can simply be accessed (Ingold 2015: 3).

The snapshot-stories are presented as part of my explorations of material things and intimacy, values and money, coordination of family and times of childhood. These are followed by an analysis that focuses on bits of the stories, and relates them to wider concerns – practices, theories, and arguments in society at large. These stories are there to help the reader to get to know the children, their parents, and the things and places they are involved with, as well as wider theoretical concerns that have to do with notions of happiness, consumption and family life today.

One way of highlighting the visits to the parks is to use images along with text and the snapshots in text. Here, images are supportive in developing an understanding of the visits, and inspiring thinking about various dimensions of the visits. Drawing on Gillian Rose (2007: 239), the images work as

complementary materials, working as a way of introducing details that go along with the text.⁶⁵

Navigating the meshwork of happiness

How can we make sense of happiness? In this part, I address analysis as a movement between details and wider practices in the materials.

I build my analyses on the openness of STS, exemplified by its slogan that “it could be otherwise” (Woolgar 2012; Woolgar & Lezaun 2015: 465).⁶⁶ Drawing on this slogan means leaving the theoretical turf war about what is *the* right (one) definition of happiness, to investigate how happiness is enacted – differently – in practice.⁶⁷ It means subordinating theoretical meanings of a general character to practices. This goes well with the ethnographic unease with definite answers, giving “less closure” to investigations and opening up new questions (Van Maanen 2011: 161; see also Law 2004: 59, 150; O’Dell & Willim 2011a: 9). It allows a productive uncertainty which Les Back (2007: 166) calls a “critical openness to the other view.” It allows wider accounts, of messy multiplicities of happiness, and connections with happiness that are discussable.

Mol (2002) has little to say about how to analyze practices. Therefore, I combine her ideas of practices with Davide Nicolini’s idea of zooming.⁶⁸ Looking at the material and moving between the index and its reference points (interviews, notes, video, and images) involves zooming in and out, paying attention to local sayings and doings, and understanding these in relation to wider involvement (Nicolini 2009: 1412; see also Svabo 2008: 165). The metaphor of zooming captures the way in which parts of the

---

⁶⁵ Images are complementary materials in three ways; to summarize, it is about their role as (1) being helpful in interview discussions, (2) supporting relations with participants, and (3) for illustrations within this book. Taken together, it means that work with images is useful for the research, and also turns them into collections of family photographs available to the participants.

⁶⁶ Notable here is a similarity in formulation between Theodor Adorno’s notion of critical studies and work in STS, both suggesting that “it could have been otherwise” (Berlant 2011: 13; Doganova et al. 2014: 91; see also Mol & Law 2002: 12).

⁶⁷ Drawing on Mol and Law (2004: 46), I avoid taking a short-cut to happiness by developing an ethnographic understanding that “consistently attends to the practices in which it is being done”, where it is not simply located as a matter inside the body or at the center of human life. This leads the analysis to focus on how happiness is enacted differently.

⁶⁸ For briefly outlined similarities with Nicolini’s approach, see Mol (2010).

material are brought to the fore, putting others in the background (Nicolini 2009: 1402).

Zooming makes happiness visible as part of practices, and provides insights into when and where it becomes involved – and where it does not. Zooming emphasizes that analysis involves ways of looking that are not fixed, but shifting, and attentive to selected details at one time. It is necessary to zoom in *and* out in order to consider practices in relation to theory, for theorizing practice (Nicolini 2009: 1392). Committed to zooming, moving between parts of the material, I explore how happiness becomes involved: in the consumption of material things, in considerations of money and value, in family practices, and enacting times of childhood.

With the involvement of theory, in dialog with descriptive explorations of practices, there comes a recognition that a concept like happiness is social, changing and involves power as part of its constitution. It is, therefore, not a naïve sort of description that I aim to deploy – where one simply observes and re-tells what happiness is – but a kind that is theoretically informed (Alvesson & Sköldberg 2008: 538–543; Willis & Trondman 2000).

Happiness is not a single theme with a presence in every bit of material collected. Happiness is consequently somewhere. It might not be central at all times. It is in children's and parents' accounts and in practices. To focus too much on happiness risks locating everything else as external to happiness, drawing a border for the purpose of a distilled classification (Ingold 2009a: 42). Meshwork recognizes the entanglements of things, but not necessarily as explicit or outspoken connections. The recognition of meshwork means that, drawing on Ingold (2009a: 40f), I develop a “practical understanding” that analytically follows the various practices that children are involved in with their families in relation to theme parks.

How things become tangled and are interrelated might differ and also be unclear. Drawing on Chris Tong (2014: 201), this means that things will remain “unaccounted for”, being left on the “outside”. What is it possible to see then? Not the totality of happiness, or the meshwork with *all* of its entanglements. But enactments of happiness within what Annemarie Mol (2002) calls sites: where practices give it a presence. It means that entanglements of the meshwork stretch beyond what it is possible to capture – in my work and in research in a wider sense. There may be loosely related parts, gaps and non-connections that can never be fully disclosed (Tong 2014: 204f). This is compatible with how Mol (2002: 87–117) both

recognizes and pays attention to gaps, distance, and silences, how she locates practices in different places that are not in contact, and how realities cannot exist in isolation even if these are enacted differently (Mol & Law 2002: 10). These ideas of Mol, Tong and Ingold challenge the belief that science is fully able to capture and represent the world.

Approaching happiness through thinking about it as part of a meshwork means that the analysis recognizes that: (1) parts of the world are entangled and involved in movement (2) entanglements are possible to grasp, but also (3) they involve uncertainties and unaccountable matters and (4) there is no hierarchy in the multiplicity of enactments of happiness.

CHAPTER 5 THINGOGRAPHY: MATERIAL INTIMACY

Children possess a variety of material things that originate from Liseberg and Astrid Lindgren's World (ALW). Toys, clothes and souvenirs of practical use, including pens and bicycle helmets, are part of their everyday lives. At home, commodities purchased in the two parks are visible through strong colors as well as through children's display of their dolls and soft toys. Children involve their characters, like Pippi Longstocking and the Liseberg rabbit, while they are talking about ALW and Liseberg.

This chapter explores material things associated with the famous character from Liseberg: *The rabbit*. Rabbit toys, rabbit pens, and images of the rabbit are all examples of theme-park materials found in the homes of children: they are things that create associations with Liseberg. I focus here on things in the homes of four girls who explicitly discuss and relate to the rabbit(s): Tove (age 9), Kim (6) and the sisters Emma (11) and Felicia (15). They all create a presence for the Liseberg rabbit at home, in decorating their rooms, drawing and in talk.

As well as these children, there are others who show me things more briefly, and without elaborating on the rabbit. Henrik (age 9) displays a pen that contains several green rabbits. Casper (6) keeps rabbit ears – headgear – from Liseberg at home. Thea (5), the sister of Leo (9), wears rabbit gear in the park and visits a shop at Liseberg that specializes in rabbit merchandise. Neither of these children elaborate upon their material things from Liseberg at home. Their involvement with material things, however, is an indicator that there are different ways of wearing, displaying and using things from Liseberg. The pen is used, and consumed, and does not last forever. Clothes and headgear provide both usefulness and the opportunity to get dressed up as the rabbit, to become part of the character (cf. Wickstrom 2006).

Whether material things and the desire for these make children happy or unhappy is a matter of debate, and researchers argue that there are “strong correlations between materialism and negative wellbeing” (Nairn 2010: 111). Others emphasize that materialist consumption is not opposed to happiness (Thin 2012: 213). Recent research on happiness in Sweden, on the contrary, suggests that materiality is important, as individual happiness

is likely to increase with access to material things (Brülde & Fors 2012; Nilsson 2012). This research concerns individual levels of happiness, where external circumstances are identified as factors through statistics. It emphasizes a correlation between material possessions and happiness. One problem with these statistically oriented studies of happiness is that they provide no understanding of the different ways in which people are involved with material things.

While materiality is disputed when it comes to happiness and well-being, intimacy is generally appreciated. Relationships and social involvement are seen as healthy and intimacy as closely connected with happiness (Berlant 1998: 282; Illouz 2007: 29, 46). The homes of children are consequently rich sites for investigations of the contested meanings of material things, intimacy and happiness.

In this chapter I aim to develop an understanding of the intertwining of material things from theme parks with children's everyday lives at home in order to discuss intimacy and happiness. Three questions guide the analysis: How and why do material things from theme parks interest children? How do they become interwoven with children's everyday lives at home? Do commercial products and brands enact intimacy and happiness?

MATERIAL THINGS AT HOME

According to Miller (2001b: 232), there is plenty of critique of consumption and materialism; however, few studies are ethnographic. Studies of material things – such as soft toys – and brands often suggest that these have a good or bad influence. Such answers are common in research where consumption often turns into an intrinsic good or bad (Miller 2001b: 232). As I am carrying out an ethnographic study, I avoid signing up to theories that provide general answers about whether material things, as such, are good or bad for children. It is however important to outline the critiques of consumption, as well as the positive aspects emphasized in some scholarship.

Materiality – including commodities and “things” in a wider sense – is assumed to create problems, and conditions that toxify childhood, leaving children unhappy (Palmer 2006; Schor 2005). Social science studies suggest that the market pushes into or penetrates intimate human relationships

(Illouz 1997, 2007; Löfgren 1979).⁶⁹ For Marxists and critical theorists building on Marx and Freud, capitalism involves a pathological fetishism, where human relations are distorted by the world of *commodities* (Böhm & Batta 2010; Böhme 2014; Kapur 2005a). Commodity fetishism as a disorientation of humans to material things has been associated since the writing of Karl Marx with problems of capitalism (Billig 1999; Böhme 2014). For Marx, it “produces a false path to happiness” (Belk 1988: 146). This idea focuses on the corrupt system of capitalism.

Where critical social scientists see the power of corporations, researchers focusing on branding look for profitable and meaningful relations between consumers and companies. It is about a mutual relationship rather than power and domination. This is the case in studies of corporate intentions to develop close connections and intimate bonds between *brand characters*, cartoonish mascots, and children (de Droog et al. 2011; Fournier 1998; Hémar-Nicolas & Gollety 2012; Manning 2010). Brand characters are a “tool” that companies use “to build a relationship between a brand and young consumers” (Hémar-Nicolas & Gollety 2012: 20). This is part of a wider trend, where companies aim “to build intimate relationships with customers” (Bügel et al. 2011: 247). Studies of brand characters build on psychological theory where the qualities of relationships between children and material things are emphasized. In psychology, soft toys have been described as *transitional objects* which give comfort during children’s first years of life and allow them to reach independence as individuals (Winnicott 1953), an independence that is associated with the pleasure of feelings of autonomy (Russon 2014: 68).

The possibilities of ethnography have been addressed in calls for studies on brands and brand characters (Gianneschi 2012: 245f; Gustafsson 2008: 19; Hémar-Nicolas & Gollety 2012: 27).⁷⁰ Drawing on the work of Steve Woolgar (2012), ethnography allows researchers to address practice and challenge claims of representation. This downplays the general claims made above, that things (e.g. soft toys) *represent* commodities within an oppressive system of capitalism, or are expressions of a toxic childhood. The question of whether such claims are relevant or not to divisions of good

---

⁶⁹ For a similar argument see Löfgren (1979: 71), suggesting that market principles push further into life and give emotions the character of commodities.

⁷⁰ Similar calls have been made in studies of tourism, regarding ethnographic attention to movements of souvenirs and other materialities (e.g. Ateljevic & Doorne 2003; Haldrup & Larsen 2006; Morgan & Pritchard 2005; Van der Duim 2007).

and bad, along with a dichotomy between the material and the social, becomes a matter of fieldwork (Miller 2001a: 16). Do children make material things good or bad? Do they make material things into a material or social issue? This approach means that material things, intimacy and children's happiness turn into a matter of exploration. It becomes possible to explore how children's material things are given importance (Miller 2008a, 2009). There is an opportunity to get a sense of material culture and society. It is not about a totalizing image of society but about insights into how material culture is involved in movements and becomes relevant to children in their homes.

There is a developing body of ethnographic research that recognizes the involvement of commercial things within people's homes (Fuentes 2011: 24ff; Miller 2001a, 2008a, 2009). Within this approach, there is not a strict division between the location of home and the surrounding world. It is observed that there are connections between places, different times, and movements of material things into the home, for example things acquired as commodities and collected as intimate memories through photographs (Miller 2001a, 2008a; see also Hetherington 1997).

To be able to approach material things originating in theme parks there is a need for concepts to describe the focus of my ethnographic inquiry. To be able to capture and include difference, I need an inclusive concept of the "material". Ingold (2012: 439) suggests that *things* are "gatherings of materials in movement, as distinct from objects", where *objects* are "completed forms that stand over and against the perceiver and block further movement." Materials are "matter considered in respect of its occurrence in processes of flow and transformation" (ibid.). For example, considering soft toys as things in this sense means that we are highlighting movement and transformation rather than the ready-made and final. They are not the completed commodities or brand characters of corporations, but take part in practices within which transformation and change takes place. Meanings might change, and materials are affected by use, becoming damaged, worn or dusty or kept in mint condition with maintenance and effort. Looking into the homes of children consequently provides an understanding of how material things become whatever they are in practice.

The variety of things that are offered in outlets at Liseberg will be explored in the next section, which provides an introduction to the rabbit and what it is involved with, in the park.

THE RABBIT AT LISEBERG

The rabbit was unveiled as a central character at Liseberg in 1983, the year in which the park celebrated its 60th birthday.⁷¹ Since its introduction, the rabbit has been a marketing “symbol” for the park. It is possible to purchase different versions of the rabbit in the souvenir outlets in the park. There is the rabbit shop (“Kaninbutiken”), and other stores display the rabbit for window shoppers, including the Liseberg shop (“Lisebergsshoppen”). These stores offer different products that include the rabbit as an image: soft toys, playthings, rabbit make-up kits, drinking bottles, clothes and even bicycle helmets. Many products that are sold in the park also display the rabbit as a logo. It is visible in displays of hamburger meals at Burger King, on popcorn packages, as well as on the tickets to the park and the attractions. Generally, the products include a rabbit that is green in color.

Figure 5:1: Sign outside the rabbit shop, Liseberg.

Figure 5:2: Shop window, rabbit soft toys, Liseberg.

The importance of the rabbit to the park is illustrated in one of Liseberg’s annual reports: “The green rabbit is Liseberg’s most central symbol and it turns up as a soft toy, as well as a logotype and a living creature in the amusement park” (*Liseberg 2011 2012*: 6). Throughout the park, the rabbit is visible on flags and signs, and it is even included as part of a traffic light just outside of Liseberg where people cross the road. People who enter the

---

⁷¹ ‘1983 – Lisipedia’, http://www.lisepedia.se/1983#Kaninen_blir_jubileumssymbol (accessed 16/06/15).

park will notice that large bushes have been trimmed into the shape of the rabbit.

Large costumed rabbit mascots work as living creatures at Liseberg and interact with visitors. There are stage shows with mascots. These rabbits meet and greet visitors as employees bring the mascots to life. These are popular and attract the attention of visitors, who take the opportunity to hug them and to snap photos with them at the rabbit house where the mascots frequently interact with children. The rabbit house is an attraction at Liseberg and it is one of a few where the rabbits are the main focus.

Visitors also go to the Rabbit River where they see “a fairy-tale land where the rabbit himself lives” and Rabbit Land, which opened in 2013, works as “the rabbits’ own universe right in the heart of Liseberg.”⁷² This attraction now features several different rabbits – which are given names such as Kanne and Kanina. At the time of my fieldwork, differences between the rabbit mascots in the park were visible in different clothing, but not through the feminine and masculine names that are now used in Rabbit Land.

Figure 5:3: Rabbit topiary, Liseberg.

Figure 5:4: Mascots, Liseberg.

---

⁷² ‘Liseberg’, www.liseberg.se (accessed 05/03/13).

When they leave the park, children and parents take with them soft toys, clothes with the rabbits on, and funny rabbit ears from the shops. Adults are also invited to answer survey questions after their time in the park and are specifically asked about whether they are happy with the visibility of the rabbits (in the plural), whether their children were approached in a good way and to what degree they contributed to a nice and happy atmosphere⁷³. These questions illustrate ambitions that the rabbits should be available as mascots, be something positive and that they should offer a good time to children specifically.

The Liseberg rabbit is a famous character in Sweden. It is documented in images published online by park visitors, as commodities from the park – balloons, headgear, soft toys – and it is visible as a great smiling character on a hot air balloon that is used to promote the park throughout the country. The rabbit here, for Liseberg, turns out to be both an “object-to-be-sold and as the bearer of a promotional message” (Wernick 1994: 15f). However, this does not tell us much about how the rabbits are used by visitors. For example, what happens to the rabbits from Liseberg in the homes of children?

THE RABBIT IN THE BEDROOM

Tove (age 9) tells me that she likes the Liseberg rabbit. This becomes obvious when she shows me her room. It is full of green Liseberg rabbits. Her collection of green soft toys of different sizes overflows the room. Small rabbits mix with giant ones. The small rabbits are all lined up next to one other on a shelf below her bunk bed. They are surrounded by small lamps that help to direct my attention to them. The larger rabbits are placed on the upper level, on top of the bunk bed where Tove sleeps. There she also has a pillow with an image of the Liseberg rabbit. Tove's room looks like a collector's room. When talking about the rabbits, Tove speaks of it in singular sense, as THE Liseberg rabbit. Tove's mother Karin, who also takes part in the showing of the room, says that she thinks Tove has a “fixation” on the rabbits.⁷⁴

Both Karin and her husband and other relatives constantly contribute to the collection by giving Tove green rabbits as presents. In the past, Karin says, Tove always wanted a new rabbit. Now she

---

⁷³ Survey, obtained from Liseberg management.

⁷⁴ Interview 1: Tove's family.

is less interested, and she tells me that they are made of a new and different material at the moment.⁷⁵

Tove's unique collection of rabbits makes her room into an exciting place to visit. No other children in the study keep or show me such a massive number of things that come from Liseberg or other parks. It provokes questions about how she has been able to gather so many rabbits, and why? Is she modest in her claim to "like" the rabbit, or is she a collector?

The bed is an important part of the lives of many people, not only in terms of sleep, but also in terms of consumption. There is a need for further research into the question: "What kind of *consumption* space is it?" (Valtonen & Närvänen 2015: 1596, italics in original). This part adds to such knowledge with an exploration of collecting, which is a common activity among children (Belk 1995).

Collecting

The material things described in the text above are well organized, not arranged in a haphazard way. The collection of rabbits makes Tove's room into what seems to be *her* place. It associates her as an individual with having a long-term interest in the rabbit. Tove collects material things that go with her interest in the rabbit, at the same time making this interest visible to others. Tove's shelves, like shelves in a wider sense, "attest to the lives lived by their owners" (Sassatelli 2007: 144).

Here, it is not fruitful to distinguish use – a comfortable bed – from collection and passionate arrangements of things, beyond use. Tove's rabbits transgress the dichotomy of use/collecting, in that soft-toy rabbits are part of both her sleeping arrangements and a display of collected things. The rabbits are arranged so that they can be touched, looked at, and take part in movement along with people in the room. Karin touches them, the rabbits touch Tove, being in her bed, and she displays them to me.

The rabbits in Tove's room make sense as things, in Ingold's sense of the term (2012: 439), as they are involved in movement and change. Consequently, they are not objects put at a distance, blocking further movement. This difference is important because it makes sense of how Tove does not make her room into a collection of objects that one is to observe from a distance, but makes them available to touch, to move around and to

---

⁷⁵ Interview 2: Tove's family.

get involved with. The rabbits are neither exhibition objects, calling for restraint and care to remain the same, or given such a personal character by Tove that they are within the reach of her, and only her.

Tove's rabbits do not tell a story of collectable objects that distance people from parts of her room or her possessions. Instead, they tell a story about how material things and a child can provide meaning, and even develop a biography, with each other. Tove's history with the rabbits of Liseberg becomes observable through her collection of material things, purchased at different times, and all brought back to her room. The rabbit is important in talk and also in a bodily sense. What you like, you keep close, I understand from listening to Tove.

Embodied intimacy

Being in Tove's bed, the rabbit toys and the pillow with a rabbit image become an intimate part of her life at home. Intimacy is a notion that has been a topic of concern and debate within the social sciences during the last few decades, including the question of whether material things can be part of intimate relationships (Cerulo 2009: 533). Kym Maclaren (2014: 56) asks the question: what is intimacy? She writes that a "beginning answer is that intimacy is a sense of closeness." This answer is relevant to how intimacy can be read in a wide sense, for example in fields of research that concern children and commodities. In research on children's involvement with brands, for example, comparisons are made with friendships and acquaintances (Ji 2002). Pushing the argument that Tove's bed is about human intimacy makes only a little sense. Many things and people are close to children, and making a case for similarities with human relations downplays actual material involvement. The notion of intimacy is, however, broader, and covers diverse involvements which are more relevant to speak of when considering how Tove and the rabbits share space, and their physical closeness to one another.

David Morgan (2011) discusses intimacy and its different dimensions, and suggests three notions that assist in understanding the close presence of material things. Morgan (ibid.: 35) uses *embodied intimacy* to encompass caring, touching and sexual intimacy, *emotional intimacy* to refer to understanding the other, including sharing and disclosure, and *intimate knowledge* as the "interweaving of personal biographies over a period" of time. These intimacies can all be seen in the example of Tove.

The routines of touch that become part of Tove's life with the rabbits in bed make sense as an embodied intimacy, being close. The rabbits' material presence provides touch in both directions; the rabbits being in contact with Tove and Tove touching the rabbits. Maintaining space for her soft toys means that the rabbit of Liseberg is physically interwoven with Tove's daily life and becomes an intimate part of her routines of sleeping and making the bed. The rabbit also interweaves into Tove's personal biography, in which others also take a part, by writing it. Following Daniel Thomas Cook (2003: 166), this means that biography fuses with consumption and that "the boundary between person and commodity" becomes irrelevant.

Tove is not involved with any groups of collectors, or fan fiction, or actively contributing to any subculture of rabbit aficionados. Her interest in the rabbit is more of a family affair, in which parents and relatives are the ones presented as having an involvement with Tove. Her mother Karin argues that Tove has a fixation, as if it could be a problem. This is said with a smile, suggesting that it really is not when it comes to Tove.

Individualism and psychology

In approaching Tove as a psychological subject, Karin enacts emotional intimacy (Morgan 2011: 35), having an intimate understanding that she is able to disclose. Karin's understanding of fixation and Tove's acceptance of it suggest that the professional language of psychology is part of everyday life in the family. Tove's individual fixation is tied to the rabbit, and this is visible to Karin, who lives with her daughter and is well read about psychological theories. In speaking about Tove's fixation she is distancing herself from what she observes, making the case that it is an individual who is into the rabbit. Karin then becomes what Viviana Zelizer (2005: 99, 162) calls a "third party" in a discussion of intimacy. As a third party, Karin is not actively involved, but external and secondary, observing a biography of Tove with her rabbits. This suggests the relevance of the individual within psychological thinking and at the same time downplays the relevance of sociological explanations or consumer culture in a wider sense.

As Tove accepts her "fixation" without contestation, the notion might seem to be correct, as she does not make it into a big deal or fuss about it. She might even agree. However, her silence may also mean something other than accepting psychological accounts. Along with her explicit interest in the rabbits comes the possibility of receiving more rabbits. If she contested

fixation as an individual trait, would Tove get any additional soft toy rabbits? While it is impossible to tell, Tove's acceptance highlights a social order in which parents purchase material things for their children, and do so, at least partly, with psychological motivations. Accepting the idea of an individual fixation opens up the possibility of material things and social involvement, including repeated park visits with the family.

What is missing in Karin's distanced approach to fixation is actually the role played by parents. Parental involvement with things that are intended for children connects the various directions that a thing might take: from purchase to the child, and from consumption to making it an intimate part of the life of a child.

Adrie Kusserow (2004: 85) suggests that uniqueness and the possibility of expressing oneself as unique is part of a type of individualism which is psychologically oriented and about letting the inside of children come out. According to Kusserow, the free flow of individual uniqueness, without constraints, is associated by parents with the happiness of their children (*ibid.*). These accounts of individualism as part of a wider order, established historically and culturally, with relevance for children says something about Tove's "fixation" and how her psychology is involved in a social order (cf. Lash 2010: 19, 100).

The rabbit soft toys at home take part in making Tove into an individual who is able to express who she is. For her parents, material things also offer the possibility of articulating who Tove is. It is relevant here that the material things turn into a way of elaborating upon Tove's psychology.

Giving a personal character to objects, keeping them close, and trying to exercise full control over them, as an individual, are traits in the theory of transitional objects (Winnicott 1953; see also Lee 2008). However, Tove is not suggesting that others are intrusive. Her rabbits, and all of her rabbits, are part of a family effort. Together, the family members provide space for Tove's favorite character and take part in arranging them.

Co-consumption and gifts

Parents are in this way not absent and secondary in relation to rabbit things, but take an active role. Parents such as Karin, as well as Tove's father and relatives, are involved in what Daniel Thomas Cook (2008: 235) speaks of as co-consumption: by purchasing commodities, taking part in arranging

them, and being there with children as they engage in activities involving their things.

Karin is involved in acquiring and arranging material things as well as making them into a psychological Tove-issue. Karin is also close with the rabbits, not in the psychological way that she assigns to her daughter, but in a material sense. Involvement, and having the rabbits close, brings her into a kind of intimacy which is beyond the three types outlined by Morgan (2011: 35): embodied intimacy, emotional intimacy and intimate knowledge. It is an involvement with material things that centers those things on another individual. It demonstrates that giving and sharing, among family members who are close, also creates material intimacy as the close presence of things.

Tove creates the possibility of receiving rabbits, again and again. This affects consumption in a wider sense, where her individual preferences and psychology lead adults to the rabbit things, as they purchase gifts for her. Material things are consequently not only about Tove as an individual and the rabbit in material isolation. The material things take part in creating social connections, beyond Tove's family, and beyond the park of Liseberg, including relatives who are providing her with gifts.

Rabbits are memorable gifts for Tove, who associates them with the people who provided her with the soft toys. Researchers who discuss gifts have pointed out that the social and personal character of gifts contrasts self-centeredness against the universality of commodities as orientations to profits (e.g. Appadurai 1999: 11; Sassatelli 2007: 145). Co-consumption is consequently a social endeavor that builds on what Morgan (2011: 35) speaks of as intimate knowledge and emotional intimacy. Providing Tove with rabbits suggests both an awareness of her affection for these toys and understanding what she wants. In this way, the gifts are helpful for enacting intimacy, "reducing the distance between two persons" (Illouz 2012: 221). In fact, gifts are able to make more than two people involved in intimacy. Relatives in the plural sense might provide one gift, thus reducing the distance between several people using a single material thing, as a gift.

By focusing on how the rabbit turns into gifts, it is possible to address the involvement of children, parents and relatives, including adults, which often goes unnoticed in analyses of children and consumption (Martens et al. 2004: 157, 166, 175). The example of Tove and her collection further suggests that the involvement of other people makes rabbits into an

expression of personal bonds, which involve both personal and sentimental meanings (cf. Sassatelli 2007: 145). It demonstrates that commodities are not unchanging and do not necessarily represent the market, and its penetration of intimate life (Illouz 1997: 11). Here, the commodities from Liseberg become material things that take part in emphasizing the intimacy of family and with relatives. Consequently, material things are accompanied by memories of the gift-givers and they make Tove's room personal, moving beyond her as an individual by including others. There is a power in gift-giving relationships, calling for returns and reciprocity (O'Dell 2002: 164). In giving credit to the givers, Tove is happily able to recognize generosity and in a sense to pay back through a process of remembering that is tied to the people who care for her.

The rabbits become entangled in a meshwork of material things, social relations, and personal meanings that make Tove's bed into a display that extends beyond the initial rabbit commodities. It is not a question of rabbits as such, but of relations and meanings that run in different directions: to the commercial setting, to relatives and families and to Tove as the girl in focus.

Immaterial entanglements

In thinking about Tove's room and the arrangement of rabbits on the shelf under her bed, I cannot avoid mentioning my initial thought that it looks like an altar. Material things in religious practice are used to mediate relationships between people and gods (Miller 2010: 71f). Similarities between religion and consumption have been discussed since Marx analyzed commodity fetishism in 1842 (Ellen 1988: 216; see also Böhme 2014). It remains part of analyses of consumer culture, and suggests that there is a "worship of things" (Labanyi 2010: 228). Is Tove a "believer"?

Tove speaks of *the* rabbit, in the singular. She does not associate any of the many toys in her room with reference to a specific rabbit. *The* rabbit is represented through her many material things. Tove makes all of the rabbit soft toys relevant to the *one* subject that she talks about and likes. Keeping different rabbits allows the immaterial rabbit to be represented materially for Tove. The rabbit is above and beyond direct reference in the sense that Tove uses words to emphasize it in the singular, as a subject that transgresses different material things. Rabbits are everywhere in her room, but where *the* rabbit is remains unclear. What this implies is a limitless collection of rabbits, without end, since none of Tove's soft toys is fully able to capture the essence of the rabbit. This might suggest that there are

greedy desires at play, where Tove wants more and more. But at the same time, she is resisting the possible call of the new types of soft toy rabbits that are available. As pointed out in the introductory example, Tove is currently not drawn to the new, and the new materials making the rabbits softer do not interest her as much. She does not reject them, but appreciates the material things that she has already been given.

In this way, *the* rabbit turns into a subject which has a presence somewhere, elsewhere, reminiscent of religious practice, where a spirit is not within a particular material thing. Olga Nieuwenhuys (2011) argues that children's play with soft toys make material things come alive. This is not the case for Tove, who keeps her rabbit soft toys mute, as material things in a collection, close to her body, and making the room a place where she can sleep.

Embodied intimacy, emotional intimacy and intimate knowledge (Morgan 2011: 35) all become involved here. In Tove's room material things, from Liseberg in particular, take part in an embodied intimacy of touch. The meaning of these many things, the rabbits, leads in several directions: to family, to relatives and their gifts, to being purchased as commodities at Liseberg. At the same time, the rabbits are material things that are present and are associated with distant places and people.

THE RABBIT IN THE LIVING ROOM

Kim (age 5) lives in an apartment that contains plenty of recognizable ingredients from popular culture. Her room is professionally painted with colorful decorations of famous characters on the walls. In the living room there are magazines, cartoons and a collection of movies. There is no sign of rabbits here at first. No commodities, such as soft toys from Liseberg. During our talk about Liseberg, however, the rabbit appears as a drawing made by Kim.

Kim speaks about rabbits as a desirable part of visits to Liseberg. Kim is enthusiastic about meeting the rabbits. She says that the rabbits are "the best". Sitting on the sofa in the family living room, Kim tells me that they – the rabbits – know her name. Her mother Lotta tells me that Kim sometimes draws rabbits at home. While discussing Liseberg, Kim uses pencils and paper to draw several smiling rabbits, explaining to me that they are at Liseberg. For Kim, the rabbits in the park are important, in ways that go beyond her drawings. To meet them she needs to go to Liseberg. Kim does not yet know when the family will go to the park. It will be a surprise

visit, arranged by her parents Lotta and Fred, who are preparing to celebrate the upcoming birthdays of Kim and her sister Mary (3) at Liseberg.⁷⁶

Figure 5:5: Kim's drawing.

Familiarity and distance

Drawing rabbits on a piece of paper from my notepad, Kim gets into a routine of creating the material and visual presence of her favorite characters. Her drawings and comments about the rabbits make it clear to me that there is a current absence of rabbits at home. When Kim speaks of the rabbits, she is referring to the different mascots available at Liseberg. While she is able to represent the rabbits, they are at the same time distant from her. For Kim, the drawings do not provide more than an image of what is present elsewhere. Representing the rabbits, at home, creates a path towards what is desirable. Kim wants to see the rabbits, to be where the mascots are, at Liseberg. She speaks of them in positive terms as being “the best”.

There is an emphasis on difference here, in terms of places, and how representation is here distinct from the reality of rabbits elsewhere. It marks a line between outside the park and inside the park, suggesting that the difference has to do with the presence and absence of rabbits. Kevin

---

⁷⁶ Interview 1: Kim's family.

Hetherington (1997) points out that places are actively made to be different, through the arrangement of meaning, material things and people. While Kim is able to produce representations at home, she also signs up to a notion of place where there are distinct characteristics and an involvement of different material things in different places. In linking the representation with the depicted reality of Liseberg, Kim is both emphasizing and navigating such a difference of place.

Previous meetings with the mascots have left memories, and connect expectations of everyday life with the upcoming visits. In her talk about the rabbits at Liseberg, Kim is able to “bring them to life” (Nieuwenhuys 2011: 417), giving them human properties, a voice, and the ability to recognize humans and use her name. Responding to her presence, having knowledge of her, and being there for her, the mascots turn out to be familiar with her, according to Kim. They are there for *her*. This suggests that the mascots are both able and willing to approach her when she visits the park.

Kim is longing for the rabbits. She wants to be where they are. Meeting the rabbits at Liseberg, so that they can interact, requires movement and reducing the distance. Kim’s rabbits are not distant objects in the sense that they “stand over and against the perceiver” (Ingold 2012: 439). They are *with* Kim, and call for intimacy as the achievement of a “desired familiarity with another”, being “the antithesis of distance” (Thien 2005: 192f; see also Illouz 2012: 221). To get close requires her to enter the park, go to Liseberg and get involved in the activities that are offered at the house of the rabbit.

Appropriating the brand (character)

The idea that people in a general sense contribute to the brand, culturally, and thereby economically, implies that there are connections between various practices and “expressions” that are produced by children like Kim (e.g. Foster 2007; Manning 2010: 44). The corporation is assumed to be a body which is able to profit from different practices in various places. This suggests that the corporation has a great reach, wherever its brands become involved, and make value through production among consumers (Carah 2011: 437). Such an approach suggests that corporations succeed in their aim of generating intimate relationships, subordinating consumers to their agenda.

Kim gives no indication of following Liseberg’s business plan. In her version of Liseberg, there are only the rabbits. Everything else is left out.

There are only rabbits in her talk, and inside the circle of the park. To meet the rabbit mascots, one has only to purchase an entrance ticket at the lowest rate. The many other attractions that are available at a greater cost are not included in Kim's drawing, which suggests what is important and leaves out what is not. Kim's focus on rabbits does not challenge consumption or Liseberg's brand, but it demarcates particular things of interest.

Brands are commonly described as providing opportunities for lifestyles and identities, suggesting that consumers adapt their existence, more or less creatively, to what corporations offer them (e.g. Arvidsson 2006: 27f; Bookman 2013). These arguments about consumer subordination to corporate strategies and their brands might be significant in focusing on goals and aims, such as how the goal of Disney is to "win over the hearts and minds of young people so as to deliver them to the market as both loyal consumers and commodities" (Giroux & Pollock 2011: 80). An ethnographic turn to practices in which children like Kim are involved with material things, however, suggests that commodities are not always desirable in the ways that corporations might be aiming for. Rather than subordination, there are parallel paths to the brand as part of the corporation.

Kim is moving along with the brand character, rather than becoming directed in one particular way. This means that she adds to the rabbit of Liseberg, subtracts from it, and enacts it into a character that builds on what are relevant fantasies and desires for her. The rabbit is not fully her own, and not fully Liseberg's. Her drawings do not talk, they are kept mute. But Kim's park-rabbits, at Liseberg, do talk. In making the rabbits talk, Kim takes part in a wider effort among consumers to animate products and animate the brand (Fournier 1998: 344f). In doing so, she subscribes to Liseberg's notion of the rabbit as a "living creature in the park" (*Liseberg 2011 2012*: 6), approaching it as something that is familiar with her.

There is a certainty in what Kim says about the talking rabbits at Liseberg that makes me uncertain. At Liseberg, in the park, the rabbits are usually, if not always, mute. In a newspaper article, the vice-CEO of Liseberg tells the story of the rabbit where he says that the silence of the rabbits is supposed to stimulate the fantasy and play of children.⁷⁷ How can the rabbits address Kim by name? While vocalization might be inappropriate among cartoonish characters in a theme park it makes sense in establishing intimacy for Kim;

---

⁷⁷ GP (06/07/12) 'Så blev kaninen symbol för Liseberg'.

making the rabbits personal to her, interweaving them into a shared biography (Cook 2003: 166; Morgan 2011: 35).

The process of involvement with a brand has been discussed in research focusing on brands and consumption. Sonia Bookman (2013: 60f) argues that identities are produced as consumers use brands, co-perform the brand, and make it come alive, living it themselves. Through this process, it is claimed that meanings are shared and that a common social world is established. Researchers studying consumption argue that consumers engage in the co-creation of brands through cultural expressions that create value and company profits (e.g. Gustafsson 2008: 20; Prahalad & Ramaswamy 2004; Thrift 2008: 41). A related observation is that production and consumption are strongly interrelated, and that it might even be of little relevance to separate the two (e.g. Johansson 2005: 220). The case of children, brands and meaning, however, has remained unexplored until now (Hémar-Nicolas & Gollety 2012). Is Kim creating value and profits for Liseberg, by linking her production of rabbits on her own, at home, with the ones in the park?

Theories of the brand emphasize the productive role played by consumers, who provide meaning to corporations that seek a “competitive advantage” through the involvement of consumers’ “creativity and innovation” to the extent “that they develop the brand in certain directions” (Foster 2007: 719). What this suggests is that corporations welcome consumer involvement but also that they are observant of what they do. Drawing on Illouz’ (1997: 11) concept, corporations do not want consumers to “penetrate” their brands, but to work along with them. Liseberg’s approach to consumers – inviting children to fantasize and to play with the rabbit mascots – places emphasis on what takes place in the park. There, the corporation is able to control what the rabbit is and becomes, where children’s fantasies are allowed only to the degree that they do not interfere with what the rabbit is supposed to be. Visitors – children primarily – who punch the mascots in the park are one such example of undesired activities, which Liseberg tries to avoid. Fighting is frowned upon, and particular ways of interacting are encouraged, including hugs.

Drawing a line between consumption and production

Kim’s involvement with the rabbit as a commercial symbol makes sense as co-creation within theories of brands (e.g. Gustafsson 2008: 20; Prahalad & Ramaswamy 2004). As noted above, it suggests that consumption is in fact

about production. It assumes that production is about symbolic values. But it is about more than that. The rabbits are material things, available as commodities of different kinds in the park, as was seen in the example of Tove's bedroom. These are produced in factories, by laborers. While children get involved with the brand, culturally, and take part in producing it, associating it with their meanings, I understand that they cannot be too involved.

While I am taking a guided tour of Liseberg, Anders, a senior member of the staff, comments that Liseberg is a business with global reach. The corporation uses production sites in Asia. I am informed that Liseberg has quality controls. The park's management travel to China to inspect the conditions under which the rabbits are produced – to ensure that no children are involved.

Why am I told about the production of the rabbit stuff and that no children take part in it? Firstly, the origin of consumer products has been a hot topic during the last few decades, in popular and critical writing that addresses the exploitation of children (for one example, see Klein 2001).⁷⁸ Anders' description of factory visits suggests that it cannot be taken for granted that children do not work there and that the management of Liseberg is aware of the possibilities and problems of poor working conditions that affect children, elsewhere. His account of how children are left out of production suggests that Liseberg does not exploit children through labor. By telling me this, Anders makes me think about how the rabbit is simultaneously a product for children that cannot be allowed to be produced by them. It makes the rabbit into an ethical and emotional concern, where children in their roles as consumers is less of a concern than the risk of children becoming involved in labor.

Kim's creative involvement with the rabbit is with it as a brand, not as a producer of the commodities that generate sales and revenue at the park. This might seem self-evident and beyond the need for comment. But what Anders is highlighting in relation to Kim and other children is that their involvement with the brand is separated from production, in the case of commodities. Production is consequently different when it comes to brands and products, and there is a risk that this point may be missed, in general talk about the

---

⁷⁸ A discussion of the conditions in industrial production and the manufacturing of Liseberg products is beyond the scope of this study. For general studies that discuss how children take part in industrial work, are exploited and also suffer from a lack of safety, see Langer (2002, 2004).

mutual involvement of consumption and production in the talk about children and their practices.

Material things – the mascots – are involved in occasional embodied intimacy, as part of meeting each other in the park. But it is not the material presence throughout everyday life of rabbits – as soft toys, or drawings – that matter to Kim. It is the living presence of creatures elsewhere, in the park, where Kim's past and future with the rabbits is. She is developing her meanings of the brand character, creating new ones that go beyond Liseberg's rabbits. She has such a creative approach in common with other children elsewhere (Ironico 2012). An absence of material things such as soft toy rabbits, along with her appreciation of the rabbit as the "best", provides a background to the combination of fantasy and thinking about representation and reality that Kim is involved with at home, outlining a shared biography which is maintained in relation to the mascots at the park. It tells a story of a desirable presence and intimacy with rabbit mascots for mass consumption, which are currently at a distance.⁷⁹

BETWEEN NOWHERE AND EVERYWHERE

The Swedish Christmas Calendar is an annual television show aired by The Swedish Public Service Broadcaster (SVT) throughout December, from the 1st to the 24th. It started in 1960, and the story differs each year. The tradition of the SVT Christmas calendar creates great interest among both children and adults in Sweden, where the episodes are watched "live" during their premiere broadcast each morning and as repeats in the afternoon. The episodes are also distributed through copies of the show.

In 1998 the program had the title *När karusellerna sover* (While the carousels sleep). It is still possible to buy the show as a DVD collection through retail companies. The show takes place in an amusement park that is closed during winter time, *not* explicitly spoken of as Liseberg. However, the show was recorded in the park and many things, including attractions

---

⁷⁹ Heinz Steinert (2003: 127) similarly points to the fact that intimacy does not necessarily involve mutual knowledge or recognition but can involve anonymity; for example, when a stage performer bonds with a mass audience. While an audience might feel that they, as individuals, know and are close to the performer, the performer is not able to engage intimately with individuals but only with a mass of people.

and background scenery, are recognizable as parts of Liseberg to people who have visited the park.

Felicia (age 11) and Emma (age 15) are sisters who frequently watch *När karusellerna sover*. It happens that they watch the show after their Liseberg visits to prolong what they describe as a positive feeling. For example, when they are at Liseberg, in the park, they search for things they have seen to see if they match the show. Emma and Felicia say that they have seen the show at least 75 times, and that it feels “cozy” when they watch it. They have watched the show since they were small. They tell me that they watch episodes of the program when they are home sick from school. It is something that has become more or less a tradition. Even though the watching is filled with tradition, Emma’s and Felicia’s parents explain that the girls do different things in the park today compared to when they were younger. For example, they do not hug the Liseberg rabbits any longer.⁸⁰

A central character in *När karusellerna sover* is a rabbit, which is simply referred to as The Rabbit. The “home” of this character is the rabbit house at Liseberg, which is an attraction that one is able to enter as a visitor to the park. While the park rabbits are generally green, the rabbit in the television show *När karusellerna sover* is white. In the show, the rabbit also has a voice, distinguishing it from the mascots at Liseberg, which are mute.

Extending emotions

Emma and Felicia approach this show as an expression of Liseberg, regardless of the differences between the show and what is offered in the park. It is a show that is about Liseberg, and it offers the possibility of extending feelings that are available in the park to the living room at home; from a place of roller-coasters, to the sofa in front of the television set.

The positive feelings associated with Liseberg are not limited to its geographical confines. The coziness which Emma and Felicia emphasize is also positive, being at home watching the VHS tape. Both park visits and watching the show are traditions that are part of their family biography. They go to the park together and Emma and Felicia watch the show together. Watching the show, they are able to create the desired feelings of coziness at home, and also memories that relate to what is available at

---

⁸⁰ Interview 1: Felicia’s family.

Liseberg. This means that troublesome times turn into a matter of care that involves siblings (Gulløv et al. 2014: 11), watching the show.

In Sweden, coziness is associated with informal and relaxed activities such as family meals and watching movies together with an emphasis on *togetherness* and setting aside time for each other (Brembeck 2012: 127). Having a cozy time involves drawing a line between the people who are included – a family, for example – and others. It is about the close presence of people.

Coziness does not, however, require the presence or absence of other humans, as Felicia's and Emma's consumption of *När karusellerna sover* suggests. The show is watched when the sisters are sick, which is a time when embodied intimacy can turn into a problem: being too close might be contagious – if one is sick but the other is not. Helping during sore times of sickness, the show becomes a way of feeling good, and likely feeling better. The feeling is part of watching, but also of being home, together. Consumption is made into part of a time with the family as well as part of an individual healing process. It makes up a particular type of consumption: one that is not about future plans, but remains in the present. Here, the rabbit of Liseberg becomes part of a shared time, where memories of past times enter the present. Being sick it is not possible to go the park, one stays at home.

Continuity and change

Intimacy is often approached as “a linear movement from distance to proximity,” while in practice it involves greater complexity (Thien 2005: 201). The character and presence of the rabbit has changed over time. It is no longer embodied intimacy that is relevant for Felicia and Tove – touching the mascots in the park – but a more distanced intimacy with the incorporation of the park's rabbit into the show. Emma and Felicia have moved away from bodily interactions. Hugs with the mascots are no longer desired as part of their visits.

Viewing the show 75 times, as a low estimation, emphasizes continuity and quantity. Stating this number, Emma and Felicia point to the importance of the show. Along with this past and current relevance of the show goes the importance of Liseberg. It is a place they have been to in the past and that they will visit again. However, the rabbit mascots are not eternally relevant to their interest in the park.

Emma and Felicia maintain the visual presence of the rabbit, as part of a favorite show. The rabbits as material things offering intimacy are simultaneously in the past, a past that their parents talk about enthusiastically. It is part of their memories as parents, of the past childhood of Emma and Felicia. In sharing these memories of the rabbit mascots, of past times, the family shares their story, of memorable times. The memorable times relate to being in the park, but are not limited to visits. Even watching the show at home is memorable, in its coziness. It is worth talking about, sharing the individual appreciation of a shared time at home.

In thinking about how Liseberg is simultaneously approached as a distant park and as a presence through memories and the show at home, a relevant question has been formulated by Chris Rojek (1997: 69): “Why travel if [...] one can explore them from representational files in the safety of one’s home?” While Emma and Felicia emphasize similarities between how they feel at home and in the park, the VHS tape is a way of prolonging rather than replacing their visits, and vice versa. It might be satisfying enough to put it in the video player at times, but there is a relation to the park that remains key, despite their now decreased intimacy with the rabbit mascots. Would the show be relevant without the family’s positive feelings for the park? Would Liseberg be important if it was not for the show? Each feeds an interest in the other, as suggested by the idea that the tape prolongs feelings for Liseberg at home, and that one look for things at Liseberg that are part of the show.

Within and beyond political concerns

Swedish public television, which broadcast the show, is subject to regulation of its content. This includes the goal of excluding commercial features from children’s television. The Swedish Broadcasting Commission works with these issues to ensure that state regulations are followed in aired programs. The Commission made *När karusellerna sover* into a case after it was aired. At stake was whether the program followed the regulations of the Swedish state. In 1999 the commission decided that the program unfairly favored Liseberg (case 534/98 and 148/99, Granskningsnämnden för radio och tv). The focus of the review of the show was the rabbit, and the question of whether it was the Liseberg rabbit or not. The content of the program was framed as going beyond what is allowed, benefiting Liseberg as a commercial actor.

The regulations mean that *some* characters are allowed to come close to children, through the media, while others are not. The rabbit is a special case in that it has been associated with a company rather than literature or children's stories from the outset. It had no place before the park first introduced it in its limited geographical space. There are characters at ALW which are widely present in television shows that do not get this kind of attention, or turn into similar problems. One difference between Pippi Longstocking and the rabbit is that the latter is not a remediated character in the sense that it does not have an origin outside of the park, but originates from practices of branding (see Bolter & Grusin 2000). Even the Disney characters are part of annual traditions on public television, being almost mandatory to watch (Hagen 2001: 229). While one can see these as commercials or the merchandising of brands (Cook 2011: 339), this is not generally the case in Sweden. The consequence is that *certain* characters, including the rabbit, are not allowed to relocate freely, for example in travelling from Liseberg to the television shows of SVT. In the view of the state and its investigation, children's familiar characters turn into a problematic matter; the familiar rabbit brings the unwanted presence of Liseberg to the show. It turns into a brand character, with the emphasis on *brand* as a problem.

Commercial involvement is not only a state issue. It involves politicians as well as outspoken activists. In this case, the author of the script of the television show, Hasse Alfredsson, in an interview in *Aftonbladet* (1998-11-04), criticized the broadcaster for its involvement in the distribution of the program in a commercial market. Alfredsson argued that, by selling various products that are related to *När karusellerna sover*, such as a CD-ROM, SVT, the Swedish Public Service Broadcaster, made money from directing products at children.

The arguments above are about the show and its undesirable commercial involvement in two ways: involving its content, and its distribution. The content benefits Liseberg, and the distribution benefits the public broadcaster SVT. Accordingly, children should be separated from commercial features and motives of profit. The anti-commercial arguments of both the state and Alfredsson, an influential Swedish cultural personality and author, direct critique, in different ways, toward the broadcasting company for getting involved in business activities and favoring commercial actors.

Along with their parents, Emma and Felicia do not make a big deal of the potentially political issue of the show. There is no talk about profits, or about the rabbit as an expression of corporate strategies and profit-making. The rabbits are not kept at a distance, belonging to others or their interests. It is *their* interests and feelings that matter to Emma and Felicia. And in outlining their approach to the rabbit and to Liseberg, by talking about the show, it becomes clear that the VHS tape does not necessarily lead to the park, or calls for visits. It can also be part of a time that is bounded to the home, where possibilities of positive feelings are incorporated by making associations with Liseberg – without spending any money. This suggests that children are able to invert the corporations' approach of involving the creativity of consumers (Foster 2007: 719), by copying products – the show onto a VHS tape.

Cultural studies investigating consumption would perhaps suggest that Emma and Felicia are here involved in creative acts or resistance that challenge a wider commercial culture. I would argue, drawing on notions of intimacy, that Liseberg and consuming the park retains a continuous emotional relevance while embodied intimacy becomes less important. Going to the park for Emma and Felicia then becomes less about hugging and coming close to the rabbit. Distance and changes in intimacy do not, however, suggest resistance. It is rather telling us that children live along with material things rather than being subordinate or superior to them, and that the relevance of material things can decrease and change over time, as children get older (cf. Belk 1988: 160).

Using an anecdotal reference, it is noticeable that people keep rabbit soft toys as adults. My friends and family refer to the places where they now keep their aged rabbits – in storage rooms, at home, and at their parents' homes. It seems as though the rabbit maintains an importance even if it is not visually present and on display. Throwing it away seems to be a challenging decision and a less likely option than moving it into the dark spaces of plastic bags and storage rooms. If intimacy no longer involves rabbit mascots, with the end of hugs, is there an endpoint to the rabbit when children grow up? Emma and Felicia hold onto their VHS tape. And why would they get rid of it or throw it away? Through this little piece of plastic they are able to create a cozy time and connections with a well-liked place elsewhere. This creates a sense of connection with past times, as a longing for past emotions in the present which can be described as nostalgic (see Kitson & McHugh 2014: 490f). Historically, nostalgia has been approached

as a disease-like matter (Dames 2010: 271) but in the case of Emma and Felicia it becomes part of care and times of healing. It is about feeling better in the present, using past experiences and positive emotions as a resource.

CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

Material things are everywhere in this study, from commodities and attractions in the parks, to the homes of children. The apartments and houses where the children live provide insights into how material things become part of intimate life and take part in individual expressions as well as family biographies (Miller 2001a; Mitchell & Reid-Walsh 2002: 122).

The analyses have shown that Liseberg is enacted outside of its geographical confines. This occurs through the use of material things that become part of the lives of children and their families, and are involved in the routines of everyday life. These things are part of decorating rooms, purchasing gifts, imagining a time to come in the park, counting collected items, of sleep, playing around, smiling at the collected mass of things, displaying it to others, and identifying who a child is (a fixated one, perhaps). The material world of theme parks *is* in the intimate or “private” sphere of the home.

The theme park does not simply enter the homes of children in one way. Borders between the places are emphasized in how children draw and talk about differences between home and the theme park. This suggests the relevance of both places, of their differences and similarities and of moving between home and Liseberg. Kim’s (age 5) and Tove’s (age 9) emphasis in their representations is about highlighting difference. Emma’s (age 11) and Felicia’s (age 15) observation of similar emotions in the park and at home does not deny differences, but does not make these into an argument for why park visits are necessary.

Concepts of the market, culture and capitalism at first seem quite distant when entering the homes of children, being shown “their” things, rooms and creative decorations, including posters and drawings. Childhood activist Sue Palmer (2006) claims that childhood turns toxic through commercial influences. This claim is similar to those of researchers and activists who argue that engagement in consumer culture creates depression and psychological problems (Layard & Dunn 2009: 59; Schor 2005: 167), that commercialism and things offer merely a broken promise of happiness (Linn 2008: 4; Mayo & Nairn 2009: 237). Also, public voices in Sweden, such as the famous psychiatrist David Eberhard (2013: 88) suggest that it is not

possible to buy happiness with money. These accounts propose that children's happiness stands in opposition to the market, and that there is a barrier between them. There are, however, no calls to overthrow capitalism. The solutions are similar to Benjamin R. Barber's (2007: 257), in balancing capitalism's destructive tendencies in relation to other independent worlds. This solution suggests, using the words of Illouz (1997: 11), that corporations should stop "penetrating" the lives of children.

"Penetration" suggests a division, a crack and a break (Illouz 1997: 11). It leads to questions about whether capitalism or markets are first outside of the lives of children, and then enter or penetrate their homes and social relations. Is there a good inside and a bad outside, against which children and capitalism are organized? This chapter indicates that notions of good *or* bad need to be reconsidered because there is no clear outside or inside. Children associate positive emotions with consumption, and they find relief and desirable opportunities in what others actively consider to be problems. This challenges the straight line as a division between children's happiness and commercial things (cf. Ingold 2007a: 155): the idea of qualities and activities that have been divided – into good or bad – simply does not hold up here. This means that, in practice, components of happiness become mingled with those of expected unhappiness (see Palmer 2006).

Zooming out, and considering material things in a wider sense in this chapter, children and their parents make these desirable rather than something that should be avoided. As with the Liseberg rabbit, material things are used for play and are part of fantasy; they become part of the biographies of children and parents, of past family life, that are spoken of in positive terms. In this way, material things are invested with meanings that emphasize personal relations and experiences. Things that have previously been considered good and bad occur at the same time: consumption *and* playful creation (drawing), individual fixations *within* social relations, remembering and unfamiliarity, feeling bad and getting better, making the rabbit present *and* distant at the same time.

Is the consumption of material things good or bad? What is good and what is bad in terms of feelings is, according to Sara Ahmed (2010b: 39), a political issue that involves struggle. In discussing children's consumption through the case of Emma and Felicia, and the regulation of commercial television in Sweden, I have highlighted a distance between practice and state policy – the concerns regarding a brand character are approached in different ways: positive and negative. This distance illustrates how good and bad are part of

both societal notions of childhood and consumption, and of children's local consumption practices. To note this is different from calling for what the world should look like, as noted by Daniel Thomas Cook (2013: 426): "We need not concur with the values and attitudes surrounding children's goods and media, but we also must not denigrate outright the very things and actions that forge the childhoods we painstakingly strive to comprehend." Where does this leave us? Do material things lead to happiness?

Material things not only enact relations with corporations but they also turn into a part of family life and social relations. Through commercial products, children maintain their lives as family at home and in relation to relatives elsewhere. This complicates the idea that children focus on material things and consumer items *instead* of engaging in social activities or playful and creative practices – contra fetishism and limited brand relations. A consequence is that the question of whether material things lead to happiness needs to be reformulated to appreciate the ways in which social and material matters are part of wider practices and everyday life.

Are consumable things part of practices of happiness that involve children? Yes, indeed they are. For some this might seem to require regulation, inspired by the laws in Sweden (Palmer 2006; Schor 2005). Laws do not, however, necessarily challenge practices of consumption among children, at home or in places like theme parks. Therefore it seems relevant to either challenge practices in a wider sense than just by targeting children (cf. Buckingham 2000: 145–167), which separates them into a partially excluded segment of society, or to develop approaches that are relevant to children, in which politics becomes part of consumption and beyond, suggesting that "it could be otherwise" (Woolgar 2012; Woolgar & Lezaun 2015: 465) when it comes to capitalism as well as childhood. The political issue, of how it *should* be, ought to involve children. Not limiting their involvement to picking brands and commodities, but extending to developing society, not ending the political history where we currently are.

CHAPTER 6

VALUOGRAPHY: MONEY

Going to Astrid Lindgren's World (ALW) and Liseberg can be an expensive endeavor. Usually it is parents who hold the wallets. They finance the visits and make preparations so that costs can be controlled. Different strategies are employed to limit spending: tickets are purchased online, in advance, covering an appropriate period for the visit, and memberships in various organizations offer reduced costs for park entrance and hotel stays. There are also the costs of getting to the parks, paying for attractions, activities and food, drinks, and snacks, as well as for buying souvenirs. There seem to be endless opportunities for consumption in the parks, with stores offering ice-cream, candy, souvenirs, books, clothes, playthings and DVDs.

Primarily, I am attentive to children's involvement with money. But the children in this study are not in a position where money can necessarily be accessed. Parents are approached in different ways for getting money. And parents approach children through money. This does not take place in a way that only involves issues of economy and happiness, it also involves other values. For example, money is used as an encouragement for children to reach goals that are considered valuable in one way or another. Also, money is saved and *not* spent, being valuable in an imagined future. Money is collected and becomes a token of social bonds. In exploring the nitty-gritty practices of theme park visits, I am interested in questions of how money and value become meaningful in terms of happiness. The answers are helpful in reaching a wider understanding of happiness through money and values.⁸¹

The aim of this chapter is to extend knowledge about children and happiness by digging into practices where money becomes related to values. At the end, this chapter addresses the questions: How can notions of happiness be enacted through money? What do notions of happiness tell us about the

---

⁸¹ Distribution comes with an assumption that money and happiness are enacted differently, rather than being a duo that work together in the same way through time and space. Such assumptions – of stable entanglements or distance – run through statistics, where correlations and non-correlations between money-in-numbers and happiness-in-numbers are emphasized.

value of money in the consumption of theme parks? These questions offer a chance to enter into dialogue with assumptions that have influenced thinking about money and happiness, through explorations that focus on the practices of children and parents.

Before I turn to the analysis, there will be two sections in which I discuss, firstly, previous studies of money and happiness, and then how *Valuography* involves these concepts in analyzing values in practice.

HAPPY MONEY

Today there is an all-encompassing interest in money and happiness. This is illustrated by current books inspiring people to “seek genuine happiness, with money as your partner” (Rowley 2005: xiv) and to “wring the most happiness out of every \$5” (Dunn & Norton 2013: 135). These books suggest that money is a resource for individuals who are aiming for happiness: make money and you will have increased opportunities for happiness. This proposal is not only a part of literature that aims to guide readers to individual success. There are happiness economists who “put a monetary price on the problem of misery and alienation” (Davies 2015: 9). The annual report on consumption in Sweden, published by the University of Gothenburg, has recently provided statistics showing that money and consumption correlate positively with individual well-being, as an expression of happiness (Roos 2012: 17, 2013). Similar observations were made some 10 years ago. According to Sören Holmberg and Lennart Weibull (2005: 33), two significant factors in happiness in Sweden are earning a lot of money and being young.

Both money and happiness are included in statistical measurements at national levels – where there are rankings including countries worldwide. In the identification of levels of happiness, money works as a partial measure, measured as GDP (Bergheim 2007; Fors 2012b). There are also alternatives, including the Gross National Happiness Index, which focus not on the economy but on measurable happiness (Sachs 2013: 7). It is a matter of dispute whether happiness and economics are two values that go together, or whether they are fundamentally different. These measurements, however, both suggest that money and happiness can be measured in universal terms.

ALW and Liseberg measure satisfaction among their visitors, which is similar to general surveys on happiness. Neither ALW nor Liseberg

considers satisfaction or happiness in life generally, but just during time spent in the park. Questions are asked by employees committed to market research about how satisfied or happy visitors are with their visit.⁸² Adult visitors provide answers through numbers on a scale, accounting for their company or family. Happiness in the parks is turned into a measureable quantity that is gradable. How happy are you with the services provided, with the attractions and the employees? Is the company of visitors happy enough to come back? Are visitors unhappy “enough” to require another visit free of charge?

Consumption and happiness are not necessarily compatible, and possibly involve different values. Barbro Johansson (2005: 11) notes that consumption is a question that involves different and contested values, and particularly so when it comes to children. Money can stand against the value of happiness in political arguments. It also does so in some psychological theories, where it has been suggested that economic success comes at the price of limited emotional fulfilment, standing in the way of happiness (Illouz 2008: 199). How can one understand what money “is” and how it becomes associated with different values?

Research investigating the social meanings and economic role of money suggests that there is now no intrinsic value to coins or bills, but that people and institutions take it as a promise – one can happily believe in their value (Bjerg 2014: 107f, 110; Mellor 2010: 11; Yuran 2014: 16; Žižek 2008: 299f). Here, money turns into an issue of belief and trust, which provide stability in the value of objects such as coins or bills. Money is part of shifting practices in which it acquires meaning and value (Zelizer 1994). This makes money into a matter that is not strictly economic but also relies on social relations and cultural factors (Dodd 2014: 287f). Money, consequently, turns out to be heterogeneous and is “continually invented and reinvented by its users” (ibid.: 305). Money also involves emotional meanings and these differ between places and situations (Schillmeier 2007: 594, 606; Zelizer 1985/1994). This complicates the approach to money as being a measure of value. It requires attention to practices that enact money heterogeneously (Dodd 2014: 288).

There have been calls for research into how children get money (Zelizer 2005: 250) and what the different sources of children’s money are (Zelizer 2002: 392). If money involves different emotions and takes part in the

---

⁸² Swedish: “Nöjd.”

enactment of happiness it is reasonable to ask how these acquire meaning in the practices by which children access money. This calls for an approach that draws attention to children's money and values in a wide sense, involving economics, emotions and happiness (cf. Samuelsson 2012; Sparrman & Sandin 2012). Here, I explore money in its heterogeneity and multiplicity. The question is not whether children should be involved with money or not; they already are, and there is little to suggest that money will disappear from the lives of children (e.g. Sparrman & Sandin 2012).

APPROACHING VALUES

Daniel Miller (2008b: 1122) suggests that we are far from short of “theories of value”, calling for studies of what value do rather than what it “is”. In line with this curiosity about doing, Isabelle Dussauge et al. (2015) outline an approach to the study of values in practice, defined as *valuography*. Examining enactments of value, the program of valuography emphasizes “empirically oriented research” and is concerned with how “certain things come to be considered valuable and desirable” (ibid.: 267f). This means avoiding general assumptions about values as a totality, and instead being attentive to multiplicities and the “simultaneous presence of various values” (ibid.: 269).

My approach to money and value suggests that there might be practices and sites where children are allowed to get involved with money, and others where they are not. It opens up space for accounts through which it is possible to see how children's money does not flow freely, as part of a general world of liberal capitalism, but how different practices and sites distribute money and values differently (Miller 1997: 13, 37).

Drawing on the work of Annemarie Mol (2002: vii, 6), I consider money and values to be *enacted* in practice. This means that enactment makes money and values into different things. Consequently, what money and values become has to do with practices and relations (cf. Dodd 2014; Mol 2002: 5; Zelizer 1994). I do not draw on Mol for the purpose of outlining a comprehensive theoretical answer to what a value or money “is”.⁸³

---

⁸³ This is a more open approach than, for example, Viviana Zelizer's (1994), which emphasizes exchange value as defining different “monies”. I am, however, inspired by Zelizer's attention to heterogeneity where money does not explicitly need to be labeled “money”, but the approach becomes too narrow here, in the definition of monies as “all

Enactment challenges universal claims in which a notion of money, value or happiness is portrayed through notions of stability – it is an achievement, in such cases. The intriguing question in ethnographizing money and values is about the ways in which these attain meaning, and how these meanings are coordinated.

In focusing on money, I consider estimations, negotiations, judgments, and priorities. At times during theme park visits considerations of money and values are rather straightforward. They involve hypothetical questions such as: Is it worth spending money on candy at this time, in the expensive shop at the theme park, when there are sweets in the caravan just outside? There are also less explicit considerations of money that require giving attention to how values are spoken about and put into practice, during interviews and in the park.

IS IT WORTH IT?

Parents hold the wallets, and pay for children. Consumption makes some things good value and others expensive. Parents and children act in relation to how things and activities are considered in terms of price: buy low-cost, avoid expensive. In spending money on theme park visits, parents and children are attentive to the value of things. They make comparisons. These can be made since there are products in the parks which can be equated with what is available elsewhere. Comparability in the prices of products runs through the visits: bicycle helmets, playthings, and restaurant visits are subject to discussions. Is it worth buying it? Does one need food, ice-cream, playthings or clothes at this time?

What is special about theme parks is that these places offer experiences that are challenging, sometimes impossible, to compare with products and experiences elsewhere. Can the value of riding a specific roller-coaster be estimated before it is experienced? Is it estimated? Experiences are trickier to compare in terms of costs than, for example, a fast-food meal. This does

---

objects that have recognized, regularized exchange value in one social setting or another” (Zelizer 1994: 21). A limitation to this approach is the focus on what happens *around* an object, such as what is said about it, without considerations of how it is part of enacting exchange value. Mol (2002) pushes the argument about objects further by examining how different realities can be enacted, so that an object like a cigarette can be simultaneously for use/smoking and have an exchange value.

not mean, however, that money value is set aside in favor of a sole focus on emotions and experiences.

Encouragements

Felicia (age 11) enjoys various attractions at Liseberg and considers the park to be part of her life, being her “backyard” (see chapter 1). However, not all attractions at Liseberg are relevant to her.

Felicia (age 11) is talking about the attractions at Liseberg when her father Björn offers her 20 euros if she tries out the thrilling roller-coaster *Balder* this year. This is one of several attractions that Felicia has not experienced. She doesn't dare to ride the big and speedy ones. This is something which her parents and even her friends are aware of, frequently speaking about the Liseberg attractions. Felicia says that she wants a million to consider riding *Balder*.⁸⁴

Being alien to riding *Balder*, Felicia makes what seems to be an impossible suggestion: she wants an offer of a million SEK (100 000 €) for even considering this attraction. There is such a difference between Björn's initial proposal and that of Felicia that nothing more happens, there is no discussion or negotiation about what is a fair and just amount. It is out of the question to enter this attraction, and this is emphasized by numbers that her parents are able to recognize.

It is not intangible points about undesirable emotions that are used in the argument that *Balder* is good, bad, nice, or scary, that it makes you happy or unhappy. Instead, two very different sums become an expression of the relevance of riding it. The million SEK suggests a value that belongs in a fantasy rather than actually being credible and leading to the attraction.

---

⁸⁴ Interview 1: Felicia's family.

Figure 6:1: Balder. Part of the wooden roller-coaster at Liseberg.

Björn's financial backing suggests that there are material benefits to gain from immaterial experiences for Felicia. In Björn's proposal, these turn into related matters. For Björn, it seems valuable to push the limits and to explore new attractions. This involves leaving the comfort zone and exposing oneself to experiences that might create fear. There is a similarity here with the attraction of uncertain feelings in sport, where you do not know the outcome (Asplund 1987: 29f). Too much certainty would probably spoil the promise of the experience. Would it even be relevant to pay for the ride if there was only certainty and that you fully knew what was going to happen? For Felicia, the certainty of too much uncertainty makes *Balder* into a challenge that, if not priceless, comes at such a cost that she does not need to discuss it further.

Liseberg offers controlled fear, where attractions are supposed to provide experiences, a sense of achievement and an adrenaline rush (Csarman 2007: 10f, 61, 204). Nick Lee and Steven D. Brown (2002: 273) discuss the roller-coaster as a "machine for generating fear effects that we can then manage," which provides an "imaginary danger" for those old enough. According to Lee and Brown, the roller-coaster provides a "test of our fear-

disposal competences” which adults, accordingly, are expected to have developed.

To recognize this imaginary fear involves an alignment with what the park is selling and what many people appreciate, but it does not come without challenges or contestation. Money enters the discussion, making it into a negotiation where unwillingness might turn into a willing agreement to experience *Balder*. It becomes a means of changing one’s perception of a particular thing, a theme park attraction. Ideas about the outcome differ for Björn and Felicia.

Here, money and emotions work together. They turn into valuable entities that are subject to exchange in pushing the limits: for the certainty of experiences that offer uncertainty. There is a value in the “imaginary danger” (Lee & Brown 2002: 273), which for Björn translates into an assessment of money.

Deborah Lupton (1998: 157) notes that family relationships are commonly “represented as providing comfort and security,” and allowing “a safe place to retreat from the dangers of the outside world.” But it is of course not only comfort and protection that are relevant here. In contrast to comfort and retreat, family relations also involve monetary transactions to encourage involvement with things that are part of the controlled fear of aspects of “the outside world”. Drawing on the work of Eva Illouz (2007), I argue that the family takes part in practices that relate to a wider cultural order of *emotional capitalism*, in which consumption creates associations between the general economy of money and the emotions of an individual. Illouz suggests that corporations are involved in offering emotionally oriented services and products: the example of internet dating sites highlights the fact that corporations turn into mediators of emotions and social life through consumption. Does the notion of emotional capitalism make sense in this case?

Following the observation that Felicia and Björn approach the world of Liseberg through money as a pay-off for surmounting challenges, it makes sense to consider how encouragements direct family life in certain directions. The interweaving of money and emotions, in the case of Felicia and Björn, generates a path from home towards places elsewhere and new experiences. Family not only ensures a delimited, “safe” place throughout life, but also provides challenges in relation to emotional life in a wider world.

Encouraging Felicia, Björn makes money into a matter of costs-benefits. In terms of money and emotions, it involves Felicia in a question of whether she should accept a benefit to balance the cost of experiencing *Balder*. It is possible for different persons to value things differently, and consequently to enact the same matter – e.g. *Balder* – differently in terms of money and (un-)happiness (Gilbert 2007: 50–53). Some pay for the privilege of experiencing *Balder*, while others require payment to even consider taking the ride. This highlights the shifting involvements of economics and emotions, and how a roller-coaster involves various considerations of what and where value is, and to whom it is considered to have a value.

Money becomes a way of crossing the boundary that *Balder* represents for Felicia and entering the attraction. Björn wants to erase the dividing line between Felicia and the attraction by offering money. But with talk of great sums of money, Felicia maintains this line by suggesting an impossible amount, making it into a measure of quantity rather than being dogmatic that she cannot be bought. There is neither an agreement between Felicia and Björn nor a conflict about money. What their discussion of the financial sum required for riding *Balder* suggests is that there is no possibility of family homogeneity during upcoming visits, as it would probably cost too much for Björn to compensate Felicia for her unwillingness to join him for a ride on the attraction.

Bribes

Encouragements like those offered by Björn are forward-oriented, offering monetary benefits from upcoming challenging activities. There are also other more direct involvements with valuable goods during park visits. Parents expect the unexpected, in considering what *might* be necessary.

Kim (age 5) and her family have just arrived at Liseberg. At the outset of the visit, Kim's mother Lotta talks about expecting some fuss, and that there might be a need for bribes. The family's father, Fred, points out attractions that he wants to try. Kim is repeatedly saying "I don't want to," refusing to take part in any of the suggested activities. Lotta tells Kim about the ride passes that they just bought; you buy these for the attractions, and that the money paid for these could have been used for other things. Fred adds quietly that they will never buy such a ticket again if Kim will not take the attractions at this time.⁸⁵

---

⁸⁵ Park visit: Kim's family.

Kim's refusals challenge the ideals of the visit, as planned by her parents. They have invested money in unlimited rides, which are now available throughout the day for the entire family. Investments in tickets for the day are useless if Kim does not join in. Doing things together, as a family, is paid for here, and is desirable and demanded. The attractions that the tickets offer are of little relevance to Kim at the beginning. A bribe opens up the possibility that the visit will eventually be carried out in a way that accords with the plan of Kim's parents. Bribes become a potential solution to a problem. Following the talk about future sanctions, not buying such tickets again, and the explanation of how the money could have been used for other things, Kim joins in. She does not show any enthusiasm.

The notion of bribes initially used by Lotta makes sense throughout the visit, where attractions generate benefits.

Lotta tells Kim (age 5): let's ride this attraction, and then there will be ice-cream.⁸⁶

Kim's involvement in the family activity is compensated with things that she as an individual enjoys; the cost of ice-creams becomes an additional expense that is manageable in relation to the initial purchase. The ice-cream seems more desirable to Kim than the attractions, in general.

It has been suggested that visits to a funfair come with expectations of an orgy-like time, but that the limited financial resources of parents make it all into a disappointment for children in their consumption (Vinterberg 1977: 251). What such an observation suggests is that children are the ones who desire to ride attractions, who see a value in entertainments, and act beyond the value of money, being committed to a hedonism that is limited by the amount of money available.

The Kim example shows that parents do not necessarily have an easy time in convincing their children of the inherently positive experiences of theme park attractions. Lotta and Fred use bribes and rewards. Rewards are widely used by parents: "Most young people have received and been rewarded with sweets throughout their childhood, but parents strive for a certain moderation" (Brusdal 2007: 393). This is the case with Kim as well, where there is not an overflow of bribes, but moderation in how an ice-cream is used as a reward that will come later. It will come to Kim after her involvement in what Karin Aronsson and Asta Cekaite (2011) call a *target*

---

⁸⁶ Park visit: Kim's family.

activity, here being riding one of the attractions that her parents have planned for. Ice-cream becomes, in Sara Ahmed's (2006: 168) words, an *orientation device*, for giving direction to life, so that subjects become aligned with others (see also Ahmed 2011: 166). This suggests that enjoyable products not only have a value as tasting good, being appreciated and desirable by individuals like Kim, but also play a part in establishing the social order.

The moderation that Ragnhild Brusdal (2007: 393) addresses when it comes to parents rewarding children makes more sense than hedonism in the case of Kim, and throughout this study. There are no visits where money, candy, ice-cream, or other desirable things flow freely. Instead, they become part of an order in which there are treats and threats, encouragements, appreciated times of sitting down between activities and indulging in some energizing snacks or food. The moderation during this visit is not about putting ascetic *or* hedonistic ideals to work but to get children and parents willingly involved in activities where it is accepted that children might not enjoy everything, but that there is something to be gained for everyone.

Ellen Seiter (1993: 20f) suggests that providing candy for children offers mothers the opportunity to be heroes for a while and that it offers them some calm. Calm and acceptance of the will of her mother describes how Kim finally joins in, without making much fuss. However, Lotta does not turn into a "hero" but rather someone who recognizes and manages different desires, through purchases of things that Kim will enjoy later.

Value for money, the value of the ticket, value of and for the ice-cream, all become involved during the course of the visit. As the ice-cream turns into a bribe it is possible to make the most, or at least more, out of the money paid for the tickets. This suggests that individual considerations of value become important here, when there are different opinions regarding the attractions in the park. The ice-cream helps in aligning different desires about consumption into family time in the park, so that there is less friction or individual resistance that might make the initial ticket investment worthless.

CASH(IN') THE BANK

Children receive money from parents for particular things, and they also use money that they already possess in the parks. This part explores how

happiness becomes visible as children get involved with money. How do they access and spend money? In different ways, it turns out.

The money of others

During the interviews, Rebecca (age 11) and her mother Anne talk about money in terms of costs and value, and also discuss it in relation to happiness.

I ask what it costs to go to ALW and if it is an expensive place. Rebecca tells me that it is “lagom”, the Swedish word for describing it as appropriate, not too much or not too little. Rebecca adds that she, in fact, does not have to pay. Her mother, Anne, looks at Rebecca and tells me that it is not particularly expensive. Lars, her husband, nods in agreement. Anne emphasizes that you get plenty of things for the money paid in terms of theater and experiences. Anne tells me that Rebecca is a happy kid, who has never cried in frustration or anger about not getting things. Rebecca, however, suggests that she has been grumpy when she has been denied ice-cream. But she has not cried over anything, Anne adds.⁸⁷

These accounts suggest that Rebecca’s parents consider money during visits to be without conflict or any unwanted emotional outcomes.

If someone else pays, why bother about money at all? Is there a value, as such, in being a child that provides a freedom in which money becomes the responsibility of others – adults, parents? Money from Anne’s and Lars’ wallets makes visits and consumption in the park possible. Rebecca is not expected to provide money for ice-cream or the visits as such, nor can she access these freely or in any amounts, for anything that one can consume at ALW. There is a line drawn here, between keeping money and spending it. While Rebecca is allowed to do the latter, she is not provided with money to keep on her own.

Researchers suggest that children are involved with money that is provided by parents and that they earn some on their own, and that money paves the way for consumption as autonomous actions by children (Davidson 2012; Hjalmarson 2007; Samuelsson 2012). It has also been argued that parents limit children’s access to money and work as gatekeepers (Martens et al. 2004: 166).

---

⁸⁷ Interview 1 and 2: Rebecca’s family.

There is a question of dependence and gatekeeping here, which highlights how Rebecca's park visit is tied to her parents' consumption and their money. The arrangement of parents who pay and the child as a consumer involves issues of happiness, as Anne suggests in her observation that Rebecca is a "happy kid" who does not get angry or frustrated. This suggests an appreciation of the un-relatedness of money and emotions. This is, as Anne implies, not necessarily a general fact among children: Rebecca might just as easily have turned out to be a child who reacts with anger and disappointment, and demands to get money and things at ALW, being something other than a "happy kid".

There is a firmness to the "happy kid" here, which goes well with gatekeeping parents who keep money in their wallets. Rebecca is, accordingly, happy regardless of whether money comes to her or not. While Anne suggests that there is a permanence to happiness, Rebecca identifies herself in contrast to this through grumpiness, at moments when she has been denied ice-cream. In her talk about money, there is not the same stability as in her mother's account. She is, instead, emotionally adapting to money and consumption. Rebecca, in her talk about grumpiness, recalls moments that make happiness into something of a strange matter; she is not the "happy kid" but a grumpy kid, turning into a stranger to her mother, as she desires ice-cream and money and these accordingly influence her emotionally.

Here, emotions are presented as part of a palette of possibilities in relation to money: happy, angry, frustrated, or grumpy. Being a "happy kid" is better than the alternatives for Anne, but Rebecca is not constantly happy. This is something which Anne does not recognize. It is perhaps unknown, and something she learns about during the interview, or something undesirable that not is worth noticing.

Anne and Rebecca act as happiness economists, who put a monetary value on happiness and undesirable emotions (Davies 2015: 9): the price of happiness is low, but at times her parent's' wallets are required, according to Rebecca. How can children like Rebecca, who rely on and spend the money of others, be considered in terms of happiness?

Etymologically, emotion relates to movement and being moved (Dahlgren & Starrin 2004: 9). There is a value in Anne's account of *not* being moved by the movement of money: a desirably blasé attitude of the individual child towards money – being, not ignorant, but untouched; being happy

regardless of wherever they are, and whether or not they are able to control this. While movement has historically been associated with positive values (Werner 2015: 170), children are exempt in the case of movements of money.

Viviana Zelizer (1985/1994) writes about the emotionally priceless child, and how she or he is valued in terms of money. Children, in Zelizer's historical study, were "reserved a separate noncommercial place", in an "increasingly commercialized world" (ibid.: 11). Zelizer highlights how borders are drawn between the adult economy and children, who are drawn into emotional thinking and valued as being priceless. Rebecca and her parents offer an insight into how "happy" can simultaneously be beyond money and work as a possession of others that becomes accessible momentarily.

The "happy kid" who reproduces the limit between children as emotional subjects and the adult economy offers a story that contrasts with arguments, explicit and implicit, that individuals use money to achieve a self-fulfilling happiness (Dunn & Norton 2013; Holmberg & Weibull 2005; Roos 2012; Rowley 2005). Pascal Bruckner (2010: 2) argues that children are told from birth to be happy. It is an imperative that, accordingly, stretches from the cradle, as young people are made responsible for their own happiness. Bruckner and other critical scholars argue that happiness makes sense as an ideology that directs people to "be" in certain ways, to align with a social order (e.g. Ahmed 2010a; Berardi 2009: 90f; Burnett 2012: 44), living happily as an individual who is autonomous, free from constraints and dependence, and is responsible for themselves (Binkley 2011: 385, 391).

The condition of Rebecca's happiness is "natural" to her mother but changing and social, involving various emotions and orientations towards rewards. Rebecca's happiness differs from a stable state where one "is"; instead she becomes happy or unhappy in relation to other people and things and the fulfilment of the imperative of happiness makes sense in relation to benefits. Rather than isolating the view of the "happy kid" who "is", Rebecca makes ice-cream or similar desirable things part of its continuous constitution. For Rebecca money turn out to be absent with a momentary presence in passing that is considered important.

Uncertain fortune

I meet Christopher (age 9) and his mother Ulrika outside ALW on a sunny day in May. They are frequent visitors to ALW. Christopher enjoys theatrical plays and visits the park for a few hours, three or four times a week, each summer.

Christopher talks about the theatrical performances he wants to see. He is also eager to test his luck in the lotteries and games that are part of the park. Christopher tells me that he carries money himself, and that his mother is also indebted to him. Christopher adds numbers for counting the debt, “45+30 is 75”, to finally present me with a number that is somewhere around 100 SEK (10 euros). Repeatedly, Christopher asks his mother Ulrika about 10 SEK for one of the games during our visit. After repeated calls for money lasting a couple of minutes, Ulrika hands over a golden 10 SEK coin to Christopher. They both buy lottery tickets. Ulrika gets a winning number and is rewarded with a soft toy, “Herr Nilsson”, a small monkey that is a character from the Pippi Longstocking stories. She does not keep it but quickly offers it to Christopher. He nods, accepts, and puts it in his bag without a word. The games attract further interest from Christopher. During a break for drinks and snacks, following the lottery, Christopher asks for another 10 SEK from Ulrika. Ulrika now tells Christopher that it will be subtracted from her debt to him. They debate but do not agree on the amount of money that Ulrika owes Christopher. Without reaching a consensus, but with the 10 SEK in his hand, Christopher smilingly moves at speed to the location of the games. I join him. After a couple of meters he suddenly slows down, to tell me that “my mother can be persuaded through nagging.”⁸⁸

Christopher asks for money, comments on it, and money leads him to activities like the lottery. There is no flow of money that goes from Ulrika to Christopher. It does not come to Christopher easily. Ulrika will not simply give any amount of money to Christopher and she differentiates the occasions when 10 SEK are given to him (1 €). Christopher goes to some effort and nagging becomes a way of getting money that is not necessarily his from his mother.

How Christopher gets the soft toy provides a contrast to the many words that are used for addressing and accessing money. “Herr Nilsson”, the prize, does not get the same attention as money, as something to talk about and to notice as a success in what Christopher is able to get. There seems to be no

---

⁸⁸ Park visit: Christopher’s family.

dispute over who is the rightful keeper of the toy, it being a product that is valuable to children rather than adults. Money, however, is less specific in this way, in practice carrying no exclusivity for adults *or* children. And the disputable matter of who should have money opens up the potential for quarrels that become a recurring part of the visit to ALW.

6:2: “Good Luck”, sign at ALW, in front of a ball game.

As he tells me about his successful nagging, I get the impression that Christopher is satisfied and happy with gaining access to money from his mother – it is something worth commenting on, telling others about. Thinking about money here leads me to consider how it is associated with Christopher and Ulrika respectively. Is there money that belongs to different individuals? Christopher refers to money that his mother has borrowed, that is his. He also suggests that there is money that he can get from his mother that is not earmarked as debt.

Christopher's request for 10 SEK does not refer either to debt money or to some other kind of money – perhaps belonging to Ulrika. It is unspecific. If Christopher asked for *his* money he would risk losing the chance of getting Ulrika's money. The request here becomes a kind of gamble, which can be profitable for Christopher if he receives money from Ulrika that is not part of the debt. The 10 SEK asked for here is not defined as a possession of one individual, but becomes an object that both Ulrika and Christopher are involved with, as something in Ulrika's wallet and as something that Christopher tries to get his hands on, by nagging.

Christopher's nagging reveals that money is not a matter of course: it might be debt money that he receives, or it might be money from his mother. These two alternatives make the desired coin into different objects. In practice, the 10 SEK is enacted as multiple objects (Mol 2002), a coin kept by Ulrika, belonging to her, and part of Christopher's plans for carrying out coming activities. The first can be considered as part of gift-giving, where Ulrika provides Christopher with money as a gift without making any claim for returns. Such an idea is recognizable in previous research, where money that children receive from parents is considered a gift (Björström 2004; Johansson 2005). But the example does not end there. The call for a 10 SEK coin leads in different directions. This is illustrated by the difference in Ulrika's answer to the first and second questions – from what might be a gift to what subsequently is made explicit as debt money.

Giving Christopher the requested 10 SEK ends his nagging, for a time. Offering 10 SEK as debt money involves discussion about who the money actually belongs to. Putting emphasis on nagging and debt, it might seem as if Christopher and Ulrika are individuals who have conflicting interests, where the parent finds a solution in giving the pestering child what is asked for (Buckingham 2011: 155–159; Lawlor & Prothero 2011). Children, accordingly, have their own needs for consumption which are not dictated by parents (Seiter 1993: 41). Money is also, however, a possible “sore point between parents and children” (Zelizer 1989: 352). These observations suggest that there can be conflicts and differences between individuals within a family, and contrasts with ideas in tourism and consumer research in which the homogeneity of families is emphasized (Kerrane & Hogg 2013; Obrador 2012).

The contrast between conflicts and gifts does not fully capture how Christopher and Ulrika relate to each other via money. Their involvement with money and each other cannot be reduced to individuals who are in

conflict *or* an example of the gift-giving parent. There is not one fixed way in which Christopher and Ulrika act as the giving parent and the receiving or pestering child. Instead, the fact that there is money without any explicit label, debt money and individually earmarked money, makes Christopher's and Ulrika's involvement with each other through money into a changing matter. They do things together, using Ulrika's money, and as Christopher collects individual debt money he uses this for consumption on his own.

Barbro Johansson (2005: 43f) has observed that there is collective money that is shared in families, which children and parents can access. The money that Ulrika shares with Christopher, however, is not the kind to which there is equal access. Ulrika is in control over how and when to share money with Christopher, including the money that is his. For Christopher, money is something to spend and for Ulrika it is something that she spends together with her son, as well as wanting and perhaps needing to hold on to it.

Christopher's access to, and use of, money can be compared with the findings from Allison J. Pugh's (2004) study. Pugh (2004) observes that there is much talk about money among children but little presence of such. Similar to Pugh's study, I observed that money becomes an intense part of talk with an occasional material presence. Christopher talks about money when there is none, and also when coins are momentarily in his hands, and he is ready to move on and spend them. Money is passing. It is as if it offers him a desirable opportunity to be in control of both money and his activities, as an individual, rather than relying on his mother in every situation.

According to Sara Ahmed (2010a, 2010b), people make orientations to happiness through objects – *happy objects* – which promise what is considered “good”. Ahmed (2010a) provides illustrations of how children and parents are involved with objects, such as gifts, that call for happiness. Ahmed suggests that different objects are made good and desirable in practice and that they are approached as if they promise happiness (*ibid.*). Happy objects are things that are established culturally and socially as good, things that people orient themselves towards and look forward to. Does money work as a happy object here?

As a means for consumption in the park, rather than as something to save, money bears similarities with how Ahmed (2010b) defines “happy objects”. Like Ahmed's happy objects, Christopher enacts money as being a thing that he wants even if it is not available. Similar to tasty seasonal fruits, which Ahmed (2010b: 31) uses as an illustration of happy objects, money

is something that Christopher looks forward to, and that he goes to some effort to lay his hands on, for the sake of consumption. A different kind of valuable resource, also in passing, will be discussed in the next section, where money and happiness go firmly together in a more direct visual sense.

Smileys

Gill tells me about how her sons Eric (age 6) and Jacob (age 4) get things at particular times, and at a specific value.

“The children don’t have candy every week. They have no particular pocket money. Now, I have introduced smileys each day. So there is an opportunity to buy some extra ice-cream during the vacation.” The smileys, Gill adds, can be added up to be used by the children when going on vacation: “then the children can take a hundred-krona note each of their smileys to play and to buy candy, then they can choose freely what to do.”⁸⁹

The smileys are marked in a calendar hanging visibly in the kitchen area of the house. The calendar lists dates, and names with smileys. According to Gill, they are worth 10 SEK each (1 €). The calendar combines a standard format presenting the days of each month, throughout the year, and a monthly image of the family from their previous vacations. The association of the smiley and monies is not haphazard, but possible to understand in relation to wider social and cultural practices.

The smileys lead to financial value being involved in a symbol that is widely recognized as representing happiness (McMahon 2006: 463f; Trumble 2004: 99–102). The smiley face was first introduced by an advertising executive in 1963, and has since spread from the USA throughout the world, being the forerunner of a vast array of commercial products that incorporate smiles under a theme of happiness (McMahon 2006: 463–465). The smiley as an equivalent to money value makes happiness and economics into part of each other. Eric and Jacob’s involvement with the smileys echoes how economics and emotions come together elsewhere, in products and services that corporations make into businesses (Illouz 2007).

Similar to the “special money” with a limited reach and usefulness that is used by children elsewhere, and that is used by corporations to “limit economic transactions” of children (Ruckenstein 2010b: 5), the smileys

---

⁸⁹ Interview 1: Eric’s family. Gill says “glada gubbar” in Swedish, which I translate as smileys. An alternative translation would be happy old men.

enact a boundary between different realities of value. The smileys become to Eric and Jacob a sign of recognition of appropriate behavior, which are collected over time. It reminds me of a so-called “token economy”, in which rewards work to encourage children’s good behavior (Christophersen & Mortweet VanScoyoc 2008).

At home, Eric and Jacob collect smileys. Good behavior during a day generates an individual smiley. Smileys on the calendar become a noticeable indicator in the family for the children’s earnings, and help to keep track over time of the money due to each child. The association of smileys and names on the calendar earmark money for Eric and Jacob as individual children in the family, and promise them opportunities for spending later on – but not at any time or in any place. Eric and Jacob collect smileys during a period of time that is not set to a week or a month, but is more fluid. For Gill, the hundred-krona note (10 €) is indicative of the amounts that Eric and Jacob are able to generate from their smiley collection for family vacations. This implies that there is some time between visits to theme parks, Swedish summer resorts and cruise ship experiences, when an amount of smileys is exchanged for general money, to purchase candy or extra ice-cream. Then the smiley tokens turn into money, another token that is recognized more widely as being of value (Mellor 2010: 14).

Eric and Jacob need to exchange smileys for general money for specific family outings during the vacation, relying on their parents to decide when the appropriate time has come for turning smileys into general money as an amount of SEK. While the smileys can be seen as offering less freedom for consumption when Eric and Jacob are at home, they might offer a greater sum of money during vacation time.

According to Barbro Johansson (2005), regular money allowances provide some sense of freedom for children in how and when they can spend money. But this kind of allowance, which is part of a weekly routine, is not something that Eric and Jacob receive, as Gill tells me. In comparison with weekly allowances, the smileys limit Eric and Jacob’s money-spending freedom as these are not predictable routine transfers of general money that can be used for consumption when they see fit. The smileys are part of dividing time into periods, of collecting smileys as money value at home, and then times of consumption during vacation when Eric and Jacob exchange their smileys for general money. The smileys cause the children to access general money in a different way than regular allowances, which are usually provided on a weekly or monthly basis (Nordea 2011; Swedbank

2011). The enactment of smileys as valuable entities works as a way for the children to accumulate money value *and* for parents to limit consumption.

Children's limited involvement in consumption has been described as an ideal of excluding them from an assumed corruption of the market (Johansson 2005; Sjöberg 2013). The smileys assist in enacting this ideal of boundaries between children and money for consumption. Saving the smileys locks Eric and Jacob's accumulated money value into a system that makes sense within the family. This does not imply that the boys are denied lollipops or consumption that they can be happy about. The smileys do, however, restrict when and with what frequency things can be consumed.

The separation between the reality of smileys at home and the value of money, elsewhere, is not total.

Using a laptop, Gill shows me images from a candy shop at ALW where Eric and Jacob had the chance to get large-sized colorful lollipops. Placing himself next to the computer Eric shows me, using his hands, the size of a lollipop that is huge, bigger than his own head. "A huge lollipop?" I ask, and he nods, smiling, and commenting that it was only "30 kronor" (3 euros).⁹⁰

In his enthusiastic description of consumption, Eric does not refer to the cost in smileys but to general money that is set as prices in shops, and is accepted as payment. To state the cost of the lollipop in smileys would not make any sense in relation to how prices are set and presented in the general money economy, where SEK are used rather than just any kind of money.

Parallel systems of value involving economics and happiness become entangled in Eric and Jacob's consumption. In terms of happiness, it is notable how rewards generate money and associations with happy symbols that widely signify emotions rather than fortunes; here they entangle. In the next part, money turns into an even more complex issue as its value is challenged during park visits. Is money valuable?

BEING FORTUNATE

At ALW and Liseberg, people spend money with consideration of what is appropriate and wise, acting as if they are certain that they get value for their money. Visitors also use money for things that seem less rational. At Liseberg, some throw money into the wishing well on the main street. Many

---

⁹⁰ Interview 1: Eric's family.

people play the wheel of fortune. There is a hope of winning at ALW and Liseberg, including ideas of beating the system and getting more value out of the money than one can count on (Cardell & Sparrman 2012). This indicates uncertainties in money spending: will wishes turn into a reality? Is money of such little value that one can “throw” or gamble it away?

Piggybanks, gifts and chocolate

Eric (age 6) and Jacob (age 4) arrive at ALW with their parents Gill and Tony in the family caravan for a two-day visit. Eric and Jacob are most involved with the characters in the park, and want to meet their favorite, Pippi Longstocking.

Eric and Jacob are joined by Gill in several activities in the park, with Tony a little distanced. In one of the shops in the park Eric and Jacob find different things to play with. They have a sword fight with Gill. And they find a box full of glittering golden coins. The coins are marked with a skull and crossbones on one side and Pippi Longstocking in relief on the other. In their exploration of the things in the shop, Eric and Jacob finger the coins, made of a plastic material. They put them into piggybanks that are placed just to the side of the coins.⁹¹

In the Pippi Longstocking stories, there are “real” golden coins, which Pippi keeps in a sack and uses to buy her friends candy. The coins that Eric and Jacob play with in the shop relate to the “real” golden coins that are part of the story, but they are not useful in the same way for making purchases of other stuff. Here, the Pippi money is bought and collected.

---

⁹¹ Park visit: Eric’s family.

Figure 6:3: Money. Eric shows me a plastic Pippi coin in their caravan, after the visit to ALW.

There is also Pippi money at ALW that can be eaten, being made of chocolate inside a golden foil wrapping.⁹²

Tony, the father of Eric (age 6) and Jacob (age 4), keeps golden chocolate money in his pocket throughout the visit. The second day he tells Eric and Jacob that these are new coins from Pippi. When Eric and Jacob receive these it is as though they are a gift from Pippi, who generously shares “her” money.⁹³

Tony keeps the coins from Pippi, close to his wallet, before giving them to the boys. Similar to how Tony describes the way in which he moves closer to the other family members when it is time to use his wallet, for making purchases, he also becomes part of the park experience in delivering money from Pippi.

When money comes to children in this way, from fictive characters like Pippi Longstocking, there is a challenge to the fundamental quality of gifts, which is the so-called duty of paying back. Marcel Mauss (1997: 17), in his

---

⁹² The foil protects the chocolate candy money and avoids a mess, so that even if the candy melts it can be taken home (see also Fjellman 1992: 164). The chocolate coins are marketed as “golden money”, and there is also the plastic “Pippi gold coin”. In Swedish: “Guldpengar” (chocolate) and “Pippi guldpeng” (plastic).

⁹³ Park visit: Eric’s family.

classic work on gifts, suggests that reciprocal gifts are called for, making continual exchange between individuals a concern. According to Ahmed (2010a), a possible way to pay back for what children get from their parents is through showing their appreciation and being happy. Ahmed and Mauss focus on how humans relate to each other, in how gifts call for a return.

Money is enacted as a personal gift, coming from Pippi. She also appears as a visual symbol on one side of the coins. This brings Eric and Jacob close to Pippi – materially and immaterially. The money bought by Tony becomes a symbol of a relationship with the character who is present in the park. And in receiving these coins as a gift, it is as though Eric and Jacob are being treated like Pippi’s friends in the story, who receive things as well (Lundby 2012).

The golden Pippi money, from Pippi, provides a contrast to the impersonal character of general money, which has been described as problematic in gift-giving. Ultimately, gift-giving is about displaying “detailed, affectionate knowledge of the recipient and the relationship” (Zelizer 1994: 82). In the case of the Pippi coins which are moving to Eric and Jacob, these are enacted as personal rather than impersonal or abstract, and they enact the presence of the character.

The enactment of Pippi money simultaneously incorporates fiction and things that are beyond the story of Pippi. Eric and Jacob are not unfamiliar with such special money, because they collect smileys at home. However, Tony, Eric and Jacob use the Pippi coins in the park in similar ways as general money: Eric and Jacob test how the Pippi coins fit into piggybanks, pointing to the material resemblance with other kinds of money and how they can be used in similar ways.

General money has been described as “worthless” in itself, being pieces of cheap metal, or paper, which acquire exchange value by way of social agreements and trust (Mellor 2010; Žižek 1993: 28). The plastic coins that Eric and Jacob get at ALW could be compared with general money in that they are of no or little economic value, if it was not for what they make possible. The object becomes a material part of children’s relationship with Pippi, the character whom Eric and Jacob appreciate and they offer a value in practice for exploring, enjoying the park, and having fun.

In selling the golden coins, ALW offers something similar to Disney Dollars, which are collected by consumers (*DisneyDollars.net*; Sorkin

1992b: 223). In contrast to such special money, which is useable for making purchases, ALW does not accept Pippi coins as having exchange value – they are for eating or playing with, period. Theories of money and economics would suggest that there is a lack of value in the Pippi money since it is not useful for making exchanges (Mellor 2010). Since it is not involved in exchange, or enacting exchange value, it is possible to question whether it is money at all (Zelizer 1994).

Focusing on how these coins are enacted in practice (Mol 2002), it becomes clear that they are used like other money by children and parents in the park: spoken of as money, distributed to children as money that comes as a gift, to be collected and remembered. Also, in addition, they are enjoyable through the possibility of eating them as snacks.

As Tony speaks of the chocolate coins as “money”, they offer value, not for exchange but as pleasurable, with an edible content. They are not spoken of as edible, fake money, or merely part of fiction. In Tony’s words these are *money* from Pippi, illustrating that fiction and the real mingle and coexist for children, while being supported by adults (Lindgren et al. 2015; see also Ehn 1983). There is no clear division between fiction and reality, but these are brought together through the golden coins, of plastic and chocolate, entangling coins from fiction with those at hand. There is a value of fiction at play, which equates the golden colors in Pippi with the reality of gold, being valuable.

Freebies

At times, children are provided with candy at ALW. Characters from the stories of Pippi Longstocking hand out candy to children who are celebrating birthdays, that one needs to pay for on other occasions. There are also companies that get involved in giving things away.

At the time when Eric and Jacob visit the park there is a lucky dip at ALW, offering children candy. Next to it, adults enjoy bundles of stuff, including bananas, soft drinks, ponchos and buns. Candy and usable stuff are provided for free or, to be more precise, at no monetary cost. Gill, the mother in the family, speaks of the kindness that is involved here, and that they are “lucky” that they – as a family – are members of the Coop or “Konsumentföreningen”. This corporation displays several logos and there are representatives

there talking with visitors. According to one representative, Coop occasionally engages in these activities, which are “fun”.⁹⁴

The activity of giving stuff away can be about “fun” and a story of “lucky” recipients. It is as though there is a conditional kindness at play in Gill’s account as no money, nor any membership, is asked for. Things seem to be given away for “free”, but the distribution of candy and things that are ordinarily sold as commodities takes place in relation to the visibility of the retailer.

Figure 6:4: Lucky dip. Coop at ALW.

Freebies do not call for money, but for a different involvement. What kind of values are enacted here? Gill emphasizes that the family is part of the Coop membership program. This suggests that the family is involved, not freeloaders who benefit from what is freely available, at this time. Gill’s

---

⁹⁴ Park visit: Eric’s family.

approach makes sense: there is nothing to pay for here, and being “lucky” refers to the fact that the things that come for “free” usually cost money. Why are different corporations displaying, handing out and selling products at ALW and Liseberg? The presence of Coop in the park in the first place suggests a different take on value from only involving money and immediate commercial concerns – transactions using coins or bills.

Elizabeth Moor (2003: 49f) notes that promotional gifts are distributed so that consumers will remember the event and also the brand. Nigel Thrift (2008: 246f) argues that event-based marketing has become increasingly important. Adam Arvidsson (2006: 89f) suggests that sponsorship is part of the making of brand value, where corporations direct efforts to reach consumers and groups in order to establish an identity that people will relate to. These observations suggest that the act of handing out candy and ponchos – bearing company logos and within an event marketing the company – is involved in current capitalist enterprises of creating economic value over time.

ALW and Liseberg provide space for companies, which promote their business to consumers. Would they do this if they did not think were no profits to gain, financially? Likely not. Corporations trust that they will generate revenue from making space into a commercial arena of displays and events that will be profitable in the long term, not only from the products sold directly to people who, for example, visit a park.

Lucky or rewarded? Getting things for “free” or working? Happiness is invested with various meanings and, as shown by Sara Ahmed (2011: 162), it is now commonly seen as “a reward for hard work, rather than being ‘simply’ what happens to you” (see also Thin 2012: 37). This suggests that current happiness involves individual efforts and responsibilities rather than being something that happens to an individual by chance (Ahmed 2010a: 10; Burnett 2012). Previous etymological meanings, of luck, chance and good fortune, are consequently subordinated to a rational sense of earning from efforts. Luck is about how the world affects the individual, being part of wider conditions that cannot be fully controlled. Hard work, in contrast, suggests a route towards rewards for what one has done or achieved.

Freebies, in this case, involve a blur of rewards and luck. You are lucky if you don’t have to reach for your wallet and instead receive appreciated things at no monetary cost, but on the other hand it makes the same sense in terms of being a reward for work – accepting promotional gifts that are

kept, and lead the way for the distribution of the Coop brand elsewhere, as the green poncho becomes useful later on, and candy at *no* cost might be remembered later on (Moor 2003; see also above, on the cheap lollipop). The simultaneous involvement of luck and rewards serve as a final observation before the final part of this chapter where I will discuss money, values and happiness.

CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

As I put different ethnographic pieces together, it becomes evident that happiness involves money, in several quite different ways which illustrate how children and parents value theme park consumption, but also non-monetary things and other activities. With its multiplicity of values (Mol 2002: 88), money turns into a changing social matter that is associated with different desires and goals, among children and parents, which influence how they relate to each other within the family. It is not an order that is the same everywhere, but that distributes money and values differently, with emotions and happiness as reference points.

By exploring practices in which money acquires value I have highlighted its heterogeneous role which creates different emotional expectations and outcomes, differing between places and situations. This suggests that money indeed “acts in complex ways”, as noted by Nigel Thrift (2005: 76).

How do notions of happiness enact the values of money? In this chapter I have shown that happiness is not necessarily an outcome of possessing money. Money in passing – or avoiding the possibility of cashing in – makes as much sense in terms of happiness. This challenges ideas in previous research that possessing money works as a means towards an individual goal of happiness (see Dunn & Norton 2013; Roos 2012; Rowley 2005).

Nowhere is a lack of money for entering the parks and consuming its products emphasized. A total absence of money is not an issue for the children and parents who are part of this study. But handling limited amounts of it is. Spending time at ALW and Liseberg is desirable, at a cost that is handled with caution rather than flowing into an excess of spending. There is more moderation than hedonism in the park consumption, and there is no reckless spending for the sake of maximizing happiness. Happiness does not provide such a tangible measure as the value of money: continually counted in numbers. Money assists in enacting happiness through encouragements with bribes, occasional purchases, negotiations, and luck.

Moderate spending takes place along with the hope of getting more than you expected for the money invested.

Research on family life has emphasized that children's involvement with money is increasing and that they are part of making decisions about consumption within the family (Hjalmarsson 2007), including vacations (Cullingford 1995; Gram 2007). In this chapter, money takes part in practices where emotions and economy come together, being part of an order that Eva Illouz (2007) defines as emotional capitalism. Here it makes sense to discuss *the emotional capitalism of family life*, with its rewarding and profitable systems of smileys, encouragements and practices where children are involved in an order in which they are subordinate to money and the resources of others. Economics and happiness entangle in family life. It is not only a concern with the "external" world but a matter that plays a role for how children and parents interact and money gives an emotional direction to life.

Capitalism has been portrayed as a threat to the happiness of children, and to the practices of play and fantasy that constitute childhood. Golden chocolate money and plastic coins are however part of playful activities and personal relations, which involve fantasy and a social involvement with material things that are enacted as valuable. This suggests that different enactments make up a complex of stories which challenge money as "one" threat to children (see Palmer 2006). If money is a threat, or the possibility of coming treats, it is so in ways that involve various values and activities. As shown initially, and throughout this chapter, money does not stand alone, there is no value in money as such. So, what do notions of happiness tell us about the values of money in the consumption of theme parks?

The stories in this chapter suggest that money is important for the multiplicity of happiness, involving future outlooks and expectations, but also unexpected opportunities for luck. Models of happiness are involved in practices where children and parents deal with money by control and forward-looking plans, as well as with hopes of fortunate circumstances. Along with happiness, money maintains multiple, shifting and sometimes uncertain values.

CHAPTER 7

CO-ORDIOGRAPHY: PARK VISITS

Months in advance of theme park visits there are discussions among children and parents about what attractions to experience. Will you dare to ride the new roller-coaster? Can we do it together? Considerations like these tell us about the expectations and ambitions of being together in the parks in imagining upcoming experiences. There is less concern with practical necessities. When arriving at the parks, many visitors need to visit the toilets or go to eat. The most frequently visited location at Liseberg is actually the toilets. It is not only the spectacular attractions that are part of park visits, but also concerns regarding individual needs, and family desires.

The aim of this chapter is to develop an understanding of family theme park visits that challenges the fixation with togetherness and its time as equaling static intimacy and shared happiness (see previous research, exemplified below). At the end of the chapter I address these questions: How is family life involved with happiness in theme parks? By whom, when and where is it enacted?

Happiness is approached through the visits and this allows me to explore how time spent at ALW and Liseberg involves children's and parents' wishes and desires, practical necessities and demands. This chapter highlights how children and parents use the parks through different practices, making family time heterogeneous. It suggests that visits involve collective and individual aspects and are quite flexible in terms of when and where family time is relevant. Initially this chapter provides a brief introduction to notions of family in research, and then proceeds to the central approach of this chapter: *Co-ordiography*. Ethnographic explorations follow, focusing on the different ways in which children and parents enact family in coordinating their park visits.

A FAMILY OF GLUE

Research on theme parks is full of observations stating that visits are about family. It is often assumed that family members stay together and do things together (e.g. Gottdiener 1982: 153; Keng 1996: 14; Shoval 2010: 173f), suggesting that theme parks are places where adults join children to find

their happiest moments and “take the role of children” (Van Maanen 1992: 11, 24f; see also Francaviglia 1981: 155). These studies – relying primarily on interviews and limited observations – emphasize the importance of the family. Accounts of family in relation to theme parks, interestingly, contrast with an observed invisibility of the family in tourism research (Obrador 2012: 404).

Studies of theme parks and visits do, however, rely on assumptions that children and parents experience parks and attractions together, being in each other’s company in general, and without going into details about dynamics or challenges. It is consequently a quite fixed idea about family that appears in this previous research, which, drawing on Pau Obrador’s work (2012: 414), does not acknowledge “multiple subject positions within the family as well as its changing nature.” It is as if the “doing” that has been highlighted in research on family as practice has not been acknowledged by research on theme parks.⁹⁵

Early on during my fieldwork, I observed that family visits did not always involve everyone equally in one and the same activity. Children and parents split up at ALW and Liseberg for different reasons. This is a quite different story from accounts in previous research. It might seem like an insignificant matter: that, for example, two siblings go to do different things with one parent each in different parts of a park. But my point is that such separations are important for how and when family becomes relevant in a setting like a theme park, and that it offers the opportunity to explore ideals and practices that permeate family time – which, in the case of leisure settings, tends to be described as happy quality time when the stress of everyday life is set aside (Blichfeldt et al. 2011: 145; Gram 2007: 27; Hjemdahl 2003a). This is not always the case, as theme park visits also involve negotiations, preferences for different activities and emotions that challenge togetherness. To make sense of how children carry out park visits with their parents – in changing ways – I will turn to two concepts: modes of ordering and coordination.

MODES OF ORDERING AND COORDINATION

Drawing on the notion of *ordering* in the work of John Law (1994: 1f) and Annemarie Mol (2010: 262f), I emphasize that continuous work is required

---

⁹⁵ “Doing family” suggests that family is accomplished in practice rather than simply being, existing as a stable social phenomenon (Morgan 1996).

in establishing order – in this case family order – as well as in keeping that order (Mol 2010: 263f). Following Mol (2010), there is not one given order (e.g. “the family”); order is achieved through practice. Family as a shared park experience – involving an order of togetherness – consequently turns into one of different possible achievements, through practices.

Mol’s (2010: 263) notion of *modes of ordering* suggests that order should be seen in multiplicity, that there is more than one way of doing order, and that it should be the subject of investigation. Modes of ordering call for an understanding of the work involved in continuously establishing and keeping order/s during visits. The latter suggests that there can be a coexistence of orders at a “single moment” (Mol & Law 2002: 7f). Using the notion of *coordination*, Mol (2002, 2010: 264) focuses on how modes of ordering and realities are organized, how they hang together, or compete and are distributed between different sites. Drawing on Mol’s (2010: 264) notion of “hanging together” I emphasize proximity and commensurability. With the idea of being “out of each others’ way” I focus on how different orders are coordinated between different sites, making it possible to see family as an achievement rather than as a natural entity that is part of theme parks. This assists in recognizing happiness as a matter of movement that might involve togetherness, but not necessarily so as individual emotions are taken into consideration.

How do modes of ordering and coordination become relevant in understanding family time in theme parks? To exemplify the outlined approach I turn to Liseberg and the notion of lost children as “runaway children”⁹⁶. This idea of runaway children helps to explicate how this chapter builds on Mol’s and Law’s work and the notions of modes of ordering and coordination that guide the analyses.

Anders, head of security in the park, tells me that runaways are counted in hundreds each year at Liseberg and that it usually takes no more than 3–5 minutes to find the parents of a child. Liseberg both predicts and holds an account of runaway children – names and numbers are documented in the park. Employees keep their eyes open for children who need assistance in solving the situation.⁹⁷

---

⁹⁶ Swedish: “Bortsprungna barn.”

⁹⁷ Guided tour with Anders at Liseberg.

Implied in the notion of runaway children is the belief that parents should be with their children throughout visits to take care of them. Parents are asked to find and collect their children at the guest service office.

The notion of runaway children implies that there is an undesired *distance* in the same way as there is a desired *proximity* of children and parents, or others, as an ideal order which calls for coordination. It works with how being “out of each others’ way” might imply actions so that people are “drawn together”, being a matter of coordination (Mol 2010: 264). These terms highlight that proximity and distance are coordinated and that different modes of ordering coexist. The example of runaway children is perhaps most relevant to human proximity and distance – between children and adults, or family members – but, following Mol (2002), it is equally important to consider the involvement of material things.⁹⁸

Figure 7:1: Runaway children. A sign asking and providing directions “Runaway children? We refer you to Guest service.”

Figure 7:2: Bracelet. The bracelet used by 5-year-old Thea during her visit to Liseberg, with the phone number of her parents (anonymized image).

---

⁹⁸ Non-human entities and agency is also on the agenda in actor-network theory and beyond (e.g. Knappett & Malafouris 2008; Latour 2005).

Liseberg and ALW offer I.D. bracelets to children. These are material things that assist in creating an order where children are aligned with parents. I.D. bracelets provide information so that children can be returned to the adults who are supposed to be in their company. This example helps to highlight the ways in which order is at play: a child becomes a runaway when a tight group of visitors – a family perhaps – fails to sustain togetherness in the park. This implies that several orders are planned for and observable in the park: one of visitors as groups, one of children that possibly involves disorder (runaway children), and one of the park, which is ready to assist and support visitors when needed.

In theme parks, material things take part in coordinating order, which is evident with the I.D. bracelet: in the case of a runaway child there is an opportunity to identify who should be contacted by the information provided in text and numbers, which helps when making the phone call to parents. The materiality of bracelets, cell phones, and the offices in the park is thus involved in making things happen so that there can be a shift from distance to proximity, transforming undesired social distance into a desired proximity – from dis-order to ideals of an appropriate order of family togetherness and control. There are also examples of other material things which, instead of connecting people, divide space – fences, park attractions, etc. – and might, in contrast, challenge the family togetherness of children and parents. Social proximity therefore relies on, and is challenged by, the material outline of the parks.

In studying family visits to Liseberg and ALW, coordination and modes of ordering become quite a complex matter, simultaneously involving the wants and needs of individuals and collectives. In the coming sections I explore modes of ordering in how children and parents coordinate distance and proximity. Coordination and modes of ordering allow me to highlight how park attractions become part of family time and also that tasks associated with work and labor blur family togetherness.

IN THE SERVICE OF CHILDREN

In this part I focus on ways in which children are accompanied by parents who provide services, rather than having a mutual focus on experiencing the parks. Moving from ALW to Liseberg, I provide stories that highlight different experiences of what this support might include.

Asking for an extra hand

There are children who visit Liseberg or ALW with one parent. This comes with certain challenges, that have to do with the limited assistance that one parent can provide to one or several children.

Evelina asks me to keep one of her sons company, as she is going to the campsite outside ALW to get shoes and clothes that are more appropriate, as the weather has changed from rain to sun. It is possible to imagine how Evelina, with her three boys, will be able to get the things quicker – keeping two of her sons in the stroller, moving it at some speed – if I keep the remaining child company. Evelina is the one parent who asks me repeatedly for help. At another time she asks me to take one of her sons to the toilet. After some hesitation I agree to this as well, being aware of the challenges faced by Evelina in taking care of three boys at the same time.⁹⁹

Evelina is a lone parent who is at ALW with her three sons – who are 2, 4 and 5 years old. Evelina does not talk about the absence of the family father as an obstacle but asks me to help her in some practical matters. Along with park experiences, I am asked to help her to carry out the visit so that needs can be taken care of. When Billy, the family father, joins in during the last day of the visit, my assistance is no longer needed or asked for. Evelina expresses her gratitude for my support, which has made things easier during the visit.¹⁰⁰

There are practical challenges involved in keeping a visit together when different individual needs become apparent to a parent who is responsible for taking care of three children. Children and parents, occasionally, ask not only me but also employees for help.

What is striking here is that Evelina makes use of a stroller that she can push forwards with some speed, if there only are two children in it. Three would not fit. Briefly sacrificing the company of the third, leaving him behind with me, makes it possible to reduce the time that it takes to solve practical matters. It allows the family to maximize their time in the park, as adults are able to control the children at hand. In the stroller they sit tight.

---

⁹⁹ Park visit. A discussion about visits to toilets with children is provided in Samuelsson et al. (accepted). The hesitation about joining children in the toilets described in that piece of research was similar here. I felt uncomfortable, while my assistance seemed unproblematic and appreciated by both child and mother.

¹⁰⁰ Interview 2: Rick's family.

Similar to security arrangements in roller-coasters elsewhere, strapped-in children are moving at speed in the stroller as Evelina moves away. Controlling the stroller allows movement where there is little risk of losing someone along the way, when the goal is to get the appropriate clothing from elsewhere. This is a way of moving through the parks that differs from movements at ALW and Liseberg in general: it emphasizes straight-line movement towards a goal, what Tim Ingold (2009a: 35) defines as transport, which is destination-oriented. In contrast to what Ingold calls wayfaring (movement that does not necessarily involve a destination), transport involves minimizing the time spent in reaching the destination. Wayfaring is not considered in terms of time in this sense, and it is typical of most of the visits to ALW and Liseberg in the sense that children and parents explore things and move around, aiming for destinations at times, but walking around to see what opportunities there are rather than arranging a plan for the trip in the park before they begin to move.

Evelina's approach to transport does not exemplify the entire visit but is about solving practical matters during a time that is not extensive. This speedy part of the visit extends the time for experiencing performances and environments for play in the park for the children. It makes efficiency and straight-line movement part of the visit, for the sake of maximizing the less goal-directed experiences that follow. I will discuss the fascinating relevance of efficiency in the following parts of this chapter.

Parent-on-demand

Not far from Liseberg, there is a family who frequently visits the park.

Tove (age 9), smilingly tells me that she knows Liseberg like the back of her hand, that it is an extension of the family living room, working as their garden and a fun backyard. It has become a tradition that Tove receives an annual pass as a Christmas gift, which includes free admittance to all the park's attractions throughout the year. Tove calls herself "a speed maniac" and is into the park attractions. Her parents, Karin and Johan, say that the park is part of their everyday life. They have the right connections, and receive VIP tickets – as "honorary guests" – so that they can enter the park without paying any admission. Karin and Johan tell me that they stroll around to see what food is available. They surf the web or engage in work tasks at a distance, using laptops and smart phones, sitting in the cafés. Karin and Johan consider themselves

to be a “service team”, meaning that they are there for Tove when or if she needs them.¹⁰¹

Is it possible to think of more divergent ways of spending time in a theme park – children riding the roller-coasters and parents sitting down to work using a laptop? Tove and her parents, accordingly, do not look for time together in the park, and do not experience the attractions together. Tove’s parents’ tickets do not include ride attractions. They spend their time doing other things.

During the first visit of the season, when it is time to use her Christmas gift for the first time, Tove plans to experience several of the park attractions.

Tove is dressed in functional clothes and a headscarf with a pattern consisting of the Liseberg rabbit – the brand character of the park. Karin, who accompanies Tove on this occasion, carries a bag with clothes for Tove. Karin spends time on her own while Tove and I move quickly through the park. During the visit with her I try to keep up my speed so I do not fall behind. While Tove and I run between carousels, Karin uses her time for strolling around. Perhaps she is also performing work-related tasks. Tove and Karin frequently go looking for each other. At times Karin turns up outside one of the attractions, waiting for us, and at other times she comes walking in our direction as we are moving quickly to the next attraction.¹⁰²

In selecting attractions, Tove decides what to do. We ride roller-coasters several times. Our speedy steps let us pass by others who would possibly otherwise stand in front of us in the queue, slowing things down. To move quickly is important for Tove, not to lose any time, making it possible to ride *many* attractions. When I move alongside Tove throughout Liseberg, it is hard not to think about sport and exercise. Being with Tove is about speed and efficiency, to make the most out of the hours that are spent in the park.

Throughout the visit there is a mixture of Tove’s experiences of the attractions, Karin’s strolling, and their shared time when Tove is using Karin’s services. When we team up with Karin our speed slows down. We sit down for food, look at things, and even stand still. She pays for food and carries stuff like Tove’s rain clothes in her bag. The Liseberg visit with Tove and Karin involves overlapping and different paths: moving in different directions, in the same direction, as well as in shifting tempos.

---

¹⁰¹ Interview 1: Tove’s family.

¹⁰² Park visit: Tove’s family.

Karin and Johan's idea of seeing themselves as a "service team" highlights the fact that Tove is accompanied and can use her parents when she needs them; that there is an opportunity for proximity at times when Tove, with her running steps, and her mother are "drawn together" (Mol 2010: 264). "Service team" captures the sense of efficiency and being there as a type of *parent-on-demand* (see DeVault 2000 for similar observations).

An important device that assists in the visits, coordinating how and when child and parent come together and allowing them to separate, is the cell phone. Both Tove and Karin carry phones. These provide opportunities for keeping in touch, from a distance. It lets Karin "accomplish mothering responsibilities", bringing the "private world of domestic responsibilities into their public world of work" (Rakow & Navarro 1993: 155). The phone, drawing on Lynn Schofield Clark's observations (2013: 150), makes it possible to "remain in touch." Here, the challenge is to coordinate Tove's experiences with the various activities in focus for Karin – working, strolling around, and serving her daughter. Multiple commitments and movements, in their own directions, could make it a time-consuming task to find each other – the phone solves this.

Efficiency

How is it possible to make sense of a visit that involves both divisions in terms of activities and sharing time together in the park? Tove and Karin keep out of each other's way, maintaining a distance, and are consequently able to focus on different activities. The different activities in which they are involved, however, are not constant or definite. An examination of Tove and Karin's visit to Liseberg suggests that there are different modes of ordering at play, where different tasks are in focus. These include the different desires and needs of children and parents, and changes from individual time into social family time, shifts from leisure and consumption into a time of labor. Thinking about how these matters are coordinated provides a rather "messy" image of what is included in park visits, with some obligations that also stretch beyond the park: being a providing parent, who takes care of one's child, when required.

Using the notion of "mess" it is possible to capture the complexity of ordering (Law 2004), in which concepts that are usually approached as dichotomies have a co-existence in practice, e.g. work/leisure, tourism/everyday life. The park visit is not necessarily (only) about leisure, as opposed to work. As suggested by the term "service team" and the use of

a laptop for labor, parents observe windows of opportunity that make space for tasks that need to be completed on time, working against demanding deadlines. They consider themselves to be on duty watching out for their children in the parks, but they are also, at times, on duty in terms of labor which generates the salary that provides the means for consumption in the park. This illustrates how there are overlapping orientations during the visit.

In creating different orders of visit, both Tove and Karin are oriented towards efficiency. Tove makes efficiency part of her visit through her speedy movements, making the most of the limited hours during her day in the park. Karin makes efficiency part of being at Liseberg, a leisure setting, by combining parenting and labor. She does not stand on the side passively waiting or observing her daughter riding the attractions.

Efficiency and accessing a parent-on-demand is not limited to Tove and Karin's visit, but is also visible elsewhere.

Shifting worlds

Tony, the father of Eric (age 6) and Jacob (age 4), keeps a distance from the rest of his family at times, making phone calls, taking care of the business through which he earns some extra money. He is at the same time there, nearby, prepared to engage in the visit when called for by Eric, Jacob or Gill, the family mother and his partner. Tony tells me that he is involved when his wallet is needed during their visit to ALW. But Tony does not simply offer financial support. After a woman pushes one of his sons, lightly, in a candy store at ALW he explains that "one is here for the children", and it "is their world". The world of children inside ALW, in which parents and adults are there to assist, is contrasted with what lies outside of the park, where Tony invites me "after work".¹⁰³

It has been suggested in previous research that parents stand on the side observing children, at playgrounds and in theme parks (Blackford 2004; Economou & Hergli 2010). In this case, Eric and Jacob face challenging adults who do not buy into the idea of ALW as a children's world. Ironically, to maintain this world – that Tony observes – it is necessary that he intervenes. He not only takes part in confronting the woman, but also throughout the visit he is there to ensure that there is money to pay for everything. There is consequently a movement between the position of being an observer and being an advocate who intervenes, ensuring that the ideal of a children's world, being about them, can be maintained. This

---

¹⁰³ Park visit: Eric's family.

suggests that adults should be servants who do not disturb children's presence in the park, but remain there for them. Parents like Tony – and Tove's mother Karin – shift between distance and presence in relation to what children do, ready to engage when called for.

Throughout park visits, parents like Tony and Karin, are *multitasking*, switching between care, experiences, labor, business, and consumption in the parks. This means that they are together with their children as well as being distanced, offering opportunities for children to be close spatially but in a sense keeping their world for themselves, as long as there are no threats.

Tony is committed to the task of serving his children, ensuring that they have space and opportunities for consumption. This means that he stays physically close to Eric and Jacob. But he does not focus in full on being part of the experiences available in the park. This enables him to carry out tasks in parallel with joining his children: making business calls (e.g. selling a car), and talking to me, another person who is close but not fully able to do the same things as children. Together with Tony, I turn into an adult who must “work” to see what children do and to take part in some of the children's activities. It is perhaps our mutual acceptance of children as the ones who are important here that leads the way to the “after work” activity.

In the caravan Tony sits down next to his wife and children, without being obliged to focus on what they do and where they are – as in the park. He is laid back, enjoying himself, and offering me beer and snacks. He consumes alcoholic beverages in the caravan, outside of the park.¹⁰⁴

The after work activity takes place in the family caravan where they spend the night outside of ALW. Whether the word work – in “after work” – refers to assisting his children, doing business, or both, is not clear. It is, however, a time of rewarding consumption for those who have put energy into work tasks.

There is a sequential approach to ordering here (Mol 1999: 84), where one order – of parents serving children – is followed by another, as adults indulge without necessarily focusing on children. Adult activities are allowed to take place. What is interesting here is how this simultaneously has consequences for children and for adults. Tony makes ALW into a world for children, and the caravan into a time and space where he allows

---

¹⁰⁴ Park visit: Eric's family.

himself to indulge in drinks. He does not consume alcohol inside the gates of ALW. Would this not be challenging the world of children? Vacation time does involve alcohol for many people – but there is a dividing line here, locating the appropriate time for drinks as following the visit to the park. A dividing line is drawn (Ingold 2007a: 81) between a world for children and the caravan, which provides space for adults outside.

Children are in focus in terms of what the parks have to offer, the attractions that are inside of the entrances. What *they* do with the attractions and the experience is what becomes important to parents. It would perhaps make little sense for parents to spend money and put in effort to conduct visits if children, like their parents, decided that there are more important things to do, than riding attractions or watching theatrical performances in the parks.

IN THE SERVICE OF PARENTS

Parents spend time during their vacations in the theme parks prioritizing their children. In this part I focus on how park visits become a parental matter.

With or against us

Speaking about Liseberg in their home, Kim (age 5) asks her mother Lotta if they can go, now, at this minute. The park is not more than an hour away and it would perhaps be doable. But this is not the day for going to Liseberg. At our first meeting Lotta tells me that the day of the visit will be a surprise for Kim and Mary (age 3).¹⁰⁵

It takes almost three months before it is time for the surprise, taking the car to the city center of Gothenburg to spend the day in the park. It is late in July when the whole family enters the park. Kim and Mary wear colorful green and pink t-shirts and are easy to spot.

Kim and Mary hold hands with their parents, from the entrance towards the ticket booths. Lotta tells me that this is a day where the “children will decide a lot”, and you go to Liseberg “for the children”.¹⁰⁶

As shown in the example in the *Valuography* chapter, there is however no acceptance of the idea that the children will be the ones who decide. Kim’s

---

¹⁰⁵ Interview 1: Kim’s family.

¹⁰⁶ Park visit: Kim’s family.

undesirable way of answering her parents' suggestions about what attractions to ride challenges the ideal order that is expected: of shared pleasures and doing things together, and getting involved in the activities provided in the park.

Previous research suggests that children decide a great deal in theme parks (Gottdiener 1997: 113), being the main decision makers in families (Gram 2007: 27; Johns & Gyimóthy 2002: 326). It is also a typical account among parents in this study: the children will decide what to do. Children's opportunities to make decisions, but not any decisions, have also been a topic of concern in research on parenting, in a wider sense, where scholars have addressed the ways in which parents adjust to children and try to adjust children to the norms of family and society (e.g. Forsberg 2009).

Kim and Mary's decisions are not allowed to be about anything, but are limited to particular choices, which Lotta and Fred make available through the ride passes: choose attractions, but do not choose not to take part. In the *Valuography* chapter I highlighted how Lotta expects some fuss relating to the need for bribes to convince Kim to join in. Her parents invest money in tickets for *doing* certain things *together* in the park: taking the attractions. Having bought ride passes for the duration of the day, additional bribes make sense as a small investment to be able to carry out the visit as a family, together. Handling the problem of dis-order that goes with refusals is about making the visit hang together, so that children and parents do things together. This suggests that visits are not without challenges; there might be a need to convince or even to coerce those unwilling to buy into what the visit should be about, to make it a shared social event for the family.

It has been argued that the contemporary child-rearing of today is more democratic than previously (Smith 2012: 30). Today, the talkative and happy child, with a voice that influences others has been described as essential (Oswell 2013: 104, 111). To have a say, to influence, is accordingly important. But parents who go to theme parks struggle with how to approach children to make things happen, as they wish, as a family, when there are different individual desires – ideas about doing different things that challenge family unity.

Focusing on the possible motivations for doing things together in the park it becomes clear that there is pressure on Kim, involving sanctions that go

beyond this specific visit. If she does not join in the attractions *now* there is no guarantee that she will have access to all the attractions in the future.¹⁰⁷

If she adapts to the pressures she is perhaps aware that there might be positive effects, and encouragements (bribes?). There are possibly things to gain from aligning with the family order of the visit, in line with her parents' ideals, riding the attractions together.

Mixing authoritarian and liberal parenting

Researchers have discussed different approaches to parenting as authoritarian and liberal. These are identified in relation to historical epochs in which the authoritarian was replaced by the liberal approach during the course of the 20th century (Fromm 1947/2003: 117; Žižek 1998). Authoritarian and liberal modes of parenting can, with the help of Slavoj Žižek's (1998) observations, be differentiated through the following: an authoritarian mode directs children through commands while a liberal mode is about posing questions which the child has the responsibility to consider and think through, as well as allowing space for discussion (see also Valentine 1996a, 1996b).

Considering the authoritarian and liberal modes of parenting, it becomes evident that they are not necessarily historically bounded but flexible and changing, and can follow each other in sequence. Rather than being located in different epochs, the authoritarian and liberal modes are mixed through directions and posing (leading) questions. One example, where there is a shift from children's decisions – parents asking questions – to those of parents, is similar to but also more obvious than the one above.

Anne repeatedly asks her daughter Rebecca (age 11) "shall we..." during their time at ALW. On one occasion she comments on her way of asking questions: "I shouldn't pose it as a question", adding "we shall".¹⁰⁸

This highlights a shift from liberal to authoritarian parenting during a park visit; from a focus on the child answering questions to a parent who is giving directions, calling for the child to follow. This challenges ideas that children necessarily have a say and that their voices really matter, even in a place

---

¹⁰⁷ Park visit, Kim's family: Fred adds quietly that they will never buy such a ticket again if Kim will not take the attractions at this time

¹⁰⁸ Park visit: Rebecca's family.

where most experiences are for children. It is perhaps the case that to decide is big but to decide what is right is bigger.

The fact that both Kim's and Rebecca's mothers change their approaches suggests that children are expected to adapt to how parents appreciate the park visits and what they consider is important to do there. Visits should, accordingly, be about activity and certain activities become more important to parents who are in the position of making demands. They have paid for the visits and for things that are consumed in the parks. To have a say – having a voice as parents – in the theme parks where children are expected to decide a lot becomes important.

A shared family visit

Why should Kim (age 5) or other children do the same things and join their parents? A first explanation could perhaps be: children are not able to take care of themselves in settings like a theme park. Or: if you go as a family you should do things together.

There are the threats and possibilities of bribes, and future visits, related to emotions and economics which might influence children in adapting to an ideal of a shared order of family. With Illouz (2007), I consider that the “cold” economy, of bribing and making threats about future non-consumption, meets the order of being together, an intimate time of being as a family. The social is here entwined with material encouragements. The interrelatedness of the social with emotions and economics, highlighted in the work on intimacy by Illouz (2007) and Viviana Zelizer (2005), can assist us in thinking beyond an appreciation of being together and valuing family time as “quality time”, emphasized in previous research on park visits (see Blichfeldt et al. 2011: 145; Gram 2007: 27). It is also quantity time – where the family, in full numbers, is expected to stay together and share the visit.

The proximity of humans within family is commonly described using the notion of intimacy. The meaning of intimacy is associated with confidence and the “warmth” of a relationship (NE; Moss & Schwebel 1993). Intimacy is about reducing distance and embracing proximity (Thien 2007: 192). In Zelizer's (2005) work on money and intimacy, intimacy involves individuals who are close to each other. She adds that there might be mixed emotions about being with one another. Intimacy is thus not necessarily considered to be an entirely warm and positive matter. Illouz' (2007) work on emotional capitalism suggests the term of cold intimacies which

highlights a central point in her analysis, of the simultaneous involvement of emotions and market calculations, of costs and benefits.

Kim's unwillingness to participate helps to cast light on how family visits that come with assumptions of doing things together face challenges and require work to be achieved in terms of togetherness. No natural warmth from either family or the park as such makes Kim part of the visit, but individual sanctions, treats and threats do work.

There are times during which problems of "family" become relevant as intimacy is challenged: there are lost children, there is fear among children which is handled differently from Kim's unwillingness. And this remark leads me to consider how shared visits can turn into something else, resulting in a family splitting up and thereby splitting experiences.

PART-TIME COMPANY

Different challenges, expectations, and desires make children and parents split up to do different things. In this part I consider how visits turn family into a part-time company.

Too far away, too close

After a couple of the park attractions, having eaten ice-cream and observed how their parents play some of the games in the park – winning them soft toys – Kim (age 5) and Mary (age 3) are on their way towards new park attractions.

Holding hands, Kim and Lotta are walking together, and soon fall behind Mary and Fred. Not by far, but enough, so that when they reconvene Fred tells Lotta that he will now take Mary to an attraction, the *Rabalder* roller-coaster. "Call me several times, if I don't hear the signal" Fred tells Lotta as the family splits up. Lotta takes Kim to see the attractions that are about the Liseberg rabbit – the brand character of the park. Mary is scared of the rabbits and when she sees them in the park she starts to shake. So a division of family turns into a solution through which Kim's fascination with the rabbits and Mary's fear can be taken into account. Kim, who enjoys the rabbits, goes with her mother for a tour of the Rabbit River. Kim enthusiastically points out where there are rabbits, and talks to her mother about whether they are real or make-believe.¹⁰⁹

---

¹⁰⁹ Park visit: Kim's family.

Kim and Mary respond differently to the rabbit mascots, getting close to them for a hug and seeking distance, respectively. The rabbit is too far away, or too close. For Kim the rabbit calls for extended intimacy.

The family meets again outside the *Rabalder* attraction. Soon a couple of rabbit mascots turn up. The mascots are dressed as policemen and interact with children. Kim approaches them for a hug. Mary, however, starts to shake when they appear. Lotta, the girls' mother, explains to me that Mary usually likes policemen but that she is afraid of the rabbits and that they don't know why. Mary keeps her distance from the mascots and turns her eyes away from them and moves close to her mother. Lotta picks Mary up in her arms.¹¹⁰

For Mary the mascots produce undesired emotional reactions that she is able to overcome by hugging her mother and turning her face away. Nick Lee (2008) describes how parents engage in making appreciated things present for children. In this case Lotta *also* contributes to making undesired things absent. Parents and children are consequently engaged in making things happen, making sure that undesirable things do not come close to them.

To imagine a change of roles where Mary would hug the rabbits seem unthinkable as she starts to shake when she notices the mascots, and stops doing so when hugging her mother. By moving in opposite directions, to the rabbit and to the mother, Kim and Mary engage in hugging, but do so differently.

Lotta seeks explanations for Mary's fear of the rabbit mascots. It is as though her shaking body needs justification in words. Why one should like the rabbit mascots and be close to them is not clear to me, but it seems to call for no explanation. Kim's ambition to hug the rabbit mascots is not discussed and does not call for emotional support from Lotta, as in the case of Mary. According to Lotta, Kim wants to see the rabbits and they go to the rabbit house, leaving Mary at a distance from the mascots together with her father.

Kim checks out the different activities that are available in the rabbit house, singing karaoke and taking a ride on a slide. Then she suddenly starts to cry, just outside the rabbit house. A rabbit mascot turns up almost instantly. It moves close to Kim. The rabbit is not alone. A man is following the character. As an employee of the park he directs his attention to Kim, telling her that with the rabbit close

---

¹¹⁰ Park visit: Kim's family.

all will be well. Just a moment later her tears stop flowing. Kim and her mother leave the rabbit house, and team up with the rest of the family to see the rabbit shop.¹¹¹

The Liseberg employee provides an explanation of how the rabbit is the solution to a problem. There is no discussion about why Kim is crying and the reasons are not addressed. The man does not seem to be familiar with Kim or what happened but he nonetheless considers the rabbits to be a solution. By proposing that having the rabbit present makes an emotional difference, so that people feel better, the employee puts into words the fact that children are expected to be happy rather than sad in its presence.

The above example shows that emotions and material things are related, and that it turns into a common project of the park employees and parents to make these work together in desirable ways: “all will be well”.

Making things distant

Lotta’s tour of the rabbit house with Kim as well as her way of making the rabbit mascots absent for Mary illustrate that there is a flexibility to do things together or to separate. The transformation from the importance of a shared visit into two different experiences has to do with preferences as well as individual considerations and sensitivities within the family. The way in which individual children want to come close to some things and keep others at a distance becomes an important matter, emotionally, which involves parents. They take part in making desirable emotions present and undesirable ones distant.

The attractions in the park generate, or are expected to generate, different emotional effects. Dizziness, fear, or something else. The avoidance of undesirable emotions is influential in the ways in which children and parents select and experience park attractions. What to do, when and how often as well as who will do it and in what company are questions that are relevant when considering how children and parents coordinate their visits to the park.

Several of the visits are divided in this way, where the possibility of undesirable emotions becomes the guiding factor in what attractions to experience. It is not only fear, but also other emotions that motivate a separation of children and parents in the park.

---

¹¹¹ Park visit: Kim’s family.

Henrik (age 9) enjoys attractions at Liseberg that are speedy.

I join Henrik on the speedy rides, feeling dizzy at times. I can hardly walk straight – we laugh about it, me and Henrik. His parents, Åsa and Frank, tell me about their feelings of nausea when taking such rides. They pass on some attractions and are waiting nearby for us to finish them. Other attractions are experienced together.¹¹²

The issue of dividing up visits for the sake of experiencing different attractions is also part of Leo's (age 9) visit to Liseberg. It involves the entire family most of the time, but not when it is time for the daunting *AtmosFear* attraction.

Leo and his father Sven leave Thea (sister) and Mathilda (mother) to do *AtmosFear* on their own. The family of four splits up into two pairs (father-son, mother-daughter), to make use of different attractions, one designed to carry smaller children and the other designed for taller individuals. Thea is not tall enough to experience *AtmosFear*. Leo says that his sister would shriek if she could join them. After *AtmosFear* they gather again in the area of Liseberg where there are attractions that shorter children can experience together with taller children and adults.¹¹³

Nausea and fear are undesirable to some, and to some degree desired by others – considering attractions like *AtmosFear*. But fear is perhaps different for Leo and Thea? *AtmosFear* makes the issue of fear both real and a hypothetical, but nonetheless relevant, issue. By coordinating visits, some visitors stay unexposed to what is (too) frightening, while Leo seems excited about going to the attraction with his father to experience *AtmosFear*.

Nick Lee and Steven D. Brown (2002: 273) provide an example of “fear” in the way in which there is an “imaginary danger” in experiencing a roller-coaster. The roller-coaster example in Lee and Brown (2002), and how Leo approaches Thea and *AtmosFear*, suggests that there is an order in which children move towards more thrilling experiences, which adults are able to handle, as they can handle the fear better, or in appropriate ways, compared with children.

Taking the examples above into consideration, it is not necessarily the case that the division between parents and children is the most revealing, suggesting that the former are willing, competent and perhaps keen to be

---

¹¹² Park visit: Henrik's family.

¹¹³ Park visit: Leo's family.

exposed to (imaginary) fear, while children are less so. Children might experience attractions that involve undesirable emotions for their parents. There is consequently an unwillingness among different visitors, regardless of age, to take part in certain attractions.

Henrik (age 9) is the one who experiences attractions which his parents describe in terms of producing undesirable dizziness and nausea. In ascribing nausea and fear to others, and to oneself, Leo and Henrik's parents suggest that they have knowledge about emotions as the result of particular activities. This knowledge allows them to avoid certain attractions and unwanted emotions.

The approach of sharing the visit as a family on a part-time basis allows a partial focus on individuals. As a consequence, there can be a division of family, and a focus on simultaneous activities in parallel. It is about making desirable activities and positive emotions part of the visit for individuals rather than negative and undesirable emotions. Shifting between doing activities all together, involving parts of the family, or as individuals make visits a matter of coexistence, simultaneously taking place in different locations within Liseberg or ALW. Central here is the recognition that visits can be "drawn apart" and "hang together" in shifting ways, so that it is possible to share some attractions and experiences while there also are things which are not enjoyable for everyone.

The visits in this study are child-centered in the sense that it is children who are expected to be most involved with the park attractions. When it comes to the attractions it is children who ride them, while parents join in or wait by the ride's exit, not the other way around. Part-time company visits suggest that parents are attentive firstly to children, and secondly to themselves. Children, regardless of their age, are not left behind for the purpose of adult-centered experiences in the attractions. The closest I get to such adult-oriented ways of approaching the parks during family visits is when Anders, the head of security at Liseberg, tells me that there at times when fathers drink too much beer, "then it can go very wrong." Without any further details from Anders it is still possible to imagine how a drunken father might be challenging when it comes to doing things together with children.

Alone in the company of four

During Casper's (age 6) visit to Liseberg, the matter of assistance and support for children becomes intricate and complex.

Casper's mother Lena, and her friend Dan, try to make the most out of the day for Casper. This means that they engage in different activities that might serve Casper. The visit has been planned so that it involves attractions in the park early during the day, and listening to Casper's favorite artist, Eric Saade, who performs during the evening, when the popular television show *Lotta at Liseberg* is recorded. Casper has prepared for the concert by creating a poster with Eric Saade's name written in large letters. Like many others in the park he is looking forward to the concert. Dan carries a bag with this poster. But he provides more support than this. The *Lotta at Liseberg* show is popular and attracts thousands of visitors to the park. Many people queue next to the stage from early during the day. They want to get themselves a good place, in front of the stage. Almost immediately after entering Liseberg, Dan walks away from us. He takes his place in the growing queue that leads to the big stage, where *Lotta at Liseberg* will be performed. While Casper, Lena and I move on to the attractions, it is clear that Lena's friend Dan will spend his time queuing here; he is our key to getting close to the stage later on during the evening.¹¹⁴

Figure 7:3: Queue, Liseberg. Queuing at Liseberg when there are popular stage performances means standing in one place for hours – at least for those who want to get close to the stage.

---

¹¹⁴ Park visit: Casper's family.

Lena and Dan have tickets to enter the park, but they do not include anything besides stage performances and access to a few attractions, in the company of children. Six-year-old Casper is the only one who has a ride pass to be able to experience all the attractions.

Lena asks her son what he wants to do. He points to an attraction with ornaments that look like animals, and asks if Lena will join him. She tells Casper that she has not got a ride pass, and can only join him in certain attractions where parents are allowed without any additional charge. I join Casper on a couple of attractions. Some of these make me feel dizzy. Casper asks if I can join him on the attraction with the animals – Lena tells him “but David isn’t your father.”¹¹⁵

Having unlimited access to the attractions at Liseberg, I am the only one close to Casper who has the possibility to go along. The fact that Lena, Casper’s mother, states that I am not his father seems to mean that Casper should not expect me to join in. Casper’s father is not present and cannot not join us during the visit.¹¹⁶ Lena marks a boundary to this by telling Casper that he cannot count on my involvement. Lena speaks about the physical absence of a father, and makes the father into an ideal character who accompanies his children. This suggests that attractions should be experienced with parents, making park visits into a family affair even if there is geographical distance between Casper and his father and no one else but me is there to join in.

The distance of Casper’s father is marked in two ways, and assists Lena in making Casper into the *one* who is going to ride attractions. My opportunities to join Casper, being there with him, are set aside and Casper experiences some attractions on his own.

Shifting between riding attractions alone, with me, and visiting parts of the park together, Casper talks with his mother about what to do and decides where to go. Casper enters an attraction called *Skepp o’ skoj*, where Liseberg invites visitors to “Be captain for a day!” Riding in a small boat on his own, Casper is navigating the pool where other children move around in boats together with accompanying adults. Clearly, Casper and the other children are not allowed to spend the entire day in the boats. Just as with other attractions in the park, it is a question of the minutes that each ride is supposed to take. I notice that Casper is having problems with steering the boat and navigating the pool. Lena tells me that “he

---

¹¹⁵ Park visit: Casper’s family.

¹¹⁶ Lena and Casper’s father are separated.

hasn't taken this ride many times." Casper is standing up in the boat, and then sitting down, seemingly annoyed over not having control over the boat. Through the loudspeakers, the attraction operator tells Casper to sit down. Repeatedly she makes calls for Casper to leave his boat – asking boat number three to dock. After what I experience as an eternity, Lena starts talking to one of the employees. And after a couple of minutes they bring Casper and his boat from the open water to where he can exit the attraction.¹¹⁷

Figure 7:4: Attractions, Liseberg. The *Skepp o' skoj* attraction at Liseberg where children navigate the pool by themselves, or in the company of adults who assist in handling the small boats, which can carry two people.

I was worried about Casper's struggles in the boat. He was out there seemingly in need. This occasion was one of the few during my fieldwork when I have considered suggesting that something needs to be done, that a child requires assistance. How many adults are there to assist this child? Four – myself, Lena, Dan and the attraction operator – or none? I did not help. I thought that maybe there were reasons for leaving Casper in the boat, perhaps an educational way of making him learn how to handle himself. Casper's visit to Liseberg is quite tricky to comprehend.

---

¹¹⁷ 'Liseberg – Skepp o' skoj', <http://liseberg.com/en/home/Amusement-Park/Rides--Attractions/Skepp-o-skoj/> (accessed 05/03/15). Park visit: Casper's family.

Around Casper and throughout the park there are adults and employees ready to serve. But they do not always do so. It is as though the distance in this attraction between Casper and adults is about making him do things on his own, withdrawing the instant services of adults at the moment when he might find them most appropriate. Karen Smith (2012: 34) argues that the recognition of children as competent actors in contemporary society might be beneficial to children at the same time as it can be a burden. The situation in which Casper navigates the pool at Liseberg resonates with the responsibilities of children, as highlighted by Smith. But there is no absolute divide, or a constant distance between Casper and others who could provide a helping hand.

As time passes, adults become engaged to help Casper and his boat move to the safe harbor, where his mother is waiting for him. The time spent in the boat involves Casper in what, following Smith (2012), can be described as the wider order of childhood, where children are expected to learn to be responsible and become independent of others. The visit involves both such an order, where the distance between Lena and Casper is significant, and one of togetherness, moving and eating together in the park. At the same time there is Dan, upon whom both Lena and Casper are relying – counting on him to secure places so that Casper will be able to see Eric Saade's performance during the evening, at the end of the visit.

While Casper's situation in the boat is somewhat exceptional, being watched by adults who do little more than observe for several minutes, it is a situation that is telling for family visits. Children and parents, in the wide sense, do move with each other and away from each other. The attractions in the park both offer them a time together and make interaction and support into a challenge. This in turn challenges ideas that theme park visits are about family togetherness, a quality time of sharing equal amounts of happiness.

CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

I propose the metaphor of the *yo-yo* to capture how children and parents are related, continually moving between proximity and distance. The *yo-yo* metaphor highlights that the movements of children and parents constitute the park visits as family visits. Movements vary in frequency, between occasional or repeated, sudden or planned, and involve voluntary or involuntary proximity and distance. These movements are called for due to

needs, wants, and what is (un)desirable. The metaphor of the yo-yo highlights how children are in practice enacting dependency equally. It provides a contrast to notions of children as either dependent or independent, emphasizing that in a sense they are both (see Smith 2012). For children here, their momentary independence goes with a dependence on parents. The same goes for parents, focused or ready to focus on their children in the parks – depending on what children do, where they are, and on being there to observe and assist, to avoid the risk of dis-order and lost children.

The yo-yo metaphor highlights the complexity of difference and similarities in the examples given in this chapter, just as when playing with a yo-yo there is an involvement of acquired skills, chance, and variations in proximity and distance as well as speed and frequency. Explorations of what can be done and the movements of children and parents make a visit into a coordinated matter. Making movements possible, children and parents make use of devices such as the cell phone – connecting children and parents, letting them be distanced but keeping in touch. This makes it possible to be simultaneously available and unavailable, experiencing attractions or doing something else, being distanced and close at the same time.

The notion of family in this thesis has been associated with intimacy, and intimacy is related to proximity or closeness, of children and parents being together. The examples in this chapter point to the partial relevance of such a notion of family, but also to what lies beyond shared experiences of family. So even though the visits here could be described as child-centered, there are challenges that parents and children face in actual situations in the theme park. While intimacy, then, has been associated with happiness (Illouz 2007; Thien 2007), is this perhaps the case only under some circumstances? Being together will at times create undesirable emotions, which distance assists in handling momentarily. What the movements of children and their parents tell us about family is a story of heterogeneity, where the coexistence of individual and collective ways of ordering a visit is significant, rather than a stable unity of family.

How is family involved with happiness in theme parks? By whom, when and where is it enacted? This chapter adds to previous research in exploring what a happy quality time might mean in practice. It is not necessarily the coherence of family, or the sacrifices of parents that create happiness, among children or adults. In practice, coherent family visits face challenges

as children and parents focus on different *or* the same activities. Family is involved with happiness as an ideal of togetherness, but also splits up for the sake of achieving individual happiness that can contrast with experiences taken together as a collective. Children, parents, park employees and characters, as well as attractions, are all involved in the enactment of happiness; not as a totality, but in messy and situated ways that are hard to anticipate as expectations meet the unexpected events of a theme park.

Happiness, in the models outlined in the introduction to this thesis, is about linear movements where achievements and means of different kinds lead individuals to happiness. Such stable linearity is not visible during the park visits I witnessed; there is no plan by which activities are carried out along a given path towards a destination of happiness. What is apparent during the visits, altogether, is the avoidance of what are known to be undesirable emotions, including fear and nausea, and orientations towards various activities – as different as work and riding the roller-coaster.

CHAPTER 8

CHRONOGRAPHY: TIME AND CHILDHOOD

Summer time. From the end of May to late in August there are increased opportunities for families to spend time together, and to visit desirable tourist destinations. Children are on summer break, and parents take their vacation. A combination of paid vacation leave for parents, the fact that many children's everyday activities are put on hold and the weather invites people to spend time outdoors makes theme park visits into a suitable activity. Season and time are consequently crucial for visits to Astrid Lindgren's World and Liseberg. Time is not only a window of opportunity; it also becomes a limitation in considerations of when, where and for how long a visit should take place.

Depending on the extent of a visit, there are different considerations in terms of the need for speed. Among children and parents visiting these parks it is common to come across reactions to how much time it takes – that things take a lot of time, or that you are lucky things went smoothly and you were allowed to enter an attraction without waiting too long. There are not many clocks on public display and those that are visible at Liseberg primarily provide information about the time expected for queuing, in minutes, rather than stating what time of day it is.

Time in theme parks is consumed as a product (Cardell & Sparrman 2012). Some people purchase one-day tickets and want to do as much as possible. Others return over several days and this allows them to slow down the pace, and avoid being stressed about what they managed to do during the day. People who consume the theme park experience shifting rhythms and get involved with time in various ways. During a visit to Liseberg, Henrik (age 9) comments that riding an attraction extends the feeling of time in comparison with standing at the side and observing.

Time in the park is entangled with expectations of a good and happy time in a wider sense. To give one example, time is approached as an important factor in choosing when one should visit a park: one mother says that it will be time to visit the theme park Legoland in Denmark later, when her daughter gets older, arguing that it is “fun if she remembers.” This is symptomatic, indicating that the timing of a theme park visit is not

haphazard – there are concerns about when the right time is. This leads to the question of the ways in which time and age are important. Moreover it raises the issue of whether childhood has a role in the enactment of happiness.

It will be shown in this chapter that theme park visits make time into a shifting and complex matter. Before I get into the ethnographic parts of this chapter, there is a section that focuses on how *chronography* serves the purpose of widening our understanding of happiness, time and childhood.

CHRONOGRAPHY AND HAPPINESS

Chronography provides an approach to the study of how time is enacted. The term chronography is used here to describe my approach to time as, borrowing from Chuk Moran (2013: 7), “an enacted, material, social practice.” A relevant question here is how time is enacted in practice (Mol 2002; see also Shove 2009: 17). Practices widen the scope of time beyond quantitative measures – moving beyond a set temporality. It is not necessarily about counting hours, but also about feelings and estimations, as in the case of Henrik above. My take on chronography is in line with how Science and Technology Studies (STS) ethnographizes target concepts (Woolgar 2012: 36). It means beginning with specific empirical questions about time, rather than building a grand theory (Lynch 2013: 454, 458).¹¹⁸ I will now briefly touch upon the notions of childhood and happiness in relation to notions of time.

Many theories of childhood “take a linear view of the developmental process” (Corsaro 2005: 23). Nick Lee and Steven D. Brown (2002: 262f) highlight that temporality is considered a substance of childhood, which is a period, a passing phase, on the way towards adulthood. Temporality suggests a chronology of life in the wider sense, where childhood is followed by adulthood. But, nevertheless, childhood scholars note that there is a need for research into the construction of time, and childhood as temporality (Prout & James 1997: 28; Uprichard 2008: 307–309).¹¹⁹

---

¹¹⁸ The term chronography is rarely used, and has not “develop[ed] as a distinct discipline as both geography and cartography” (Jessop 2008: 285; see also Sharma 2013).

¹¹⁹ Calls for research regarding time have also been made elsewhere in social and cultural research (Birth 2007; see also Adam 1995: 6; Halas 2010; Harro-Loitand & Kõresaar 2010).

Time and age are also concerns in research on happiness. In statistics, there is a U-shape of happiness, suggesting that children and seniors are happier than middle-aged people (e.g. Blanchflower & Oswald 2008; Frijters & Beatton 2012). Parents are, statistically, unhappier than other adults (Gilbert 2007: 220f). This might contradict expectations, and also challenges the model of family, in which children are approached as external goods of happiness. These encompassing observations provide a broad and rather abstract image, where age and the constitution of family explain happiness.

There is an observation in studies of theme parks that makes sense here and provides detail to the above research. Nick Johns and Szilvia Gyimóthy (2002) write about parents who sacrifice themselves for the sake of happy children in visiting the Danish theme park Legoland: “although adults were happy to come to Legoland on their children’s account, they often did not like it themselves” (ibid.: 324). There is a division of time here during family visits, between a pleasurable time for children and a purposeful time for adults – being there for the sake of the children (cf. Dolan 2015). This contrasts with ideals of theme parks as places that offer families a shared time, to “concretize the experience of family” (Willis 1995: 51), and fulfill ideals of the “happy family” through tourism (Carr 2011: 16, 21). It indicates that there might be tensions regarding time, or that pleasure for one person involves the sacrifice of others (Ahmed 2008, 2010a; Baader 2012: 495f).

The common happiness model, which constructs it as an individual orientation, involves ambitions of overview, involving a linear time that suggests the possibility that calculable actions and rational choices lead individuals to happiness; that by doing “this and that”, happiness will be achieved (e.g. Csikszentmihalyi 2002; Dolan 2015). Theme parks fit within this line of thought, where some individuals achieve happiness through visits. There is, in my view, too much certainty about happiness in such an approach, with its narrow focus on the individual. I would, however, suggest that time and happiness do not only involve assumptions of an overview into the future, and what Ingold (2009a, 2009b) speaks of in terms of transport – where individual happiness is certain if one spends time going to a particular destination. The notion of time also involves opportunities that cannot be foreseen.

The model associated with chance and luck emphasizes that there are times when happiness arrives, and that one cannot control these times at the outset. This model takes a different view of time, involving what I call:

timely opportunities. Following Hans Rämö (1999: 312), it is a time that might not come back, being a moment of right and opportune time. Rämö suggests that the notion of *kairos* – timely occasions – is rarely used nowadays.¹²⁰ There is instead a dominance of chronology, *chronos*, which involves ambitions of overview and an “exact quantification of time” (Rämö 1999: 315). By considering these shifting concepts in practice, it is possible to explore how time and happiness become entangled in different ways. Chronography allows for explorations of chronology *and* beyond into the timely opportunities which arise during visits to theme parks.

Together, these different notions of time allow me to emphasize that time is not necessarily homogeneous, but that there are also different social rhythms and that time, in practice, is multiple and heterogeneous (cf. Adam 1995: 12; Birth 2013: 233; Kern 1983). Practices are consequently not only *in* time (that is quantified), but they also *enact* time (Mol 2002; Moran 2013). I explore time, age and happiness as interlinked and entangled concepts through park visits. The point is to explore time through practice with regards to happiness rather than arguing for what time “is”.

I have thought about how, for whom and under what circumstances does time, and different times, become a matter of concern in the parks. In this chapter I explore beginnings, endings, timing and duration. This leads me to focus on how children, parents, and the parks are involved in practices that enact time with the concerns of childhood in mind, including contrasts with and movements towards adulthood. Several of these matters have to do with expectations. This means that children and parents outline what is likely to happen in the future.

CHRONOLOGY

In this part, I focus on how theme park consumption involves expectations of another time to come, which is different from the present and involves the transformation of children. Children and their parents identify growth

---

¹²⁰ John Urry (2000: 114) suggests there is now a dominance of clock-time, chronological time. Mikhail Epstein (2011: 79) even speaks of *chronocracy*, which emphasizes the importance of chronology. Chronocracy makes sense in relation to arguments about the Taylorism of leisure and theme park settings, emphasizing efficiency and control over time throughout the visits (e.g. Sorkin 1992b: 223). Research on theme parks also suggests that time there is distinct from everyday life, as a time away from (chronological) time (e.g. Baudrillard 1998; Ritzer & Liska 1997: 106).

and development as influential for how and where one should spend time, now and in the future. It points to possibilities and desires to experience new things. In this, material aspects of the theme parks become important.

Bodily possibilities

Children are measured at Liseberg to ensure that they are tall enough to take part in the attractions that call for a certain number of centimeters. There are different categories of attractions – requiring minimum heights of 90, 110, 130 or 140 cm. These numbers are important for whether an individual can ride an attraction or not. Measurements are critical at Liseberg and in parks with ride attractions more generally, where the exactness of numbers implies safety (Csarmann 2007).

Figure 8:1: Ruler, Liseberg, asking “How tall are you?”

In the “guest service office” at Liseberg, children are subject to measurement – inspected by park employees to discover whether they qualify to enter an attraction. This is a voluntary procedure and a preferred way of dealing with the issue of height for some visitors.

Henrik (age 9) is one of the participants who is measured in this study. Visiting the guest service office at Liseberg, he is placed next

to a ruler and measures 131.5 centimeters tall. During the measurement Henrik stands straight, still, and stretches his body. Employees use the ruler to measure him while his parents observe. He receives a bracelet with the number 130 on it, giving access to rides without further measurement throughout the park attractions during the day. Henrik tells me that he thinks it should state 131.5, being the actual measured height of his body.¹²¹

Going to the “guest service office” helps to minimize inspections at each attraction. The bracelet offered there becomes a sign of authorized use, a key for Henrik to access attractions that require 130 cm, so that employees do not need to bring out the rulers, again and again. It speeds up his passage through the entrances and the time in the park can be focused on riding the attractions. Bracelets, like the one worn by Henrik, become a solution to the challenges of measuring bodies that are on the move – that eagerly and quickly want to pass through the entrances to the attractions. It means that employees can look at the arms of children before they suggest that one should stop for the necessary measurement – it has already been conducted.

A fixed and measurable height becomes important at the outset of park visits. To adjust the body to fit it for measurement suggests that height is not continually fixed. During the measurement there is a kind of focus on the body “as is”, which is visible in how Henrik calls for a more specific bracelet – with *his* height, rather than a generic number. His height, along with other children’s, is stretched out to its maximum capacity.

---

¹²¹ Park visit: Henrik’s family.

Figure 8:2: Bracelets. Having received the bracelet stating that his height is more than 130 centimeters, but less than the tallest height category – 140 cm – Henrik is equipped to start riding attractions at Liseberg.

During the 12-hour day at Liseberg, Henrik is keen on taking many attractions and some of them several times. Being authorized, it is clear to Henrik and his parents which rides are available to him, and which are not, at this time. While being measured, however, as shown elsewhere, there are also children who deploy strategies to make them as tall as possible, using shoes that increase their height a bit (Cardell & Sparrman 2012). The ambition among children and parents to experience new attractions does not involve any material additions to gain height. Children and parents in this study accept the measurements and also, more or less actively, buy into the idea that bodies ought to be observed, defined and subject to inclusion or exclusion. They accept that Liseberg defines when bodies are allowed to enter the attractions, due to issues of safety.

Family park visits involve not only an acceptance of the height that has been achieved at the current moment. Anticipation of growth to come is part of the park visits. Time is expected to generate numbers.

Lotta says that her youngest daughter Mary (age 3) is expected to grow before next summer: “she will be 108.5 centimeters next summer, if she follows her growth curve.”¹²²

As months or years pass, growth takes place and previously unavailable attractions become accessible to a child. Numbers in the park become a hierarchy against which children’s development is matched. Mary becomes subject to transport through time, in the sense that one point in the centimeter curve is expected to connect to another; probably with an expected end to it – being grown up. Lotta’s comments about this development provide the most explicit example of such a detailed line of thought. But it makes sense to consider this approach in a wider sense: there are no children or parents in this study who expect that children will *not* reach the upper category required to use all the attractions. Not having worries about this is significant for expectations of times to come in at least two ways.

Children can expect to grow, in due time, and they do not approach their current visit as a one-off occasion. They will likely come back, sometime in the future, after growth. Time, therefore, makes sense in relation to expectations that children will move along a predictable curve, where the future involves certainties about growth and continuous consumption. This suggests that current visits relate to future ones.

The above observations provide a story about time that is focused on growth. Measurement becomes a part of noting that development is taking place – also making visible (im)possibilities of consumption to children and parents. The possibilities and impossibilities illustrate that Liseberg, along with other commercial spaces, organizes consumption in stages of growth (Cook 2004: 97, 118f). Sara Ahmed (2006: 51) has pointed out that spaces are for “some kind of bodies more than others.” This is especially true when it comes to riding attractions in theme parks (Csarman 2007). What I would add is the importance of time and change in a theme park like Liseberg, where categories of height run alongside an expected trajectory outlining the coming growth of children. Consequently, the opportunities at Liseberg are constituted to align repeated consumption of the theme park with the “natural” physical development of children (cf. Langer 2004: 256).

Waiting for some things thus becomes a requirement, which is accepted by the children and parents in this study. The notion of waiting is associated

---

¹²² Park visit: Kim’s family.

with the becoming of children, a time of developing (Qvortrup 2005: 5). Some argue that children learn to wait throughout childhood (Ehn & Löfgren 2007: 24–26). Children do not – and are not required to – accept this for the sake of waiting as such. Waiting is consequently not related to an ideal that children should postpone pleasures that are available for increasing the happiness of life in a wider sense (Binkley 2014: 59ff; see also Brusdal & Frønes 2014: 1440). There is no focus on the moralism of waiting, or as an explicit part of an educational agenda. Waiting is consequently set aside, in favor of an active time where visitors experience available attractions. There is no big fuss about the fact that, for example, a roller-coaster is not yet available, as there are other opportunities at hand.

Beyond numbers

In contrast to Liseberg, there is no explicit significance to numbers at ALW – either in age or height. In theory, these are not relevant for being able or unable to do certain things in this theme park. As I join children it becomes clear, however, that adult bodies do not easily fit in. They are too big.

In a small-scale house I am guided by Eric (age 6) to a corner where I can stand upright, and he tells me that “here, here it is normal for you.” Not bending my back becomes preferable to Eric who observes how the small house fits himself and his brother but not me.¹²³

Fitting in, or not, divides the bodies of shorter children and taller adults in these houses in the park. The material scales at ALW result in a division that challenges the inclusion of adult bodies, especially so in the spaces of the miniature houses. ALW consequently makes height into a problem in ways that are less explicit but more obvious than at Liseberg. The tall ones need to stoop, bend down, to move along; the antithesis to ideals of good posture (Ingold 2007a: 153; Turmel 2008: 138–142).

---

¹²³ Park visit: Eric’s family.

Figure 8.3: Small houses. A man uses a video camera to record children inside one of the many miniature houses at ALW.

Few parents enter the small houses at ALW, and the tight spaces leave adults outside. This inverts the order of waiting: it is not children who are waiting here, but parents who stand outside during the activities of their children inside the houses, waiting for these to end. This is the case generally at ALW.¹²⁴ Growing implies that time in the houses is likely to end, as being tall means waiting.

Children do not stay long in the cramped spaces of ALW. They spend minutes there rather than hours. Perhaps this is because most of the small houses offer little in terms of content – there are tables and chairs in some of them, but usually not much more. Leaving these houses, children rejoin their parents.

Some activities at ALW require additional height, and at times children call for such, provided by parents. There are children who ask taller adults to

---

¹²⁴ Here, there is a connection between chronography and scalography, the study of scale in practice (see Hinchliffe 2009; Yaneva 2009).

“lift me”. This enables children to see beyond what their eyes can see when they are standing on the ground. Exploration of the contents of the park then becomes a collaborative affair, involving several bodies: child + adult + physical strength + materiality. This is a turn away from the focus on individual bodies at Liseberg (cf. Samuelsson et al. accepted).

Together, the above observations suggest that time and material things are entangled. Some attractions leave adults waiting, others call for a social and shared time so that children will be able to observe and experience what is available in the theme park. The shifts between attractions that exclude and include park visitors correspond with a mix of ideals that are part of previous models of happiness. Depending on where one spends time, and in which company, different ideals become relevant: childhood time with a focus on children’s play, family time with a focus on togetherness, and theme park time as a matter of consumption and positive experiences. These ideals – from the previous models of happiness – are consequently entangled with the material outline of the park and concrete social situations in which considerations of time are made. Children are allowed time to play on their own, while parents are just outside, ready if there are any problems, followed by times that offer family togetherness (cf. Hallman & Benbow 2010: 15; Mayall 1998; Stearns 2010). If a park visit is to include different times, there is a need for continuous change, from a focus on children’s activities, to social time, sharing experiences.

Changing phases

Tove (age 9) and her parents Karin and Johan tell me about Tove’s history at Liseberg. We speak about her long-time enthusiasm for the park, and the family’s consumption of it. Both Tove and her parents have noted changes. Karin speaks of previous times when Tove visited the park attractions together with her parents. We are smiling and laughing as Karin presents the experiences of the young Tove at Liseberg. Karin describes how “there is some kind of development,” referring to the fact that Tove stopped hugging the rabbits. Tove has moved away from the children’s area at Liseberg to other attractions. “The next phase is when you start to ride the bigger attractions,” Karin continues, speaking about how Tove is now experiencing the attractions on her own, without accompanying parents. According to Karin, Tove is now big enough to manage by herself, “more or less”. Tove quickly adds, with what seems to be

some uncertainty, that “the next phase is probably where I can manage to be on my own at Liseberg.”¹²⁵

Tove notices that managing herself, individually, is part of a time to come in the park. She is aspiring towards the bigger attractions. Movement from one attraction or park to the next resonates with developmental thinking and ideas that children grow and mature. Tove and Karin – who is knowledgeable about psychological concepts of development, which according to Alan Prout and Allison James (1997: 10) are dominant notions of childhood – provide an account of the individual child, where park visits make sense through the notion of “phases”. This notion has been discussed by Ivar Frønes (2005: 271), who writes that it includes periods of “structural stability” and transition, which “refers to more fluid periods of moving from one phase to the next.” What does the transition between phases imply here?

Phases and transitions resonate with chronology and the overview of a temporality of childhood, involving a before and after, that transport the child to what comes next. In the story about Tove there is a before, a present and also a future, which all entangle with Liseberg and its different attractions. Tove and her parents claim that the so-called children’s area of Liseberg is no longer of any interest to her. Past activities at Liseberg are remembered as traces of a previous time, which provide a background to what is taking place now and what will happen in the future. This means that time becomes associated with physical and mental development, where getting older and growing leads on to new destinations. The older and bigger Tove gets, the more she is expected to do on her own, taking part in more thrilling experiences.

As Tove follows a line of development, others no longer need to travel along with her in the park. Following this comes increased autonomy, and changed experiences plot Tove’s way onwards, into a future of expected development. This illustrates how Tove’s time comes with expectations of becoming something else, transforming from being accompanied by her parents to having a presence as an individual child in the theme park.

Here, the theme park works as a place where Tove elaborates on possibilities to manage herself, which is a matter of concern not only for her but also for her parents. Tove and her parents are not spending time in the park for the “simple” or only purpose of fun, but are interweaving the appreciated attractions with psychological theories of child development.

---

¹²⁵ Interview 1: Tove’s family.

Through park visits, they are able to test and observe how Tove takes care of herself. Liseberg here turns into a *testing site* for a child's developing autonomy. During limited times, Tove is able to prove herself, in relation to her parents, in moving towards the certainty of being able to manage herself. My proposed notion of a testing site highlights how development is expected and also explored, in relation to attractions and within a spatially limited place.

The future expectations of age and growth are part of a developmental approach and, according to Virginia Morrow (2013: 151f), this involves a "fixation with numerical age" which comprises "very powerful normative ideas about the 'right' and the 'wrong' age to do certain things." Children are expected to mature, grow up, and wait for the right time (James et al. 1998; Qvortrup 2005). There is a value in growing up, which, according to previous research, children also find important (e.g. Corsaro 2005: 134f; Kvale Sørenssen 2012: 180).

While children might value the increasing opportunities in the theme park, it is notable that parents also play an important role in outlining the times to come.¹²⁶ They speak of when families will visit a park, and what is the appropriate park at a particular age. Kim's (age 5) mother Lotta says that other parks than Liseberg will likely be visited when her two daughters get older. Mathilda says that her daughter Thea (age 5) needs to be older before they visit the Danish theme park Legoland. Helene considers this to be the final year when her daughter, Tina (age 6), is likely to find ALW of interest, and she assumes that Tina is growing up and away from the park.

The focus on numerical age suggests that children, in due time, make up a good match with particular places. Their *being* in the present is not relevant to some of the theme parks that are available for consumption, but will be later as children *become* something different.¹²⁷ And this is what the timing of visits is about – a chronology of age against which individual children are measured.

---

¹²⁶ Previous research emphasizes that *children* "do" childhood, and are involved in reproducing it (see also Cody 2012; Halldén 2007: 29–31; Helleiner 2007; James & James 2004: 12; König 2008; Markström & Halldén 2009: 120; Russell & Tyler 2002: 622). This means that research on children and on childhood blur into each other (Shanahan 2007: 408).

¹²⁷ The notions of being and becoming are outlined by, for example, Lee (2001) and Uprichard (2008).

TIMELY OPPORTUNITIES

In this part, I address opportunities that unfold during theme park visits, which, for both children and adults, make up “the right and judicious moment[s] to act” (Metcalf 2006: 247). The timing here is of a different kind than the time discussed above; involving greater uncertainties about time as well as opportunities that arise more or less suddenly.

Pacifiers as loss and gift

Growing (up) involves expectations of leaving certain things behind. A critical situation in which many children are expected to move on, leaving things behind, in the past, is the termination of the use of pacifiers (UK: dummy/dummies). At ALW and Liseberg there are special containers that are designated for the purpose of leaving pacifiers – a barrel at ALW and a machine at Liseberg.

Figure 8:4: Barrel. A barrel where pacifiers are collected by Pippi Longstocking at ALW, placed next to trash bins. 2011.

Figure 8:5: Machine. A machine at Liseberg, where pacifiers are collected outside the house of the rabbits. 2012.

At Liseberg, children in large numbers leave their pacifiers just outside the rabbits' house. At ALW, famous park characters such as Pippi Longstocking are involved in collecting the pacifiers in a barrel, as part of their performances in the park. Park visitors have previously left pacifiers wherever they see fit, for example in the house of Pippi Longstocking (Economou & Hergli 2010: 58). By setting up special installations, ALW and Liseberg try to remain in control – so that pacifiers not will be left in just any place, throughout the park.

When is the appropriate time to leave precious things behind? Leaving children's pacifiers is part of family life in general and is here expected to take place during a scheduled time in the park. Leaving pacifiers in the parks involves deciding that it is the right place to do so, as well as considerations of timing. Is it an appropriate time “now” or will there be too much sadness and anxiety? Children face a situation which is associated both with a risk of sadness and a chance for separation. The latter is evident in talk about the fact that the pacifiers are “gifts” to those who need them more, like the “baby” rabbits at Liseberg.

Parents prepare, getting children used to the idea of separation.

Jacob (age 4) is expected to leave his collection of pacifiers the next day at ALW. When it is time to leave these on the second day it is Jacob's mother Gill who hands over the pacifiers to Pippi Longstocking. Pippi puts them in a barrel under the supervision of children and parents. His brother Eric (age 6) is there and his father Tony records the event with his smart phone. Jacob is standing to the side, silently observing how his pacifiers end up next to many others, now separated from the children who are taking part in the same event. After his pacifiers have been left, Jacob receives a hug from Gill. Following the separation from his pacifiers, Jacob puts his thumb in his mouth. Gill asks if this is what Jacob will do now. In their caravan Jacob keeps another substitute: a lollipop shaped like a pacifier, bought in a candy shop during the first day at the park.¹²⁸

Getting rid of the pacifiers at ALW makes sense, and perhaps becomes somewhat easier than the alternative of putting them into a meaningless trash bin at home, or thinking of them as slimy plastic things, of no value. The gift to characters like Pippi or the rabbits at Liseberg makes pacifiers into something important that are not wasted. Their importance remains, but someone else receives them. The point here is that, as a pacifier moves into

---

¹²⁸ Park visit: Eric's family.

the park, children's experiences of an ordinary and mundane material thing become mixed with fiction, making them entangle and even uphold one another (Lindgren et al. 2015).

Ahmed (2006: 168) writes about how material things give direction to life. Ahmed is focusing on arrangements of furniture, but nonetheless it makes sense to discuss the barrel around which Jacob and his family gather in her terms, as an orientation device that suggests directions for his future life: not using pacifiers anymore. The range of products that are for sale at ALW and Liseberg further assists in phasing out pacifiers, making the time of separation a bit easier – both parks sell lollipops shaped like pacifiers.¹²⁹ With such a lollipop, Jacob receives a material substitute – to go along with his thumb – and is able to consume something similar to the pacifier, for a while. This candy lasts throughout their time at ALW and is why there is no need for the ordinary plastic pacifiers, at this time.

Is Gill's hug supposed to comfort, to celebrate, or to get close to observe how Jacob is experiencing the separation? Perhaps all of these. It suggests that the time of the pacifier is in the past but that now there is an uncertain time ahead. In Jacob's case there is uncertainty about what he will do in the future, revealed in his mother's question regarding his thumb. Also there is an uncertainty in the present.

Deborah Lupton (2013: 7) suggests that pacifiers are "important means of controlling and civilising the disorderly infant body by reducing crying," which results in an "intense grief and a sense of loss when caregivers attempt to wean them from the dummy." Jacob's separation from his pacifiers does not generate any tears. Neither does it make him especially happy, at the moment.

Jacob's visit to ALW signifies a break with previous routines, which is expected to change his everyday life. Drawing on the work of Randall Collins (2004: 18), it marks an end to a long-term encounter; it is a transition ritual. It is a ritual in which a transition is played out against current routines, so that Jacob moves on from being dependent on his pacifiers. The involvement of the pacifiers in this ritual demonstrates their "sentimental value" and that the plastic objects carry "personal meanings" (Lupton 2013: 5). The park, the fictive (actor) Pippi Longstocking and the barrel become

---

¹²⁹ Observed at ALW during the visit with Eric and Jacob's family, and at Liseberg during the visit with Kim and Mary.

involved to facilitate the attempt to say goodbye, to leave cherished things behind, which calls for documentation. Images make it possible to look back, to remember this time in the future.

Will this time be happily remembered? To answer this question with a yes/no would involve assumptions about chronology that build on certainty. Moving beyond the likelihood of individual happiness – for Jacob – it is however possible to consider the event in relation to theoretical assumptions. Leaving the pacifier makes sense in terms of the uncertainty of *happ* in the model of luck and chance: one cannot predict and does not know later outcomes, in the present. Timely opportunities do not provide the certainty and chronological overview that are part of models of happiness outlining recipes for action. Control is possibly lost, drawing on Lupton (2013). And control is indeed important in previous models of happiness – to manage your life situation for the purpose of individual happiness.

What Jacob and Gill, along with the pacifiers, highlight is that time involves uncertainties, and makes theme park visits into a testing site, of dependency, control and emotions. Control and emotions go with happiness, but they provide no clear-cut answer about whether there is a happy time, or a time that – following ideals of separation from pacifiers – has to take place somewhere and soon enough. To learn that there is an end to becoming part of theme park visits, not only in the case of pacifiers but also in other ways.

Research usually emphasizes that theme park visits are associated with predictability and an absence of surprise (e.g. Arnal 2001; Gottdiener 1982; Marin 1984; Sorkin 1992a). Reading this research one easily gets the impression that there is control over time, that it is a happy time, and that ideals of experiencing minimal stress become a reality (e.g. Hjemdahl 2003a: 36–46; Lukas 2010: 144). Leaving pacifiers behind is, however, a possibly challenging and uncertain activity. These are managed in ways that make ideals about a positive time, without tears, more likely to occur – providing candy, hugs and creating space for talk about what will happen. This suggests a need for concepts of happiness that comprehend it as an achievement – among alternatives – in relation to time and material things: making chance and opportunity relevant rather than happiness as a guarantee of positive emotional outcomes.

By incorporating the ritual of leaving pacifiers, making them into gifts, ALW assists parents and children in tackling a time of loss that might

otherwise produce different emotions – expected and unexpected. The sentimental value and the personal meanings are strong enough to motivate his father’s documentation, his mother’s concern about the thumb in the mouth and the attention of Pippi Longstocking and ALW. Saying goodbye to the pacifier creates an emotional connection between children and the theme park through the transition ritual. ALW is the place where it happened – the time when it was right to leave a previous time behind.

In one sense this ritual is about timing, being a time that might not come back. Did Gill pick the right time to leave Jacob’s pacifiers? Time in this case makes sense in terms of a trial, where chronological ambitions mix with an awareness of timely opportunities – that timely opportunities arise in relation to the material things at hand – barrels, pacifiers, candy. Who knows the outcome? It is uncertain.

Stuck in the park

When I talk to Tove (age 9) and Rebecca (age 11) they argue, independently, that Liseberg and ALW, respectively, will always remain important. Tove speaks of Liseberg as a place for all ages, and claims that she does not know when to say stop in terms of visiting the park. Rebecca claims that there would be no summer without ALW. ALW and Liseberg are not only part of life currently, but they will be so continually, with no end in sight.

There are children and families who make a continuing presence in the park into an important issue, and nowhere is this more evident than for Rebecca.

Sitting next to Anne, observing Rebecca, who is climbing on one of the park attractions, she tells me that Rebecca “is really too old”. Anne continues “she is the most conservative. If it’s summer vacation then it’s ALW.” And: “She’s pretty small. Mentally.” Anne and Lars are not parents who wait for their daughter throughout the many days that are spent in the park. They watch the stage performances and join Rebecca in activities.¹³⁰

Rebecca’s mother Anne reflects on the relevance of ALW in relation to the age of her daughter, 11. In Anne’s description of Rebecca, it seems as though she is failing to live up to the expectations associated with her age. The term small here is not about body size, touched upon previously, but about an approach to ALW that is perhaps more childish than one would

---

¹³⁰ Park visit 1: Rebecca’s family.

expect from a girl of this age. Putting an end to the activities that Rebecca is involved with at ALW seems to be the preferable way to go from the parents' point of view. But is it?

What makes the issue of theme park visits into a somewhat contradictory matter in terms of age, and the relation between childhood and adulthood, is that Rebecca's parents find time in the park enjoyable as well.

During our first meeting before the park visit, Anne starts by saying that they, as adults, have just as much fun. They appreciate being in the park. Lars adds that there are many dimensions to the stories of Astrid Lindgren which are part of ALW, and that adults get the "deeper" message.¹³¹

Thus, according to Anne and Lars, adults approach ALW in different and deeper ways than children. Regardless of the differences in how things are appreciated, ALW is made into a relevant and fun park that is worth visiting repeatedly. The argument put forward by Anne and Lars makes childhood and adulthood into temporalities that provide different perspectives on similar activities, resulting in equal amounts of fun. The argument here is that children can be too "old", but that there is no end to fun. This makes the boundary between childhood and adulthood into a complex issue where it is suggested that an equal involvement in activities produces the same result: "fun". Deep versus surface? Is this what differentiates adults from children, and divides adulthood from childhood?

Returning to what takes place in the park during one of Rebecca's visits, age-boundaries are further challenged.

Rebecca imagines that there is a shop selling alcohol located in one of the small houses, where empty bookshelves and a desk are the only interior furnishing. Similar to a bartender, Rebecca stands behind the desk and asks me what I would like to order, of the available beer and liquor. Something without alcohol, I suggest. And Rebecca symbolically hands over a glass of "juice", through a movement of hands and arms through the air. I take a sip. Rebecca laughs and tells me that there actually is alcohol in the drink. She tells me that I am drinking beer, strong beer. In a playful way I pretend to be troubled, saying "oops", at the same time feeling amused by Rebecca's trick. Moving her arms at speed in my direction, Rebecca tells me "here is an antidote". "That's good", I

---

¹³¹ Interview 1: Rebecca's family.

reply. I am the only other person present, someone whom she can direct and control to some extent.¹³²

It is possible to understand Rebecca's way of making me into a drunken customer in her bar as a timely opportunity to explore the consequences of incorporating intoxicating substances into the park. I do not play drunk, but my "oops" is followed by a solution to the problem – the antidote. In this way, Rebecca recognizes that this is not a time to play out extensive intoxication. The antidote undoes the effects of my consumption, through illusion and playfulness.

In her visual study of advertising, Johanna Sjöberg (2013: 55–57) offers two concepts which assist us in moving beyond the dichotomy of childhood and adulthood and to recognize age-related divisions as cultural constructions: "childity" and "adulty". Rather than defining, or essential, properties that belong to children and adults respectively, the two concepts open up the possibility of understanding what is associated with being a child and being an adult – in practice.

These concepts help in exploring how Rebecca makes imagination part of a timely occasion, momentarily involved in an adulty activity that seems inappropriate in the park. She is momentarily focusing on an adulty practice of drinking in a theme park that is centered on childity, and consequently interweaves the two. What is challenging here is the example of how Rebecca enacts herself; she is adultifying herself as a bartender, misleading me, someone who wants a drink that would be appropriate for children in this place. The situation involves ideals about what adults should and should not do; to play along with children, or, as a responsible adult, focus on the fact that now is an inappropriate time for alcohol.

While Anne expresses the belief that her daughter is small "mentally" Rebecca can, at the same time, become involved in adulty activities. This highlights that one does not necessarily need to limit one's actions to childity because one is a particular age. Linear approaches to time are set aside, momentarily, in favor of humor, fun, and explorations of the possible. Rebecca does not simply stick with childity or adulty practices, but playfully makes this difference visible. She is consequently involved in movements between activities that can be considered examples of childity and adulty. Time in the park allows her this opportunity, in my company.

---

¹³² Park visit 2: Rebecca's family.

There is no stability here, in the sense that Rebecca is either transgressing expectations all the time, or conforming throughout the visit. In practice, timely opportunities coexist with the chronological time of childhood. They do so in two ways that make sense within Ingold's (2009a: 35) theoretical notions of movement, and the difference between transport and wayfaring. This suggests that time is heterogeneous (Birth 2013), that in some spaces timely opportunities coexist with her parents' mindfulness about the chronological time of childhood.

ALW provides timely opportunities for children and also for their parents to step away from their numerical age, so it is no longer a fixed matter. One can, for a time, move beyond expectations, and what is considered age-appropriate. The time in the park is consequently not *one* line of transport through childhood in the sense that people match appropriate activities or go to a more "grown-up" park to fit possible age expectations. Rebecca's parents address their belief that she is too old but do not rush into a point-to-point development. This involves notions of transport, but does not hinder wayfaring and it suggests that there are "multiple lines" (Ingold 2009b: 152) of age and becoming at play, in practice and as an ideal (Lee 2001). The different possibilities at ALW, and the idea of shifting perspectives, make the park relevant for visits through time.

The perceptual divide between children and adults, in terms of development, suggested by Rebecca's parents does not fully hold – as childhood in the park mixes with adult practices. There is a blurring here (Prout 2005: 34), which in extension makes it challenging to define exactly where the boundary between childhood and adulthood lies. What are the possible effects of a blurring of the boundary between childhood and adulthood in theme parks? In *The Future of Childhood*, Alan Prout (2005: 34) suggests that:

... the boundary between childhood and adulthood, which modernity erected and kept in place for a substantial period of time, is beginning to blur, introducing all kinds of ambiguities and uncertainties. This is the soil from which anxiety about the 'disappearance' of childhood grows and it is the feature of contemporary childhood that demands new approaches to its understanding and analysis.

To see childhood as existing, or not, is a rather narrow take on the issue of time; it is binary and does not allow the inclusion of complexity or differences. It is, however, an idea that has gained prominence. In his work

on childhood and the media, David Buckingham (2000: 21) writes that popular psychology suggests that children “are growing up deprived of childhood.” The existence of hurried, stressed children, involved in the same activities as adults, including consumption, makes the case that childhood no longer exists. Accordingly, we are witnessing the “death of childhood” (ibid.: 32f; see also Jenks 2005: 117–136; Prout 2011), making it into a historical phenomenon of past times.

The examples of Rebecca and Tove – who both desire to stay in their parks for now and forever – suggest that childhood and adulthood blur. They want to be there, grow there, rather than moving on elsewhere. The blur becomes a way of avoiding stress and strict concerns about appropriate childhood development. The parks have been important to these girls for years and an abrupt end seems to be far, far away. Time becomes less important than being in place. Their parents play along, and provide support. For these girls, theme park visits are not an “escape” from everyday life, but are a central part of constituting it (cf. Horkheimer & Adorno 1997[1944]: 153, 158). To terminate their time at ALW and Liseberg, indefinitely, would to say the least create unhappiness.

Parents and childly time

Mischief and humor are part of park visits, and children and parents find different ways to have a laugh.

Gill and Tony joke with each other, but some things stand out as being childish. Gill tells her husband Tony that he is the same age as the boys (aged 4 and 6) as all three of them appreciate the same kind of toilet humor, jokes about wee-wee and poo-poo. Gill and Tony speak of themselves as crazy, a label that might be appropriate to describe their playful interaction, pinching each other, and making jokes about each other. Gill and Tony move between seriousness and playing and laughing.¹³³

Park visits bring together children and adults in ways that make the boundary between childhood and adulthood less relevant, as parents enact childly in relation to one another and their children (Sjöberg 2013: 55–57). Transformations and playful movements between adultly and childly illustrate the importance of timely opportunities, which in fact involve *and* move beyond a dichotomy of childhood/adulthood.

---

¹³³ Park visit: Eric’s family.

What is it about Tony's jokes that associates him with childlike? Growing up involves expectations about what is considered mature. Maturity is "integrally tied to adulthood" (Mortimer & Aronson 2000: 29). Momentarily, Tony is acting against linear development, in an anti-linear way (cf. Renold & Ringrose 2011: 403), but there is also at the same time the possibility that he will change, and quickly turn into a responsible parent. There is not a total immersion in childlike. Instead of considering time as flowing in one direction, it makes sense to speak of Tony as becoming (Lee 2001), including childlike that creates joy and laughter during the visit.

At Liseberg, adults get involved in attractions that are primarily for children, in order to give support. In one of the attractions, parents join their children, which gives a funny impression to many of the people standing at the side observing the ride. On one occasion, I joined children in the Small Frogs attraction. Many of the other adults who were observing their children smiled at me as I sat in the middle of the attraction, about 50–70 cm taller than those in my company.

I can only speculate about what it would mean to enter this attraction without children, to spend time there for the sake of the attraction alone. As part of the so-called children's area at Liseberg, the Small Frogs ride, along with other ones, only makes sense in relation to children – if you join in as an adult, you do so in the company of children.

8:6: Small Frogs, attraction at Liseberg, with one seat in the middle for adults.

Adults do have an interest in the parks. Alan Bryman (1995: 88f) points out that families are the target group of Disneyland, but that adults make up the vast majority of visitors. While this is probably not the case at Liseberg or ALW on most days, there are parents – like Rebecca’s, above – who are explicit about the fact that their interests are part of the motives for visiting theme parks. Other parents argue along similar lines, where it actually starts with their interest:

Emil’s (age 6) parents, Frank and Åsa, say that their previous visits to ALW were about their interest as adults. Frank tells me that it is a park for everyone. Åsa looks forward to what Emil will appreciate in the park.¹³⁴

The initial adult motivation to go to ALW makes it into a matter beyond the age of children and childhood, where hopefully a child – following his parents – will enjoy the park as well. From a focus on their own experiences

---

¹³⁴ Interview 1: Emil’s family.

they will, accordingly, shift to put Emil at the center of attention, and this multiplies the meaning of time. It is not only time in the park that is interesting, but also the time of their son. The coming visits with Emil turn into a timely opportunity, which goes with exploring whether a child enjoys the same things as his parents. It means that theme parks not only turn into a testing site for childhood, but for parenthood as well, where interests within a family are explored on the initiative of parents.

Gill Valentine (1997: 66) relates current dominant understandings of childhood to a conception in “which children are temporally segregated from the adult world.” This separation is an ideal which Valentine associates with notions of happy children, who are distanced from the responsibilities and problems of the adult world (*ibid.*; see also 1996a: 587; Valentine & McKendrick 1997: 220). In this study, involvement along with, rather than separation from, children who are of the right age becomes key for parents, who find opportunities in exploring and enjoying attractions that are associated with childhood. This suggests, at the same time, that development is important and that people, regardless of age, in fact, might find that theme parks offer things that are of relevance to them.

The examples in this section indicate that parents are not distanced, but involved with children, that they spend time in theme parks and the attractions – and that they simultaneously find the contents of the parks to be relevant to them. They also take responsibility, creating a time of togetherness, a social time. It is a time during which the role of children in growing finds its parallel in adult explorations and experiences of attractions that are primarily for children.

The happy ending

Parents are central in terminating theme park visits. This assists in an understanding of the notion of happy time. Spending time at Liseberg and ALW includes ambitions of positive emotions and getting involved in various experiences. Time spent in the parks is managed so that it is likely to be a happy time. This means that children and parents do not necessarily stay as long as possible – for the duration that their tickets allow.

Having spent almost five hours at Liseberg, riding attractions, playing games and consuming ice-cream, it is time for Kim (age 5) and her family to leave the park. Their parking ticket is expiring. Kim's parents say to each other that it is time to leave. Fred says that his daughters will fall asleep as soon as they leave Liseberg,

and tells me that Kim and her sister Mary (age 3) are now starting to get grumpy. The last thing they do, before leaving the park, is to purchase candy and balloons with Mickey Mouse for Kim and Mary. Kim and Mary hold their balloons tight, and leave the park with their parents.¹³⁵

There is an end to the time and the possibility of happiness in the parks. To extend time in the park any further might generate both a parking fine and increasingly grumpy children. Kim and Mary are not eager to stay for the sake of riding additional attractions, and they have also been told that they will receive things at the end of the visit. With regard to the analysis of bribes above (in the *Valuography* chapter), where these are used for the purpose of directing activities, it becomes relevant to explore what role the candy and balloons have here. Is there a right time to consume these things, and to leave the park?

Some of the things that are offered for sale at Liseberg challenge the possibilities of using the park in full. The balloons are such an example. They are big and easily move at speed in the wind. It makes sense to purchase them when there are no more attractions to experience. Balloons, during Kim and Mary's visit, turn into a part of the visit as their birthday gift, and a possible reward for spending time in the park along with their parents. The focus, then, is not on the many things available in the park, but on *their* balloons, which they keep close. Consumption of some things becomes a matter of timing, at the end.

To end park visits at the right moment, just in time, is something that also concerns other parents.

Anne, the mother of Rebecca (age 11), asks her daughter at the end of one of the days in the park to "Get rid of the sourness". Anne not only uses verbal directions to make her daughter part of the presence of happiness, she also tells me that she wants to give Rebecca's visit a happy ending. Ironically, they spend their last few minutes at the so-called cry-maker street, as Anne calls it, playing with the actual name of the street, which is named after one of Astrid Lindgren's stories. Anne calls it this because of the many children who are tired and start to cry at the end of the day as they head towards the nearby exit area. The situation during late afternoons when children cry and make a fuss is, however, not permanent, or characteristic of the park in general when listening to Anne. The first

---

¹³⁵ Park visit: Kim's family.

time I meet the family, she describes ALW overall as a place where “there is very little fuss. You realize that there are happy children, and it all works very well.”¹³⁶

In general, children at ALW have a happy time, according to Anne. They are happy, with one timely and challenging exception. The problem is that children start crying at the end and this suggests that too much time was spent at ALW, or that a visit was not carried out in an ideal way.

There are similarities and differences between the two visits outlined above. Both involve considerations of when is the appropriate time to leave the park. These considerations engage parents after having spent hours in the park – experiencing attractions and performances. Grumpiness or sourness, as such, is not a general motive – at any time – for leaving the parks. But at times, late during the day, it turns into an incentive for moving on. Rather than boosting energy levels by consuming food or snacks in order to stay in the park, grumpiness becomes a reason for moving on, going back home. It means that children and their parents do not necessarily strive to maximize their time in the park, when there are negative physical consequences generating undesirable emotions.

Anne makes crying into a problem of others, rather than being an issue that really affects her or Rebecca. This suggests that practical knowledge about time and possible challenges becomes relevant for parents with ambitions to leave the park smoothly without risking uncontrollable situations of crying children. It is suggested by Anne that children, parents and the park in a wider sense do not have the capacity of determining the appropriate ending. Who wants to see children cry when the theme park generally provides a happy time? Knowledge and emotions become entangled here. Providing a happy ending for Rebecca suggests that Anne is knowledgeable about time and acts in relation to it and the emotions of her daughter. This means that timing, and timing in relation to a child and children in general, becomes a key component for understanding when it is enough, for the day.

Considered in terms of knowledge, the happy ending involves ambitions of having an overview of people – oneself and others – so that one does not become a victim of uncertain circumstances of time. It means looking into the future, but also being ready to act in relation to what is taking place at the moment. How to manage time and how to be with children in the park becomes a concern for parents, so as not to risk tears, sourness and

---

¹³⁶ Park visit 1, interview 1: Rebecca’s family.

grumpiness becoming a prevalent and memorable part of the visits. The ending is consequently important for challenges of time and happiness.

CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

Parents offer elaborate considerations of when it is the appropriate time to visit a theme park, and when it is time to leave. For some children, however, there is no endpoint to park visits: ALW and Liseberg become part of a possible eternity. ALW and Liseberg offer different and changing experiences over time and this suggests a continuing relevance. To return there becomes part of a cycle of time. Theme park visits involve a variety of possibilities – relating to the past, present and future – and are subject to both continuity and change as time goes by, and as children grow.

In the first part of the analysis, it was shown that children and parents scrutinize bodies and development in relation to chronological time, which is expected to involve transformations that go with a linearity of age. In consequence, dominant ideas of how the child should develop pose the question of what happens next. Is it time to leave the parks behind and engage in matters moving towards adulthood? The second part of the chapter addresses the uncertainties of time, which add to and also challenge the initial ambitions of chronological time.

Depending on the age of their children, some families go to different parks. The individual age of children becomes important in arguments about why time should be spent at one park and not at another: in making plans for visits and generating expectations as well as reviews of the parks, parents relate the age of their children to what specific parks have to offer. What complicates time in the parks is that the development of individual children is not the sole focus of visiting ALW or Liseberg. Accompanying siblings and parents do not passively stand on the sidelines, and this complicates the idea that it is the age of a particular child – age, development and appreciation – that motivates spending time at the theme park.

Are time and age important for enacting happiness? Time and age are entangled with and provide complex meanings for happiness. Time in the theme park involves both meaning – a sense of purpose with regards to age – and a time of pleasure, regardless of age. Purpose and pleasure, according to Paul Dolan (2015), are what define happiness. This is a definition to build on and it makes sense in ethnographizing time and considering the role of happiness: time becomes heterogeneous, simultaneously involving timely

opportunities and chronology – mixing pleasure and purpose – for individual children and parents. It puts emphasis on opportunities for happiness in the present, and also involves goals that influence expectations and practices regarding time in a wider sense.

Does childhood have a role in the enactment of happiness? It has been suggested that childhood involves greater happiness than later parts of life; that children are happier than other people. There is a qualitative difference between the two entities at play here, which is organized by the quantitative measures of temporality: childhood and adulthood. However, nothing in my data suggests that children are happy and that their parents are less happy, or unhappy. There is no continuous or clear division between adults who sacrifice themselves and children who are happy (Johns & Gyimóthy 2002: 329). Childhood and age consequently become relevant as abstract considerations during visits, suggesting how one should act. In practice, when approaching the attractions and when it comes to explicit concerns of desirable emotions – made possible by having fun, engaging in park activities together – there are more direct concerns: whether the child is happy, and what needs to be done in terms of timing so that positive experiences become dominant during the time in the theme park. This suggests that there not is one model of happiness at play, but that the enactment of time – as chronology and timely opportunities – involves both the haphazard, which cannot be controlled, and ambitions of managing time in rational ways so that one makes happiness more or less likely, in the park and during everyday life in a wider sense.

CHAPTER 9 HAPPY-FARING: CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

Based on both commonly held ideas and the discussions and analyses in this study, a family theme park visit to the Swedish parks Liseberg or Astrid Lindgren's World (ALW) can be seen to come with expectations of positive emotions and happiness, both by the park and its visitors. However, happiness is not necessarily instant or guaranteed – it involves work, and tackling various challenges. Ideals of family life – e.g. togetherness, sharing experiences – are part of how theme park visits are approached. Parents are involved with their children to manage them in ways that lead to a desirable visit, including active consumption, and positive attitudes towards what has been paid for. Here, control and the fulfillment of expectations are important as the haphazard or the unexpected are generally perceived as undesirable. This explains why children and their families often play it safe – by not pushing each other into attractions that are too challenging. Visits are about mitigating the risk of being surprised in undesirable ways that might create the uncontrollable presence of negative emotions, when happy emotions are desirable.

The analyses in this book demonstrate the ways in which children and their families enact happiness as an important part of park visits. Happiness, it is shown, multiplies alongside ideals of being together/togetherness, ideals of childhood and children's development, and getting as much value as possible for the money invested. These concerns, it turns out, do not necessarily either involve *or* exclude happiness. This study shows in detail the ways in which happiness is entangled with family life and theme park organizations, making happy visits complex and “messy” (Law 2004). This in turn challenges commonly shared and theoretical models of happiness which suggest linear and singular isolated routes to happiness.

The relational notion of enactment that is employed in this study makes happiness into an achievement carried out by both humans and non-humans in interaction, rather than an abstract or natural matter that simply exists. That is, enactment provides a take on the issue of happiness that emphasizes its entanglements and multiplicities. I find this important, because it both provides empirical insights into a notion that is sometimes described as an

enigma (Bruckner 2010: 3), and shows the struggle that families go through in order to make happiness.

During visits to the two theme parks, Liseberg and ALW, children are encouraged and even instructed by demanding parents to adapt to the park settings and to modify their emotions to fit in with what is expected from a visit. Parents direct children towards individual positive expressions, acting to suppress their undesirable emotions. The parents in the study make the theme parks into locations where failures of achievement or to experience positive emotions and outcomes are scrutinized in relation to individuals. For example, parents of children who are not in sync with the parental ideals of family life, who oppose the plans of parents and the opportunities provided by the parks, need parental motivation, or even bribes, to turn the visit into a happy one. It is accordingly not necessarily the parks or the parents who fail to provide happiness when families spend time in the parks; in all possible ways children are important agents in this. Happiness considered through family visits suggests that it is an achievement. It cannot be taken for granted. However, when it is a happy time, the families credit the parks rather than one another! This reproduces the idea and image of parks as happy places (see Gram 2005a; Lukas 2010: 144; Van Maanen 1992). Considering the involvement of various ideals and the efforts made by children and parents to carry out a theme park visit it is, I suggest, no less than a wonder that it works out quite well, which it does in this study.

So, can it be argued that happiness exists in the theme parks? Children and parents in this study describe Liseberg and ALW as places that provide desirable and happy emotions. They use similar notions to those used in branding and by employees at Liseberg and ALW when talking about it: love, positive emotions and actual happiness. Theme parks are accordingly places that children and adults love and feel happy about. The shared story of happy and positive outcomes, the purchase of material things and memories from the park visits unite families. In the interviews conducted with the families, none of them suggest that their time was a failure (even though conflicts existed), and most of the children were already longing for another visit. Without expressing friction and troubles, the families share their success stories of happiness with the corporations.

As theme parks are supposed to make children especially happy, the question is whether children really do become happy when visiting the parks for a couple of hours or, as some do, for days or weeks? Labels like “happy kid” suggest that happiness is an individual property. However, the

ethnographic findings of the study suggest that happiness should not be located within the interior of individual bodies. Children and parents in this study ascribe happiness and positive outcomes to particular bodies, things, places, money, time and experiences, which perhaps is necessary when navigating the vagueness of happiness – it calls for some concretization. The answer here must therefore focus on the social role of happiness, rather than speculating on children as containers of internal emotions and happiness.

Consequently, happiness turns into a matter that is with and always also beyond the individual, which aligns him or her with ideals in a complex social and material world. During family visits, for example, children are expected to consume the parks in ways that live up to several ideals: social family time, childhood aspirations, value-for-money through efficiency, and being happy about having the opportunity to visit the park as an individual. Thus, ideals that are noticeable in the models of the happy family, the happy childhood, the happy theme park, happy individuals and collectives, become mixed up together. It is not a question of *either* family *or* individual, of *either* childhood *or* consumption; these entangle without any concern, they coexist, and can also be managed in sequence, following on from each other.

Another important finding of the study is that these family visits are mainly about spending and sharing time together in and through different family constellations. There is a constant motion during which family members move in and out of different family groupings in what I have chosen to call *yo-yo* movements. These movements turn out to be a necessary condition for happiness: balancing individual desires with collective ambitions and creating an enjoyable time shared by the family. My notion of a *testing site* that is used for addressing time adds an exploratory dimension to our understanding of happiness and consumption, suggesting that life at large involves not only certainties, but also trials and observations of what works. However, whether things “work” or not, as has been shown, has implications for happiness.

Park visits and everyday life outside the park “leak” into each other, involving memories and expectations. It is reasonable to suggest that the involvement of mundane concerns in theme park visits, and vice versa, indicates that there is no clear-cut division between time in the parks and everyday life. This is important for the thesis at large: there is no given division between the content of the book chapters because family life,

consumption, time and the value of money constantly move in and out of one another.

Visits to theme parks require money. The study shows that parents are willing to spend hundreds of euros on a family day out in a park. Money is not only a means for entering the parks, and purchasing things, but is also a matter that directly involves children and parents with happiness – emotionally and symbolically. There is a value in having access to money, and keeping money, that points towards happiness as the achievement of economic success.

In this study, children and parents find theme park consumption to be worth it: they do not spend money recklessly, and this provides a sense that one is knowledgeable about appropriate costs, which generates feelings of satisfaction – where one receives a lot for the money spent, or even is able to “earn” money.

I argue that the possibility of answering the question of *whether happiness exists* has to do with our perception and recognition of consumption, and the involvement of commercial matters requires further clarification when addressing happiness (cf. Atkinson 2015). I would like to suggest that the notion of *emotional capitalism* (Illouz 2007) is important in order to position and situate the study in relation to wider responsibilities and politics. Under emotional capitalism, corporations offer consumer products and services that involve emotional expectations and desires. The concept suggests that capitalism is a “culture in which emotional and economic discourses and practices mutually shape each other” (ibid.: 5). In this way, the notion of emotional capitalism adds another layer to our understanding of happiness as in this study it repeatedly becomes entangled with consumption, implying the need for money.

This thesis shows that children and their families are deeply and happily involved with theme parks. Corporations and their branded products are welcomed as part of a happy story about life in which children consume enjoyable experiences, rather than the nightmare-like reality that political activists portray in discussing a consumer childhood (e.g. Linn 2008; Palmer 2006). Is it then relevant to transform children’s lives by limiting their consumption?

In this study, happiness is of an inclusive kind, in terms of consumption and economics. There are probably few incentives for children or parents to

disrupt a social order in which they can afford desirable pleasures, and where they are allowed to adapt and flexibly explore different, productive aspects of family life and childhood.

This thesis assists in recognizing that children and their families, along with corporations and municipalities, are involved with emotional capitalism: entangling economics and emotions. To me it is surprising to see how the state is actively involved in associating happiness and childhood with the profit motive that is central within capitalism. It tells a different story about Sweden than the one in which the social democratic state relies on capitalism as a tool to help strengthen a social democracy (cf. Sandin 2012).

The analytical focus on entanglements poses a challenge to calls for activism around childhood happiness: it is not enough to withdraw commercial goods from children, on the grounds that such goods are bad for them. It is not possible to identify *one* center of capitalism against which to direct any actions. It requires, instead, a perspective on change that reaches beyond children, into wider political concerns focusing on politics and the kind of culture and society that we want to live in.

A further discussion of children as part of society and culture is needed in order to outline a blueprint for future politics. It would benefit from abolishing the popular belief that “you are the creator of your own happiness.” To recognize the involvement of various actors and their entanglements with happiness might be a challenging task in emotional capitalism. Corporations have much to gain from suggesting that there exists the possibility of pure and true individualistic happiness, available through their products and experiences. And it seems in this study that the children and parents visiting family theme parks are keen to buy into this line of thought. It provides a simple solution, a fantasy of how one becomes happy. In the quest for happiness and fulfilling ideals of family life, theme parks become a destination.

Finally, I want to raise the question: does happiness exist at all? As we are all probably aware at this time, there is no guarantee of happiness – there are, according to this study, timely opportunities for happiness that highlight its haphazard character, through consumption. However, it also indicates that enacting happiness also means becoming involved with wider social, cultural, material and emotional matters. In the end, there are happy occasions and so much more. The co-consumption that children engage in along with their parents opens up a field for further inquiries into how our

own contemporary childhood is constituted through market interactions. Play spaces, commercial sporting activities and public enterprises all offer children experiences and emotions, and many of them at a cost which not everyone can afford. It is a development that deserves further exploration.

REFERENCES

- ‘1923 – Lisipedia’, <http://www.lisepedia.se/1923> (accessed 18/06/15).
- ‘1983 – Lisipedia’, http://www.lisepedia.se/1983#Kaninen_blor_jubileumssymbol (accessed 16/06/15).
- Aarsand, Paul & Lukas Forsberg (2009). ‘De öppna och stängda dörrarnas moral – dilemman i deltagande observation med videokamera’, in Anna Sparrman, Jakob Cromdal, Ann-Carita Ewaldsson & Viveka Adelswärd (eds.). *Den väsentliga vardagen: några diskursanalytiska perspektiv på tal, text och bild*. Stockholm: Carlsson. PP. 148–168.
- Adam, Barbara (1995). *Timewatch: the social analysis of time*. London: Polity.
- Adams, Judith A. (1991). *The American amusement park industry: a history of technology and thrills*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- Adorno, Theodor W. (1986[1954]). *Minima moralia: reflexioner ur det stympade livet*. Lund: Arkiv.
- Adorno, Theodor W. & Max Horkheimer (2011). *Towards a new manifesto*. London: Verso.
- Aftonbladet (04/11/98) “‘Kommersiell smörja, SVT’”, <http://www.aftonbladet.se/noje/9811/04/hasse.html> (accessed 11/08/15)
- Ahmed, Sara (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ahmed, Sara (2006). *Queer phenomenology: orientations, objects, others*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Ahmed, Sara (2007). ‘The Happiness Turn’, in *New Foundations* 63: 7–14.
- Ahmed, Sara (2008). ‘Sociable happiness’, in *Emotion, Space and Society* 1(1): 10–13.
- Ahmed, Sara (2010a). *The promise of happiness*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Ahmed, Sara (2010b). ‘Happy Objects’, in Melissa Gregg & Gregory J. Seigworth (eds.). *The affect theory reader*. Durham: Duke University Press. PP. 29–51.
- Ahmed, Sara (2011). ‘Happy Futures, Perhaps’, in E.L. McCallum & Mikko Tuhkanen (eds.). *Queer Times, Queer Becomings*. Albany, NY, USA: State University of New York Press. PP. 159–182.
- Ahuvia, Aaron (2008). ‘If money doesn’t make us happy, why do we act as if it does?’, in *Journal of Economic Psychology* 29(4): 491–507.
- Alanen, Leena (2011). ‘Editorial: Critical Childhood Studies?’, in *Childhood* 18(2): 147–150.
- Althén, Kajsa (2010). ‘Att våga tänka annorlunda’, in Leif Jonsson (ed.). *Astrid Lindgrens världar i Vimmerby: en studie om kulturarv och samhällsutveckling*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press. PP. 64–104.
- Alvesson, Mats & Kaj Sköldbberg (2008). *Tolkning och reflektion: vetenskapsfilosofi och kvalitativ metod*. 2. ed. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

- Anderson, Jon (2004). 'Talking whilst walking: a geographical archaeology of knowledge', in *Area* 36(3), 254–261.
- Appadurai, Arjun (1999). 'Introduction: commodities and the politics of value', in Arjun Appadurai (ed.). *The social life of things. Commodities in cultural perspective*. Cambridge: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge. PP. 3–63.
- Archer, Kevin (1997). 'The limits to the imagineered city: sociospatial polarization in Orlando', in *Economic Geography* 73(3): 322–336.
- Arnal, William (2001). 'The Segregation of Social Desire: "Religion" and Disney World', in *J Am Acad Relig* 69(1): 1–20.
- Arnould, Eric J. & Craig J. Thompson (2005). 'Consumer culture theory (CCT): Twenty years of research', in *Journal of consumer research* 31(4): 868–882.
- Aronsson, Karin & Asta Cekaite (2011). 'Activity contracts and directives in everyday family politics', in *Discourse & Society* 22(2): 137–154.
- Arvidsson, Adam (2006). *Brands: meaning and value in media culture*. London: Routledge.
- Aspers, Patrik (2007). *Etnografiska metoder: att förstå och förklara samtiden*. Malmö: Liber.
- Asplund, Johan (1987). 'Idrott och samhällsordning', in Ulla Bergryd (ed.). *Den sociologiska fantasin: teorier om samhället*. Stockholm: Rabén & Sjögren. PP. 11–32.
- Atkinson, Paul, Sara Delamont & William Housley (2008). *Contours of culture: complex ethnography and the ethnography of complexity*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Atkinson, Paul (2015). 'Happiness and the capture of subjectivity', in *Self & Society* (online first): 1–8.
- Ateljevic, Irena, & Stephen Doorne (2003). 'Culture, Economy and Tourism Commodities Social Relations of Production and Consumption', in *Tourist Studies* 3(2): 123–141.
- Baader, Meike S. (2012). 'Childhood and happiness in German romanticism, progressive education and in the West German anti-authoritarian Kinderläden movement in the context of 1968', in *Paedagogica Historica* 48(3): 485–499.
- Back, Les (2007). *The art of listening*. Oxford: Berg.
- Ballas, Dimitris & Danny Dorling (2013). 'The geography of happiness', in Susan A. David, Ilona Boniwell & Amanda Conley Ayers (eds.). *The Oxford handbook of happiness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. PP. 465–481.
- Barber, Benjamin R. (2007). *Con\$umed: how markets corrupt children, infantilize adults, and swallow citizens whole*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Baudrillard, Jean (1998). 'Disneyworld company', in *ARCHIS*: 52–54.
- Bauman, Zygmunt (2001). 'On mass, individuals, and peg communities', in Nick Lee & Rolland Munro (eds.). *The consumption of mass*. Oxford: Blackwell. PP. 102–113.
- Bauman, Zygmunt (2006). 'Children make you happier ... and poorer', in *International Journal of Children's Spirituality* 11(1): 5–10.

- Beckman, Anita (2009). *Väntan: etnografiskt kollage kring ett mellanrum*. Diss. Göteborg: Mara.
- Belk, Russell W. (1988). 'Possessions and the Extended Self', in *The Journal of Consumer Research* 15(2): 139–168.
- Belk, Russell W. (1995). *Collecting in a consumer society*. London: Routledge.
- Ben-Arieh, Asher & Ivar Frønes (2011). 'Taxonomy for child well-being indicators: A framework for the analysis of the well-being of children', in *Childhood* 18(4): 460–476.
- Ben-Arieh, Asher, Ferran Casas, Ivar Frønes & Jill E. Korbin (2014). 'Multifaceted concept of child well-being', in Asher Ben-Arieh, Ferran Casas, Ivar Frønes & Jill E. Korbin (eds.). *Handbook of Child Well-Being: Theories, Methods and Policies in Global Perspective*. Dordrecht: Springer. PP. 1–27.
- Berardi, Franco (2009). *The soul at work: from alienation to autonomy*. Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e).
- Bergheim, Stefan (2007). 'The happy variety of capitalism', in *Deutsche Bank Research: Current Issues*. April 25. PP. 1–22.
- Berlant, Lauren (1998). 'Intimacy: A special issue', in *Critical Inquiry* 24(2): 281–288.
- Berlant, Lauren (2011). *Cruel optimism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Best, Joel & Kathleen S. Lowney (2009). 'The disadvantage of a good reputation: Disney as a target for social problems claims', in *The Sociological Quarterly* 50(3): 431–449.
- Billig, Michael (1994). 'Sod Baudrillard! Or Ideology Critique in Disney World', in Herbert W. Simons & Michael Billig (ed.). *After postmodernism: reconstructing ideology critique*. London: Sage. PP. 150–171.
- Billig, Michael (1999). 'Commodity Fetishism and Repression Reflections on Marx, Freud and the Psychology of Consumer Capitalism', in *Theory & Psychology* 9(3): 313–329.
- Binkley, Sam (2011). 'Happiness, positive psychology and the program of neoliberal governmentality', in *Subjectivity* 4(4): 371–394.
- Binkley, Sam (2014). *Happiness as enterprise: an essay on neoliberal life*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Birth, Kevin (2007). 'Time and the biological consequences of globalization', in *Current Anthropology* 48(2): 215–236.
- Birth, Kevin (2013). 'Calendars: Representational homogeneity and heterogeneous time', in *Time & Society* 22(2): 216–236.
- Bjerg, Ole (2014). *Making money: the philosophy of crisis capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Bjurström, Erling (2004). 'Gåvans makt. När barn skolas till konsumenter', in *Locus* 2004(1).
- Blackford, Holly (2004). 'Playground Panopticism: Ring-Around-the-Children, a Pocketful of Women', in *Childhood* 11(2): 227–249.
- Blackshaw, Tony (2013). 'How shopping changes leisure', in Tony Blackshaw (ed.). *Routledge handbook of leisure studies*. New York: Routledge. PP. 358–372.

- Blanchflower, David G. & Andrew J. Oswald (2008). 'Is well-being U-shaped over the life cycle?', in *Social science & medicine* 66(8): 1733–1749.
- Blichfeldt, Bodil Stilling (2008). 'What to do on Our Holiday: The Case of in Situ Decision-Making', in *Anatolia* 19(2): 287–305.
- Blichfeldt, Bodil Stilling, Bettina Møller Pedersen, Anders Johansen & Line Hansen (2010). 'Tween Tourists', in *Journal of Tourism Consumption and Practice* 2(1): 1–24.
- Blichfeldt, Bodil Stilling, Bettina Møller Pedersen, Anders Johansen & Line Hansen (2011). 'Twins on Holidays. In-Situ Decision-making from Children's Perspective', in *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 11(2): 135–149.
- Blom, Katarina & Sara Hammarkrantz (2014). *Lycka på fullt allvar: en introduktion till positiv psykologi*. Stockholm: Natur & kultur.
- Bogost, Ian (2012). *Alien phenomenology, or, What it's like to be a thing*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Boje, David M. (1995). 'Stories of the storytelling organization: A postmodern analysis of Disney as "Tamara-Land"', in *Academy of Management journal* 38(4): 997–1035.
- Bok, Sissela (2012). *Om lycka: från Aristoteles till vår tids hjärnforskning*. Göteborg: Daidalos.
- Bolin, Göran (2014). 'The Death of the Mass Audience Reconsidered: From Mass Communication to Mass Personalisation', in Susanne Eichner & Elizabeth Prommer (eds.). *Fernsehen: Europäische Perspektiven*. Konstanz & München: UVK. PP. 159–172.
- Bolter, Jay David & Richard Grusin (2000). *Remediation: understanding new media*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Bookman, Sonia (2013). 'Branded cosmopolitanisms: 'global' coffee brands and the co-creation of 'cosmopolitan cool'', in *Cultural Sociology* 7(1): 56–72.
- Brembeck, Helene (2012). 'Cozy Friday: An Analysis of Family Togetherness and Ritual Overconsumption', in Barbara Czarniawska & Orvar Löfgren (eds.). *Managing overflow in affluent societies*. London: Routledge. PP. 125–140.
- Bruckner, Pascal (2010). *Perpetual euphoria: on the duty to be happy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Brusdal, Ragnhild (2007). 'If it is good for the child's development then I say yes almost every time: how parents relate to their children's consumption', in *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 31(4): 391–396.
- Brusdal, Ragnhild & Ivar Frønes (2014). 'Well-Being and Children in a Consumer Society', in Asher Ben-Arieh, Ferran Casas, Ivar Frønes & Jill E. Korbin (eds.). *Handbook of Child Well-Being: Theories, Methods and Policies in Global Perspective*. Dordrecht: Springer. PP. 1427–1443.
- Brülde, Bengt (2007). *Lycka och lidande: begrepp, metod och förklaring*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Brülde, Bengt & Filip Fors (2012). 'Kan man köpa lycka för pengar? Om konsumtion och lycka', in *Konsumtionsrapporten 2012*. Centrum för konsumtionsvetenskap CFK Handelshögskolan vid Göteborgs universitet. PP. 23–30.
- Bryman, Alan (1995). *Disney and his worlds*. London: Routledge.

- Buckingham, David (1997). 'Dissin' Disney: Critical perspectives on children's media culture', in *Media, Culture & Society* 19(2): 285–293.
- Buckingham, David (2000). *After the death of childhood: growing up in the age of electronic media*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Buckingham, David (2011). *The material child: growing up in consumer culture*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Burnett, Simon (2012). *The happiness agenda: a modern obsession*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bügel, Marnix S., Peter C. Verhoef & Abraham P. Buunk (2011). 'Customer intimacy and commitment to relationships with firms in five different sectors: Preliminary evidence', in *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* 18(4): 247–258.
- Böhm, Steffen & Aanka Batta (2010). 'Just doing it: enjoying commodity fetishism with Lacan', in *Organization* 17(3): 345–361.
- Böhme, Hartmut (2014). *Fetishism and Culture. A Different Theory of Modernity*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Callon, Michel & John Law (1995). 'Agency and the hybrid *Collectif*', in *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 94(2): 481–507.
- Callon, Michel (1999). 'Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation', in John Law & John Hassard (eds.). *Actor network theory and after*. Oxford: Blackwell. PP. 67–83.
- Cannella, Gaile Sloan & Radhika Viruru (2004). *Childhood and postcolonization: power, education, and contemporary practice*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Carah, Nicholas (2011). 'Breaking into The Bubble: Brand-building labour and 'getting in' to the culture industry', in *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 25(3): 427–438.
- Cardell, David & Anna Sparrman (2012). 'Enacting money at an amusement park', in Anna Sparrman, Bengt Sandin & Johanna Sjöberg (eds.). *Situating child consumption*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press. PP. 115–132.
- Cardell, David (2013a). 'Tysta barn och talande robotar – om tema- och nöjesparksforskningens problem och barnstudiernas möjligheter', in Karin Helander (ed.). *Nu vill jag prata! Barns röster i barnkulturen*. Stockholm: Stockholms universitet förlag. PP. 141–152.
- Cardell, David (2013b). 'Tema- och nöjesparker: drivkrafter och definitioner', in Josefine Syssner & Lasse Kvarnström (eds.). *Det turistiska fältet och dess aktörer*. Lund: Studentlitteratur. PP. 175–192.
- Carpiano, Richard M. (2009). 'Come take a walk with me: The "Go-Along" interview as a novel method for studying the implications of place for health and well-being', in *Health & place* 15(1): 263–272.
- Carr, Neil (2011). *Children's and families' holiday experience*. Abingdon, Oxon, England: Routledge.
- Casey, Emma (2008). 'working class women, gambling and the dream of happiness', in *Feminist Review* 89: 122–137.
- Cederström, Carl & André Spicer (2015). *The wellness syndrome*. Cambridge: Polity.

- Cele, Sofia (2003). 'The jigsaw approach. Understanding children's experience of the physical environment', Paper for *The International Conference on Methodologies in Housing Research*, Stockholm, Sweden, 22–24 September.
- Cele, Sofia (2006). *Communicating place: methods for understanding children's experience of place*. Diss. Stockholm: Stockholms universitet, 2006.
- Cerulo, Karen A. (2009). 'Nonhumans in Social Interaction', in *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 35: 531–52.
- Christophersen, Edward R. & Susan Mortweet VanScoyoc (2008). 'The Home Chip System: A Token Economy for Use in the Natural Home', in Craig Winston LeCroy (ed.). *Handbook of Evidence-Based Treatment Manuals for Children and Adolescents*. Cary, NC: Oxford University Press. PP. 456–468.
- Cieslik, Mark (2015). 'Not Smiling but Frowning: Sociology and the Problem of Happiness', in *Sociology* 49(3): 422–437.
- Clark, Lynn Schofield (2013). *The parent app: understanding families in the digital age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clarke, Alison J. (2007). 'Coming of Age in suburbia: gifting the consumer child', in Marta Gutman & Ning De Coninck-Smith (eds.). *Designing modern childhoods: history, space, and the material culture of children*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press. PP. 253–268.
- Clavé, Salvador Anton (2007). *The global theme park industry*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Cody, Kevina (2012). 'No longer, but not yet': Tweens and the mediating of threshold selves through liminal consumption', in *Journal of Consumer Culture* 12(1): 41–65.
- Colebrook, Claire (2007). 'Narrative happiness and the meaning of life', in *New Formations* (63): 82–102.
- Collins, Randall (2004). *Interaction ritual chains*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Cook, Daniel Thomas (2000). 'The other "child study": Figuring children as consumers in market research, 1910s–1990s', in *The Sociological Quarterly* 41(3): 487–507.
- Cook, Daniel Thomas (2003). 'Spatial Biographies of Children's Consumption Market places and spaces of childhood in the 1930s and beyond', in *Journal of Consumer Culture* 3(2): 147–169.
- Cook, Daniel Thomas (2004). *The commodification of childhood: the children's clothing industry and the rise of the child consumer*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Cook, Daniel Thomas (2008). 'The missing child in consumption theory', in *Journal of Consumer Culture* 8(2): 219–243.
- Cook, Daniel Thomas (2011). 'Children as Consumers', in Jens Qvortrup, William A. Corsaro & Michael-Sebastian Honig (eds.). *The Palgrave handbook of childhood studies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. PP. 332–346.
- Cook, Daniel Thomas (2013). 'Taking exception with the child consumer', in *Childhood* 20(4): 423–428.
- Cook, Deborah (1996). *The culture industry revisited: Theodor W. Adorno on mass culture*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Corsaro, William A. (2005). *The sociology of childhood*. 2. ed. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- Costley, Carolyn, Lorraine Friend, Emily Meese, Carl Ebberts & Li-Jen Wang (2007). 'Happiness, Consumption, and being', in Russel W. Belk & John F. Sherry (eds.). *Consumer Culture Theory* (Research in consumer behavior, 11). Emerald. PP. 209–240.
- Cross, Gary S. & John K. Walton (2005). *The playful crowd: pleasure places in the twentieth century*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Csarmann, Helena (2007). *Berg-och-dalbanan: jakten på den heliga G-kraften*. Diss. Stockholm: Axl Books.
- Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly (2002). *Flow: the classic work on how to achieve happiness*. London: Rider.
- Cullingford, Cedric (1995). 'Children's attitudes to holidays overseas', in *Tourism Management* 16(2): 121–127.
- Cunningham, Hugh (2007). 'Childhood and happiness in Britain', in *GRAAT No. 36, Histoires d'enfant, histories d'enfance*. PP. 19–30.
- Czarniawska, Barbara (2007). *Shadowing and other techniques for doing fieldwork in modern societies*. Malmö: Liber.
- Czarniawska, Barbara (2013). 'On meshworks and other complications of portraying contemporary organizing'. Gothenburg Research Institute. PP. 6–21.
- Dahlgren, Lars & Bengt Starrin (2004). *Emotioner, vardagsliv & samhälle: en introduktion till emotionssociologi*. Malmö: Liber.
- Dames, Nicholas (2010). 'Nostalgia and its disciplines: A response', in *Memory Studies* 3(3): 269–275.
- Danby, Susan, Lynette Ewing & Karen Thorpe (2011). 'The novice researcher: Interviewing young children', in *Qualitative Inquiry* 17(1): 74–84.
- Davidson, Shosh (2012). 'Consider the fact that I am considerate', in Anna Sparrman, Bengt Sandin & Johanna Sjöberg (eds.). *Situating child consumption*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press. PP. 97–114.
- Davies, William (2015). *The Happiness Industry: how the government and big business sold us well-being*. London: Verso.
- Davis, Susan G. (1997). *Spectacular nature: corporate culture and the Sea World experience*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Davis, Susan G. (2005). 'Touch the Magic', in Leslie King & Deborah McCarthy (eds.). *Environmental sociology: from analysis to action*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. PP. 255–273.
- de Droog, Simone M., Patti M. Valkenburga & Moniek Buijzena (2011). 'Using Brand Characters to Promote Young Children's Liking of and Purchase Requests for Fruit', in *Journal of Health Communication: International Perspectives* 16(1): 79–89.
- Degen, Monica Montserrat & Gillian Rose (2012). 'The sensory experiencing of urban design: the role of walking and perceptual memory', in *Urban Studies* 49(15): 3271–3287.

- DeVault, Marjorie L. (2000). 'Producing family time: Practices of leisure activity beyond the home', in *Qualitative Sociology* 23(4): 485–503.
- DeVault, Marjorie L. (2011). 'The Family Work of Parenting in Public', in Anita Ilta Garey & Karen V. Hansen (eds.). *Families in Focus: At the Heart of Work and Family: Engaging the Ideas of Arlie Hochschild*. Piscataway: Rutgers University Press. PP. 161–170.
- Diener, Ed (2000). 'Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index', in *American Psychologist* 55(1): 34–43.
- DisneyDollars.net*, <http://disneydollars.net> (accessed 28/07/15)
- Dodd, Nigel (2014). *The social life of money*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Doganova, Liliana, Martin Giraudeau, Claes-Fredrik Helgesson, Hans Kjellberg, Francis Lee, Alexandre Mallard, Andrea Mennicken, Fabian Muniesa, Ebba Sjögren & Teun Zuiderent-Jerak (2014). 'Valuation Studies and the Critique of Valuation', in *Valuation Studies* 2(2): 87–96.
- Dolan, Paul (2015). *Happiness by Design. Finding pleasure and purpose in everyday life*. Penguin Books.
- Duncan, Grant (2007). 'After happiness', in *Journal of Political Ideologies* 12(1): 85–108.
- Duncan, Grant (2013). 'Politics, paradoxes and pragmatics of happiness', in *Culture, Theory and Critique* 55(1): 79–95.
- Dunn, Elizabeth & Michael Norton (2013). *Happy money: the science of smarter spending*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Dussauge, Isabelle, Claes-Fredrik Helgesson & Francis Lee (2015). 'Valuography: studying the making of values', in Isabelle Dussauge, Claes-Fredrik Helgesson & Francis Lee (eds.). *Value Practices in the Life Sciences and Medicine*. Oxford University Press. PP. 267–285.
- Eberhard, David (2013). *Hur barnen tog makten*. Stockholm: Bladh by Bladh.
- Eckert, Gisela (2001). *Wasting time or having fun? Cultural meanings of children and childhood*. Diss. Linköping: Univ.
- Eco, Umberto (1986). *Travels in hyperreality: essays*. San Diego, Calif.: Harcourt.
- Economou, Konstantin & Rakel Hergli (2010). 'Samtidigt i Vimmerby', in Leif Jonsson (ed.). *Astrid Lindgrens världar i Vimmerby: en studie om kulturarv och samhällsutveckling*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press. PP. 45–63.
- Edensor, Tim (2001). 'Performing tourism, staging tourism: (Re)producing tourist space and practice', in *Tourist studies* 1(1): 59–81.
- Eder, Donna & Laura Fingerson (2001). 'Interviewing children and adolescents', in Jaber F. Gubrium & James A. Holstein (eds.). *Handbook of interview research: context & method*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE. PP 181–202.
- Ehn, Billy (1983). *Ska vi leka tiger?: daghemsliv ur kulturell synvinkel*. Lund: LiberFörlag.

- Ehn, Billy & Orvar Löfgren (2007). *När ingenting särskilt händer. Nya kulturanalyser*. Stockholm/Stehag: Brutus Östlings Bokförlag Symposion.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara (2011). *Gilla läget: hur allt gick åt helvete med positivt tänkande*. Stockholm: Leopard.
- Ellen, Roy (1988). 'Fetishism', in *Man* 23(2): 213–235.
- Elwood, Sarah A. & Deborah G. Martin (2000). "'Placing" interviews: location and scales of power in qualitative research', in *The Professional Geographer* 52(4): 649–657.
- Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz & Linda L. Shaw (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Epstein, Mikhail (2011). *PreDictionary: An Exploration of Blank Spaces in Language*. Atelos.
- Fakta om svensk turism 2010* (2011). Tillväxtverket.
- Fjellman, Stephen M. (1992). *Vinyl Leaves: Walt Disney World and America*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Foster, Robert J. (2007). 'The work of the new economy: Consumers, brands, and value creation', in *Cultural Anthropology* 22(4): 707–731.
- Forgacs, David (1992). 'Disney animation and the business of childhood', in *Screen* 33(4): 361–374.
- Fors, Filip (2012a). *Lycklig?: sju studier om välbefinnandets och livstillfredsställelsens bestämningsfaktorer*. Diss. Umeå: Umeå universitet.
- Fors, Filip (2012b). *Nya mått på välfärd och livskvalitet i samhället. Underlagsrapport 4 till Framtidskommissionen*. Stockholm: Fritzes.
- Forsberg, Lucas (2009). *Involved Parenthood: Everyday Lives of Swedish Middle-Class Families*. Diss. Linköping: Linköpings universitet.
- Fournier, Susan (1998). 'Consumers and their brands: Developing relationship theory in consumer research', in *Journal of consumer research* 24(4): 343–353.
- Francaviglia, Richard V. (1981). 'Main Street USA: A comparison/contrast of streetscapes in Disneyland and Walt Disney World', in *The Journal of Popular Culture* 15(1): 141–156.
- Francis, Leslie (2011). 'Religion and happiness: perspectives from the psychology of religion, positive psychology and empirical theology', in John R. Atherton, Elaine Graham & Ian Steedmand (eds.). *The Practices of Happiness*. London: Taylor & Francis. PP. 113–124.
- Frijters, Paul & Tony Beaton (2012). 'The mystery of the U-shaped relationship between happiness and age', in *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 82(2): 525–542.
- Fromm, Erich (1947/2003). *Man for himself: an enquiry into the psychology of ethics*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Frønes, Ivar (2005). 'Structuration of Childhood: an Essay on the Structuring of Childhood and Anticipatory Socialization', in Jens Qvortrup (ed.). *Studies in modern childhood: society, agency, culture*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. PP. 267–282.

- Frønes, Ivar (2011). 'Childhood: Leisure, Culture and Peers', in in Jens Qvortrup, William A. Corsaro & Michael-Sebastian Honig (eds.). *The Palgrave handbook of childhood studies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. PP. 273–286.
- Fuentes, Maria (2011). *Att göra hem: en studie av unga mäns boende och konsumtion på 2000-talet*. Diss. Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet.
- Fung, Anthony & Micky Lee (2009). 'Localizing a global amusement park: Hong Kong Disneyland', in *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 23(2): 197–208.
- Furedi, Frank (2006). 'Why the 'politics of happiness' makes me mad', in *Spiked Online*.
- Gabriel, Yiannis & Tim Lang (2008). 'New faces and new masks of today's consumer', in *Journal of consumer culture* 8(3): 321–340.
- Gad, Christopher & Casper Bruun Jensen (2010). 'On the consequences of post-ANT', in *Science, Technology & Human Values* 35(1): 55–80.
- Gallacher, Lesley-Anne & Michael Gallagher (2008). 'Methodological Immaturity in Childhood Research? Thinking through participatory methods', in *Childhood* 15(4): 499–516.
- Gianneschi, Marcus (2012). *Vara och märkas: unga konsumenters relationer till klädinindustrins varumärken*. Diss. Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet.
- Gilbert, Daniel Todd. (2007). *Stumbling on happiness*. London: Harper Perennial.
- Gilfoyle, Timothy J. (1998). 'White cities, linguistic turns, and Disneylands: The new paradigms of urban history', in *Reviews in American History* 26(1): 175–204.
- Gillis, John R. (2008). 'Epilogue. The Islanding of Children—Reshaping the Mythical Landscapes of Childhood', in Marta Gutman & Ning De Coninck-Smith (eds.). *Designing modern childhoods: history, space, and the material culture of children*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press. PP. 316–330.
- Giroux, Henry A. (2009). 'Disney, Casino Capitalism and the Exploitation of Young Boys: Beyond the Politics of Innocence', in *truthout*, 15/04/09, <http://truthout.org/archive/component/k2/item/83567:disney-casino-capitalism-and-the-exploitation-of-young-boys-beyond-the-politics-of-innocence> (accessed 09/03/15)
- Giroux, Henry A. & Grace Pollock (2011). 'Is Disney Good for Your Kids? How Corporate Media Shape Youth Identity in the Digital Age', in Shirley R Steinberg (ed.). *Kinderculture: the corporate construction of childhood*. 3rd ed. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. PP. 73–92.
- Gottdiener, Mark (1982). 'Disneyland: A Utopian Urban Space', in *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 11(2): 139–162.
- Gottdiener, Mark (1997). *The Theming of America*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Gottschalk, Simon & Marko Salvaggio (2015). 'Stuck Inside of Mobile: Ethnography in Non-Places', in *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 44(1): 3–33.
- GP (2012-07-06) 'Så blev kaninen symbol för Liseberg', <http://www.gp.se/nyheter/goteborg/1.998009-sa-blev-kaninen-symbol-for-liseberg> (accessed 29/06/15)

- Grady, John (2007). 'Visual Sociology', in Clifton D. Bryant & Dennis L. Peck (eds.) *21st Century Sociology: A Reference Handbook*, Volume 2. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks (CA). PP. 63–70.
- Gram, Malene (2005a). 'Communicating with the Family: Fun Park Websites', in Andrew J. Frew (ed.). *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2005*. Vienna: Springer. PP. 543–554.
- Gram, Malene (2005b). 'Family holidays. A qualitative analysis of family holiday experiences', in *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 5(1): 2–22.
- Gram, Malene (2007). 'Children as co-decision makers in the family? The case of family holidays', in *Young Consumers: Insight and Ideas for Responsible Marketers* 8(1): 19–28.
- Granskningsnämnden för radio och tv (08/12/98) 'Dnr 534/98'.
- Granskningsnämnden för radio och tv (19/05/99) 'SB 148/99'.
- Gulløv, Eva, Charlotte Palludan & Ida Wentzel Winther (2014). 'Engaging siblingships', in *Childhood* (online first).
- Gustafsson, Clara (2008). *Brand trust: corporate communications and consumer-brand relationships*. Diss. Stockholm: Stockholms universitet.
- Hagen, Ingunn (2001). 'Norway: Norwegian Memories of the Disney Universe', in Janet Wasko, Mark Phillips & Eileen R. Meehan (eds.). *Dazzled by Disney: the global Disney audiences project*. London: Leicester University Press. PP. 222–256.
- Halas, Elzbieta (2010). 'Time and memory: a cultural perspective', in *Trames* 14(4): 307–322.
- Haldrup, Michael & Jonas Larsen (2006). 'Material cultures of tourism', in *Leisure studies* 25(3): 275–289.
- Halldén, Gunilla (1991). 'The child as project and the child as being: Parents' ideas as frames of reference', in *Children & society* 5(4): 334–346.
- Halldén, Gunilla (2007). 'Barndomssociologi och möjligheten av ett psykosocialt perspektiv', in Gunilla Halldén (ed.). *Den moderna barndomen och barns vardagsliv*. Stockholm: Carlsson. PP. 25–40.
- Halldén, Gunilla (2011). *Barndomens skogar: om barn i natur och barns natur*. Stockholm: Carlsson.
- Hallman, Bonnie C. & S. Mary P. Benbow (2010). '“Seeing if you can catch the one picture that just makes it”: Placing Family Life Through Family Zoo photography', in Bonnie C. Hallman (ed.). *Family geographies: the spatiality of families and family life*. Don Mills, Ont.: Oxford University Press. PP. 10–30.
- Hamilton, Carrie (2007). 'Happy Memories', in *New Formations* 63: 65–81.
- Hammersley, Martyn & Paul Atkinson (2007). *Ethnography: principles in practice*. 3. ed. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Harbers, Hans (2005). 'Science in Context: The Paradoxes of Universalism and Liberalism', in *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 30(4): 575–582.

- Harrington, Maureen (2013). 'Family leisure', in Tony Blackshaw (ed.). *Routledge handbook of leisure studies*. New York: Routledge. PP. 230–242.
- Harrington, Michael (1979). 'To the Disney Station: Corporate Socialism in The Magic Kingdom', in *Harper's*, January 1979: 35–44, 86.
- Harro-Loit, Halliki & Ene Kõresaar (2010). 'Revising Time in Cultural Research', in *Trames* 14(4): 303–306.
- Hartl, Ann & Malene Gram (2008). 'Experience production by family tourism providers', in Jon Sundbo & Per Darmer (eds.). *Creating experiences in the experience economy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. PP. 232–252.
- Heidegren, Carl-Göran (1995). 'Det goda livet i upplevelsesamhället', in Mikael Carleheden & Margareta Bertilsson (eds.). *Det goda livet*. Stockholm/Stehag: Symposium. PP. 29–42.
- Heisley, Deborah D. & Sidney J. Levy (1991). 'Autodriving: a photoelicitation technique', in *Journal of Consumer Research* 18(3): 257–272.
- Helleiner, Jane (2007). 'Over the River. Border childhoods and border crossings at Niagara', in *Childhood* 14(4): 431–447.
- Hémar-Nicolas, Valérie & Mathilde Gollety (2012). 'Using brand character when targeting children: what for? An exploration of managers' and children's viewpoints', in *Young Consumers: Insight and Ideas for Responsible Marketers* 13(1): 20–29.
- Hendry, Joy (2000). 'Foreign country theme parks: a new theme or an old Japanese pattern?', in *Social Science Japan Journal* 3(2): 207–220.
- Hetherington, Kevin (1997). 'In place of geometry: the materiality of place', in *The Sociological Review* 45(S1): 183–199.
- Heung, Vincent CS, Nelson Tsang & Mavis Cheng (2009). 'Queuing Behavior in Theme Parks: A Comparison Between Chinese and Western Tourists', in *Journal of China Tourism Research* 5(1): 41–51.
- Hinchliffe, Steve (2009). 'Scalography and worldly assemblies'. Unpublished paper presented at 'From Scale to Scalography'. Oxford: Said Business School, Oxford University.
- Hjälmarson, Hanna (2007). *En växande marknad: Studie av nöjdheten med konsumtionsrelaterade livsområden bland unga konsumenter*. Diss. Stockholm: Handelshögskolan i Stockholm.
- Hjemdahl, Kirsti Mathiesen (2003a). *Tur-retur temapark: oppdragelse, opplevelse, kommers*. Kristiansand: Høyskoleforl.
- Hjemdahl, Kirsti Mathiesen (2003b). 'When Theme Parks happen', in Jonas Frykman & Nils Gilje (eds.). *Being there: new perspectives on phenomenology and the analysis of culture*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press. PP. 129–148.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell (2003). *The managed heart: commercialization of human feeling: Twentieth anniversary edition with a new afterword*. 2. ed. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell (2012). *The outsourced self: intimate life in market times*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

- Holmberg, Sören & Lennart Weibull (2005). 'Lyckan kommer, lyckan går', in Sören Holmberg & Lennart Weibull (eds.). *Lyckan kommer, lyckan går: trettio kapitel om politik, medier och samhälle: SOM-undersökningen 2004*. Göteborg: SOM-institutet, Göteborgs universitet. PP. 9–36.
- Holt, John Caldwell (1975). *Escape from childhood: the needs and rights of children*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Hookway, Nicholas (2013). 'Emotions, body and self: Critiquing moral decline sociology', in *Sociology* 47(4): 841–857.
- Horkheimer, Max & Adorno, Theodor W. (1997[1944]). *Upplysningens dialektik: filosofiska fragment*. Göteborg: Daidalos.
- Hunt, Pauline & Ronald Frankenberg (1997). 'It's a small world: Disneyland, the family and the multiple re-representations of American childhood', in Allison James & Alan Prout (eds.). *Constructing and reconstructing childhood: contemporary issues in the sociological study of childhood*. 2. ed. London: Falmer. PP. 105–122.
- Hylland Eriksen, Thomas (2008). *Jakten på lycka i överflödssamhället*. Nora: Nya Doxa.
- Hyman, Laura (2014a). 'Happiness and memory: some sociological reflections', in *Sociological Research Online* 19(2): 1–9.
- Hyman, Laura (2014b). *Happiness: understandings, narratives and discourses*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Högdahl, Elisabeth (2003). *Göra gata: om gränser och kryphål på Möllevången och i Kapstaden*. Diss. Lund: Univ.
- Illouz, Eva (1997). *Consuming the romantic utopia: love and the cultural contradictions of capitalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Illouz, Eva (2003). *Oprah Winfrey and the glamour of misery: an essay on popular culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Illouz, Eva (2007). *Cold intimacies: the making of emotional capitalism*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Illouz, Eva (2008). *Saving the Modern Soul: Therapy, Emotions, and the Culture of Self-Help*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Illouz, Eva (2012). *Why love hurts: a sociological explanation*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Ingold, Tim (2007a). *Lines: a brief history*. London: Routledge.
- Ingold, Tim (2007b). 'Materials against materiality', in *Archaeological dialogues* 14(01): 1–16.
- Ingold, Tim (2008). 'When ANT meets SPIDER: Social theory for arthropods', in Carl Knappett & Lambros Malafouris (eds.). *Material agency: towards a non-anthropocentric approach*. New York: Springer. PP. 209–215.
- Ingold, Tim (2009a). 'Against space: Place, movement, knowledge', in Peter Wynn Kirby (ed.). *Boundless worlds: an anthropological approach to movement*. New York: Berghahn Books. PP. 29–43.

- Ingold, Tim (2009b). 'Point, line and counterpoint: From environment to fluid space', in Yves Christen & A. Berthoz (eds.). *Neurobiology of "Umwelt": How Living Beings Perceive the World*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg. PP. 141–155.
- Ingold, Tim (2010). 'Bringing things back to life: Creative entanglements in a world of materials'. ESRC National Centre for Research Methods. NCRM Working Paper Series 05/10. PP. 1–14.
- Ingold, Tim (2012). 'Toward an Ecology of Materials', in *Annual review of anthropology* 41: 427–442.
- Ingold, Tim (2015). *The life of lines*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- 'International Day of Happiness', <http://www.dayofhappiness.net/about/> (accessed 20/03/15).
- 'International Day of Happiness 20 March', <http://www.un.org/en/events/happinessday/> (accessed 21/01/15).
- 'International Day of Happiness, Secretary-General's Message for 2014', <http://www.un.org/en/events/happinessday/sgmessage.shtml> (accessed 21/01/15).
- Ironico, Simona (2012). 'The active role of children as consumers', in *Young Consumers* 13(1): 30–44.
- James, Allison, & Chris Jenks (1996). 'Public perceptions of childhood criminality', in *British Journal of Sociology* 47(2): 315–331.
- James, Allison, Chris Jenks & Alan Prout (1998). *Theorizing childhood*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- James, Allison, & Adrian L. James. (2001). 'Childhood: Toward a theory of continuity and change', in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 575(1): 25–37.
- James, Allison & Adrian L. James (2004). *Constructing childhood: theory, policy, and social practice*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- James, Allison & Alan Prout (1997). 'Re-presenting Childhood: Time and Transition in the Study of Childhood', in Allison James & Alan Prout (eds.). *Constructing and reconstructing childhood: contemporary issues in the sociological study of childhood*. 2. ed. London: Falmer. PP. 227–246.
- Janson, Malena (2007). *Bio för barnens bästa?: svensk barnfilm som fostran och fritidsnöje under 60 år*. Diss. Stockholm: Stockholms universitet.
- Jacquemot, Nicolas (2009). *Vad optimister vet – och du kan lära dig: hitta vardagsglädjen med positiv psykologi*. Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand.
- Jeffrey, Bob & Geoff Troman (2004). 'Time for Ethnography', in *British Educational Research Journal* 30(4): 535–548.
- Jenkins, Rebecca, Elizabeth Nixon & Mike Molesworth (2011). 'Just normal and homely': The presence, absence and othering of consumer culture in everyday imagining', in *Journal of Consumer Culture* 11(2): 261–281.
- Jenks, Chris (2005). *Childhood*. 2. ed. London: Routledge.

- Jessop, Martyn (2008). 'Digital visualization as a scholarly activity', in *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 23(3): 281–293.
- Ji, Mindy F. (2002). 'Children's relationships with brands: "True love" or "one-night" stand?', in *Psychology & Marketing* 19(4): 369–387.
- Johansson, Barbro (2005). *Barn i konsumtionssamhället*. Stockholm: Norstedts akademiska förlag.
- Johns, Nick & Szilvia Gyimóthy (2002). 'Mythologies of a theme park: An icon of modern family life', in *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 8(4): 320–331.
- Johnson, David M. (1981). 'Disney World as structure and symbol: Re-creation of the American experience', in *The Journal of Popular Culture* 15(1): 157–165.
- Jonsson, Leif (2010). 'Introduktion', in Leif Jonsson (ed.). *Astrid Lindgrens världar i Vimmerby: en studie om kulturarv och samhällsutveckling*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press. PP. 11–25.
- Kapur, Jyotsna (2005a). *Coining for Capital: Movies, Marketing, and the Transformation of Childhood*. New Brunswick, NJ, USA: Rutgers University Press.
- Kapur, Jyotsna (2005b). 'Obsolescence and Other Playroom Anxieties: Childhood in the Shadows of Late Capital', in *Rethinking Marxism* 17(2): 237–255.
- Karlén, Joakim (2004). *Tio år med Astrid Lindgrens värld: tankar om turism och upplevelseindustri*. Vimmerby: SIC-SAC.
- Katz, Cindi (2008). 'Cultural Geographies lecture Childhood as spectacle: relays of anxiety and the reconfiguration of the child', in *Cultural Geographies* 15(1): 5–17.
- Kelly, Catriona (2009). 'A joyful soviet childhood: licensed happiness for little ones', in Marina Balina & Evgeny Dobrenko (eds.). *Petrified Utopia: Happiness Soviet Style*. London: Anthem Press. PP. 3–18.
- Keng, Kau Ah (1996). 'Theme Parks and Attractions in Singapore: An Overview', in *Visions in Leisure and Business* 15(3): 13–24.
- Kern, Stephen (1983). *The culture of time and space 1880–1918*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Kerrane, Ben, & Margaret K. Hogg (2013). 'Shared or non-shared? Children's different consumer socialisation experiences within the family environment', in *European Journal of Marketing* 47(3/4): 506–524.
- Kingfisher, C. (2013). 'Happiness: Notes on History, Culture and Governance', in *Health, Culture and Society* 5(1): 67–82.
- Kitson, Jennifer & Kevin McHugh (2014). 'Historic enchantments—materializing nostalgia', in *Cultural Geographies* 22(3): 487–508.
- Klein, Naomi (2001). *No logo: no space, no choice, no jobs, no logo: märkena, marknaden, motståndet*. Stockholm: Ordfront.
- Knappett, Carl & Lambros Malafouris (2008). 'Material and Nonhuman Agency: An Introduction', in Carl Knappett & Lambros Malafouris (eds.). *Material agency: towards a non-anthropocentric approach*. New York: Springer. PP. ix–xix.

- Kusenbach, Margarethe (2003) 'Street Phenomenology: The Go-Along as Ethnographic Research Tool', in *Ethnography* 4(3): 455–485.
- Kusserow, Adrie (2004). *American individualisms. Child rearing and social class in three neighborhoods*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (1991). 'Happiness: A definitional effort', in *Metaphor and Symbol* 6(1): 29–47.
- Labanyi, Jo (2010). 'Doing things: emotion, affect, and materiality', in *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 11(3–4): 223–233.
- Lainsbury, Andrew (2000). *Once upon an American dream: The story of Euro Disneyland*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Langer, Beryl (2002). 'Commodified Enchantment: Children and Consumer Capitalism', in *Thesis Eleven* 69(1): 67–81.
- Langer, Beryl (2004). 'The Business of Branded Enchantment', in *Journal of Consumer Culture* 4(2): 251–277.
- Langer, Beryl (2005). 'Research note consuming anomie: Children and global commercial culture', in *Childhood* 12(2): 259–271.
- Lash, Scott & Celia Lury (2007). *Global culture industry: the mediation of things*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Lash, Scott (2010). *Intensive culture: social theory, religion and contemporary capitalism*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Latour, Bruno (2004). 'Why has critique run out of steam? From matters of fact to matters of concern', in *Critical inquiry* 30(2): 225–248.
- Latour, Bruno (2005). *Reassembling the social: an introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford: University Press.
- Law, John (1994). *Organizing modernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Law, John (2004). *After Method. Mess in social science research*. London: Routledge.
- Lawlor, Margaret-Anne & Andrea Prothero (2011). 'Pester power – A battle of wills between children and their parents', in *Journal of Marketing Management* 27(5–6): 561–581.
- Layard, Richard & Judy Dunn (2009). *A Good Childhood*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Layard, Richard (2011). *Happiness*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Lee, Jo & Tim Ingold (2006). 'Fieldwork on foot: perceiving, routing, socialising', in Simon Coleman & Peter Collins (eds.). *Locating the Field: Space, Place and Context in Anthropology*. Berg: Oxford. PP. 67–86.
- Lee, Nick (1998). 'Towards an immature sociology', in *The Sociological Review* 46(3): 458–481.
- Lee, Nick (2001). *Childhood and society: growing up in an age of uncertainty*. Maidenhead: Open University.
- Lee, Nick & Steven D. Brown (2002). 'The disposal of fear: childhood, trauma, and complexity', in John Law & Annemarie Mol (eds.). *Complexities: social studies of knowledge practices*. Durham: Duke University Press. PP. 258–280.

- Lee, Nick (2008). 'Awake, Asleep, Adult, Child: An A-humanist Account of Persons', in *Body & Society* 14(4): 57–74.
- Levisen, Carsten (2014). 'The story of "Danish Happiness": Global discourse and local semantics', in *International Journal of Language and Culture* 1(2): 174–193.
- Lindgren, Anne-Li (2009). 'Utbildningsmedier i ett kritiskt barnperspektiv: skolfilm, skolradio och förskoleprogram', in Judith Lind (ed.). *Historien, barnen och barndomarna: vad är problemet?: en vänbok till Bengt Sandin*. Linköping: Linköpings universitet. PP. 171–192.
- Lindgren, Anne-Li, Anna Sparrman, Tobias Samuelsson & David Cardell (2015). 'Enacting (real) fiction: Materializing childhoods in a theme park', in *Childhood* 22(2): 171–186.
- Linn, Susan (2008). *The Case for Make Believe*. New York: The New Press.
- Linstead, Stephen & Alison Pullen (2006). 'Gender as multiplicity: Desire, displacement, difference and dispersion', in *Human Relations* 59(9): 1287–1310.
- Linstead, Stephen & Torkild Thanem (2007). 'Multiplicity, virtuality and organization: The contribution of Gilles Deleuze', in *Organization Studies* 28(10): 1483–1501.
- Liseberg 2011 (2012). Göteborg: Liseberg AB.
- 'Liseberg', www.liseberg.se (accessed 05/03/13).
- 'Liseberg – Skepp o' skoj', <http://liseberg.com/en/home/Amusement-Park/Rides--Attractions/Skepp-o-skoj/> (accessed 05/03/15)
- 'Liseberg – Strategiskt ramverk', <http://liseberg.se/sv/hem/Sidfot/Om-Liseberg/Strategiskt-ramverk/> (accessed 03/06/15).
- 'Liseberg – Ägare och ägardirektiv', <http://liseberg.se/sv/hem/Sidfot/Om-Liseberg/Agare-och-agardirektiv/> (accessed 18/06/15).
- Lukas, Scott A. (1998). 'Signal 3: Ethnographic experiences in the American theme park industry'. Unpublished dissertation.
- Lukas, Scott A. (2008). *Theme Park*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Lukas, Scott A. (2010). 'From Themed Space to Lifespace', in Judith Schlehe (ed.). *Staging the past: themed environments in transcultural perspectives*. Bielefeld: Transcript. PP. 135–153.
- Lundby, Erika (2012). '"If you have money, you can be kinder to them": possessions and economic resources in children's peer groups', in *Young Consumers: Insight and Ideas for Responsible Marketers* 13(2): 136–146.
- Lupton, Deborah (1998). *The emotional self: a sociocultural exploration*. London: SAGE.
- Lupton, Deborah (2013). 'Infants and/as objects', Presentation at the Relational Consumption: Beyond Individuals and Choices Workshop, Monash University, Melbourne, 16 August.
- Lynch, Michael (2013). 'Ontography: Investigating the production of things, deflating ontology', in *Social Studies of Science* 43(3): 444–462.

- ‘Lär känna Saltkråkan’, <http://www.saltkrakan.se/lar-kanna-saltkrakan/> (accessed 03/06/15).
- Löfgren, Orvar (1979). ‘Känslans förvandling: Tiden, naturen och hemmet i den borgerliga kulturen’, in Jonas Frykman & Orvar Löfgren (eds.). *Den kultiverade människan*. Malmö: Gleerups förlag. PP. 21–130.
- Löfgren, Orvar (1993). ‘The Great Christmas Quarrel and Other Swedish Traditions’, in, Orvar Löfgren & Daniel Miller (eds.). *Unwrapping Christmas*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Löfgren, Orvar (1996). ‘Konsumtion som vardaglig praktik och ideologiskt slagfält’, in *Socialvetenskaplig tidskrift* 1–2: 116–127.
- Maclaren, Kym (2014). ‘Intimacy and embodiment: An introduction’, in *Emotion, Space and Society* 13: 55–64.
- Madison, D. Soyini (2012). *Critical ethnography: method, ethics, and performance*. 2. ed. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE.
- Manning, Paul (2010). ‘The semiotics of brand’, in *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39: 33–49.
- Marin, Louis (1984). *Utopics: spatial play*. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities.
- Markström, Ann-Marie & Gunilla Halldén (2009). ‘Children’s strategies for agency in preschool’, in *Children & society* 23(2): 112–122.
- Martens, Lydia, Dale Southerton & Sue Scott (2004). ‘Bringing children (and parents) into the sociology of consumption towards a theoretical and empirical agenda’, in *Journal of Consumer Culture* 4(2): 155–182.
- Matusitz, Jonathan (2010). ‘Disneyland Paris: a case analysis demonstrating how glocalization works’, in *Journal of Strategic Marketing* 18(3): 223–237.
- Mauss, Marcel (1997). *Gåvan*. Lund: Argos.
- Mayall, Berry (1998). ‘Children, emotions and daily life at home and school’, in Gillian Bendelow & Simon J. Williams (eds.). *Emotions in social life: critical themes and contemporary issues*. London: Routledge. PP. 135–154.
- Mayo, Ed & Agnes Nairn (2009). *Consumer kids*. London: Constable & Robinson Ltd.
- McAllister, Matthew P. (2007). “‘Girls with a passion for fashion’ The Bratz Brand as integrated spectacular consumption”, in *Journal of Children and Media* 1(3): 244–258.
- McFall, Liz (2009). ‘Devices and desires: How useful is the ‘new’ new economic sociology for understanding market attachment?’, in *Sociology Compass* 3(2): 267–282.
- McKendrick, John H., Michael G. Bradford & Anna V. Fielder (2000). ‘Kid customer? Commercialization of playspace and the commodification of childhood’, in *Childhood* 7(3): 295–314.
- McMahon, Darrin M. (2006). *Happiness: a history*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Mellor, Mary (2010). *The future of money: from financial crisis to public resource*. London: Pluto.
- Mestrovic, Stjepan Gabriel (1997). *Postemotional society*. London: Sage.
- Metcalf, Alan (2006). ‘“It Was the Right Time To Do It”: Moving House, the Life-Course and Kairos’, in *Mobilities* 1(2): 243–260.

- Miles-Watson, Jonathan (2010). 'Ethnographic insights into happiness', in John Atherton, Elaine Graham & Ian Steedman (eds.). *Practices of Happiness*. Hoboken: Taylor & Francis. PP. 125–133.
- Miller, Daniel (1997). *Capitalism: An Ethnographic Approach*. Oxford, GBR: Berg Publishers.
- Miller, Daniel (2001a). 'Behind Closed Doors', in Daniel Miller (ed.). *Home possessions: material culture behind closed doors*. Oxford: Berg. PP. 1–19.
- Miller, Daniel (2001b). 'The poverty of morality', in *Journal of consumer culture* 1(2): 225–243.
- Miller, Daniel (2008a). *The comfort of things*. Malden, MA: Polity.
- Miller, Daniel (2008b). 'The uses of value', in *Geoforum* 39(3): 1122–1132.
- Miller, Daniel (2009). 'Individuals and the Aesthetic of Order', in Daniel Miller (ed.). *Anthropology and the individual: a material culture perspective*. New York: Berg. PP. 3–24.
- Millhauser, Steven (1993). 'Paradise Park', in *Grand Street* 47 (autumn): 62–94.
- Mitchell, Claudia & Jacqueline Reid-Walsh (2002). *Researching children's popular culture*. London: Routledge.
- Mitrašinović, Miodrag (2006). *Total landscape, theme parks, public space*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Mol, Annemarie (1999). 'Ontological politics. A word and some questions', in John Law & John Hassard (eds.). *Actor network theory and after*. Oxford: Blackwell. PP. 74–89.
- Mol, Annemarie (2002). *The body multiple: ontology in medical practice*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Mol, Annemarie (2010). 'Actor-network theory: Sensitive terms and enduring tensions', in *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 50: 253–269.
- Mol, Annemarie (2011). *Omsorgens logik: aktiva patienter och valfrihetens gränser*. Lund: Arkiv.
- Mol, Annemarie (2012). 'Ontologisk politik: ett ord och några frågor', in Cecilia Åsberg, Martin Hultman & Francis Lee (eds.). *Posthumanistiska nyckeltexter*. Lund: Studentlitteratur. PP. 181–198.
- Mol, Annemarie & John Law (2002). 'Complexities: An Introduction', in John Law & Annemarie Mol (eds.). *Complexities: social studies of knowledge practices*. Durham: Duke University Press. PP. 1–22.
- Mol, Annemarie & John Law (2004). 'Embodied action, enacted bodies: The example of hypoglycaemia', in *Body & society* 10(2–3): 43–62.
- Moor, Elizabeth (2003). 'Branded Spaces. The scope of new "marketing"', in *Journal of Consumer Culture* 3(1): 39–60.
- Moore, Alexander (1980). 'Walt Disney World: Bounded ritual space and the playful pilgrimage center', in *Anthropological Quarterly* 53(4): 207–218.
- Moran, Chuk (2013). 'Time as a social practice', in *Time & Society* (online first).

- Morgan, Alastair (2014). 'The happiness turn: Axel Honneth, self-reification and 'sickness unto health'', in *Subjectivity* 7(3): 219–233.
- Morgan, David H. J. (1996). *Family connections: an introduction to family studies*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Morgan, David H. J. (2011). *Rethinking family practices*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Morgan, Nigel, & Annette Pritchard (2005). 'On souvenirs and metonymy: Narratives of memory, metaphor and materiality', in *Tourist studies* 5(1): 29–53.
- Morrow, Virginia (2013). 'What's in a number? Unsettling the boundaries of age', in *Childhood* 20(2): 151–155.
- Mortimer, Jeylan T. & Pamela Aronson (2000). 'Adulthood', in *Encyclopedia of sociology* 1: 25–41. New York: Macmillan Reference USA.
- Moss, Barry F. & Andrew I. Schwebel (1993). 'Defining intimacy in romantic relationships', in *Family relations* 42(1): 31–37.
- Nairn, Agnes (2010). 'Children and Brands', in David Marshall (ed.). *Understanding children as consumers*. Los Angeles: Sage. PP. 94–114.
- Nasaw, David (1999). *Going out: the rise and fall of public amusements*. 1., Harvard University Press paperback ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- NE 'intimitet', www.ne.se (accessed 15/01/15).
- Newcomb, Chris (2003). 'Crossing the Berm: The Disney Theme Park as Sacralized Space'. Diss. The Florida State University.
- Nicolini, Davide (2009). 'Zooming in and out: Studying practices by switching theoretical lenses and trailing connections', in *Organization Studies* 30(12): 1391–1418.
- Nieuwenhuys, Olga (2011). 'Can the Teddy Bear Speak?', in *Childhood* 18(4): 411–418.
- Nilsson, Anna (2012). 'Lyckan och välbefinnandet: Ett moraliskt dilemma?', in *Konsumtionsrapporten 2012*. Centrum för konsumtionsvetenskap CFK Handelshögskolan vid Göteborgs universitet. PP. 20–22.
- Norberg, Johan (2009). *Den eviga matchen om lyckan: ett idéhistoriskt referat*. Stockholm: Natur och kultur.
- Nordea (2011). *Föräldrar, barn och ekonomi*. <http://hugin.info/1151/R/1566209/486282.pdf> (downloaded 04/10/13).
- Nordenfelt, Lennart (1993). *Quality of life, health and happiness*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. (2008). 'Who is the happy warrior? Philosophy poses questions to psychology', in *The Journal of Legal Studies* 37(S2): 81–113.
- O'Dell, Tom (2002). 'Upplevelsens makt: Gåvobyte i det senmoderna', in Tom O'Dell (ed.). *Upplevelsens materialitet*. Lund: Studentlitteratur. PP. 151–166.
- O'Dell, Tom (2007). 'Tourist experiences and academic junctures', in *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 7(1): 34–45.
- O'Dell, Tom & Robert Willim (2011a). 'Irregular ethnographies: an introduction', in *Ethnologia Europea* 41(1): 5–14.

- O'Dell, Tom & Robert Willim (2011b). 'Composing ethnography', in *Ethnologia Europea* 41(1): 27–40.
- Obrador, Pau (2012). 'The place of the family in tourism research: Domesticity and thick sociality by the pool', in *Annals of Tourism Research* 39(1): 401–420.
- OED*, second edition, www.oed.com: "Model" (accessed 150816).
- Ojajärvi, Jussi (2001). 'The weakest link and the commodification of subjectivity by the means of play', in *Journal for Cultural Research* 5(4): 477–489.
- Oswell, David (2013). *The agency of children: from family to global human rights*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Packard, Josh (2008). '‘I'm gonna show you what it's really like out here’; the power and limitation of participatory visual methods', in *Visual Studies* 23(1): 64–77.
- Palmer, Sue (2006). *Toxic childhood: how the modern world is damaging our children and what we can do about it*. London: Orion.
- Paterson, Mark (2006). *Consumption and everyday life*. London: Routledge.
- Pecora, Norma Odom (1998). *The Business of Children's Entertainment*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Persson, Jonas (1996). 'VM och Liseberg i västsvenskarnas hjärtan', in Lennart Nilsson (ed.). *Västsvenska perspektiv: SOM-undersökningen Västsverige 1995*. Göteborg: SOM-institutet. PP. 109–122.
- Pettigrew, Simone (2011). 'Hearts and minds: children's experiences of Disney World', in *Consumption Markets & Culture* 14(2): 145–161.
- Phelan, Shanon K. & Elizabeth Anne Kinsella (2013). 'Picture This... Safety, Dignity, and Voice—Ethical Research With Children Practical Considerations for the Reflexive Researcher', in *Qualitative Inquiry* 19(2): 81–90.
- Philips, Deborah (2002). 'Consuming the West Main Street, USA', in *Space and Culture* 5(1): 29–41.
- Philips, Deborah (2012). *Fairground Attractions A Genealogy of the Pleasure Ground*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Pink, Sarah (2007a). *Doing visual ethnography: images, media and representation in research*. 2 ed. London: SAGE.
- Pink, Sarah (2007b). 'Walking with Video', *Visual Studies* 22(3): 240–252.
- Pink, Sarah (2008). 'An urban tour. The sensory sociality of ethnographic place-making', in *Ethnography* 9(2): 175–196.
- Pink, Sarah (2009). *Doing sensory ethnography*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Pink, Sarah, Phil Hubbard, Maggie O'Neill & Alan Radley (2010). 'Walking across disciplines: from ethnography to arts practice', in *Visual Studies* 25(1): 1–7.
- Pink, Sarah (2011). 'Drawing with Our Feet (and Trampling the Maps): Walking with', in Tim Ingold (ed.). *Redrawing anthropology: materials, movements, lines*. Farnham: Ashgate. PP. 143–156.
- Pink, Sarah (2013). 'Engaging the Senses in Ethnographic Practice: Implications and Advances', in *The Senses & Society* 8(3): 261–267.

- Pole, Christopher (2007). 'Researching Children and Fashion An embodied ethnography', in *Childhood* 14(1): 67–84.
- Prahalad, Coimbatore K. & Venkat Ramaswamy (2004). 'Co-creating unique value with customers', in *Strategy & leadership* 32(3): 4–9.
- Prout, Alan & Allison James (1997). 'A New Paradigm for the Sociology of Childhood? Provenance, Promise and Problems', in Allison James & Alan Prout (eds.). *Constructing and reconstructing childhood: contemporary issues in the sociological study of childhood*. 2. ed. London: Falmer. PP. 7–33.
- Prout, Alan (2005). *The future of childhood: towards the interdisciplinary study of children*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Prout, Alan (2011). 'Taking a step away from modernity: reconsidering the new sociology of childhood', in *Global studies of childhood* 1(1): 4–14.
- Pugh, Allison J. (2004). 'Windfall Child Rearing Low-Income Care and Consumption', in *Journal of Consumer Culture* 4(2): 229–249.
- Qvortrup, Jens (2005). 'Varieties of Childhood', in Jens Qvortrup (ed.). *Studies in modern childhood: society, agency, culture*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. PP. 1–20.
- Rakow, Lana F. & Vija Navarro (1993). 'Remote mothering and the parallel shift: Women meet the cellular telephone', in *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 10(2): 144–157.
- Raz, Aviad E. (1999). *Riding the black ship: Japan and Tokyo Disneyland*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Raz, Aviad E. (2002a). *Emotions at work: normative control, organizations, and culture in Japan and America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center.
- Raz, Aviad E. (2002b). 'Japan at play in TDL (Tokyo Disneyland)', in Joy Hendry & Massimo Raveri (eds.). *Japan at play: the ludic and the logic of power*. London: Routledge. PP. 285–299.
- Reeh, Henrik (2005). *Ornaments of the metropolis: Siegfried Kracauer and modern urban culture*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Renold, Emma & Jessica Ringrose (2011). 'Schizoid subjectivities? Re-theorizing teen girls' sexual cultures in an era of 'sexualization'', in *Journal of Sociology* 47(4): 389–409.
- Reyers, Anne & Jonathan Matusitz (2012). 'Emotional regulation at Walt Disney World: An impression management view', in *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health* 27(3): 139–159.
- Ritzer, George & Allan Liska (1997). "'McDisneyization" and "Post-Tourism": complementary perspectives on contemporary tourism', in Chris Rojek & John Urry (eds.). *Touring cultures: transformations of travel and theory*. London: Routledge. PP. 96–109.
- Roberts, James A. (2011). *Shiny Objects. Why We Spend Money We Don't Have in Search of Happiness We Can't Buy*. New York: HarperCollins.

- Rojek, Chris (1997). 'Indexing, dragging and social construction', in Chris Rojek & John Urry (eds.). *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Roos, John Magnus (ed.) (2012). *Konsumtionsrapporten 2012*. Göteborg: Centrum för konsumtionsvetenskap, Handelshögskolan vid Göteborgs universitet.
- Roos, John Magnus (ed.) (2013). *Konsumtionsrapporten 2013*. Göteborg: Centrum för konsumtionsvetenskap, Handelshögskolan vid Göteborgs universitet.
- Rose, Gillian (2007). *Visual methodologies: an introduction to the interpretation of visual materials*. 2. ed. London: Sage.
- Rowley, Laura (2005). *Money and happiness: a guide to living the good life*. Hoboken, N.J.: J. Wiley.
- Ruckenstein, Minna (2010a). 'Toying with the world: Children, virtual pets and the value of mobility', in *Childhood* 17(4): 500–513.
- Ruckenstein, Minna (2010b). 'Currencies and Capitalisms on the Internet', in *Journal of Virtual Worlds Research* 2(4): 4–10.
- Russell, Bertrand (1996). *The conquest of happiness*. New York: Liveright.
- Russell, Rachel & Melissa Tyler (2002). '“Thank Heaven for Little Girls: Girl Heaven” and the Commercial Context of Feminine Childhood', in *Sociology* 36(3): 619–637.
- Russon, John (2014). 'Between two intimacies: The formative contexts of individual experience', in *Emotion, Space and Society* 13: 65–70.
- Rämö, Hans (1999). 'An aristotelian human time-space manifold from chronochora to kairotopos', in *Time & Society* 8(2–3): 309–328.
- Sachs, Jeffrey (2013). 'Introduction', in John F. Helliwell, Richard Layard & Jeffrey Sachs (eds.) *World happiness report*.
https://circle.ubc.ca/bitstream/handle/2429/44498/Helliwell_J_et_al_World_Happiness.pdf?sequence=1 (accessed 24/07/15). PP. 2–9.
- Samuelsson, Tobias (2012). 'Not all about the money. Children, work, and consumption', in Anna Sparrman, Bengt Sandin & Johanna Sjöberg (eds.). *Situating child consumption*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press. PP. 81–96.
- Samuelsson, Tobias, Anna Sparrman, David Cardell & Anne-Li Lindgren (accepted). "“The active, competent child, capable of autonomous action”: an inherent quality or the outcome of a research process?", in *AnthropoChildren*.
- Sandin, Bengt (2012). 'More children of better quality. Pricing the child in the welfare state', in Anna Sparrman, Bengt Sandin & Johanna Sjöberg (eds.). *Situating child consumption*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press. PP. 61–70.
- Sassatelli, Roberta (2007). *Consumer culture: history, theory and politics*. London: SAGE.
- Schillmeier, Michael (2007). 'Dis/abling spaces of calculation: blindness and money in everyday life', in *Environment and Planning D* 25(4): 594–609.
- Schor, Juliet B. (2005). *Born to buy: the commercialized child and the new consumer culture*. New York: Scribner.

- Schweppenhäuser, Gerhard (2009). *Theodor W. Adorno: an introduction*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Seiter, Ellen (1993). *Sold Separately. Parents & Children in Consumer Culture*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Seligman, Martin E. P. (2002). *Authentic happiness: using the new positive psychology to realize your potential for lasting fulfillment*. New York: Free Press.
- Shanahan, Suzanne (2007). 'Lost and found: The sociological ambivalence toward childhood', in *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 33: 407–428.
- Sharma, Sarah (2013). 'Critical Time', in *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 10(2–3): 312–318.
- Shoval, Noam (2010). 'Monitoring and Managing Visitors Flows in Destinations using Aggregative GPS Data', in Ulrike Gretzel, Rob Law & Matthias Fuchs (eds.). *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2010: Proceedings of the International Conference in Lugano, Switzerland, February 10–12, 2010*. Vienna: Springer Vienna. PP. 171–183.
- Shove, Elizabeth (2009). 'Everyday Practice and the Production and Consumption of Time', in Elizabeth Shove, Frank Trentmann & Richard R. Wilk (eds.). *Time, consumption and everyday life: practice, materiality and culture*. Oxford: Berg. PP. 17–33.
- Sjöberg, Johanna (2013). *I marknadens öga: barn och visuell konsumtion*. Diss. Linköping: Linköpings universitet.
- Sjöholm, Carina (2009). 'Astrid Lindgrens Småland som produkt i den nya ekonomin', in Inger Littberger Caisou-Rousseau, Maria Nilson & Carina Sjöholm (eds.). *Speglingar av Småland*. Hestra: Isaberg. PP. 51–80.
- Smith, Karen (2012). 'Producing governable subjects: Images of childhood old and new', in *Childhood* 19(1): 24–37.
- Smith, Ruth C. & Eric M. Eisenberg (1987). 'Conflict at Disneyland: A root-metaphor analysis', in *Communications Monographs* 54(4): 367–380.
- Sorkin, Michael (1992a). 'Introduction: Variations on a Theme Park', in Michael Sorkin (ed.). *Variations on a theme park: The New American City and the End of Public Space*. New York: Hill and Wang. PP. xi–xv.
- Sorkin, Michael (1992b). 'See You in Disneyland', in Michael Sorkin (ed.). *Variations on a theme park: The New American City and the End of Public Space*. New York: Hill and Wang. PP. 205–232.
- Sparrman, Anna (2002). *Visuell kultur i barns vardagsliv: bilder, medier och praktiker*. Diss. Linköping: Univ.
- Sparrman, Anna (2005). 'Video-recording as Interaction: Participant Observation of Children's Everyday Life', in *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 2(3): 241–255.
- Sparrman, Anna (2009). 'Ambiguities and paradoxes in children's talk about marketing breakfast cereals with toys', in *Young Consumers: Insight and Ideas for Responsible Marketers* 10(4): 297–313.

- Sparrman, Anna & Pål Aarsand (2009) 'Review and Commentary', in *Journal of Children and Media* 3(3): 303–307.
- Sparrman, Anna (2011). 'Barnkulturens sociala estetik', in *Locus* 3–4: 25–44.
- Sparrman, Anna & Bengt Sandin (2012). 'Situating child consumption: An introduction', in Anna Sparrman, Bengt Sandin & Johanna Sjöberg (eds.). *Situating child consumption*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press. PP. 9–31.
- Sparrman, Anna (2014). 'Access and gatekeeping in researching children's sexuality: Mess in ethics and methods', in *Sexuality & Culture* 18(2): 291–309.
- Spradley, James P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt.
- Stearns, Peter N. (2010). 'Defining Happy Childhoods. Assessing a Recent Change', in *The Journal of the History of Childhood and Youth* 3(2): 165–186.
- Stearns, Peter N. (2012a). *Satisfaction not guaranteed: dilemmas of progress in modern society*. New York: New York University Press.
- Stearns, Peter N. (2012b). 'The History of Happiness', in *Harvard Business Review* jan–feb, PP. 104–109.
- Steinert, Heinz (2003). *Culture industry*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Stephens, Sharon (1995). 'Introduction. Children and the Politics of Culture in "Late Capitalism"', in Sharon Stephens (ed.). *Children and the politics of culture*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press. PP. 1–34.
- Strömberg, Per (2007). *Upplevelseindustrins turistmiljöer: visuella berättarstrategier i svenska turistanläggningar 1985–2005*. Diss. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.
- Svabo, Connie (2008). 'Experience offerings: who or what does the action?', in Jon Sundbo & Per Darmer (eds.). *Creating experiences in the experience economy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. PP. 157–175.
- Swedbank (2011). *Veckopengen VI*.
http://www.swedbank.se/idc/groups/public/@i/@sc/@all/@kp/documents/article/fm_349600.pdf (downloaded 04/10/13).
- Symes, Colin (1995). 'Taking people for a ride: Dreamworld, Sea World and Movieworld as excursive practice', in *Journal of Australian Studies* 19(44): 1–12.
- Säävälä, Minna (2006). 'Entangled in the imagination: New middle-class apprehensions in an Indian theme park', in *Ethnos* 71(3): 390–414.
- Söderberg, Johan & Adam Netzén (2010). 'When all that is theory melts into (hot) air: Contrasts and parallels between Actor Network Theory, autonomist Marxism and open Marxism', in *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization* 10(2): 95–118.
- Söderfeldt, Ylva & Pieter Verstraete (2013). 'From Comparison to Indices: A disabling perspective on the history of happiness', in *Health, Culture and Society* 5(1): 249–264.
- Sørenssen, Ingvild Kvale (2012). 'Twins as a commercial target group. Children and Disney filling the category', in Anna Sparrman, Bengt Sandin & Johanna Sjöberg (eds.). *Situating child consumption*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press. PP. 177–193.

- Tesfahuney, Mekonnen & Katarina Schough (2010). 'Inledning: det globala reseprivilegiet', in Mekonnen Tesfahuney & Katarina Schough (eds.). *Det globala reseprivilegiet*. Lund: Sekel. PP. 11–18.
- Thien, Deborah (2005). 'Intimate distances: considering questions of 'us'', in Joyce Davidson, Liz Bondi & Mick Smith (eds.). *Emotional geographies*. Aldershot: Ashgate. PP. 191–204.
- Thin, Neil (2012). *Social happiness: theory into policy and practice*. Bristol: Policy.
- Thompson, Grahame (1983). 'Carnival and the Calculable: Consumption and Play at Blackpool', in Fredric Jameson (ed.). *Formations of pleasure*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. PP. 124–137.
- Thrift, Nigel & John-David Dewsbury (2000). 'Dead geographies – and how to make them live', in *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18: 411–432.
- Thrift, Nigel J. (2005). *Knowing capitalism*. London: SAGE.
- Thrift, Nigel (2008). *Non-Representational Theory. Space, politics, affect*. London: Routledge.
- Tong, Chris (2014). 'Ecology without Scale: Unthinking the World Zoom', in *Animation* 9(2): 196–211.
- Travlou, Penny, Patsy Eubanks Owens, Catharine Ward Thompson & Lorraine Maxwell (2008). 'Place mapping with teenagers: locating their territories and documenting their experience of the public realm', in *Children's Geographies* 6(3): 309–326.
- Trell, Elen-Maarja & Bettina van Hoven (2010). 'Making sense of place: exploring creative and inter-active research methods with young people', in *Fennia* 188(1): 91–104.
- Trumble, Angus. (2004). *A brief history of the smile*. New York: BasicBooks.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu (1998). *Escapism*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Turmel, André (2008). *A historical sociology of childhood: developmental thinking, categorization, and graphic visualization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tyler, Melissa (2009). 'Growing Customers Sales-service work in the children's culture industries', in *Journal of Consumer Culture* 9(1): 55–77.
- Uprichard, Emma (2008). 'Children as 'being and becomings': Children, childhood and temporality', in *Children & Society* 22(4): 303–313.
- Urry, John (2000). *Sociology beyond societies: mobilities for the twenty-first century*. London: Routledge.
- Urry, John (2005). 'Beyond the Science of 'Society'', in *Sociological Research Online* 10(2).
- Valentine, Gill (1996a). 'Angels and devils: moral landscapes of childhood', in *Environment and Planning D* 14(5): 581–600.
- Valentine, Gill (1996b). 'Children Should Be Seen and Not Heard: The Production and Transgression of Adults' public Space', in *Urban Geography* 17(3): 205–220.
- Valentine, Gill (1997). "'Oh Yes I Can.'" "Oh No You Can't": Children and Parents' Understandings of Kids' Competence to Negotiate Public Space Safely', in *Antipode* 29(1): 65–89.

- Valentine, Gill & John McKendrick (1997). 'Children's outdoor play: exploring parental concerns about children's safety and the changing nature of childhood', in *Geoforum* 28(2): 219–235.
- Valtonen, Anu & Elina Närvänen (2015). 'Gendered reading of the body in the bed', in *Journal of Marketing Management* 31(15–16): 1583–1601.
- Van der Duim, Rene (2007). 'Tourismscapes an actor-network perspective', in *Annals of Tourism Research* 34(4): 961–976.
- Van Maanen, John (1992). 'Displacing Disney: Some notes on the flow of culture', in *Qualitative Sociology* 15(1): 5–35.
- Van Maanen, John (2011). *Tales of the field: on writing ethnography*. 2. ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Wert, William F. (1995). 'Disney world and posthistory', in *Cultural Critique* 32 (Winter, 1995–1996): 187–214.
- Veenhoven, Ruut. *Happiness in Sweden* (SE), World Database of Happiness, Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands. <http://worlddatabaseofhappiness.eur.nl> (accessed 28/01/15).
- Vinterberg, Søren (1977). 'Organiserade orgier, dröm och dressyr, ritual och revolt', in Anne Lise Andreassen (ed.). *Barnmarknad: kritik av barnmedier och -miljöer*. Stockholm: Gidlund. PP. 243–257.
- Warren, Stacy (1999). 'Cultural contestation at Disneyland Paris', in David Crouch (ed.). *Leisure/tourism geographies: practices and geographical knowledge*. London: Routledge. PP. 109–125.
- Watts, Laura & John Urry (2008). 'Moving methods, travelling times', in *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26(5): 860–874.
- Werner, Ann (2015). 'Introduction: Studying Junctures of Motion and Emotion', in *Culture Unbound: Journal of Current Cultural Research* 7(2): 196–173.
- Wernick, Andrew (1994). *Promotional Culture: Advertising, ideology and symbolic expression*. London: Sage.
- Wickstrom, Maurya (2006). *Performing Consumers. Global capital and its theatrical seductions*. New York: Routledge.
- Wierzbicka, Anna (2010). 'The "history of emotions" and the future of emotion research', in *Emotion Review* 2(3): 269–273.
- Wiles, Rose, Andrew Clark & Jon Prosser (2011). 'Visual Research Ethics at the Crossroads', in Eric Margolis & Luc Pauwels (eds.). *The SAGE handbook of visual research methods*. Los Angeles, Calif.: SAGE. PP. 329–356.
- Wilk, Richard (2001). 'Consuming morality', in *Journal of Consumer Culture* 1(2): 245–260.
- Wilk, Richard (2011). 'Reflections on orderly and disorderly ethnography', in *Ethnologia Europaea* 41(1): 15–25.
- Williams, Christine L. (2006). *Inside toyland: working, shopping, and social inequality*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

- Williams, Raymond (1985). *Keywords: a vocabulary of culture and society*. Rev. ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Willis, Paul & Mats Trondman (2000). 'Manifesto for Ethnography', in *Ethnography* 1(1): 5–16.
- Willis, Susan (1995). 'The family vacation', in *Inside the Mouse: Work and Play at Disney World*. Durham: Duke University Press. PP. 34–53.
- Wing Yee Choi, Kimburley (2007). 'Remade in Hong Kong: how Hong Kong people use Hong Kong Disneyland', *Theses & Dissertations*, Paper 6.
http://commons.ln.edu.hk/cs_etd/6. Diss.
- Winnicott, Donald W. (1953). 'Transitional Objects and Transitional Phenomena—A Study of the First Not-Me Possession', in *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 34: 89–97.
- Wong, Kevin KF & Phoebe WY Cheung (1999). 'Strategic theming in theme park marketing', in *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 5(4): 319–332.
- Woolgar, Steve (2012). 'Ontological Child Consumption', in Anna Sparrman, Bengt Sandin & Johanna Sjöberg (eds.). *Situated consumption*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press. PP. 33–52.
- Woolgar, Steve & Javier Lezaun (2015). 'Missing the (question) mark? What is a turn to ontology?', in *Social Studies of Science* 45(3): 462–467.
- Wright, Chris (2006). 'Natural and social order at Walt Disney World; the functions and contradictions of civilising nature', in *The Sociological Review* 54(2): 303–317.
- Wright Mills, C. (2002). *White collar: the American middle classes*. New York: Oxford U.P.
- Yaneva, Albena (2009). 'Ethnographies of scaling. An enquiry on the production of "voluntary blind" empirical accounts'. For the workshop "Scalography", Oxford, 8 July 2009. PP. 1–10.
- Yi'En, Cheng (2014). 'Telling Stories of the City: Walking Ethnography, Affective Materialities, and Mobile Encounters', in *Space and Culture* 17(3): 211–223.
- Yoshimoto, Mitsuhiro (1994). 'Images of Empire: Tokyo Disneyland and Japanese Cultural Imperialism', in Eric Smoodin (ed.). *Disney discourse: producing the magic kingdom*. New York: Routledge. PP. 181–199.
- Yuran, Noam (2014). *What money wants: an economy of desire*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Zelizer, Viviana A. (1985/1994). *Pricing the priceless child: the changing social value of children*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Zelizer, Viviana A. (1989). 'The social meaning of money: "special monies"', in *American journal of sociology* 95(2): 342–377.
- Zelizer, Viviana A. (1994). *The social meaning of money*. New York: BasicBooks.
- Zelizer, Viviana (2002). 'Kids and commerce', in *Childhood* 9(4): 375–396.
- Zelizer, Viviana A. (2005). *The purchase of intimacy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

- Žižek, Slavoj (1993). *Tarrying with the negative: Kant, Hegel, and the critique of ideology*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Žižek, Slavoj (1998). 'Risk society and its discontents', in *Historical Materialism* 2(1): 143–164.
- Žižek, Slavoj (2002). *Did somebody say totalitarianism? Five interventions in the (mis)use of a notion*. London: Verso.
- Žižek, Slavoj (2008). *In defense of lost causes*. London: Verso.
- Zornado, Joseph L. (2001). *Inventing the child: culture, ideology and the story of childhood*. New York: Garland.
- 'Årets Lyckoframjare', <http://www.globalhappiness.com/sv/arets-lyckoframjare> (accessed 30/03/15).
- Öhnander, Bengt A. (1998). 'Från komarker till nöjespark', in Bo Sigvard Nilsson & Bo Johansson (eds.). *Liseberg 1923–1998: från komark till nöjespark*. Göteborg: Liseberg AB. PP. 13–18.