Parenting, child culture, and emotional relations in postwar Norway

Schrumpf, Ellen
Department of Business, History and Social Sciences - University of South-Eastern Norway

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination, and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record.

Schrumpf, E. (2022). Parenting, Child Culture, and Emotional Relations in Postwar Norway. *The Journal of the History of Childhood and Youth 15*(1), 48-74. http://doi.org/10.1353/hcy.2022.0003

© 2022 by Johns Hopkins University Press.

Except where otherwise noted, this item's license is described as Navngivelse 4.0 Internasjonal

Parenting, Child Culture, and Emotional Relations in Postwar Norway

By Ellen Schrumpf

> I feel I had a safe, good and happy childhood in the areas around Ola Narr [Tøyenparken in Oslo]—we spent the whole day outdoors, we were many same aged children in the apartment blocks, so we always had playmates. Sometimes we quarreled of course and said bad things to and about each other but in general, the friendship was good among us children who grew up in the two apartment blocks of ours.[1]

Here a woman describes what she remembers as her happy Norwegian childhood in the 1950s. She was born in 1947, on the east side of Oslo, and she pinpoints some characteristics of growing up at that time. First, she underlines that growing up mainly consisted of outdoors activities, preferably in nature and distant from parents. Second, she explains that being a child was experienced physically as well as emotionally within a specific child culture, and third, she tells of friendship and child-to-child relations independent of parents and other grown-ups.

In Norwegian history, the decade of the 1950s is often described as children's "happy decennium."[2] Socioeconomically, the postwar years were marked by optimism and promising prospects. Generally, welfare in economic and material terms increased, mortality—particularly child mortality—decreased, fertility increased, and housing and living conditions improved. Most mothers were housewives and houseworkers, and the divorce rate was low. Compared to later decades, children were to a lesser degree institutionalized in kindergartens and schools, and children in rural and urban areas spent a lot of time on their own, in outdoor activities.[3] The street was a common playground for urban children: "We lived in our own

house with a garden but the street was our regular playground in summer and winter. There were no cars," says a girl born in 1947.[4]

The 1950s may be said to be "happy" when seen in a socioeconomic perspective. In this article, however, parenting strategies, child culture, and emotional relations in postwar Norway are approached in a cultural and micro-historical perspective. The article is based on forty-eight interviews with people, most of them born in the 1940s and 1950s, collected by the Norwegian Folk Museum in 2016 and 2017. The interviews are digitalized and archived in Norwegian Ethnographic Collections (NEG 0259), where they serve as a memory bank available for researchers as well as the general public. The interviewees were asked about play in childhood and the respondents are both women (26) and men (22) and from rural (15) and urban (33) areas in different parts of Norway. The interviews vary in length and content. Some are just short answers to questions about play in childhood, and others are long, wide, and detailed narratives about family, parenting, and growing up in a specific place at that time. The longest interview fills eleven written pages. The NEG material is accordingly a rich source base, from which I have extracted what they tell about parenting, child culture, and emotional relations in postwar Norway.

We have to keep in mind, however, that in these memories, the past is seen and interpreted in retrospect by elderly people. Further, parenting and child culture are phenomena full of meaning, and we have to read and interpret the texts carefully. I read the memories as narratives, in which experiences from the past are selected elements in constructed and meaningful stories in the present.[5] Hence, I read and understand them as combinations of what actually happened in the past as well as the way past events have been selected, interpreted, and narrated in the present.[6]

The aim of this article is to discuss the following on the basis of these selected memories:

- What do they tell about parenting strategies in postwar Norway?
- What do they tell about child culture as learning arenas?
- What do they tell about emotional relations within and outside families?

History of Emotions, Parental Love, and Child Culture

Parenting and child-rearing are phenomena that are indeed emotional. Children are affected by parent's emotional styles—and vice versa—and child-rearing is not least an emotional process. The history of emotions is accordingly an important perspective and analytical tool in this article about parenting and child culture in postwar Norway. According to German historian Ute Frevert, all human relations and actions in the private and public spheres are provoked by and constructed of emotions, both individually and collective. Frevert further claims that emotions are powerful and affect all human relations.[7] Emotions and emotional recommendations change, however, and these changes form a significant part of the history of childhood.[8]

How can we then understand and analyze emotions? Emotions are neither static nor ahistorical. They are bodily phenomena, experienced by the person who lives in that body. Experiences and expressions are bodily, mentally, and culturally framed, and expressions of emotions are controlled according to norms, values, and traditions. Such expressions are also accordingly historically and culturally constructed and are products of educational processes.[9]

Families are the primary institutions through which emotional education takes place. Parents have the power to affect individual emotions and control emotional expressions. They can encourage children to feel shame, pride, and joy and to suppress rage, hatred, and compassion. Further, parents have the power to control how children express emotions and make them adjust to specific norms and traditions.[10] On the other hand, children are not powerless. In history, children have always been valuable to their parents, emotionally,

culturally, and economically. Parenting is a reciprocal educational and civilizing process in which both children and parents participate. Education is, however, not only a reciprocal and vertical adult-child process: Children inform and educate each other in child-to-child relations, and they are also shaped by material and natural environments, such as the architecture of the homes, clothes, and outdoor play areas.[11]

Parental love is central to the history of emotion. Based on a thorough investigation of parent-child relations in English and American diaries 1500–1900, social historian Linda Pollock claims that parents in general have always loved their children, protected them, and cared for them with the social and material substances needed for children's survival.[12] We know that children have been neglected throughout history due to poverty and/or personal inadequacy, and historians have often accentuated parent's neglect.[13] Neglect is, however, the exception and not the rule in childhood history, according to Pollock. Her statement about continuous parental love and care is used as a point of departure in this article. The *ways* parents loved their children and children loved their parents have, however, differed throughout history.

Parenting is here understood as the process of promoting and supporting the physical, emotional, social, and intellectual development of a child from infancy to adulthood. Parenting involves the style (emotional climate) and the practices (behavior) that parents use in their child-rearing.[14] Parenting styles and practices have changed significantly throughout history. Earlier parents strove to sustain their children physically, instill moral character, and ensure that their children would grow up to be responsible adults. It is not that earlier parents did not wish their children to be happy, but it was not central to parenting.[15]

Child culture is defined as children's own culture, passed from one generation of children to the next. Child cultures exist in child societies, outside parent's control and protection. In

child societies, children are confronted with success and failure, and they learn to adapt and to take advantage of the possibilities in an often non-idyllic environment.[16] Children's cultures are socially contextualized, but they do not simply adapt to changing social and cultural circumstances. These cultures involve conflicts with adults who seek to regulate and direct children's activities. As in every power relationship, we see a process of conflict, negotiation, and contestation.[17]

Postwar Norway: Welfare State, Politics, Childhood, and Families

> The place was Borgestad between Skien and Porsgrunn. There, we divided into two groups; the toads from the islet and the rockers who lived in the hills, we did not mingle because we kept to our neighborhoods, and the road divided the place. Most fathers worked at Hydro or Borgestad factories, and mothers stayed home. There were children in all houses in the street, and we managed ourselves during the day.[18]

In this memory from a small town in the southern part of Norway in the 1950s, we learn about fathers who were absent most of the day and mothers domestic presence. Further, it tells about children who lived their lives outdoors in a child-organized community.

The postwar years witnessed the establishment of the Norwegian welfare state. The ideological support for the welfare state peaked around 1975, and thereafter the "classical era" of the welfare state ended. The distinctive characteristic of the Norwegian welfare state is the role of an active state. The interwar period, with economic crises and high unemployment rates, had proved existing social security benefits insufficient, and new ideas about collectivism and public responsibility governed by the state won support. In the welfare state, citizens' responsibility was public-private rather than, as before, private-public, and the state took the lead in organizing universal and egalitarian social welfare for everyone.[19] Since children carried the hopes and promises for the future, they were a target group in welfare

politics, and public care and responsibility for children's welfare were cornerstones of the welfare state.[20] Consequently, the meaning of childhood, and the relationship between children, parents, society, and the state, have been affected by the construction of the welfare state.[21]

Legislation to protect children in the private and public spheres was brought in during these years. One example is the child benefit law of 1946. The law introduced a new family policy that aimed to curtail economic differences between families with and without children.[22] Another example is the child protection law of 1953, which secured benefits and protection for children irrespective of economic and social background.[23] The regulatory history dates to the prewar years, when living conditions, and population decline were regarded as critical social welfare problems.[24] After the war, these problems led to increased state responsibility for children's welfare. Further, legislation promoted a professional responsibility for child welfare based on scientific knowledge. Child welfare officers were professionals educated at specific institutions, and their pedagogy and psychological approaches provided the welfare state with new knowledge about child welfare.

Schooling was, however, still important, and social and gender equality was a political objective. The elementary school law of 1959 introduced equal education for girls and boys and the same schedules in urban and rural schools.[25] Postwar education was based on modern principals such as active pedagogy and "learning by doing." In such schools, pupils were supposed to be active participants in the learning process.[26]

Securing children's health and material welfare was also an ambition of the postwar welfare state, and the Norwegian public school system was a means to realize these ambitions. In school all children, regardless of social background, gathered, and in addition to education, they were served healthy breakfasts and they were weighed and measured in order

to detect malnutrition and secure normal growth. Meals and doctors at school originated in the interwar period. Large-scale vaccination programs were put into effect (in 1952) to prevent infectious deceases such as diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough, and polio. [27]

In postwar Norway, there was a substantial lack of housing. In 1945, the social democrat government promised 100,000 new housing units, and the proposed standard was three rooms and a kitchen. Still, the apartments in the cities consisted of two rooms and kitchen for a long time, and cramped housing was even more common in rural districts.[28]

The Norwegian family of the 1950s was a nuclear family. Three-generation families were rare, as were live-in lodgers and domestic servants. Family members lived close together in one- or two-room apartments, and we can assume that housing conditions influenced parenting strategies and education at that time. According to psychologists and psychiatrists in postwar Norway, the ideal was to let small children sleep separate from the parents at night, and from the age of four, children should sleep separately from their siblings as well. The ideal was that children should have rooms of their own, and it was a minimum requirement to separate girls and boys from puberty on[29] under a rationale that cited hygienic standards, health, and morals. These approaches aimed for children to become individuals and to be able to execute self-control and autonomy instead of relying on diffuse external social control. Compared to the 1930s, when natural science framed medical doctors' and psychologists' strict body and mental hygienic principles for child education, "the happy child" emerged as child education's main principle and aim in postwar Norway.[30] It is, however, obvious that practice and ideals were different and that the ideals were class-specific and corresponded with the material, cultural, and moral standards and aspirations of the expanding middle class in the postwar nation.

Housing policy was important in the welfare state and huge housing construction projects took place in reconstruction areas in the districts and urban areas. Huge postwar suburbs emerged, and new and hygienic houses were built with help from public sources, such as the Norwegian National Housing Bank, established in 1946.[31] Still, the advised housing standards were out of reach for most working-class and some middle-class families. Most families lived in small apartments. Accordingly, children slept close together with parents and siblings and in a specific sensory and emotional atmosphere. The atmosphere influenced and informed the child's body and soul about certain values and norms, such as moderation, loyalty, and adjustment as well as specific notions of proximity and safety. On the other hand, a child with a room of his/her own would be bodily informed about independence and individuality. Upper-, middle-, and working-class children had accordingly different material and emotional upbringings.[32] Material civilizing strategies in postwar Norway were class specific and contrasting, as was the modern welfare state, which promoted values like autonomy, independence, and self-realization, on the one hand, and community and social responsibility on the other.[33] Over the longer term, the first set of values gained ground compared to the second in the sense that the welfare state's support was informed by individual rather than collective values.

Postwar Norway was a time of high fertility; the country experienced a "baby boom," with 1946 as the year with the highest birth rate.[34] The new suburbs were particularly crowded with children. Erik shares that Bøler elementary school was "presumably the second biggest in Norway. When I started at school in 1962, we were 300 first graders and three classes in my grade."[35] How did congested houses and the large number of children influence parenting strategies in the cities, suburbs, and rural districts?

Parenting Strategies in the Norwegian Welfare State

> I was born in 1949 and grew up with my mother, father and two brothers in an old apartment building in the center of Oslo; in the Majorstua-Marienlyst district. It was a time of huge postwar cohorts of children … Same-aged playmates were accordingly no problem. We lived in a small apartment and so did many other families as well. . . . The message to most of us was usually: "Go out and play! . . . I think we were about 40-50 children just from 10-12 apartment staircases. At that time, the grownups cared minimally about what the children did outdoors, and the means to control was limited. They allowed us to do almost whatever we wanted and sort things out for ourselves.[36]

This girl, born in Oslo in 1949, remembers childhood in ways that seem to reflect important features of urban housing and living conditions in postwar Norway. The large number of offspring meant that children had peers inside and outside their families. Small apartments and a desire for order and quiet indoors made parents, usually the mothers, send the children outdoors, where they spent time together with playmates. Children lived accordingly in an environment where they were out of reach of their parents' control, and they decided for themselves what to do. Parents were, however, still responsible for children's education and a variety of ideas and theories about education and parenting strategies flourished on the book market. What ideas about parenting did the literature at that time express?

On the one hand, contemporary psychologists and ideologists, including Åse Gruda Skard and Nic Waal, advised parents to fulfill the needs of "the happy child" and avoid conflicts between children and parents.[37] They encouraged parents to be close and sensitive to children's needs, to show empathy, and to use intervention and identification as parenting strategies. In the literature, punishment was strongly condemned.[38] At the same time, both the praxis of parenting and the unspoken ideas and norms about parenting and childhood in

postwar Norway are summed up in notions of independence and autonomy, ideals that are deeply rooted in Norwegian culture.[39] This article thus asks the following: Which norms and ideas can we recognize from different rural and urban districts and social classes in the personal stories about parenting at that time? According to the memories, did parents use the advised closeness and intervention or did they use other educational methods?

"I was corporally punished twice. My parents regretted it, we have talked about it later," says Johan, who was born in 1946 in Oslo's West End.[40] This statement can be understood as an expression of different and simultaneously conflicting parenting norms and strategies around corporal punishment at that time. It is hard to discern to what extent and for how long parents eventually used corporal punishment as a parental strategy in postwar Norway. An opinion poll from 1946 shows that 48 percent of parents believed that corporal punishment was an acceptable strategy—thus, close to half of the parents agreed with hitting children in order to make them behave. In 1972, corporal punishment was, however, declared illegal in Norway.[41] We can then assume that corporal punishment gradually went out of practice. We can also assume that when corporal punishment was no longer in use, the emotional relations between parent and child changed. Even if the parent, usually the father, hit his child for his/her "own good," each blow probably provoked feelings like harshness and distance in both fathers and their children. The law of 1972 can be seen as a milestone in a long cultural and emotional change in which the request for parents to use authority and strictness in educating their children to become well behaved and polite was gradually replaced with an ideology and request for parents to educate their children with love and proximity.

Other methods of punishment isolated children who had been naughty or disobedient. Beate shares that after swimming in the river without permission, her mother sent the siblings, Olav and Beate, to bed: "Olav and I were immediately sent to the loft to go to bed, in the middle of the day! . . . The punishment was not too bad."[42] Isolation and exclusion from

friends and/or family, and spending time on one's own, was punishment that hit the child's soul rather than their body and might be experienced as painful. In the aforementioned case, though, Olav and Beate stayed in bed together, so, as expressed in the story, they did not feel that the punishment was too bad.

Strictness and punishment were presumably executed as means for the parents to raise children to become capable adults. According to the interviews, though, did parents express love and care in other ways? From what has been shared, it seems like emotion-based strategies such as bodily and verbal proximity were not parental strategies at that time. Parents' love for their children was expressed through material support. Generally, the father was the breadwinner of the family. In the cities he left early in the morning and arrived home late in the afternoon. In order to support their families, fathers were absent, but they were also absent because they had the freedom to spend time on their own: "Mother and three children went on holidays in the mountains in summer while father went sailing," Hanne shares. She was born in 1956 in Nordstrand, Oslo.[43]

Still, fathers—often in absentia—were referred to authoritatively in families. "Wait till father gets home," was a common phrase mothers used to discipline their children. Families' timetables were adjusted to fathers', so when urban fathers returned from work, dinner was served. Children remember that they had to be punctual: "Father was strict about dinner time; half past four, at that time we had to be home."[44] Fathers stand out as the ones who executed discipline just by being present.

Parenting strategies seem, however, to be a matter of geography and social class. From this working-class home, the daughter tells of a loving father who had close relations with his children:

> My father was very clever at inventing plays! When we went hiking, he could stop and make small waterfalls with his shoes so we could sail there with matches. . . . He joined us on the ski slope and held us between his legs so we could manage to be standing down the whole slope. I remember that he was laying on the floor together with me making plasticine figures. I also played hairdresser with his hair. I think he was ahead of his time. He worked shift and when he was off work, he went on trips with us so my mother could have some time on her own.[45]

This story about a loving working-class father has historical references. In Norwegian history, such popular child-rearing practices were regarded to be non-controlling and permissive.[46] The aforementioned father was close to his children, spent time with them, and ensured his wife had some relief during the day. Such fathers were, however, exceptions. In another story, we hear about a friend whose father every now and then went out to play with his children. He was, however, "the only parent I knew about who did so."[47]

Parenting is, of course, a matter of individual personalities and differs from one parent to another. We can, however, trace some patterns in parenting styles from postwar Norway in the available documentation. In general, mothers appear as emotionally mild while fathers are presented as the ones who maintained authority and strictness and eventually executed punishment in families:

> In some homes, it was obvious that the parents had different opinions and for one of my friends it was essential to get permission from his mild mother, and get away before his father came home and predictably put his foot down.[48]

The absent-but-strict father appears evenly in memories of urban childhoods. A Swedish inquiry from 1949 about parenting concluded that fathers were mentally and emotionally detached and absent in relation to their children. Norwegian sources and literature conclude

less categorically but point in the same direction. Sunday activities were usually the domain of the fathers. They arranged hikes in the woods and visits to family members or downtown.[49] The Sunday fathers are also present in the memories. “On Sundays we rose up early in the morning and went hiking, following in father’s footsteps,” Hanne, born in 1956 in Oslo, reports.[50] Fathers participated also in playing games, such as chess: “When I was at the age of ten chess became, however, my obsession. I played with my father, who taught me.”[51]

In postwar Norway, the radio was the central place around which all family members gathered, in particular on Saturdays afternoons, says Kjell.[52] Fathers were masters of the radio. The radio reported sport events, news, and entertainment and, from 1947, children’s hour, initiated by psychologist Åsa Gruda Skard and with educators as hosts. The radio was an important normative instrument in constructing family unity, national identity, and, from 1947, child culture.

In the cities, most middle- and working-class mothers stayed home in postwar Norway. Neither before nor after were housewives as numerous as during these years. Still, some 5 to 10 percent of married women were registered as wage workers in the 1950s and 1960s. These women represented conflicting ideas about women’s “place” at the time and can be seen as a precursor to women’s liberation in the 1970s.[53]

Mothers and housewives were the primary child educators. Stay-at-home mothers in urban areas were seen as one reference point for good parenting and motherhood at that time. “Mother was home, it was always someone there to come home to,” says a girl from Oslo who was born in 1956.[54] Housewives were, however, confronted with new demands and sky-high expectations concerning cleaning, order, maintaining a distinguished residence, and cooking, in addition to children’s appearance and upbringing.[55] It was not seen as legitimate to have small children in daycare and kindergarten, and if that was the case, only for a few

hours per day. Hegemonic parenting discourse required that children belonged in their homes together with their mothers. Mothers and children nonetheless spent minimal time together. Except for the very small children, there seems to be a discrepancy between ideals and the reality regarding motherhood and parenting.

In general, we can assume that mothers expressed parental love and care through practical matters, such as care for food, clothing, and clean and tidy homes. According to urban memories, though, mothering practices varied. Some mothers were child-friendly and others were not:

> It was differences between them, differences which related to their attitudes towards children and children's position in the family. Some had open doors for their own children as well as other children, in other homes the desire for tidiness ruled and few traces of children were accepted. Different homes and different opportunities for children's expressions.[56]

In the cities, mothers and housewives were busy keeping the house clean and tidy, getting clothes washed and freshly ironed, and preparing meals. Expectations both internalized and external (social) were enormous and pointed to certain standards. Mothers prioritized clothing, food, and keeping order in their homes, so in the memories many tell such stories: "Mothers stayed home for the most, and they preferred that we played outdoors. In winter sometimes we were allowed to have a friend home."[57] Housework was time-consuming and close physical and emotional contact between mother and child was presumably limited. Investigations from the 1950s indicate that mothers spent one hour per day caring for their children. Mothers were nearby but they did not spend much time together with their children. The belief was that sound and healthy children could manage on their own.[58]

The youngest children, however, lived under their mothers' supervision except for a few, mostly destitute children in the cities who spent the whole day in one of the very few daycares in operation. Such institutions were not only for childcare—the welfare state also had civilizing aims, imparting middle-class standards. This became obvious when a public kindergarten for the children of single and working mothers opened in the east end of Oslo in 1953. Critical voices accused the municipality of extravagance since the kindergarten for destitute east end children was equipped with both porcelain and silver cutlery.[59]

Fig.1A few children attended kindergarten in the 1950s.

Supervised playgrounds where children played outdoors a few hours a day were another kind of child minding available in the cities. This was paid work for nannies, who were responsible for as many as twenty children, sometimes more. At first, these were outdoor nurseries in public parks and, as such, were in accordance with the Norwegian notion of "natural" childcare, which indicated that spending time in nature was good for children.[60] In the 1950s and 1960s, however, the need for shelter, toilets, and places to eat and to dry wet clothes made apparent the need for park infrastructure in the form of small, simple wooden houses.[61]

Schoolgirls cared for the youngest children. They were pram pushers in the afternoons, and this was an attractive job for girls who wanted to earn some pocket money. Paid work strengthened schoolgirls' independence and was an example of postwar Norway's parenting strategy of letting children manage themselves. Both the pram pusher and the child in the pram were children on their own, away from parents' control. The phenomenon seemed to worry no one at that time. Today the pram pushers are gone.

Pram pushing was not the only paid work for children in urban areas; they also had summer jobs and worked at home: "Every summer we had to work; at the factory, weeding,

being a paper boy and at the same time help out at home. . . . Parents were busy working. At home it was doing laundry, hanging it out to dry, fetching firewood,"[62] says Jan Sigvart from Stavanger. He was a working-class kid and he worked for pay in the summer and then at home for no pay. "We started to work early," recalls another boy from eastern Norway.[63] Such memories indicate that children in urban areas worked.[64] Child work can likewise be seen as a parenting strategy in which work is perceived as good for children—teaching them to be self-reliant, independent, responsible, and disciplined.

A few daycares, some supervised playgrounds, pram pushers, and other kinds of child work all contributed to children's education outside of parental control. From what the memories indicate, it seems that parenting strategies in the cities in postwar Norway involved parenting by deputy and distance. Further, it looks like children grew up, more or less, in a "father-absent culture." There was a difference between urban and rural childhoods, however, as expressed in this interview:

> I remember that grown-up relatives from rural areas felt sorry for us Oslo-kids who had to play in the middle of the dirty city—I, however, pitied my cousins who did not have as much as two meters of asphalt to draw a proper hop-scotch.[65]

How were parenting strategies in rural areas different from urban parenting? An investigation of rural districts in western and northern Norway up to the 1980s concludes that rural children to a larger degree participated in the adult world. They had much work, often paid work, such as milking, shoveling, raking hay, feeding livestock, shepherding, fishing, digging potatoes, and housework. Children at different ages worked together with parents and/or other adults:[66] "Many people belonged to the farm community," a boy born in 1945 explains, referring to his childhood locale.[67]

Play was also part of growing up in these districts, and play and work are referred to as interconnected: "Growing up in rural districts or farms meant that play and education were two parts of the same matter," Oddny Jakset (1945) shares. She grew up in the rural district of Lesja. She also underscored children's proximity to nature and animals.[68] Anne (1947) pinpoints as well the close relation between play and work: "I grew up in the countryside, in a smallholding. The woods and fields were our playgrounds when we were free from work," she says.[69] Parental strategies in rural districts were apparently more traditional and work-life oriented.[70] Further, rural parenting strategies seemed to give children more freedom to explore the world on their own:

> I used to say that I grew up on the shoreline. . . . We were not allowed to be on the quay, but on the bergs and on the shoreline was alright. . . . In summer we "swam" in the sea, we kept close to the place where the exit of the sewage was (it was closed), it was warmer there. We did not have a fishing boat, but others had and we were allowed to go out fishing sometimes, but I was most happy being on the shoreline.[71]

In the cities, suburbs and rural areas in postwar Norway, parenting strategies seem to differ but in general they assumedly reinforced—and were reinforced by—ideals of independence and autonomy. The ideals encouraged children to stand on their own feet and spend much time outside of parental control, staying outdoors and in nature. In rural districts, independence through work was an even stronger norm and a virtue of necessity. Long-distance walks back and forth to school made self-reliance a necessity as well. Einar was born in 1937 in Gravdal in Hardanger on the western coast of Norway. Only three families lived there and Einar says that the children "rowed five kilometers back and forth to get to school and shop. Much toil."[72] The school road, long or short, was also an arena where children practiced autonomy, independence, and freedom outside parental control.

Child Culture—Child-to-Child Education

> Young children learned from older children as soon as they were old enough. It is funny to think about, that a children's play culture existed, which was inherited from older to younger and probably was very old. Adults never took part in the play, parents on the sideline was out of the question. Teeth were knocked out sometimes, in particular the boys got silver teeth little by little. [73]

The 1950s appear here as a time when a specific child culture existed. Siblings and age-integrated groups of children grew up, matured, and educated each other in a world of their own. The literature supports this interpretation, claiming that postwar Norway had a specific classical child culture and that neither before nor after were children on their own and uncontrolled like in these years.[74]

The child is subject and agent in child culture, and child cultural activities often presupposed complicated cooperation in which children learned to negotiate, mediate, compromise, and solve social problems.[75] The initial quotation for this section dates from 1950s rural west-coastal Norway. Such narratives commonly emphasized how all children were included and part of a big social and educational set in postwar Norway. In the following account from a medium-sized city in Norway, child culture is remembered as inclusive:

> All children on the street were included, as well as the streets around. The core consisted of ten to twelve children of different ages. . . . The nice thing was that the milieu was so good, everybody played with each other. We were outdoors playing in all kinds of weather.[76]

It seems like child culture in postwar Norway was open. Arne was born in 1957 in a village close to Oslo. He describes growing up in rural surroundings and a field where children were

free to play. He also tells of Strømmen Verksted, a local business. The company had a junkyard, which children used as playground. In Arne's grandfather's empty house, the boys played cards and chess, and Arne himself had a chemical laboratory in the living room. There they made moonshine, a few liters. Halfway through the interview, Arne adds that he was later diagnosed with minor brain damage, something like Asperger's syndrome. He shares that he was a lonely child, but he was included and part of the child community at that time. He was not diagnosed as child, which indicates that in the first decades after World War II, diagnoses to a lesser degree than in later decades divided children into "normal" and "abnormal," insiders and outsiders.[77]

Given the postwar population boom, crowds of children dominated urban landscapes at that time. In settings where older and younger children participated, they share that the older ones took care of and educated the younger ones:

> I was young and usually I had a bigger hand to hold; Bente or Britt—they were safe hands. . . . The very best in childhood was that we younger kids were allowed to be together with older children and then we tried to do everything right even if we did not know the rules exactly.[78]

Through play and outdoor activities in cities and rural districts, young children learned from older ones how to master specific tasks like biking, skiing, skating, swimming, playing ball, and singing games. In such settings, learning was a reciprocal process in which children themselves were masters. Children transmitted skills and practical knowledge from one child generation to the next.

In role play, children copied adult life. Still, children controlled and organized the activities themselves.[79] We can assume that when playing with dolls, which was considered

girl's play, the girls acquired skills such as care, tidiness, punctuality, and emotionality. The girls were free to explore the virtues of motherhood in a world of their own:

> When we were old enough to go away from the apartment blocks, we walked with our doll's pram, juice and food and blanket, and we were allowed to go to Tøyen Botanical Garden where we picnicked—the dolls were seated on the blankets.[80]

Clearly, girls cooperated with each other and copied their mothers, in preparation for later roles as mothers and housewives. Eva, who later became a schoolteacher, underlines the point that through play, children received both cognitive and emotional education:

> Play is education. In play, children acquire knowledge, they play things in order to understand what is going on. Role play is common already in toddlerhood. And gradually it includes emotions, words and personal perceptions and opinions of real life as the child matures and acquires knowledge and insight.[81]

Role play was gender specific; girls played mother and child with dolls or paper dolls, they rolled doll prams and sewed doll clothes. It is evident from the memories that children constructed and reconstructed the gender roles and divisions of that time:

> We cared for dolls and fed them and changed diapers and turned the doll carriage away from the wind and made food before father arrived home. It was just like in our real world . . . father returned from the office and then it was dinner time.[82]

Sometimes the dolls were replaced with children, such as younger siblings: "the seven-year-old sister of mine looked after me," says Per Gustav Nilsen (1952) from Oslo.[83]

Role play is a process in which children make their way into a gender-divided grown-up world. Men's memories show how boys followed masculine roles: They made go-carts, workshops, chemical laboratories, and model trains, and they played war games with toy

soldiers and warships indoors, and cops and robbers and Indians and cowboys outdoors. The Cold War, nuclear threat and political insecurity influenced children's play: "We played heads of states, it was best to be Kennedy but someone had to be Nikita Khrushchev as well," explains Kjell Husvik (1955) from Høland.[84] The macro world intervened in boy's play while the micro world—home and family—dominated girl's play. Cultural, social, and emotional education in play was accordingly gendered. While girls developed practical and emotional skills such as care and proximity, boys learned fighting and anger and fear.

Crossing gender role boundaries was not easy, according to Erik. Collecting pictures and cards was gender specific: "When it came to collecting, the gender division was strong. Glossy prints was the big thing for girls, definitely a girl thing, while boys would not at all approach such an activity."[85] Erik experienced how children were gatekeepers and enforced gender roles as he one day joined a leisure activity:

> It was an organized leisure time activity with equal activities for boys and girls. I participated and the first offered activity was knitting and sewing. I really enjoyed it until I told my playmates about it and their message was clear; that was a girlish thing and nothing for a boy to do and in addition enjoy.[86]

In rural districts, it seems, however, that gender division in play was less strict. Olaf, a boy from a rural inland district, shares that he had a mechanical horse and a doll:

> I had a doll, named Ellen. . . . We jumped in the hay, made corridors and holes in the hay. The grown-ups did not like it since the quality of the hay got poor. We smoked in the hen's house (luckily, the whole farm did not catch fire). We played father, mother, and child in the doll's house. Cowboys and Indians also. We made tails out of leaves. Boys and girls were together—small and bigger ones—we were about the same age, four to five years' age difference.[87]

Olaf grew up in a rural district in central Norway, Toten. He had seemingly no problem playing with a doll, and in his narrative, the doll and horse are ascribed equal value. In Toten, girls and boys played together in different role play, both father and mother and cowboys and Indians. Rural child culture seems less gender divided and more open and complex.

The concepts that, according to the memories, characterize both urban and rural child culture in postwar Norway were community and solidarity. In cities, children played in streets, backyards, paddocks, and small parks: “We had a huge bus stop in front of the place where I lived. . . . We played there in the afternoons. . . . What made the play so funny was the solidarity between us, I believe,” explains a girl born in 1961 who grew up in Oslo’s east end.[88] Places like bus stops, streets, loops, and hills are referred to children’s domains. Here, children ages six through fourteen played without the surveillance of grown-ups. These child-organized cultural spheres appear as important educational arenas in which they mastered physical challenges as well as friendship, solidarity, identity, competition and conflict resolution outside of parental control.

Mastering physical skills—for example, riding a bike—was a way to freedom, Johan explains: “I started biking as soon as I managed the bike and biked to places like Huk and Paradise Bay. This was freedom.”[89] Johan had the feeling that he could go anywhere and achieve anything with his bike. The feelings of freedom and being out of grown-ups’ reach and control was splendid. For girls, also, the bike was a means to freedom, according to this anonymous girl, born in 1947: “On my tenth birthday I got a brand new bike, which was at the top of my wish list. I was proud and now I could bike around in the district—that was freedom.”[90]

Self-built forts in trees, weeds, or snow likewise seemed to particularly symbolize the un-surveilled child culture of postwar Norway. The fort was a grown-ups free space: “Even less

control did the grown-ups have when we were in the wood. There we constructed pine-needle huts and gradually also huts with rope ladders," explains Erik.[91] Another "imagined" place was a rockery, which the children pretended to be a car and made a cockpit and sleeping beds there.[92] Almost all interviewees in this source mention such self-built forts and places as very special:

> We had two big oak trees nearby our house and there we built forts and hung cordage and pulleys so we could upload stuff to the forts. We pretended that the two oaks were a ship and then we sailed away.[93]

The children experienced the forts as their own "rooms," a place where they could retreat, be on their own, or together with playmates. There they could feel independent and free. In such self-constructed environments, the children were bodily present in what Sarah Pink calls atmosphere, which arises from things and people in the environment and brings together things and processes of different types and qualities (the material, the social, the affective) that might generate a range of feelings. Atmosphere can be understood as a spatial experience of being attuned to and by a material world and folds together affect, emotions, and sensation in space.[94] Taking this concept as a point of departure, the assumption is that children in the fort experienced with their bodies an atmosphere constituted by things and people in the environment, and the atmosphere generated feelings of freedom, closeness, coziness, independence, and excitement: "We had huts in the reed. Exciting, because the reed was so high. Age circa nine, ten, eleven. Had a boyfriend. It was fantastic to spend time in his hut. The heartbeat then was the most exciting and the best."[95]

To build and spend time in forts appears as a remarkable and important child cultural experience at the time. According to their memories, children put much effort into building them: "we could keep on for days and it was so cozy to light candles in the cave," explains

Greta.[96] The fort can be interpreted symbolizing postwar Norwegian child culture's main characteristics, namely self-reliance, independence, unity, and community.

Another characteristic of child culture that stands out clearly in the memories is spending time in nature. The forts were located in nature, in woods, fields, snow, beaches and ponds: "Nature was reconstructed into houses, shops with goods and everything we wanted," Anny Østlyng (b. 1947) says.[97] Another girl shares that in winter, children swam among ice floes, skated on the ice and made snow huts and angels in the snow.[98] It seems like water held a strong attraction for children, and in spring, they made dams: "Snow plus gravel was construction material. Think we were two or three on each dam. When we let the water go and the dam below gave in, then the victory was complete."[99] Playing hide-and-seek in the dark, a much-referenced activity, generated another specific atmosphere of excitement. Norwegian child culture seems accordingly to be constructed and reconstructed in shifting natural environments—from coast to mountains, summer and winter, light and dark, and cold and warm weather. The child is in dialogue with, shaped by and shaping, nature and their material surroundings.

Fig. 2 Norwegian children playing in the snow.

How nature, places, and things are in dialogue with and inform the children's development is vital in order to understand child culture and children's education.[100] How children organized themselves in gangs that moved around in the neighborhoods and in nature is another part of this picture. The Sinsen gang organized and ran a track—"the Hasle track"—that was about three kilometers long. The gang organized Sunday trips as well:

> It was a relatively regular routine on Sundays that the Gang living nearby went hiking in the Lillo-field . . . and, not at least shorter or longer bike trips. Most of the boys got

> bikes early, that is to say when we mastered the bike. The bike gave us opportunities to go on trips long distances from home.[101]

Children perceived such independence and spending time away from parental control as positive experiences, according to the memories. The gang phenomenon dates long back in history, but existed still in the postwar years. Belonging to a gang was likely important for children's identity and perception of who they were. Fights between gangs in neighboring districts strengthened internal ties between the members of the gang and constructed simultaneously borders between "insiders" and "outsiders":

> It was fights between the Sinsen gang and Torshov gang in the Torshov valley; it must have been in the middle of the '50s. Those of us who were too young to participate enjoyed watching the fights from a distance. In winter, organized snowball fights were popular as well, but more innocent.[102]

Fights against an external enemy also likely generated loyalty and unity among children in urban areas, with a collective, local identity as the outcome. Gang fights were premised on a lack of supervision, as they were out of parental control and not allowed. Bullying younger kids was not allowed, either, although child culture in the streets was not always nice and harmonic. This narrator tells of an age-based power hierarchy and says that the younger kids feared their elders and the hooligans:

> By virtue of strength and age, they had considerable power so they bullied younger kids, made them steal toys and money from even younger ones, beat them up, made them steal and do criminal acts.[103]

Another girl says that fooling grown-ups was a popular activity, mostly in urban areas. Grown-ups were then the external "enemy." Children made parcels or tied an empty pocketbook to a string, placed it on the road and hid themselves in the bushes. When grown-

ups approached, they pulled the string. To fool grown-ups was considered great fun and since it was on the edge of acceptability, it was experienced as exciting as well.[104] When fooling grown-ups, children constructed an upside-down world where they were the ones in power and grown-ups the childish and foolish ones. Apple stealing and snitching was fun but also a shady business and could satisfy the children's need for excitement and to be disobedient. Spying on old and strange men, like the "Hønsemann," who probably was a bit of an alcoholic, was another mentioned activity. The "Hønsemann" lived in a roost nearby. He was mysterious and scary and children spied on him with a magnifying glass and flashlight.[105]

> We remember the angry men. Those who had zero tolerance for children's noises, who freaked out when they saw children using the lawns for play and recreation and who in general were against children and in particular children who played, moved or opened their mouths.[106]

Such stories tell us that children respected and even feared adults, and adults sometimes used their power to bully and harass children. Further, they share that sometimes children explored forbidden grounds because of the excitement it caused and sometimes fought back if they found grown-up rules unfair: "One day there was a sign in the tree saying that football was not allowed. The sign was removed immediately by older boys who thought that it was too much rules. And, so it was."[107]

A power hierarchy in the streets appears evident: angry men bullied children and older boys bullied younger kids. Child culture in postwar Norway seems to have been a contested space in which children matured and had a variety of experiences. Further, child culture appears as a child-organized space in which child-to-child education took place, promoting physical, cognitive, and emotional skills. Children's emotional education included facing fear,

excitement, and anger, but also safety, care, and belonging. This specific, uncontrolled child culture stands out as one main signifier of growing up in postwar Norway.

"Paradise Lost"? Parenting, Child Culture and Emotions in Postwar Norway

> Today no children can play the way we did because grown-ups see and hear everything that happens.[108]

This article is based on the memories of play and childhood in postwar Norway collected from elderly people in 2016 and 2017. Past and present are interconnected in the memories, so the past is interpreted and evaluated in relation to the present, as the citation above exemplifies. Statements such as "I think that children today often have more adult-directed activities and that is not at all good for them"[109] and "the fact [is] that organized sport, play and outdoor activities have taken over the spontaneous and improvised"[110] are other expressions of how past and present are related in memories, and in general, past parenting strategies and child culture are ascribed positive value. Freedom to be spontaneous, self-governed, and un-surveilled is generally accentuated. The narratives about parenting and child culture in the past can be perceived as a story about a "paradise lost," free, uncontrolled, and wild:

> We ran and biked as far as we dared to, and climbed in trees and in anything which allowed us to climb, we did gymnastics on banisters and stuck our tongues to metallic doorknobs in winter, we spied on drunkards and sweethearts, and held on cars and busses on wintry roads and threw snowballs at each other and broke each other's teeth, arms and legs and we did all such things that children today just can only dream of being allowed to or have the possibility to do.[111]

Such narratives are both mythical and nostalgic, and thus the concluding question is: based on the interpretations of the memories, how can we understand parenting, child culture, and emotional relations in postwar Norway?

Interviewees obviously interpret and value the past and tell stories in ways that are both subjective and normative. Still, some common features concerning parenting, child culture, and emotional relations in postwar Norway are evident. First, we have seen that even if the Norwegian welfare state considered families and homes to be the main institutions for children's growth and education, a primary parenting strategy was to send the children outdoors and let them manage themselves. This strategy can be characterized as authoritative parenting—that is, a strategy that encourages children's autonomous and independent strivings.[112] This parenting strategy corresponds with the norms of independence, self-realization, autonomy, community, solidarity, and joint responsibility that were key elements in the welfare state's political culture. When children were entrusted to neighborhoods, streets, and that time's specific child culture, children learned to adjust, negotiate, and solve problems together with playmates. The uncontrolling parenting strategy, however, did expose children to accidents. In Oslo in 1951, twenty-three children died in traffic, drowning, suffocation, and fall accidents. In 1982, only one child died under such circumstances.[113]

Further, this parenting strategy seems to be emotionally distant. The memories tell of children who spent time outdoors together with playmates. Such distant parenting can be seen as a caring strategy to secure children's futures, since self-reliant and autonomous children would presumably succeed when they as adults entered the stable and safe state-regulated labor market. In postwar Norway, when the interwar crises were still top of mind, we can also understand that it was a practical expression of parental love and care to ensure that children had shelter, food, and clean and tidy homes and clothes.

From the memories here, we have seen that the 1950s and 1960s were decades when a time specific child culture flourished. Siblings and age-integrated groups of children lived in a world of their own in which they grew up with and educated each other. Physical, cognitive, and emotional resources and skills were presumably as much acquired horizontally in child-to-child relations as between generations. Staying outdoors together with playmates in the streets and in nature in all kinds of Norwegian weather can also be seen as physically and culturally educational. Children learned to be strong and healthy, according to Norwegian welfare state norms and values.

Finally, how can we understand parenting strategies and child culture in postwar Norway in relation to contemporary strategies and culture? In contemporary pedagogic and psychologic literature, many of today's caregivers are referred to as "helicopter parents," "tiger mums," and "curling-parents," and the younger generation as "generation perfect" and/or "generation perform."[114] The literature points to high pressure on the young generation to succeed, indicating today's parents' increasing efforts to ensure that their children win in sports, education, and their future work. Further, the literature underscores that the pressure has a disciplining effect on the young generation as parents and adult survey and control play, friends, homework, and extracurriculars. Increased infantilization is another consequence highlighted in the literature and, in addition, the fact that children and youth have become more dependent on their parents economically and emotionally.[115] Contemporary parenting is characterized by a new child-centered strategy, which implies close proximity and an emotional investment in the child. Children's needs are constantly centered in the family and parents do whatever they regard as needed in order to support the child's self-development. Proximity, emotionality, and intimacy are likewise focused in child education and parents seek to remove the traditional role-based distance with their children—they want to break down generational differences.[116] The child-centered family is not only a Norwegian

phenomenon. According to Paula S. Fass, the change was visible in America in the 1970s and 1980s and became high on the social agenda in the 1980s. Children of middle-class parents had less freedom of physical movement and less room to explore alternatives to the success-driven futures their parents had designed for them.[117]

These few glimpses into contemporary parenting discourses and research point to differences and changes between the past and present concerning parental strategies, child culture, and intergenerational emotional relations. Even though the changes have roots in the past and can be seen in a longer historical perspective, the most remarkable time of change was probably the years after 1975, when the classical era of the Norwegian welfare state downscaled. According to the memories here and the contemporary literature, children's play and outdoors activities have changed from being spontaneous and improvised—and on natural playgrounds, within the frames of children's own agency, and outside adults' control—to organized activities on constructed venues such as tennis courts, football fields, and adult-supervised pools. Likewise, parenting strategies have changed from distant to present and active, as parents support and push their children to triumph in arenas of education, sports, appearance, and the arts, so they can perform and succeed in the future competitive global neoliberal labor market. Educational reforms such as Reform 94, *Kunnskapsløftet* (2006), with 13000 benchmarks, and the *Program for International student Assessment* (PISA, 2000), plus increasing testing in kindergarten and school can be seen as consequences of but also reinforcing such changes. Discipline, infantilization, and dependency are probable consequences here, as well as the end of a self-governed child culture.

An underlying assumption in this article is the constancy of parental love and that the interpretation of the memories herein has shown *how* parents loved and cared for their children in postwar Norway. The study suggests, however, that the *ways* parents loved their

children has changed dramatically from emotionally distant to in close proximity in the years between 1950 and 2020.

---

[1] Girl born 1947 in Oslo/Carl Berner, NEG 0259/00099, Norwegian Folk Museum (NFM).
[2] See Jan Eyvind Myhre, *Barndom i storbyen. Oppvekst i Oslo i velferdsstatens epoke* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1994), 75.
[3] Myhre, *Barndom i storbyen*, 15.
[4] Girl born 1947 in Østfold, NEG 0259/00095, NFM.
[5] *Cf* Jostein Lorås, "Muntlige kilder – faktuelle eller narrative lesemåter?" *Historisk tidsskrift* 86, no. 3 (2007): 436.
[6] Ingar Kaldal, *Historisk forståing og forteljing* (Oslo: Samlaget, 2003), 96.
[7] Ute Frevert, *Emotions in History—Lost and Found* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2011), 132, 133.
[8] Peter N. Stearns, "Childhood Emotions in Modern Western History," in *Childhood in the Western World*, ed. Paula S. Fass (New York: Routledge, 2013), 158–73.
[9] Frevert, *Emotions in History*, 98.
[10] Frevert, *Emotions in History*, 213.
[11] Ellen Schrumpf, "En tredje vending i barndomshistorien? Fra struktur til kultur og materialitet," *Historisk Tidsskrift* 91, no. 2 (2012): 251–78.
[12] Linda Pollock, *Forgotten Children: Parent-Child Relations from 1500 to 1900* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 42, 43.
[13] See, for example, Lloyd deMause, ed., The History of Childhood (New York: The Psychohistory Press, 1974); Elisabeth Badinter, *Det naturligste av verden? Om morskjærlighetens historie* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1981); Philippe Ariés, *Barndommens historie* (Oslo: Gyldendal, 1981).
[14] Jane B. Brooks, *The Process of Parenting*, 9th ed. (New York: McGraw Hill Higher Education, 2012).
[15] Julia Grant, "Parent-Child Relations in Western Europe and North America, 1500–Present," in *Childhood in the Western World*, ed. Paula S. Fass (New York: Routledge, 2013), 103–24, 117.
[16] Per Olav Tiller, *Hverandre. En bok om barneforskning* (Oslo: Gyldendal, 1989), 77; Åse Enerstvedt, *Kongen over gata* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget), 12.
[17] Steven Mintz, "The Changing Face of Children's Culture," in *Reinventing Childhood after World War II*, eds. Paula S. Fass and Michael Grossberg (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 38–50, 39.
[18] Girl born 1948 at Borgestad, a rural place between two Norwegian cities in southern Norway. NEG 0259/00047, NFM.
[19] Anne-Lise Seip, *Veiene til velferdsstaten* (Oslo: Gyldendal, 1994), 15, 16.
[20] Ellen Schrumpf, "Det hygieniske barnet. Oppdragelsesidealer ved overgangen til " barnets århundre," in *Den mangfoldige velferden. Festskrift til Anne-Lise Seip*, eds. Edgeir Benum, Per Haave, Hilde Ibsen, Aina Schiøtz, Ellen Schrumpf (Oslo: Gyldendal, 2003), 76.
[21] Bengt Sandin, "Children and the Swedish Welfare State: From Different to Similar," Paula S. Fass and Michael Grossberg, *Reinventing Childhood after World War II* (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 110–38, 110.
[22] Seip, *Veiene til velferdsstaten*, 187.

---

[23] Tora Korsvold, *For alle Barn! Barnehagens framvekst i velferdsstaten* (Oslo: Abstrakt forlag, 1998), 19, 84, 91.
[24] Seip, *Veiene til velferdsstaten*, 127.
[25] Tora Korsvold, *Perspektiver på barndommens historie* (Bergen: Fagbokforlaget, 2016), 72.
[26] Myhre, *Barndom i storbyen*, 130.
[27] Aina Schiøtz, *Viljen til liv. Medisin- og helsehistorie frå antikken til vår tid* (Oslo: Samlaget, 2017), 253.
[28] Elsa Reiersen and Elisabeth Thue, *De tusen hjem. Den Norsk Stas Husbank 1946–1996* (Oslo: Gyldendal, 1996), 144.
[29] Myhre, *Barndom i storbyen*, 104.
[30] Monica Rudberg, *Dydige, sterke, lykkelige barn. Ideer om oppdragelse i borgerlig tradisjon* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1983), 58, 59, 213.
[31] Schiøtz, *Viljen til liv*, 269.
[32] Schrumpf, "En tredje vending i barndomshistorien," 251–78.
[33] Per Olav Tiller, "Barns beste den gang—og nå?" in *Velferdssamfunnet barn*, eds. Tordis Dalland Evans, Ivar Frønes og Lise Kjølsrød (Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal, 1994): 20.
[34] In 1946, the number of newborns was 71,157, in 1956, the number had decreased to 64,371, and in 2019 the number was 53,788. SSB tab. 05532.
[35] Boy born 1955 in Oslo, NEG 0259/00039, NFM.
[36] Girl born 1949 in Oslo, NEG 0259/00025, NFM.
[37] Rudberg, *Dydige, sterke, lykkelige barn*, 225.
[38] Rudberg, *Dydige, sterke, lykkelige barn,* 215, 217.
[39] Tiller, *Hverandre,* 81.
[40] Boy born 1946 in Oslo, NEG 0259/0031, NFM.
[41] In 1972, the law, which gave parents the right to punish their children, was repealed, despite the opinion that the right to use physical punishment in child-rearing still existed. From the 1980s, however, it became clear that punishment such as spankings and beatings were no longer accepted and considered illegal. Nevertheless, it was not expressed in the 1981 child law. In 2010, there was zero tolerance for all kinds of slaps and spankings in Norway. *Aftenposten* March 3, 2015.
[42] Girl born 1959 at Andøya, northern Norway, NEG 0259/00105, NFM.
[43] Girl born in 1956 in Oslo, NEG 0259/00129, NFM.
[44] Boy born in 1941 in Stavanger, NEG 0259/00112, NFM.
[45] Girl born in 1955, NEG 0259/00077, NFM.
[46] Rudberg, *Dydige, sterke, lykkelige barn*, 82.
[47] Girl born in 1949 in Oslo, NEG 0259/00025, NFM.
[48] Boy born in 1946 in Oslo/Sinsen, NEG 0259/00121, NFM.
[49] See Myhre, *Barndom i storbyen*, 109, 110.
[50] Girl born in 1956 in Oslo, NEG 0259/00129, NFM.
[51] Boy born in 1946 in Oslo/ Sinsen, NEG 0259/00121, NFM.
[52] Boy born in 1955 in Høland, NEG 0259/00107, NFM.
[53] Ellen Cathrine Lund, "Med lønnsarbeid i husmorperioden—Rjukankvinner på tvers," *Arbeiderhistorie* (2001): 9, 24.
[54] Girl born in 1956 in Oslo, NEG. 0259/00129, NFM.
[55] Myhre, *Barndom i storbyen,* 76.
[56] Boy born in 1946 in Oslo/ Sinsen, NEG 0259/00121, NFM.
[57] Girl born in 1952 in Bærum, NEG 0259/00033, NFM.
[58] Myhre, *Barndom i storbyen*, 108, 109.
[59] Myhre, *Barndom i storbyen,* 119.
[60] See Ellen Schrumpf, *Barndomshistorie* (Oslo: Samlaget, 2007), 44.

[61] Tove Solbakken, *Barneparken. Arbeid og frihet for kvinner* (Oslo: Byantikvaren Omsorgsbygg, 2019): 78.
[62] Boy born in 1941 in Stavanger, NEG 0259/00108, NFM.
[63] Boy born in 1955 in Høland, NEG 0259/00107, NFM.
[64] In 1892, children's work was regulated and children younger than twelve years were not allowed to work in factories. Children's work in primary industries was never regulated in Norway. See Schrumpf, *Barndomshistorie,* 50.
[65] Girl born in 1949 in Oslo, NEG 0259/00025, NFM.
[66] Tiller, *Hverandre*, 106.
[67] Boy born in 1945 at Toten, NEG 0259/00056, NFM.
[68] Girl born in 1945 at Lesja, NEG 0259/00137, NFM.
[69] Girl born in 1947 in a rural place, NEG 0259/00059, NFM.
[70] See Ellen Schrumpf, *Barnearbeid—plikt eller privilegium?* (Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget, 1997).
[71] Girl born 1956 in Honningsvåg, NEG 0259/00008, NFM.
[72] Boy born 1937 in Gravdal in Hardanger, NEG 0259/00120, NFM.
[73] Girl born 1953 in west coastal Norway, NEG 0259/00063, NFM.
[74] See Myhre, *Barndom i storbyen*, 95.
[75] Tiller, *Hverandre*, 77, 79.
[76] Girl born in 1950, NEG 0259/00033, NFM.
[77] Psychologist Ole J. Madsen claims that the growth in diagnosis has increased for each generation in postwar Norway and that diagnoses are instruments of social control. Ole J. Madsen, *Generasjon prestasjon* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2018), 20.
[78] Girl born in 1959 at Andøya, NEG 0259/00104, NFM.
[79] Myhre, *Barndom i storbyen*, 92, 95.
[80] Girl born 1947 in Oslo/Carl Berner, NEG 0259/00099, NFM.
[81] Girl born 1955 in Askim, NEG 0259/00093, NFM.
[82] Girl born 1945 in Bærum, NEG 0259/00079, NFM.
[83] Boy born 1952 in Oslo, NEG 0259/00062, NFM.
[84] Boy born 1955 in Høland, NEG 0259/00107, NFM.
[85] Boy born 1946 in Oslo/Sinsen, NEG 0259/00121, NFM.
[86] Boy born 1946 in Oslo/Sinsen, NEG 0259/00121, NFM.
[87] Boy born 1945 at Toten, NEG 0259/00056, NFM.
[88] Boy born 1961 in Oslo/Grønland, NEG 0259, NFM.
[89] Boy born 1946 in Oslo/Frogner Oslo, NEG 0259, NFM.
[90] Girl born 1947 in Oslo/Carl Berner, NEG 0259/00099, NFM.
[91] Boy born 1955 in Oslo, NEG 0259/00039, NFM.
[92] Boy born 1957, NEG 0259/00027, NFM.
[93] Boy born 1957, NEG 0259/00027, NFM.
[94] See Sarah Pink et al., "Researching in Atmospheres," *Visual Communication* 14, no. 3 (2015): 352, 353.
[95] Girl born 1945 in Bærum, NEG 0259/00076, NFM.
[96] Girl born 1956 in Honningsvåg, NEG 0259/00008, NFM.
[97] Girl born 1947, NEG 0259/00059, NFM.
[98] Girl born 1956 in Oslo/Nordstrand Oslo, NEG 0259/00129, NFM.
[99] Boy born 1942 in Oslo, NEG 0259/00030, NFM.
[100] Ellen Schrumpf, "Barns omsorgserfaringer—et historisk perspektiv," in *Omsorgsforståelser. Mellom poesi, profesjon og politikk*, ed. Randi Kroken (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2018), 117–36.
[101] Boy born 1946 in Oslo/Sinsen, NEG 0259/00121, NFM.

[102] Boy born 1946 in Oslo/Sinsen, NEG 0259/00121, NFM.
[103] Boy born 1946 in Oslo/Sinsen, NEG 0259/00121, NFM.
[104] Girl born 1952 in Bærum, NEG 0259/00031, NFM.
[105] Girl born 1952 in Bærum, NEG 0259/00031, NFM.
[106] Boy born 1946 in Oslo/Sinsen, NEG 0259/00121, NFM.
[107] Girl born 1947 in Oslo/Carl Berner, 0259/00099, NFM.
[108] Girl born 1955 in Askim, NEG 0259/00093, NFM.
[109] Girl born 1955, NEG 0259/00077, NFM.
[110] Boy born 1946 in Oslo/ Sinsen, NEG 0259/00121, NFM.
[111] Girl born 1949 in Oslo, NEG 0259/00025, NFM.
[112] Diana Baumrind, "Current Patterns of Parental Authority," *Developmental Psychology Monograph* 4, no. 1(2) (1971): 2. Other parenting strategies are the authoritarian and permissive.
[113] [113] Myhre, *Barndom i storbyen*, 152.
[114] Bent Hougaard, *Curlingforeldre og servicebarn: en håndbok i barneoppdragelse* (Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk, 2005); Ole Jacob Madsen, *Generasjon prestasjon.*
[115] Harriet Bjerrum Nilsen, "Spenningen mellom seksualisering og infantilisering," *Nordisk tidsskrift for ungdomsforskning* 1 (2020): 7, 8.
[116] Per Are Løkke, "Å hakke seg ut av egget." *Tidsskrift for Norsk Psykologforening* 53 (2016).
[117] Paula S. Fass, "The Child-Centered Family? New Rules in Postwar America," Paula S. Fass and Michael Grossberg, *Reinventing Childhood after World War II* (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 1–18, 11.