The social construction of everyday concepts. Constructing the "tween"[1]

Ingvild Kvale Sørenssen

This paper discusses the social construction of the concept tween and whether this concept can be useful when engaging in research with children in the ages of 8–12. The paper will start by describing social construction, from there, the paper will move on to everyday concepts, before discussing the concept tweens as a theoretical and empirical concept. A question to be asked is: is the tween an everyday concept? Who or what constructs tweens? As the concept derived from marketing efforts (Cook and Kaiser 2004; Sørenssen 2014) another question becomes: should we use it as academics and general public? And if we do use the concept, what do we gain or possibly lose when using the term? What are the possible limits or benefits tied to engaging with this concept?

The social construction of everyday concepts

The notion of social construction implies that a concept is not a natural given but rather is created and given meaning by someone or through interaction with different actors.

Concepts are socially constructed, what they come to mean are socially constructed. Concepts do not merely appear and arrive in our communal social consciousness. Concepts are not something that can be found and that are untainted by human interaction. Concepts are language. We speak – we embed meaning in our talk. Ideas and concepts are not neutral or factual, they are laden with meaning. These meanings are not solely defined by the use of language but also through objects and practices, as Hacking states. "Concepts, practices and people interact with each other. Such interaction is often the very point of talk about social construction" (Hacking 1999: 29). This is what we are interested in, the interaction between concepts, practices and people.

A problem with the term social construction is the word social. Hacking (1999) suggests we move away from using social to merely using construction. In Hackings view, concepts cannot be anything *but* socially constructed, rendering the word social to be redundant, and should only be used when discussing inanimate objects, phenomena or facts that are usually thought of as part of nature, existing independent of human society (Hacking 1999: 40). However, I would argue that social is not only redundant, it also favours the social over the material rendering the material invisible. This is problematic. When exploring concepts, we need to give credit to other actors in addition to the social actors taking part in the construction. The world is not merely social, it is highly material. Non-human entities, be it body, chairs, books or television programs, also inform the construction of a concept. Therefore we need a theoretical perspective

which enables us to account for the material and non-human entities which also take part in the construction of a concept. I will now give two examples of concepts and discuss how they are constructed.

The first example is the concept of childhood. In 1962 Philippe Ariès in the book *Centuries of childhood* claimed that: "In medieval society, the idea of childhood did not exist" (Ariès 1962: 125). Ariès used artwork from the medieval times to illustrate this. This book has later been criticized. However, Ariès still stands as one of the major contributors to the field of childhood history and social studies of children and childhood (Corsaro 1997). In addition Ariès' book opened up for the concept of childhood not always being the same thing, and what we consider the concept of childhood to contain today in our part of the world is thus constructed in a specific time and place and culture. Thus, childhood can be perceived not as something solely biological, but rather as something social which is ever changing and constructed by people and things that are used to do childhood, like prams, toys, lunchboxes and children's bodies.

Another example of constructed concept is the child viewer. This is a concept which, as Hacking (1999) argues, is a useless and meaningless category. The child viewer is a construct. According to Hacking, the child viewer of television was not a definite class of children until the child viewer of television became thought of as a social problem. When people started being afraid that television would make children violent and made into consumers too soon, that was when then the child viewer became constructed as a concept. According to Hacking the child viewer was reconstructed in 1997 at a world congress on the child viewer of television; the child viewer was no longer perceived as passive victims but was rather presented as active and competent actors. The reason for this change Hacking (1999) states was new technology and interactivity. Hence, the construction of the concept of child viewer was actively reconstructed due to material entities such as technology.

A problem with constructed concepts from the outside, as is the case with the child viewer, is that it is not informed by children's voices, but rather by moralizing voices. The classification and construction of the abstract child viewer thus does not necessarily resonate with those considered to be child viewers. Thus, not only is the concept of the child viewer constructed as a certain classification, it is also the children themselves who become constructed or reconstructed as child viewers. This might influence how children perceive themselves as child viewers. As Bowker and Star state: "People get put into categories and learn from those categories how to behave" (2000: 311). Thus a point to be made is that if we make use of the label "the child viewer" we take part in constructing a definite kind of person or as Hacking argues, we construct the child viewer as a species (1999). This then becomes real, parents might think of their children as child viewers and children might also think of themselves as child viewers. The concept can therefore have an influence on the lived lives of those put into the categories. There is power in constructing concepts and categories. The constructions are not merely abstract but can have real outcomes.

If we consider the concept of the social in social construction, as a concept the child viewer is not merely socially constructed. The child viewer is also constructed by the material artefacts of the television as an entity, television programs, the child as body as well as the social surroundings of the child. Thus, we need to embed the material

or the technical in this construction as well. We need to see the construction of concepts as not merely social but also give an account for the material or the non-human actors.

Everyday concepts

Let us now turn to everyday concepts and one of the leading theorists of the everyday: Erving Goffman. Goffman made use of everyday concepts such as the stage, the actor, back stage and front stage and other dramaturgical metaphors from the theatre realm in order to scrutinize the interaction between people (Goffman 1959). To encompass the social interactions people have with each other Goffman stated that we were all, to some extent, acting according to what frame we were in. This is explored in his book *Frame Analysis* (Goffman 1974). On frames Goffman states that frames are: "the principals of organization which govern events – at least social ones – and our subjective involvement in them" (Goffman 1974: 11). Thus, when we come into a room or any other social setting we first assess what type of frame we find ourselves in, based on previous experiences with these frames we then act accordingly as to not lose face, as this, according to Goffman, is one of the main goals we as humans have. According to Goffman we work on our impression management, and engage in facework to preserve both our own face and the face of those which we have dealings with (Goffman 1955).

The notion of frames when discussing the construction of an everyday concept is beneficial, however Goffman does not leave much room for the individual to change the frame, to act against it, as this would lead to loss of face and would then require some extensive face saving. A question is where do these frames come from? Who has the power of definition and who stages? To use theatrical metaphors as Goffman so eloquently does in his writings: Who provides the stage, the props, and the scenery? How does a concept become constructed? How does it attain meaning? How can a frame change?

To theoretically afford more agency to the individual within a frame and within a concept, as well as seeing the work the non-human objects do in a construction, I employ actor-network theory (ANT). Drawing on Latour (2005), with his sociotechnical or social-material view, we can elucidate how both humans and non-humans, such as objects and concepts co-construct the frames and concepts. In this perspective things, people, and concepts do not merely come into being on their own, but rather are mutually enacted within a network consisting of different human and non-human actors and practices. This does not mean that power is distributed equally among the actors: "ANT is not, I repeat is not, the establishment of some absurd 'symmetry between humans and non-humans'. To be symmetric, for us, simply means not to impose a priori some spurious asymmetry among human intentional action and a material world of causal relations" (Latour 2005: 76). By decentring the subject and rather pay attention to materials and practices we can focus on how children, childhood, and non-human items are mutually constitutive. Drawing on ANT opens Goffman's frames to be flexible, negotiable and continuously being constructed and re-constructed. Or in the language of ANT, assembled and reassembled.

Tweens

If we now move focus from general concepts to specifically talking about "the tween" as a concept a question is: what is this concept?

How is it constructed and by whom and what? For those who are not familiar with the tween concept I will briefly describe it.

Tween as a concept and consumer group did not suddenly appear. It is a concept derived from marketing efforts in order to target and segment a consumer group by which marketers can then cater to, making more revenue (Cook 2004; Turow 1997).

Tween is a concept and a category encompassing those who are seen to reside in the space between childhood and teenagers approximately aged 8–12 (Sørenssen 2012). Thus this concept contains what Hacking (1999) calls a species, tween is a concept classifying people according to age. Bourdieu states when arguing that youth is just a word, that "Age is a biological datum, socially manipulated and manipulable; and that merely talking about 'the young' as a social unit, a constituted group, with common interests, relating these interests to a biologically defined age, is in itself an obvious manipulation" (Bourdieu 1993: 95). Thus, by classifying children or people based on biological age, we are indeed constructing, or manipulating, concepts and in prolongation, we construct "real" people.

Perceiving tweens as an everyday concept, we can view the everyday concepts from a top-down approach or as a bottom-up approach. Regarding the top-down construction of tweens as an everyday concept I will briefly discuss three such constructions: the marketers, general media, and academics before moving on to the bottom-up approach: learning from those classified.

The top-down approach

From the top-down construction, tweens can be seen as a concept, the same way that the child viewer discussed earlier was con-structed. The top-down construction of tweens as an everyday concept is done from the outside of the everyday lived context but attempts to describe the everyday.

Marketers and those invested in this concept attempt to create and construct a concept and a reality so that we conceptualize children the ages 8–12 differently than we previously did. Tweens are by marketers constructed as competent and strong consumers which are hard to sell to, but it is still "worth the pain" as Lindstrom and Seybold states (2004: 46). For tweens are by some marketers considered as the heart of the child market (Siegel, Coffey, and Livingston 2004). There are mainly three reasons for this: tweens are thought to have an enormous spending capacity on their own. Tweens are seen as having a say in parents purchasing from cereal and shampoo to computers and cars (Lindstrom and Seybold 2004; Siegel et al., 2004). The third reason to target tweens is that they are perceived as consumers today as well as they represent consumers tomorrow.

In addition, from the top-down construction, tweens as a concept is used in the media, when talking about sexualisation of children (Bragg, Buckingham, Russell, and Willett 2011). Like the child viewer, tween and especially tween girls becomes a concept when there is something which is considered to be problematic. However, tweens as a concept is not only constructed as problematic in the general media. For example when President Obama took office in 2008, the concept tween was used about his daughters, which at that time were in their tween-ages (Sørenssen 2014). Thus, as a general media concept it is also used for describing age.

Academic construction or use of the concepts tweens is also a top-down construction of everyday concepts. James,

Jenks and Prout (1998); Adler, Adler and Mandell (1986); and Borland, Laybourn, Hill and Brown (1998) all call attention to the lack of focus on what they call childhood's middle years. Thus there seems to be a gap in theorizing this space. Lately, there has been a number of research projects investigating consumption in childhood, and academics look more specifically at the tween (see for example: Andersen 2011b; Bickford 2012; Cody 2012; Kafai 2008; McGladrey 2013; Tufte and Rasmussen 2005; Willett 2005). The studies mostly focus on the meaning of tween's consumption, media use and ICT use. The studies offer great insights in construction of the tween "space" by tweens and their navigation through the structures around them by for example exploring why it's not necessarily thought of as OK for a fifth grader to wear thongs (Rysst 2010), or why when starting junior high one should get a pair of Levi's jeans as part of ones anticipatory socialization strategy (Wærdahl 2003). These studies thus include material artefacts in the construction of this space.

In all the three constructions mentioned here, tweens are constructed in relation to consumption, except possibly at times within the general media, where tween is also used as an age demarcation. For the marketers this is not problematic as they construct tweens as savvy and competent consumers whom are hard to reach. Both within the general media and in academics discourses, there has been a tendency to focus on potential risks, sexualisation, and the loss of childhood; Kids Growing Older Younger (KGOY) (Andersen 2011a). Like the concept of the child viewer it becomes a concept which we talk about when it is seen as troublesome.

I want to argue that we can make use of the concept tweens and widen it, in an at-

tempt to avoid reducing children in this age space merely as consumers, when using the concept of tweens. Yes, consumption does play a pivotal part in western children's lives today; however consumption cannot be isolated and is only one of several factors which are a part of the everyday life of those inhabiting the age group that is considered tweens today.

The bottom-up approach

In order to understand the construction of this social space, there is a need to investigate how children inhabiting the age group that is defined as tweens make meaning of this space in addition to how the market and academic literature theorize this space. This is the bottom-up approach, the emic approach. Looking at what those classified as tweens think and do allows for a different understanding than merely discussing the concept tweens as constructed by marketers, academics, or the media.

The so called tweens in my study did not make use of the concept tweens and therefore did not domesticate, or incorporate the concept. But they did mirror the description of tweens. They talked about themselves as being in-between younger children and teenagers. They described themselves as shifting between different age performances. This is what I label age shifting and what I found to be a key feature in the children's construction of the tween category (Sørenssen 2014). Age shifting is the possibility to shift between engaging in childhood and teenager repertoires depending on the situational and relational contexts and frames. Age shifting I found could be induced due to both social frames and enabled by the use of material objects. The quote under exemplifies how social frames regulate age shifting:

Ida: In school we're like teenagers at home we're more like, we go out to play in the snow and stuff.

In this quote, doing tween, does not entail material objects but is rather situated in practice. Front stage practice and back stage practice in the words of Goffman (1959). There are limits within frames regarding what age doing is appropriate; playing in the snow at school implicitly in Ida's quote is not appropriate behavior. In my empirical material I found that age shifting was not merely dictated by exterior forces and frames. There were contexts where the frame was more flexible:

Ingvild: Does one outgrow Disney Channel?
Sandy: Well, it's sort of only for periods. Sometimes you want to be a little cool, and then you watch The Voice or MTV, and sometimes sort of childish and then watch Disney.

In this quote we see that Sandy can age shift within the same frame, as a back stage practice. Here both age repertoires are equal depending on Sandy's mood. This quote also exemplifies how a non-human entity such as television channels becomes part of the practice of tweenhood. Age shifting, I found, can thus be done with the help of artefacts. In the quote above television channels act as artefacts, however, age shifting can also be done through practice without direct ties to consumer goods as in the case with Ida. This also suggests the need to incorporate artefacts and non-human entities in the exploration of the construction of a concept. Doing tween is not merely social.

Tweens is a concept which can encompass more than merely children as con-

sumers. It is a constructed age category where the main characteristic is that inhabitants of this category move between acting like a child and acting like a teenager. And although one might argue that all age categories give leeway to acting out different age identities, no other age category is defined as having their feet in two different age identities in the same way and this is also what I found in my empirical material.

Whether the concept tween will steadily gain ground in the future, is unknown. There are examples of constructed concepts derived from marketing efforts which have leaked into the public as a "natural" age and stage in life. Toddler for example is a concept which did not originally come from marketing efforts, however it was the clothing industry in the 1930s who popularized this concept according to Cook (2004). Today when we speak of toddlers, usually one does not connect it with clothes or marketing, rather the concept has come to mean a stage in children's lives from they stand up till they quit diapers. If tweens as a concept will travel the same route that toddler did, is too soon to tell, but it is a possibility.

Why use a market constructed concept?

To classify is human state Bowker and Star (2000) and pose the question: what work do classifications do? So while we can be informed and inspired by Goffman (1959, 1974) regarding exploring the everyday life, Bowker and Star (2000) take a step back and examine what is it we do when we classify and sort things out?

Theorizing this age group could be useful as researchers have called attention to the lack of focus on the middle years of childhood theoretically. In addition, as the children I talked to clearly classified them-

selves as differing from those older and those younger, empirically there also seems to be a gap which can be filled with the concept of tweens. Therefore I want to argue that using the term tweens as a name of a category of children who are thought of as being in-between childhood and teenagers can be useful.

Bowker and Star (2000) talk about dances between the classifier and the classified. We can view this as a dance between the marketers and children in the ages 8–12.

> We have nowhere seen either unambiguous entities wanting to be classified or unified agencies seeking to classify them. The act of classification is of its nature infrastructural, which means to say that it is both organizational and informational, always embedded in practice (320).

We need to explore the lived lives and the practices of those classified in order to understand their place in society as well as their own understandings of this place. Marketers and academics describe belonging to the tween category as having multiple identities as being the actual core of the category, a metaphor often used is straddling feet, having one foot in childhood and one in youth (Rysst 2005; Siegel et al. 2004; Tufte 2011). Being a tween thus seems to be defined as moving between age categories. This is what I have observed and labelled age shifting in my work.

What can we indeed learn from the concept tween? I would argue that the importance of analysing how those classified make sense of and understand their classification, and how they domesticate or not, what is offered to them serves as a tool to learn more about tweens. On one hand we cannot learn anything from the concept tweens if we do not explore those classified, this is an important aspect, exploring the classified from an everyday life of those classified. However on the other hand we can also learn that concepts such as classifications are living classifications: "The only good classification is a living classification" (Bowker and Star 2000: 326). This implies that what is embedded in a concept will change in relation to, as I referred to Hacking earlier: concepts, practices and people interact with each other (1999: 29), this is part of what makes classification living. This is also construction talked about earlier, the continuously changing and constructed space.

In relation to Bowker and Star and their living category (2000), I would argue that the concept "tween" is a living classification which is not static and the concept itself, deriving from "in-between" also contains a flexibility at its core: age shifting.

If we go back to Hacking (1999) and his discussion on the child viewer which he rendered as meaningless and a category which we are better without, in relation to the concept tweens – is this concept meaningless and one which we are better without? The concept tweens is constructed as a market segment and therefore poses as a problem for both academics and the general media, exactly because of its ties with the consumer world. In addition there are threats implied that, like the child viewer, kids grow up too fast, become too materialistic and are somehow at risk. However, I do not find the concept to be meaningless as the children I talked to resonated with the content of the concept tweens, and there seemed to be an empirical gap in the classification of children.

The concept of child viewer was reconstructed, or reassembled, moving from constructing the child viewer as passive

towards active, according to Hacking, in part due to the development of new technologies: "Children's relationships to screen change because of changes in the material world of manufacture and commerce. But they also change because of the way in which these phenomena are conceptualized" (Hacking 1999: 28). This then influences how we perceive a concept, what it means, but also has "real" outcomes, in that the concept influences practices.

According to Hacking there is a phenomenon he calls the looping effect, this means that "what was known about people of a kind may become false because people of that kind have changed in virtue of what they believe about themselves" (Hacking 1999: 34). This suggests a self-fulfilling prophecy and renders us to be cautious in how we take part in constructing a concept and a category. There is power in classifying and taking part in the construction of concepts, this is something we need to be aware and vary of.

> Classification by age (but also by sex and of course class...) always means imposing limits and producing an order to which each person must keep, keeping himself in his place (Bourdieu 1993: 94)

This quote implies that the danger in classifying people within categories, like Goffman's (1974) frames, renders no or little agency to those classified, or those in a particular frameset. This becomes a problem if we are not open to the dynamic nature of categories and the "living classifications" which Bowker and Star (2000) discuss. Thus, in order to use any concepts or classifications in a beneficial way, we need to always be aware of their dynamic and changing ways.

There are limits with using a market constructed concept. By claiming that chil-

dren are competent we are in many ways paving way for marketers to cash in on this with their claims that these children are so savvy and do not need protection and can be marketed directly too because they are the generation digital.

However, as a researcher who has been in the media the past couple of years talking about tweens, I take a part in the construction of the concept in the public eye. By doing so I am able to broaden the concept of tweens to not just apply for when Miley Cyrus or Justin Bieber are having concerts or talk of tweens and consumption reducing tweens to merely be seen as consumers. Rather, I am able to take action and attempt to fill this category with my findings from the children in hopes that the children's voices, although through my interpretation and my voice, will be spoken for. For although the children I talked to did not make use of the concept tweens, they did describe themselves as middle children and as being different from those older and younger. As I found that age shifting was a key feature in the age doings and understanding of themselves and their place in society, I can help nuance and construct tweens as something different than merely a market segment.

By embedding tweens as a concept of childhood allows us to see the practices of those classified as tweens as doing tweenhood and not either playing at youth, or being childish, as this later type of understanding of their practices might render the practices as trivial. By exploring what tweens do, in light of the concept of tweens their practices can be explored and understood and given meaning from their place in this category and not as a childish or "wannabe teen". This might shed another light on their practices. We can understand and widen our understanding for them as a group, a space.

Answering the question posed by Bowker and Star (2000): what do classifications d? We can perceive and understand "tween" as a separate practice which is co-constructed by the tween's practices, the objects used to do tween and the top-down construction of the everyday concept: tween

I would argue that the construction of a concept or a classification can actually give more leeway and value to the children's, or tweens, practices. We need to perceive tweens in their own right, not as an in-between liminal practice, but rather as being and doing tween, not merely being children and becoming teenagers.

Note

[1] This paper is a slightly rewritten version of my trial lecture defending my doctoral thesis: "Domesticating the Disney tween machine. Norwegian tweens enacting age and everyday life" held at Norwegian University of Science and Technology, NTNU, October 10th 2014. For my trial lecture I was given the title: "The social construction of everyday concepts. What we can learn from the 'tween' (A summary of the thesis was published in *Barn* no 4 2014, eds.)

Literature

Adler, P. A., Adler, P., and Mandell, N. 1986. *Sociological Studies of Child Development* Vol. 1: Jai Pr.

Andersen, L. P. 2011a. Tweenhood. In: L. P. Andersen, eds. *Tweens: mellem medier og mærkevarer*: 129–150. Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur.

Andersen, L. P. 2011b. *Tweens : mellem medier og mærkevarer*. Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur.

Ariès, P. 1962. *Centuries of Childhood*. New York.

Bickford, T. 2012. The new 'tween' music industry: The Disney Channel, Kidz Bop and an emerging childhood counterpublic. *Popular Music* 31(03): 417–436.

Borland, M., Laybourn, A., Hill, M., and Brown, J. 1998. *Middle Childhood: the Perspectives of Children and Parents*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Bourdieu, P. 1993. *Sociology in Question* Vol. 18. Sage.

Bowker, G. C., and Star, S. L. 2000. *Sorting Things out: Classification and its Consequences*. MIT press.

Bragg, S., Buckingham, D., Russell, R., and Willett, R. 2011. Too much, too soon? Children,'sexualization'and consumer culture. *Sex Education* 11(3): 279–292.

Cody, K. 2012. 'No longer, but not yet': Tweens and the mediating of threshold selves through liminal consumption. *Journal of Consumer Culture* 12(1): 41–65.

Cook, D. T. 2004. *The Commodification of Childhood: The Children's Clothing Industry and the Rise of the Child Consumer*. Duke University Press Books.

Cook, D. T., and Kaiser, S. B. 2004. Betwixt and be tween. *Journal of Consumer Culture* 4(2): 203.

Corsaro, W. A. 1997. *The Sociology of Childhood*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Pine Forge Press.

Goffman, E. 1955. On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Psychiatry* 18(3): 213–231.

Goffman, E. 1959. *The presentation of self in everyday lif*e. Garden City, New York: A doubleday Anchor Original.

Goffman, E. 1974. *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper and Row.

Hacking, I. 1999. *The Social Construction of What*? Harvard University Press.

James, A., Jenks, C., and Prout, A. 1998. *Theorizing Childhood*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kafai, Y. B. 2008. *8 Gender Play in a Tween Gaming Club. Beyond Barbie and Mortal.* Kombat: New perspectives on gender and gaming.

Latour, B. 2005. *Reassembling the Social – An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory* Vol. 1. Norfolk: Oxford University Press.

Lindstrom, M., and Seybold, P. B. 2004. *Brandchild: Remarkable Insights Into the Minds of Today's Global Kids and Their Relationship with Brands*. London: Kogan Page.

McGladrey, M. L. 2013. *Becoming Tween Bodies. Journal of Children and Media* 1–18. doi: 10.1080/17482798.2013.805305

Rysst, M. 2005. Det koster å være kul. *Tidsskrift for ungdomsforskning* 5(2):5–26.

Rysst, M. 2010. 'I Am Only Ten Years Old' : Femininities, clothing-fashion codes and the intergenerational gap of interpretation of young girls' clothes. *Childhood* 17(1): 76–93.

Siegel, D. L., Coffey, T. J., and Livingston, G. 2004. *The Great Tween Buying Machine: Capturing Your Share of the Multi-billion-dollar Tween Market*. Chicago: Dearborn Trade Publishing.

Sørenssen, I. K. 2012. Tweens as a commercial target group. In: A. Sparrman, B. Sandin and J. Sjöberg, eds. *Situating Child Consumption: A Critical Approach to Childhood Consumption in the 21st Century*: Lund: Nordic Academic Press.

Sørenssen, I. K. 2014. *Domesticating the Disney Tween Machine. Norwegian Tweens Enacting Age and Everyday Life.* PhD, NTNU, Trondheim.

Tufte, B. 2011. Tweens og medier. In: L. P. Andersen, ed. *Tweens: mellem medier og mærkevarer*: 29–52. Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur.

Tufte, B., and Rasmussen, J. 2005. Children and adolescents' use of the Internet – with focus on tweens. In: B. Tufte, J. Rasmussen and L. B. Christensen, eds. *Frontrunners or Copycats?*: 118–135. København: Copenhagen Business School Press.

Turow, J. 1997. *Breaking up America: Advertisers and the New Media World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Willett, R. 2005. Constructing the digital tween: Market discourse and girls' interests. In: C. Mitchell and J. Reid-Walsh, eds. *Seven Going on Seventeen: Tween Studies in the Culture of Girlhood*: 278–293. New York: Peter Lang.

Wærdahl, R. 2003. *Learning by Consuming: Consumer Culture as a Condition for Socialization and Every Day Life at the Age of 12* 4:2003. Oslo: Universitetet i Oslo.

Ingvild Kvale Sørenssen underviser for tiden ved Pedagogisk institutt, Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet (NTNU). Hun disputerte i oktober 2014 med avhandlingen *Domesticating the Disney Tween Machine: Norwegian Tweens Enacting Age and Everyday Life* ved Institutt for tverrfaglige kulturstudier ved NTNU hvor hun også har arbeidet som forsker på et EU-finansiert prosjekt UseITSmartly om ungdom og grønn IKT-bruk.

Ingvild Kvale Sørenssen, Institutt for tverrfaglige kulturstudier, Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet, NTNU, NO-7491 Trondheim, Norge. Email: ingvild.sorenssen@ntnu.no