“My God I’m wearing Tesco!”:

Fashion, pre-teen femininity and the commercialisation of childhood

Creative Education, Creative Research

Teaching history and theory in a creative arts institution for over twenty years, I have sometimes been challenged to justify what I teach – for instance, why are dry theoretical concepts relevant to the everyday work of a fashion journalist? Because good journalists should offer new perspectives, and I help students to learn how to research, using academic ideas to help explore and critique the fashion industry and the wider world, debating movements such as #metoo, #blacklivesmatter and challenging the ethically and environmentally unsustainable status quo. My teaching practice is informed by my own research, which keeps me up to date with the latest fashion studies. Partly inspired by debates with students about the fashion business and links with commercialisation, sexualisation and children’s fashion consumption, I undertook a PhD exploring these issues; this chapter is based on that research.

Gap in our knowledge

“My God I’m wearing Tesco!”, exclaims 10-year-old Georgia[[1]](#footnote-1), in exaggerated horror, as she realises that she has admitted to wearing a piece of clothing from a supermarket chain, in a focus group with friends. Her comments, further discussed below, imply young girls’ awareness of the branding of fashion and its’ commercial source. Edwards (2020), in a recent academic article about children’s clothing, addresses continuing popular concern in the UK about fashion being part of both the sexualising and commercialising of childhood, suggesting that there is very little research about children’s relationship with dress. This chapter focusses on what commercialisation might involve and what part it may play in girls’ understanding of fashion, particularly examining notions of consumerism and economic activity in relation to how girls talk about their consumption of clothing.

Childhood in a commercial world

In British newspaper articles addressing the commercialisation of childhood, fashion is presented as a significant part of a contemporary world ensuring that ‘the boundaries between adulthood and childhood have become dangerously blurred’ (Lichtenstein, *MailOnline* 2010). Here childhood and adulthood are constituted as fixed life stages associated with separate identity positions of child and adult, distinctions that are considered to be under threat from social change. Children are seen as increasingly targeted by ‘greedy retailers’ (Daily Mail 2010) who are part of a ‘marketing culture that now targets young girls relentlessly’ (McCartney, *Telegraph* 2010). The supposition is that advertisers are manipulative and that children are incapable of negotiating or resisting their marketing ploys. Children are assumed to be more conformist than adults and are ‘under pressure to keep up with trends’ (Cochrane, *Guardian* 2010) and the result is children who have become ‘more materialistic’ (Taylor, *Guardian* 2010) and now have ‘false’ needs, newly created wants and desires that corrupt their innocence.

From this popular discussion it can be seen that childhood is perceived as a stable period when children are passive, innocent and vulnerable (MacDonald 2003: 110). Hence children are frequently presented in the media as particularly in need of protection. It is argued that we are currently living in what can be characterized as a ‘risk society’ (Giddens 1991; Beck 1992, 1999). The claim is that British society has been profoundly transformed since the 1970s, with economic rationalism, reduced welfare state, de-industrialisation and increased globalism meaning politics and decision-making are conducted at an international rather than local level; these changes mean that there is sense of insecurity, fragmentation and a breakdown of social networks. Global and technological change is thought to have eroded all that was secure, unchanging and natural (Giddens, 2000, p. 51).Yet, the construction of childhood has come to symbolise all that is natural and traditional (Jenks 1996), so the constant concern about childhood being at an end reflects wider fears about change in contemporary life. As Prout (2000) explains, in a world increasingly seen as shifting and uncertain, children, because they are regarded as unfinished, are considered good target for attempts to control the future. Critics of the emotive language and unsubstantiated claims used in contemporary debates about the commercialisation and sexualisation of childhood, such as Bragg *et al* (2011),Smith and Attwood (2011) and Kehily (2012), indicate that the concern about young girls is linked to wider anxiety about what is considered an increasingly consumerist and sexually explicit Western culture.

Paradoxically, the universalised notion of the child as fragile, at risk and in need of protection is also operating in a society in which children are also seen as individuals with increased autonomy and have more legal rights that they can assert (directgov 2008). The bestowal of civil rights suggests that children are to some extent legally invoked as citizens (Buckingham 2000). These contemporary changes to childhood also include the shift to individualization (Christensen and Prout 2005), which is embedded in Beck’s (1992; 1999) notion that people, regardless of their age, are coming to think of themselves as unique individuals who can shape their own identities. Children are increasingly aware of cultural norms and expectations and are enjoined to speak, make themselves visible, and regulate their own behaviour (James *et al* 2005). This individualization of childhood is driven not only by children gaining rights as citizens, but also because within marketing, advertising and popular culture children are increasingly being addressed as consumers (Kenway and Bullen 2001). Marketers are progressively addressing children more directly, because with fewer children being born in Britain than in the ‘baby boom’ of the mid-twentieth century (Office of National Statistics 2008a), children are likely to live in households with fewer siblings and so have a larger share of the family wealth (Gunter and Furnham 1998). Britain is also, on the whole, an increasingly affluent society (Bocock 1993; Ransome 2005: 37); therefore children are an attractive target market. [[2]](#footnote-2) Other alterations in family life have also affected children’s access to money and goods; marketing literature suggests that with an increase in households in which both parents work and higher levels of divorce, upheaval for children and less time spent with them by their parents sometimes results in giving children money or gifts (Key Note 2001; Kenway and Bullen 2001). Children today have more ‘pester power’ than children had in the past, and as Boden (2006a) emphasises, collectively these changes mean that children’s consumption is of growing importance and marketing companies are increasingly targeting them with new consumer goods. One of the commercial areas that has benefitted from this rise in children’s consumption of goods is the fashion market - designer labels now do children’s ranges and supermarket chains such as Asda and Tesco are offering children’s fashion (Boden 2006a). In the commercial world the pre-teen is recognised as an important consumer and both the children, and their parents, are faced with an array of targeted goods. How girls respond to this commercial address, and what their everyday practices of fashion consumption might tell us, is the focus of this chapter.

Girls as consumers

In current childhood sociology children are not seen as merely passive recipients imprinted upon by society but as agents constructing and maintaining their social and cultural worlds (Renold 2005). Although the new paradigm in childhood studies research children as agents, few who take up this paradigm examine children’s consumer lives (see Cook 2008 for a critique of this absence). The girl child as active social agent and their lived experience of consumer culture is addressed by Russell and Tyler (2002), as they ask what it means to do feminine childhood against the backdrop of contemporary consumer culture. Femininity is an aesthetic phenomenon bound up with the commodified world, one which could be seen to be commercially exploitative, however, it is a world in and through which girls become women (Russell and Tyler 2002). Russell and Tyler (2002) acknowledge the continuous nature of identity work and refer to the active doing of childhood, which ‘recognizes the status of children as active social agents, yet also emphasizes the extent to which children are involved in an ongoing inter-subjective process of “becoming”’ (Russell and Tyler 2002: 622). Russell and Tyler (2002) maintain that whilst girls engage in active meaning, they have an awareness of what are frequently adult expectations about gender. Russell and Tyler (2002) conclude that whilst girls are active and knowing in their performance of gender through the consumption of make-up and accessories, they do not question the ideal of femininity that exists, thereby suggesting that there is a limit to girls’ critical awareness. My intention is to draw on this notion of the complexity of girls’ positions as subjects and to explore girls’ active engagement with fashion and dress.

More recent research has turned its’ focus on to *teenage* girls’ interaction with fashion as its specific interest (such as Abbott and Sapsford 2003; Klepp and Storm-Mathisen 2005; Raby 2010). But it is vital to attend to the specificity of age because cultural constructions for every age group within a particular historical moment differ (Renold 2005), and if popular discussion positions children as non-agents then it is work with the specific age grouping of 8 to 11-year-olds will bring that positioning into question. Furthermore, as those who have researched children’s fashion assert, there has been little exploration of children or specifically young girls’ fashion as material culture (Pilcher 2009, Boden *et al* 2004, Cook and Kaiser 2004). An exception is an ethnographic study carried out by Boden *et al* (2004) with children aged 6 - 11, which acknowledges that children’s consumption is affected by social structures and parental concerns; it describes how children use their consumption to demonstrate an increased autonomy from their parents and develop notions about what suits them and signifies their self-image (Boden *et al* 2004: 11). Children also exert considerable power in the family, influencing parental consumption in terms of clothing both for themselves and their parents.

Pilcher (2013) posits that children’s consumption is significantly different to adult consumption in that there are specific discourses and cultural determinants of childhood that structure both the production and consumption of children’s clothes. These discourses explored in Boden *et al* (2004) and Pilcher’s (2009) earlier work, frame childhood as a time of innocence, or as Renold (2005) more explicitly states - assexuality. As well as these discourses of childhood, there are other frameworks shaping children’s consumption of clothing such as the production-market of children’s clothing (what is available to be worn) and their ‘life world’ (Pilcher 2013: 92) involving many social and cultural influences such a gender, age, family and peers. Pilcher (2013) argues that children’s consumption is shaped, not only by the frameworks and discourses listed here but also by their own determination and sense of self. Determinativity is a useful concept for thinking through many of the factors that shape young girls’ consumption of fashion and suggests that research with girls must acknowledge social and cultural, family and peers but also girls’ own reflexivity and ability in using dress to present the self (Pilcher 2013: 95). These ideas will be engaged with in relation to my own findings.

Researching with girls about fashion: a methodology

In order to do qualitative research with young girls, one of the most straightforward ways is to get access through schools; I sent letters to head-teachers of primary schools in the predominantly white, middle-class, city of Bridworth in the South of England. The two that responded positively, passed on information about my research and asked the girls to register their interest. Information sheets and consent forms were then sent to both parents, and to the girls, in keeping with my methodological perspective of treating children as social actors. Once agreements were in place, empirical research was carried out in 2011 and 2013 with thirty-two girls aged 8 to 9 and 10 to 11-years-old. Six focus groups of between three and eight participants were undertaken to investigate the negotiation of fashionability, as fashion is a social phenomenon and inter-subjective practice (Bottero 2010).

Focus groups or group interviews are group discussions conducted with typically six to eight participants, focussing on debating a set of questions (Morgan 1998). My groups ranged from as few as three participants, to as many as eight girls. The girls were in groups in which they were familiar with everyone, and were friends with some of the participants, which helped to foster a comfortable and non-threatening atmosphere (Renold 2005) in which they discussed going round to each other’s houses, family members the others knew of and friends that they had common. The group debated the questions amongst themselves with minimal intervention from me, the researcher (Gibbs 1997), for between forty minutes and an hour. Although I provided some direction for the groups, the intention was that in their interaction the girls shaped the discussion and raised topics that were of interest to them. Their familiarity with each other also allowed their shared interests to come to the fore. Focus groups can help to redress the power imbalance between the researcher and participants, as they are ‘particularly useful for allowing participants to generate their own questions, frames and concepts and to pursue their own priorities on their own terms and in their own vocabulary’ (Barbour and Kitzinger 1999: 5). The intention was that because the researcher’s power was also reduced in terms of simply being outnumbered, the girls did not just tell me what they thought I wanted to hear (Punch 2002: 325).

My interest was in fashion worn outside of the official school context and in girls’ interaction with fashion and their clothes. Therefore, as the girls usually wore a uniform in school time, I conducted these focus groups on special dress-down days at the schools. Girls’ clothing choices were to be the starting point for the discussion, so that the girls’ own wardrobes influenced their interaction. The aim was not to suggest that there is any ‘neutral’ or ‘natural’ setting (Barbour and Kitzinger 1999) but that on special days, wearing their own clothes at least freed the girls from some of the usual official school constraints on dress, if not from parental ones. This chapter focusses on data collected from two groups of girls, one of each age range, as they are representative of many of the key issues related to retail and purchasing fashion that arose in the focus groups.

Girls’ consumption of fashion and their engagements with consumer culture

*Knowledge of fashion retailers*

All the girls that took part in this study were knowledgeable about names of many fashion retailers and explained where their clothes came from, therefore are conscious of the production-market for children’s clothes (Pilcher 2013). For example, in response to being asked where they went to buy clothing, Focus Group 4 replied:

Focus Group 4 (Aged 8-9)

Lucie: Primark, Next

Sara: Debenhams

Ella: Primark, Gap, Debenhams, I love

Sara: Next

Ella: I like Next definitely

Lucie: Hollister

Ella: Hollister, Abercrombie, except that nothing at Hollister fits me

Leah: George

Lucie: Monsoon

Here, even in the younger age group, familiarity with a whole range of fashion retailers of girls’ clothes is shown, ranging from the cheapest such as Primark and supermarket brands like George at Asda, to the more expensive High Street stores like Gap. This group, like all in my study, and in the work of others (Boden 2006b; Rysst 2010), could identify which brands they liked and ones that fitted them too (Rysst 2010).

In Focus Group 2 there was lots of discussion about the shops that the girls bought their clothes in and some evaluation of what these stores were like.

Focus Group 2 (Aged 10-11)

Lauren: New Look, Primark

Jessica: Primark, Primark, I get everything from Primark

Georgia: I hadn’t been to Primark until it first came to Bridworth

Lauren: Yeah like the first day it opened I quickly got on the bus

Georgia: I would never go into a cheap shop but then my mum started going in the charity shops in Bridworth

JB: Yeah

Georgia: Cos she likes it in there … so ever since then she keeps going in the charity shops so it got me into going into places like Primark

JB: Hmm

Georgia: These are from Primark ((pointing at boots)), New Look ((pointing at leggings)) New Look ((pointing at skirt))

…

Georgia: Tesco ((pulling at t-shirt))

Lauren: Tesco?

Georgia: My God I’m wearing Tesco!

Lauren: I got this from Primark ((pulling at sweatshirt)), no, no Debenhams…I quite like Debenhams it’s quite fashionable

Georgia: Yeah

Lauren: I got these from Primark ((pulling at jeans)) and my plimsolls from New Look…

Georgia: Debenhams can be a bit babyish

The girls knew where each item of clothing they were wearing was purchased from, so they clearly played an active role in choosing the clothes or paid attention to the labels that were in their clothes, as Boden (2006a) also found. Much of what the girls were wearing was from cheap but up-to-date fashion chains such as New Look and Primark. Georgia described how originally, she was disdainful of shopping in cheap shops like Primark, however once her mum began to think that shopping in charity shops was acceptable, then going to Primark was alright. She also expressed some mock horror that her t-shirt came from Tesco, so even within a group of friends who shop in stores such as Primark, the wearing of very cheap clothes from a supermarket chain was a matter of some unease. This kind of evaluation suggests the cultural capital to differentiate between store types was evident (Bourdieu 2010). In this extract the problem is also raised, acknowledged in all bar Group 1, of ensuring that you were dressed appropriately for your age; here the concern is about clothes that might be too young for your age. Engagement with or rejection of certain goods from popular culture can be used to express ideas about age grade, life course and growing up (Boden 2006a; Pilcher 2013; Blanchard-Emmerson 2021).

At the other end of the age scale, commercialisation has been posited as rushing girls through their life course by encouraging the wearing of clothes thought to be too grown up for their age. However, girls also understood that just because certain clothes are aimed at them, they need not necessarily wear items that are considered to make them look too old, as seen even in the younger age group below.

Focus Group 4 (Aged 8-9)

Sara: yeah, sometimes, I love Primark but sometimes in Primark

Ella: it’s a bit cheap

Sara: yeah but sometimes in Primark they’re for kids but they’re really like grown up clothes and say I really like them but I’m just not being me when I wear them

Lucie: what I think about Primark is that they’ve got like really nice clothes and they look really nice but then they’re really cheap but people buy them and they’re not good quality

This excerpt demonstrates Sara’s understanding of the discourses of childhood (Pilcher 2013), and the maintenance of an asexual appearance whereby girls should not look too old. These discourses were engaged with in all except one focus group, thereby showing the critical awareness of girls as social actors (James *et al* 2005). Sara’s reflection that to look older would be inauthentic to the construction of her current aged identity suggests a knowing interaction with the discourse of childhood; more about this relationship between pre-teen dress, age and identity construction can be found in Blanchard-Emmerson (2021). In her wanting to ‘be me’, Sara also implies the desire to be active in her constitution of subjectivity discussed further below. What is also evident here, is that the participants are conscious of the price of goods and that cheapness is often linked with poor quality, knowledge potentially linked again to girls’ cultural capital (Bourdieu 2010).

*Pressure to consume*

In relation to the popular concern about commercialisation, evidence for the commercial pressure on girls to consume could also be found. Some girls competed about how much they were able to spend on clothes and how much clothing they have, as the following extract demonstrates.

Focus Group 2 (Aged 10-11)

Jessica: my mum says I can go shopping in Primark soon with 20 pound

Lauren: I spent with my old friend Nicky, I spent about £60 on clothes

Georgia: I get £20 a week on clothes cos I keep moaning ‘I’ve got no clothes’ but I’ve got 7 drawers full and a whole wardrobe/ and 2 drawers under that. So I’ve got 9 drawers and I’m still asking for more, so I get £20 a week for it

Jessica: I’ve got ((counts under breath with fingers)) I’ve got 16 drawers full of stuff

JB: Wow!

Jessica: Plus a whole cupboard full, it’s about from there to there

Lauren: I’ve got a chest of drawers full of stuff, a wardrobe and boxes that go under the bed

Not only did the girls enjoy shopping and spending money on dress, but they were also boasting here about how much furniture was full of their clothing. However, Georgia was conscious that she had plenty of clothes, and that wanting more was unnecessary over-consumption. Conversely, she has the self-awareness to acknowledge that she still asks for additional clothing, feeling a compulsion to consume. As with Russell and Tyler’s (2002) argument that girls do have some critical awareness about the social construction of gender, but did not critique the existence of the ideal, here the limit of criticality is reached in the refusal to consume. However, over-consumption of fashionable goods is a huge social and environmental issue that many adults are only beginning to recognise, let alone reach sustainable conclusions to (Bly, Gwozdz and Reisch 2015).

Also, despite this exuberant discussion of consumption, when I asked Georgia about whether she was allowed to go out and spend the £20 clothes allowance, the following exchange took place:

Georgia: Yes, I’m getting £62 because I sold one of those biscuit dogs I’ve got that does all those commands

Lauren: Oh no

Georgia: I sold him on eBay. My step-dad bought it for me and he didn’t know and he was pretty upset. So I was a bit annoyed and then, well, he was annoyed anyway. So I had £62 and £20 so I had £82

JB: And so you are just allowed to go and buy whatever you like with that?

Jessica: Yeah

Lauren: Yeah

Georgia: No. My mum won’t give me £62 because I’ll go out and spend it on rubbish

Lauren: Basically I

Jessica: That’s what my mum said

Lauren: Basically I save up all year and then at the end of the year I do a big shop of clothes

Georgia: I save up, but even when I say I’m going out, my mum says ‘no you’re not’

Regardless of their seeming embracement of consumerism, there was recognition that money for shopping trips may not be unlimited or automatically forthcoming, demonstrating that girls are agents capable of reflecting on their social worlds (James *et al* 2005). Whilst again there was no suggestion that you might not want to spend at all, there was awareness that in order to have more money to spend, you might have to sell some of your own goods or save up. And although at first there was the intimation that the girls could spend money on whatever clothes they like, there was a shift to acknowledge that spending would be a matter of negotiation with mothers. Parents, particularly mothers, are ‘life world’ influences (Pilcher 2013) shaping children’s consumption.

Furthermore, economics are understood to play a part in their family’s ability to spend; financial constraints and the expense of consumption were discussed in all the Focus Groups, thereby suggesting girls’ agency involves some monetary sense. Children’s economic agency is an area recognised by Xolocotzin and Jay (2020) as in need of further research. What can be seen above, is that as well as some understanding of monetary cost of fashion goods, girls in the study were predominately happy to buy in cheap shops, and several other groups talked positively about buying clothes from Ebay, charity shops (Focus Groups 3, 5 and 6) and receiving hand-me-downs (Focus Group 4 and 6). Therefore, girls are not always the rampant consumers of the latest trends that popular discussion might have us believe. However, many girls were certainly interested in what was currently in fashion and this chapter turns to their engagement with trends next.

*Pressure to keep up with trends*

When asked about how they knew what was in fashion, the younger group answered:

Focus Group 4 (Aged 8-9)

Ella: magazines, I do lots of *Girl Talk* which has quite a lot of pages about what styles there are, what celebrities wear and they have loads

Sara: my mum’s magazines

Millie: I usually just check what my friends

Ella: in my mum’s magazine there was a 10-page spread about fashion so I tore it out and put it in my room

Sara: I normally just get all the fashion magazines

Ella: normally on a dress as you please day like today… if I like something someone else is wearing I just get the style

Sara: not exactly the same but

Leah: (inaudible) like what celebrities wear and fashion in *Girl Talk*

Ella: cos I always have my own look I don’t copy anybody else’s so I’m normally being my own person with my style and stuff so I kind of

Sara: it’s like basically it’s a coincidence that me and Millie wore all this

Ella: cos they were discussing wearing dresses and high heels they were discussing it together

Sara: yeah

=Millie: so we just added to each other and stuff

In this extract there are several sources of fashion knowledge: girls’ magazines, adult fashion magazines, what celebrities are wearing and friends. (The rejection of what celebrities’ wear as being appropriate for young girls to wear is discussed in Blanchard-Emmerson 2017). Yet, despite their interest in other people’s style and what is fashionable, the girls also discuss notions of individuality and self-expression, or in Pilcher’s (2013) words ‘determinative me-making’. This determinativity is an interactive process and here can be seen to take place in relation to peers, as well as within commercialised popular culture. This evaluation and collaborative dialogue between friends, of their knowledge base and fashion practice, is an example of engagement with fashion being an ‘intersubjective practice’ (Bottero 2010).

Indeed, ideas about what was fashionable were also a matter of negotiation between friends. In Focus Group 2 everyone stated that pink was fashionable, and I then asked what else was ‘in’:

Focus Group 2 (Aged 10-11)

Jessica: Black

Georgia: Fluorescent colours

Lauren: Yeah mostly bright colours

Georgia: Hi Tops are in (.1) sometimes ((says tentatively looking at Lauren))

Lauren: Yeah sometimes

Georgia: Some girls wear/

Lauren: Boob tubes are in

Georgia: Yeah but I wouldn’t want to wear them in winter, even though I am personally

Jessica: Jumpers because like everyone else wears them like boys and stuff

Georgia: Mm ((wrinkles up her nose))

Lauren: Mm kind of

Georgia: But I don’t really care about boys’ fashion

Jessica: Shirts, like girl shirts

((Georgia and Lauren look at each other, Lauren pulls face))

Georgia: yeah/

Jessica: I’ve got a couple of them

Here we see different suggestions being made and either confirmed, qualified or covertly denied or ignored by the other participants. Lauren confirmed that it was bright colours and not black that was in, Georgia paused after her proposal of Hi Tops and looked to Lauren to corroborate, a confirmation she only receives when qualified with a ‘sometimes’. Lauren and Georgia sought to endorse each other’s ideas of fashionability at every turn. Yet they were at odds with Jessica, whose suggestions remain unsupported or were skirted round with replies such as ‘But I don’t really care about boys’ fashion’. At one point Jessica’s suggestion was verbally endorsed with a ‘yeah’ from Georgia, but this assent was undermined by the look exchanged between Georgia and Lauren and by Lauren’s face-pulling; thus, girls were disagreeing whilst avoiding open conflict (Underwood 2004: 2). What was in fashion was clearly not defined just by what was available in retail outlets or about straightforward following of prevailing styles but instead was a matter of debate and negotiation between girls themselves. The negotiation demonstrates the inter-subjectivity (Bottero 2010) of determining fashionability and suggests some sense of agency on the part of the girls to sometimes take up only the fashion trends that they either individually or collectively, in friendship groups, agree upon or decide to pick up (as Woodward 2007 suggests happens with adults).

Conclusion

The data arising from this research suggests that girls as young as eight are aware of the commercial nature of fashion, its retailers and trends, and the pressure to consume. Therefore, in many respects the participants are living commercialised lives. However, what is missing from the popular debate about this commercialisation, is the nuance and complexity of girls’ engagements with the discourses of childhood and fashion. These engagements have brought to light girls’ understanding of how they are meant to dress in relation to age, their disagreements about fashion, their negotiations about what to consume and where from. Evidence presented here suggests that girls are sometimes thoughtful consumers of cheap and second-hand clothing and are often conscious of financial constraints. Overall, young girls’ relationship with fashion is, as Pilcher (2019) proposes, mindful of a whole range of influences that shape their consumption, including self-determination – their desire to be themselves.

As the research was based on predominately white, middle-class girls, there would be merit in examining other races, classes, and the experiences of boys, of the commercial call of fashion. Additionally, the acknowledgement of consumerism by the participants, combined with the recent rise of youth-based environmental activism, suggests a future study could consider how growing awareness of fashion’s negative impact influences girls’ current fashion consumption.
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