View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

brought to you by CORE

provided by Winchester Research Repository

The care-less marketplace: exclusion as affective inequality

Martina Hutton

Faculty of Business, Law and Sport, University of Winchester, Winchester, UK

West Downs 205, Romsey Road, Winchester, SO22 4NR, Martina.Hutton@winchester.ac.uk

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

The care-less marketplace: exclusion as affective inequality

Abstract

The care-less marketplace is a discrete site which reinforces structural inequality in the affective domain of life. Drawing on the work of pro-care feminist theory, this empirical paper explores marketplace exclusion from the perspective of economic disadvantage and its impact on relations of love, care and solidarity. Adopting a voice-centred-relational approach, this interpretative study examines the narrative accounts of a diverse group of women living in diverse poverty contexts. Articulating marketplace exclusion as a series of affective burdens, material struggles and disconnections embedded within the relational web of family, friends and community - these experiences mirror participants' imposed exclusion in the marketplace due to chronic economic hardship. Through the diffusion of an alternative theoretical lens, affective inequality surfaces the importance of care and how it is often most visible in the lives of vulnerable consumers when it is absent or broken.

Keywords: Marketplace exclusion, affective inequality, care-less, poverty, relational

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

Introduction

"Human lives are interwoven in a myriad of subtle and not so subtle ways"

(Carole Gilligan 1995)

While people are undoubtedly economic actors and consumers, neither their rationality nor their economic consumer choices can be presumed to be devoid of relationality (Gilligan, 1982, 1995; Lynch, Lyons and Cantillon, 2007). Yet the very notion of the consumer as a relationally engaged person navigating the marketplace, whilst simultaneously experiencing discrimination and antagonism, is somewhat overlooked in consumer research. This paper therefore explores marketplace exclusion from the perspective of economic disadvantage and traces its impact on relations of love, care and solidarity as a consequence, to characterise the marketplace as care-*less* – a generative site of structural inequality in the affective domain of life. As a contribution, the paper extends the concept of affective inequality as a new theoretical approach for articulating experiences of marketplace exclusion as it intersects with impoverishment. Moreover, at the economic-affective interface, this paper defines experiences of *affective inequality* as disrespect, relational carelessness and emotional disconnection. Despite growing recognition among scholars of the importance of marketplace exclusion, the daily, invisible forms of affective suffering such as anxiety, worthlessness, and discrimination, embedded in ordinary relationships and interactions remains a neglected area of inquiry (Illouz, 2012). Furthermore, consumer researchers have not succeeded in problematizing relational or affective issues in depth within the context of poverty, particularly from the perspectives of those who sit on the periphery of this social reality.

Drawing on the theoretical foundations of pro-care feminist theory which examines the complexity with which power relations, exploitation and discrimination are embedded in all manner of care relations (Folbre, 1994; Kittay, 1999; Nussbaum, 2001; Tronto, 2002), this paper introduces affective burdens, material struggles and disconnections as new themes of

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

imposed marketplace exclusion through poverty. These findings explore the circuits of relational conflict located in the everyday lives of women, as they reconcile the tension of impoverished marketplace interactions with the judgement and disrespect of others. By extending the lens of affective inequality to our understanding of marketplace exclusion, conventional distinctions between the public and private realities of consumption are dissolved. This is important to draw attention to how the affective system and market system as structural sites, co-constitute and reinforce emotional injustice for women who are already economically and socially compromised.

This multi-method, interpretative study adopts the voice-centred-relational approach, an innovative, analytical tool to examine the narrative accounts of a diverse group of women living in diverse poverty contexts. The study's explicit focus on women is supported by research which demonstrates the disproportionate psychological and social burden women shoulder when coping with poverty (Bubeck, 1995, Cantillon and Nolan 2001; Folbre, 1994).

To begin, the paper contextualises what is meant by the affective system, it explains how love, care and solidarity are integral to the functioning of the affective system and its interfacing with economic, political and cultural domains. This is followed by an overview of pro-care feminist scholarship and an exploration of how care, affect and exclusion have been dealt with in consumer and marketing research. Next the multi-method research design is discussed including the use of the voice-centred relational analysis technique. This is followed by the findings section which traces the web of relational exclusions characterising affective inequality. Finally, the paper concludes by discussing how affective inequality might extend our thinking around what constitutes marketplace exclusion.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

The affective system

The affective system is concerned with providing and sustaining relationships of love, care and solidarity. These three elements are integral components of the affective domain of life, as each element involves work that produces outcomes that can be seen and felt, if not always easily measured or quantified. Care relations within the affective domain takes three main forms and can be explained using the concentric view of care relations developed by Lynch, Baker and Lyons (2009). Firstly, primary care relations (also known as love labour) typically relate to the intimate sphere of the family and are defined by their strong attachments, interdependence and depth of engagement. Secondary care relations are comprised of relatives, friends, neighbours and work colleagues where there are lower order engagements in terms of emotional investment and time but require general care work nonetheless to maintain important bonds and networks. Finally, tertiary care relations comprise of solidarity work and involve relatively unknown others for whom we care politically or economically though volunteering and activism. What each of these care relations have in common is the varying degree of dependency and interdependency, relations of giving and receiving and power relations.

The affective system does not operate in structural isolation, extending beyond the family, into many other social structures, arrangements and institutions. It influences the operation of the political, economic and cultural systems, insofar as it enables or disables people to engage in those fields (Baker et al. 2004, 219). For example, in the gendered division of labour, women undertake more care work than men in all classes, with poorer, working class, ethnic minority and migrant women undertaking a disproportionately high level of caring (Lynch and Walsh, 2009), relative to higher status groups. This is despite the fact that their resources to do so are often limited and these constraints impact their equal representation in political and economic domains. The interaction of affective and other

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

inequalities is also visible in the lives of economic migrants cut off from family and friends, as well as people experiencing poverty who are viewed as unworthy, in a consumer-defined world (Blocker et al. 2011, 2013; Sayer, 2005; Skeggs, 2004). It has also been observed in the lives of prisoners whose experiences of isolation render them dehumanised and denied of any meaningful, caring contact (Hill et al, 2015). As a consequence, affective inequality can take three forms: i) when people have unequal access to meaningful, loving and caring relationships, ii) when there is inequality in the distribution of the emotional and other work that produces and sustains such relationships (Lynch et al., 2009) and iii) when people have unequal economic resources which impact on their relations of love and care through relational dis(connections) and intra-household inequalities (Cappellini, Marilli, and Parsons, 2014; Hutton, 2015). Egalitarian theorists have highlighted how little explicit attention has been given to the negative counterpart of affective relations – relations of hatred, abuse and social animosity (Lynch et al., 2009). Thus, it is important to consider a reconceptualization of affective inequality as it interfaces with marketplace dynamics through disrespect, relational carelessness and emotional disconnection.

As economic and emotional spheres in society become increasingly blurred (c.f. Illouz, 2007), inequality is a particular risk when the attention is solely focused on the individual and their experience of pain, rather than the social and cultural systems in which care and compassion is lacking or present (McRobbie, 2002). The affective system therefore represents an important site of social relations that requires problematizing (Baker et al., 2004) as it intersects with the economic system of the marketplace.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

Pro-care feminist theory

The spheres of life that women inhabit - the affective domain in particular, has become the subject of research under the growing influence of pro-care feminist scholarship. This theoretical body of knowledge draws attention to the affective domain as a distinct sphere of social action, deeply interwoven with the economic, political and cultural spheres of life. Shifting intellectual thought from the sociological fixation with Weberian and Marxist structuralist trilogy of social class, status and power as the primary sites for the generation of inequalities and exploitations (Lynch, 2007), pro-care theorists position "care" as the most basic moral value where people are recognised as having rights and deserving of social justice (Held, 1995). The concept of "care" can be defined as a feeling which enables us to understand the position of others in order to care for and support them. Care can also be interpreted as "care-giving," broadly conceived of, as work that involves looking after the physical, social, psychological, emotional and developmental needs of one or more people (Lynch et al., 2009).

Although pro-care feminist work spans many social science disciplines, a number of common themes can be identified from an (in)equality standpoint – namely, the need for care, the work of care, and the quality of the relationships and interactions between caregivers and care-recipients. To further elaborate on these perspectives, feminist legal theorists reconstitute care as a public good, to ensure that such work does not lead to poverty and social exclusion. This means taking it out of the private sphere and reframing it as a collective responsibility. Legal theorists have therefore critiqued a host of laws that impact upon the affective, focusing on the consequences of unpaid care-giving for (female) care providers and the conditions of and access to relationships of love, care and solidarity for children and sexual minorities (Fineman, 2004). In political theory, the ethics of care approach advocated by Bubeck (1995) focuses on how to avoid the exploitation of women as

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

carers, how to address inequalities in meeting people's need for care, and how to promote an equal distribution of the burden of caring in society. Similarly, Kittay (1999) argues for a connection-based conception of equality that recognises dependency as a typical condition of human life, while Nussbaum's (1995; 2000) capability approach identifies care-related factors such as love and affiliation, as well as protection from assault and abuse, as central human capabilities that an adequate theory of justice should promote. Sociological scholars such as Skeggs (2004) have documented the ways in which social class inequalities are not only experienced at an economic level but also emotionally, as social judgements on tastes, lifestyles and values. Sayer (2005) has also highlighted the failure of mainstream sociologists to investigate the emotional impact of injustices, particular the moral judgement related to class and worth, while Connell (1995, 2002) has documented how the dearth of scholarship on masculine identities is attributable to the neglect of the affective system. Furthermore, sociologists operating within the pro-care narrative have also focused on the power relations between the providers and recipients of care which has been a major subject of research among disability studies scholars in particular (Oliver 1990).

From an economics standpoint, a number of theoretical and empirical studies have implicitly touched on the affective domain including labour market theory, reinterpretations of unpaid labour and work (Folbre, 1994, 2004; Lynch, 2007) and welfare issues relating to commodified care and marketized intimacy (Ungerson, 1997). Critiquing the "add women and stir" approach to tackling exclusion, Noddings (2001) suggests that this view obscures the contributions made by women who are restricted to the separate sphere of homemaking and private care-giving. Drawing parallels between the household and the marketplace, Folbre and Braunstein (2001) compare two logics of contractual relationships, egalitarian and patriarchal governance, to highlight how women are forced to overspecialize in reproductive labour. In examining the wage gap between men and women, Barker (1998) demonstrates

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

how gender-specific social expectations about women's roles and caring obligations affect their labour market experiences. Furthermore, Strassman (1993) has interrogated the often implicit assumption that people are responsible for taking care of their own needs and take only their own needs and wishes into account. She argues that while it may fit the profile of a select few, this view fails to recognise the economic reality of children, older people, those with disabilities or many others who do not have independent or sufficient access to economic resources (Lynch et al., 2009).

In summary, pro-care feminist literature have proven to be an important theoretical foundation for delineating the similarities of unpaid work to paid work and for identifying the differential status and opportunities this confers on care givers regardless of gender (Ungerson, 1997) in multiple domains. Yet despite the contribution that pro-care scholars have made to our understanding of the centrality of care in society (Folbre, 1994; Kittay, 1999; Lynch et al., 2009; Nussbaum, 2000), the affective system and its constituent inequalities remains an emerging and somewhat trivialized issue that must be "recovered" (Cantillon and Lynch, 2017) and problematized as a context where affective divisions, emotional hierarchies (Illouz, 2007), social antagonism and care-less experiences are uniquely embedded.

Care, affect and the marketplace

Within consumer research, several scholars have incorporated elements of care, connectedness and relationality into their work as it relates to the intersection of mothering, role transition and consumer socialisation. Exploring the emotional transitions women make en route to motherhood, Davies et al. (2010) highlight how the consumption process creates ambivalence and mixed emotions for those that feel under-resourced to deal adequately with this transition. Applying a practice theory lens to examine mothering, Molander (2017)

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

emphasizes embodiment and the multiplicity and fluidity of the experiences mothers carry with them throughout life. Advancing the themes of "caring for" and "caring about", Hogg, Curasi and Maclaran (2004) illustrate the fluid boundaries located in family work and demonstrate how consumption acts as a conduit for communication and maintenance of family ties. In particular, they highlight the importance of feminist perspectives on care, as it relates to primary care (family) relations and consumption realities.

Turning to the issue of affect, Gopaldas (2014) highlights how the socio-cultural treatment of consumer affect foregrounds the collective, enduring and proactive components of emotional experiences. Differentiating between affective states which are considered 'individual, momentary reactive emotional episodes in the consumer's mind' (1008) from the concept of marketplace sentiments defined as 'collectively shared emotional dispositions towards marketplace elements' (995), Gopaldas articulates how political, economic and social forces produce collectively shared emotional dispositions in marketplace cultures among relatively affluent consumers engaged in ethical consumption. Consumer emotions therefore provide a useful context for explaining how objects become incorporated into the web of interpersonal relationships and emotional spheres of society (Illouz, 2009).

Regarding how issues of exclusion intersect with the negative counterpart of care relations such as racism and marginalisation, Bone, Christensen and Williams (2014) highlight the enduring discrimination ethnic minority consumers experience when seeking finance, with Bennett et al. (2016) extending the concept of marketplace trauma to enhance our understanding of how exclusion and invisibility increases amongst those who carry particular social identity markers. 'Through the marginalisation, non-inclusion and subordination of certain groups or people in the marketplace, acts of omission and commission are regularly committed via social structures discourses and market practice' (Bennett et al. 2016, 286). Offering an alternative lens on restriction and vulnerability under

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

the rubric of spatial inequality, Saatcioglu and Ozanne (2013) and Saatcioglu and Corus (2016) highlight how marketplace exclusion can also be experienced as spatial segregation, social isolation, unfair distribution of resources and exclusion from various spheres of everyday life including the marketplace and the workplace. Looking specifically at impoverishment, Hamilton's (2012) focus on stigma avoidance and distancing strategies provides important insights on how low-income mothers' perception of "care" manifests in self-sacrifice and the use of material items as a conduit for social acceptance (Hamilton and Catterall, 2006) with respect to dependent children. Furthermore, felt exclusion from contemporary consumer society stems from deep dissatisfaction as a consequence of resource and consumption constraints within impoverished communities (Hamilton, 2009; Hill and Stephens, 1997).

Despite these important scholarly developments on the forms and manifestations of marketplace exclusion, the under-representation of affective issues as they interface with the market is implicitly supported by the assumption that the marketplace has solely a public influence on consumers. The language of care and personal life remains invisible in what is perceived as an explicitly public domain (Nussbaum, 2001). Consumer researchers have not succeeded in problematizing relational or affective issues within the context of marketplace exclusion and more specifically, as they relate to issues of poverty and economic marginalization. The affective sphere is a particular space where voice, relationships and women (Gilligan, 1995) become central to, rather than peripheral in the framing of marketplace exclusion as care-less.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

Research Design

Participant Recruitment

This study emphasised a multi-method interpretivist approach as a means to gather empirical data. The researcher was actively engaged in participatory dialogue and collaboration over an eight month period with a total of seven organisations and community groups representing the interests of those living in diverse poverty contexts. These organisations comprised of four lone parent community groups, one homeless organisation, one disability awareness group and one group representing members of the Travelling community. In terms of recruitment strategy, the first phase involved negotiating access with each of these organizations. Introductory letters were sent to each group, outlining the purpose of the study, asking for their help in making contact with groups of women willing to share their experiences in a confidential environment. This was followed-up with a phone conversation with each community group leader and a face-to-face meeting to explain how the study aligned with their groups' ethos and the need for more realistic representations of low-income people and the challenges they faced. After three months of discussions with group co-ordinators about the aims and objectives of the study, the second phase involved the development of an ethically approved fieldwork protocol (which addressed prevention of harm to participants, informed consent, no deception, provision of confidentiality and anonymity). The protocol also comprised of a participant information sheet, a focus groups discussion guide and a one-to-one interview guide – all of which were reviewed by the centre co-ordinators. Once the stakeholders were happy with the content and format of the questions, they agreed to disseminate the information sheets and to facilitate introductory meetings with women they felt would be interested in participating. The third phase of recruitment therefore entailed preliminary meetings with women chosen by the community groups. It was on the basis of these preliminary meetings that women chose either to

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

participate or not, as they were able to assess if the questions being asked were relevant to their lives. Participants could select to engage in either a focus group or one-to-one discussion and their participation was entirely voluntary and unpaid.

A total of 30 women took part in the study; 13 women chose to participate in two focus group discussions (6 participants in Group 1 and 7 in Group 2) and 17 women selected to be interviewed on a one-to-one basis. The women ranged in age from 26 to 58, and had diverse geographical, family, martial and educational backgrounds. Additional layers of diversity were achieved though the inclusion of women living with disabilities and impairments, women living in geographically isolated areas, women with previous histories of homelessness and "Traveller" women. Travellers are an indigenous ethnic minority group in Ireland whose identity and culture is based on nomadic tradition. They are widely acknowledged as one of the most marginalized and excluded groups in Irish society, facing an 84% employment rate (Pavee Point, 2017). The participant profiles (shown in Tables 1 and 2) provide a more detailed overview of all participant backgrounds.

Focus groups

The use of focus groups afforded participants a supportive environment in which to discuss the complex and multi-faceted nature of affective inequality and marketplace exclusion. Yet despite its methodological strengths, focus groups remain underutilised by scholars who take alternative, feminist and critical approaches in consumer and marketing research (Tadajewski 2016, 336). For this particular study, a group approach also fostered collective support and provided a less intrusive context for participants to articulate the meaning of their difficult experiences. To create a safe space for women to talk, two naturally occurring social groups were used, with their own established culture and knowledge of each other. Power reduction is an integral part of lessening feelings of intrusion in people who are already disempowered on a daily basis. As a method, the focus groups enabled participants to exercise a

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

considerable degree of control over what was discussed, choosing to engage in collective silence on certain issues they did not wish to reveal to the researcher. Discussions centred on the gendered experience of economic exclusion, and how this intersected with market and consumption-related demands.

In-depth interviews

One-hour, one-to-one in-depth interviews with women were also undertaken. Interview questions were focused around several themes, including the poverty transitions they had made in their life, and the burden of managing on a low-income. Both group and one-to-one interviews were audio-recorded and later transcribed, with the permission of participants, and pseudonyms were used to protect their identity. Participants indicated an interest in reading the collective findings of the study as opposed to reviewing a transcribed narration of their individual stories. Once findings had been analysed and collated, they were distributed to all of the seven groups that facilitated and supported the study. Of the seven organizations, three groups responded very positively circulating the findings to the women and offering to send comments in return. However participants did not offer additional comments on the findings once they had been distributed. The stakeholders were keen to point out that this was a positive sign as any concerns or negative portrayals would have been voiced by women given their relationship with the support groups.

Voice-Centred-Relational Analysis

Women for a combination of psychological and political reasons often voice relational realities that otherwise remain unspoken through the use of conventional thematic or individualised forms of analyses (Gilligan, 1995). Consequently the use of a relational analytical mode was chosen for this study to better reflect the realities of women's lives and experiences. Devised by Brown and Gilligan (1992) the voice-centred-relational method of

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

data analysis focuses on listening to "care and justice voices" in narrative accounts (c.f. Brown, Debold, Tappan and Gilligan 1991) and centres on "selves-in-relation" (Ruddick, 1989) or the "relational being" (Jordan, 1993), a view of human beings as embedded in a complex web of intimate and larger social relations. The emphasis on interdependence and relationality that lies at the heart of this method supports the development of innovation and adaptation when examining social exclusion, a terrain in which the public and private are often blurred (Byrne, Canavan and Millar, 2009). The aim of voice-centred-relational approach is to encourage the art of listening to the reading of group and individual transcripts (DeVault, 1990; Gilligan, 1992; Mauthner and Doucet, 1998). For the purposes of this study, four readings were conducted. The first reading comprised of "reading for the plot" and main events in participants' lives, and for "reader-response" – the issue of reflexivity in terms of the researchers' social location and emotional responses to the participant. This reflexivity and emphasis on decision-making differentiates this method from other modes of analysis such as grounded theory. The second reading comprised of "reading for the voice of I" or how the participants perceived and experienced themselves as actors. This shed light on the meanings, relationships and contradictions central to participants' caring sphere and identified how women often appeared caught between two voices (Mauthner and Doucet, 1998), in terms of the disconnections they felt in the marketplace and at home. Reading three focused on "reading for relationships" to identity the broader inter-personal networks and ties that defined economic exclusion. Consciously reading for relationships was particularly valuable in revealing participants' difficulties linked to perceived obligations, anxieties and concerns within relationships, which informed the theme of affective burdens in more detail. It particular the focus on "we" charted how women described their relationships with family, friends and more formal social interactions in the marketplace, how these were compounded by impoverishment and how women as narrators, felt shamed, ignored or classed during these

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

interactions. Finally, the fourth reading aimed to place participants within broader political, social and cultural structures. This identified how participants were constructed in moral terms when interacting with the key structures identified in the data, such as, family, charities, neighbourhoods and social services. Overall this multi-layered emphasis on narratives shifted analysis the away from "coding" and helped to maintain differences between respondents. Through this analytical approach a reconstructed view of marketplace exclusion was made possible where the relational web of its effects surfaced within the affective sphere of participants' lives.

.

Table.1: Participant Profile - Focus Groups

Name*	Age	Ethnicity	Marital Status	Family Status	Employment Status
(Group 1)					
Beth	47	Irish	Married	3 children	Working in the home
Kate	38	Nigerian	Single	3 children	Works part-time
Mary	49	Irish	Widowed	6 children	Part-time job-shares
Joanne	40	Nigerian	Married	4 children	Working in the home
Stephanie	32	Irish (Traveller)	Single	3 children	Social welfare recipient
Masie	50	Irish (Traveller)	Widowed	4 children	Social welfare recipient
(Group 2)					
Carrie	41	Irish	Married	3 children	Works full-time (low paid)
Marian	40	Irish	Married	2 children	Working in the home
Meg	44	Irish	Married	3 children	Working in the home
Jessica	26	Irish (Traveller)	Single	2 children	Social welfare recipient
Louise	51	Irish	Separated	2 children	Social welfare recipient
Samantha	53	Irish	Divorced	3 children	Recipient of disability benefit (mental health)
Collette	26	Irish (Traveller)	Single	2 children	Social welfare recipient

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

Table.2: Participant Profile – In-depth Interviews

Name*	Age	Ethnicity	Marital Status	Family Status	Employment Status
Rose	45	Irish	Widowed	4 children, parenting alone after partner's suicide	Social welfare recipient
Abby	39	Irish	Married	3 children, expecting her 4th	Working in the home
Cathy	33	Irish	Married	3 children	Working in the home
Margaret	47	Irish	Married	No children	Part-time work
Siofra	35	Irish	Separated	2 children	Social welfare recipient
Bridget	47	Irish	Separated	4 children	Social welfare recipient
Michelle	30	Irish	Separated	2 children	Social welfare recipient
Danielle	39	Irish	Single	1 child	Social welfare recipient
Jacinta	28	Irish	Single	3 children	Social welfare recipient
Lisa	31	Irish	Single	2 children	Social welfare recipient
Lucy	55	German	Married	4 children	Works full-time (low paid)
Lily	52	Irish	Married	No children	Recipient of disability benefit
Nora	58	Irish	Married	6 children	Working in the home
Florence	47	Irish	Widowed	8 children	Works part-time (low paid)

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

Marie	44	Irish	Married	2 children	Recipient of disability benefit
Debra	55	English	Married	4 children	Recipient of disability benefit
Eliza	34	Irish	Single	3 children	Social welfare recipient; Previous history of homelessness

(*All participants either chose or were provided with pseudonyms)

Findings

The following section traces the web of relational exclusions which characterise affective inequality as it interfaces with economic disadvantage. Findings will demonstrate how the individualising and isolating nature of the market undermines the affective norms of trust, mutuality and respect, with marketplace interactions and consumption pressures placing tremendous strain on participants' care relations. Individualisation from the point of view of participants means, that concern or care for others has steadily evaporated within mainstream society and has been replaced with an indifference towards those less privileged. The dissolving empathy, the intensification of disconnection, and disrespect (Pemberton, et al., 2014), participants' experience, reinforce their status as citizens of "unequal worth" (Lister, 2004). The following accounts explore the interface between the economic and the affective spheres highlighting how participants oscillate between family, community and consumption pressure on limited incomes, with the influence and power of the marketplace occupying a constant presence in their lives. To illustrate this, two new themes related to marketplace exclusion are introduced; i) material struggles and disconnections and ii) affective burdens. These themes explore the circuits of relational conflict located in the everyday lives of women, as they reconcile the tension of impoverished marketplace interactions with the judgement and disrespect of others.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

Material struggles and disconnections

Although we cannot assume that the needs and desires of economically constrained consumers are identical to those of affluent ones (Hill, 2015), the contradictory and transient nature of the market was repeatedly highlighted by participants. A proportion of them strongly emphasised how their lives operated on the periphery of the consumer world believing their economic circumstances protected them from being dictated to by the pressures and expectations of marketplace trends. Yet ironically, for these women in their 40's and 50's living in a busy urban environment, the very nature of their impoverishment kept them in daily contact with the market, bargain hunting and looking for some semblance of satisfaction:

> Carrie ... people think it's going to make them happier...material things, and it doesn't...
>
> Louise ...I think we're all in it...I'm in it...in a struggling way...
>
> Samantha ...a short blast of happiness maybe...
>
> Marian ...it's a false sense of security...
>
> Samantha ...it doesn't last...no it's not real!

A number of participants however strongly believe their lives to be outside of the consumer world, associating it with more affluent people. Beth, a married woman with three children, outlines how she is comfortable with being disconnected:

> It [the consumer world] seems so far removed from my life. But there are women in my acquaintance who go out and buy something when they're feeling down....it's how they deal with the stresses in their lives. On the outside looking in, not being part of it simply because of my financial situation would never allow me to be part of it.....it seems to be on-going and it doesn't seem to change the stresses....they seem to be

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

> buying every week. It's not like they buy this week...they feel better and that's it for the month....it's self-perpetuating (Beth).

Disconnection was not only experienced as a consequence of economic circumstances, those who had lived through major life transitions also felt more separated from the material world than they once did. Lily had a life altering car accident ten years ago which left her with multiple disabilities, including facial disfigurement:

> To go from having a job and having money and your own independence... in the past if I was going to a wedding for example...I'd just go out and buy an outfit, I didn't care what I paid for it, but now I just don't go...sometimes you just wish you could have your life back before the accident and have your job and your money and if I wanted to go…I never buy clothes, never buy clothes, all my sisters give me hand me downs, I never buy clothes...no, no I don't have the money.

Already constructed as "other" through her chronic, daily experiences of pain and embarrassment over her looks, Lily's interaction with the marketplace left her feeling rejected and served as a reminder of her impoverished circumstances. Indeed, for many women in this study their experiences of economic inequality translated into consumption inequalities and differential well-being causing, psychological strain (Hill and Stephens, 1997; Hutton, 2015; Layte et al., 2000); intra-household inequality (Cantillon and Nolan, 2001) and neighbourhood tensions (O'Loughlin, 2006). Their struggles with material disconnection also manifested in regular antagonistic incidences of marketplace surveillance and retail discrimination. Recounting experiences of shopping trips engendered powerful negative reactions in participants. 'When a marketing system excludes or discriminates against people in certain groups, it fails to deliver a desirable standard of living to such groups, resulting in restricted consumption' (Bennett et al., 2016; 286). Women characterised the market as an unnecessary and confusing place where regular interactions

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

with aggressive sales people left them feeling out of place and degraded. Carrie, a married woman with three children and a full-time job and Eliza, a lone parent of three children share their experiences of scrutiny and discrimination in this regard:

> You can't even do your shopping in peace because they [shop assistants] harass you...they make you feel like criminals.....even clothes-wise, you can't even go in and look at something, without someone on your heels saying..."can I help you? ...but they're not trying to help you... they are watching you! (Carrie)

> I find sometimes when I go into shops...security....they start following you around because they don't like the look of you, or they don't like the way you're dressed... I have a tattoo on my hand so now when I'm going into shops, the sleeve comes down over my hand, or I'll turn my hand the other way when I'm wheeling the pram around the aisles (Eliza)

Now stable, after several years of heroin addiction, Eliza's physical appearance still carried markers of her past. She believed the combination of her physicality and tattoos contributed to how others saw her - as part of a deviant, impoverished underclass. Although the marketplace is recognised as a fear-inducing environment for some consumers (Davies et al., 2010; Russell and Taylor, 2005), for the women in this study, the contradictory nature of consumption was experienced as a matter of individual choice, and at the same time, functioned as a method of scrutiny and control (Gibson-Graham, 2002). The emotional energies women invested in managing consumption efforts with scare economic resources became depleted under such antagonistic circumstances. For participants such as Eliza, the marketplace represented a social site where they felt continually policed:

> It's not nice, like sometimes it's degrading, why are they staring at me, why are they following me around, why out of everybody, hundreds in this shop, are they following

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

me around? If you approach the security guard to ask, "why are you following me around?"... they want to escort you out of the shop, because you've just questioned them! Just leave me to do my shopping and they're saying, "we are just doing our job."

Marketplace incidents such as these are not to be underestimated for women like Eliza who had successfully transitioned from a life of prostitution, drug addiction and homelessness to a stable role as a parent. Many role transitions can be independently challenging and stressful (Hogg et al., 2004; Davies et al,. 2010) without additional generative experiences of discrimination. What Eliza had experienced in her private life was mirrored to a lesser degree in the marketplace as she attempted to stretch limited finances to provide for her three children who had recently been returned to her from social services. The emotional and affective consequences of scrutiny, labelling and abuse in such retail exchanges created affective inequalities by undermining participants' individual sense of self-worth and self-esteem (Cook, 2001). Furthermore, the reality of women's circumstances often resulted in difficult encounters at retail checkouts when their economic lives became visible to others. The stress involved in having to return essential items they needed, but could not afford, led to further to judgement and embarrassment.

> I asked the checkout girl, can you take something back, I need the medication for my child. She said no, it's paid for, I'm not going back recalculate and mess everything up ...I get very frustrated, having to put back something that I actually need, to pay for something I *really* need... it's embarrassing as well … it's a bit of both, so I usually just run out of the shop!

As a lone parent with three children surviving on social welfare payments, Jacinta struggled every month to provide for her family. Like many participants in this study, she dreaded planning the weekly shopping and the mental calculations required to avoid such

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

embarrassment and the judgement of others. Similarly, Collette a Traveller woman and a lone parent of two young children, explains her feelings of alienation in having to pay for her children's Christmas toys in instalments from as early as June, through the use of in-store gift cards:

> I keep looking at people in front of me in the queue... and they're just handing out money...and I have all these cards squashed up together that I've paid off for six months...and these people can just walk in and say...I'll have that....it make me feel very upset to be honest with you....I'm there struggling to get the toys in the first place.

Gopaldas (2014) suggests that more research is required on marketplace situations where consumers feel required to hide their true feelings however for participants such as Jacinta and Collette, they could not disguise their emotions, particularly when relational or dependent others were impacted by their perceived shortfalls in consumption. From an affective standpoint these excerpts are significant, as we often recognise the presence or absence of care in the lives of not only of those familiar to us, but even among strangers, especially when we engage or interact with them in public environments (Lynch, 2007). Restricted access to economic resources required participants to engage in an increased amount of emotional work to mitigate the effects of family consumption deficits. For lone parents in particular, their economic realities resulted in little independence of life, social exclusion, stress, a lack of leisure time and emotional exhaustion. Impersonal, decentred power operated in both the affective and economic systems to render the consumption lives of participants more burdensome (O'Brien, 2009). Within the affective domain, material struggles and disconnections in the market occurred within the sphere of secondary care relations – within retail settings, which were socially exploitative, embarrassing and somewhat dehumanising for women already grappling with economic difficulties. These experiences and practices are

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

particularly important to highlight as forms of marketplace exclusion as they sustain market-level inequalities related to gender (Fischer, 2015) and reinforce the fact that impoverished consumers' experiences of the marketplace stand in sharp contrast to those not located at the base of the pyramid (Martin and Hill, 2015). Low-income limits options, depletes emotional energies, and renders those experiencing it less powerful and less important. This in turn, creates emotional divisions and emotional hierarchies which, as Illouz (2007) emphasizes, implicitly organizes moral and social arrangements at the economic-affective interface to the determinant of less privileged people.

Affective burdens

Whilst financial and affective burdens are inseparably bound, the latter is characterised by a combination of moral sanctioning, competitiveness and fractured intimate relationships. The findings in this section demonstrate the nature of inter-personal struggles women faced on a continuous basis. Firstly, within the secondary sphere of care relations, within the neighbourhoods and the local communities where participants lived, a lack of possessions made women feel less than, while paradoxically, the possession of certain items were used a basis for further discrimination:

> My neighbours reported me to social workers....they made false claims that my kids weren't dressed or eating properly. I was running up a bill in my local shop to make sure I had all the best things in my house for my kids, the social worker or whoever else would call to see me (Bridget)

In the above quote, Bridget, a separated woman with four children, admits to getting into debt by consuming more than she could afford to manage the shame of being discriminated against by her neighbours. Although there is now a growing volume of consumer credit

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

obligations manifested by poorer households (Langley, 2014), it is important to look at the root causes of debt obligations resulting from credit consumption as located within affective exclusion. In Bridget's case, it was an obligatory decision to alleviate social workers concerns that she could provide the basics for her family. From an affective standpoint, she believed she was displaying moral worth through consumption in order to gain the respect of powerful others (social workers) and relational others (neighbours). Similarly Rose, a recently widowed mother of four children who lived with bi-polar disorder, explains her frustration over her treatment by local community and charity workers:

> Recently I have needed some help from the Christian Charity.... but because I have a car I won't get any help...or it's the same if I go to the Health Centre and they say, you've a car outside the door, you don't need our help.... what the hell has my car got to do with it! I'm up to my eyes in debt over it and it doesn't work very well.... and still they'll say, you know there's nothing we can do for you, you must be getting on ok if you can afford a car.

Referring to explicit encounters of competitiveness with neighbours, Stephanie a Traveller women and lone parent of three children surviving on welfare payments communicates her experiences of social comparison and competitive consumption:

> They sort of compete, the older kids in the neighbourhood say to the younger kids, those trainers are cheap and nasty … look at mine, they have a Nike sign! When you open your window and you see how that's directed at your child – it's hurtful you know?

Advocating for a greater consideration of the moral impact of socio-economic discrimination described in these narratives, Sayer (2005) suggests that the concerns people have regarding their position and how others view them is emotionally and relationally valid. For many participants, neighbours and members of their broader community deprived them of dignity

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

and respect and isolated them on the basis of appearance and perceived consumption choices. This is somewhat of a departure from the romanticized notion of community support where life is easier in communities stocked with reciprocity and social trust (Puttnam, 1995). As these excerpts demonstrate, neighbourhoods mired by poverty were often less likely to produce the kind of relational trust that underpinned neighbourly care of so-called social capital (Leonard, 2004).

Within the domain of relatives, kin and friendship networks, interpersonal conflict and affective anxieties related to consumption were equally apparent. For participants, contexts such as Christmas, Birthdays and general socialising proved a source of chronic tension for them. They spoke of reducing their attendance at events or cutting back on gifts to manage the expectations of others and to alleviate financial pressure. In particular, Meg, a focus group participant, married with four children and working in the home was particularly vocal about the responsibility in managing the appearance that everything was under control to extended family members:

> My sister's expectations are greater...she's very materialistic......I would feel pressure in keeping with that standard for her...so I would spend more on her children than my own, because I know she would be disapproving (Meg)

The individualising nature of the market directly conflicted with the building of solidarity and a sense of community as many women felt significant pressure to keep up and narrow any perceived differences through consumption vis-a-vis more affluent family members, even to the detriment of their own families and feelings of self-worth. Furthermore, the tension of being in friendships with higher income people proved to be an added strain for women that could not be eradicated. Lucy, married with four children and a low-paid youth worker, reveals the strain of working hard to earn extra money for socialising and still feeling othered by her friends:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

> My female friends often meet for dinner ...I find it really stressful either to get the money together to go for a dinner which I mostly can't ... or for making excuses why I can't go for dinner, I usually say, I have a headache or I'm too busy ..I can't admit I have no money, because, then they will pay for me and who wants that!

On one hand, participants tended to be in denial about their socio-economic realities, reluctant to acknowledge it, and on the other, acutely aware of it and sensitive to its struggle and minute indicators as manifested through the class patterning of consumption (Sayer, 2005). Beth and Mary both is their 40's and living in an isolated rural area, had nine children between them, their exchange which follows, illustrates how consumption as a process of signification was embedded within the fabric of women's everyday relational interactions:

Mary I feel very criticised... going to the school to collect the children....there are groups of women competing with each other, very much putting pressure on each other in terms of what they own, how they look..it drives me insane.....I just walk past them..

Beth Do you think they notice you?

Mary Probably.... I'm usually wearing something not considered appropriate for a "mother".... they frown upon me.

This exchange is significant because there is a tendency to locate the causative factors contributing to particular inequalities in the attributes of disadvantaged people; in their gender, poverty, or race, rather than in the structured affective relations, the planned and unplanned exclusionary systems, that transform these very attributes into inequalities (Baker et al., 2004).

So far the affective exclusions outlined in this paper, are located discreetly outside of the intimate sphere of the family. The neglect of private, intimate relationships in research reflects the traditional concern with public, institutional and structural forms of social life and

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

the lack of interest in women's relationships (Mauthner, 1998). However recent research has emphasised how unequal power relations and consumption pressures intersect in the sphere of primary care relations (Hutton, 2015). Within this context consumption conflicts are also 'rooted in the intersecting structural contexts of gendered poverty and intra-household inequality' (1711). For participants in this study affective burdens, as they intersected with the marketplace were shouldered directly and disproportionately by them as illustrated by one focus group participant, Joanne, a Nigerian woman living in Ireland for 10 years, married with four children and dependent on her husband's income:

> Men can't even make a budget plan! I said to my husband, "If you want to, let's exchange roles maybe for this week. You go to the shop and buy what you think we need for the house." He refused and I said, "no because if you don't care what I'm doing in the house, maybe you think the woman is just at home, looking after the children." There is more mental work going into the running of the home and caring for the children, but he is not there – he chooses not to see!

The conception of her husband as a separate self was intrinsically problematic for Joanne, conjuring up the image of an autonomous individual – signifying a disconnection from emotions and a blindness to care work within the family, which Gilligan (1995) suggests set the stage for psychological and social conflict. In fact throughout participants' narratives, care was absent in observed patterns of intra-household inequality, where family members occasionally pursued their own interests at the expense of other members (Costa, 2005; Dwyer and Bruce, 1988; Folbre, 1986; Webster, 2000), even when participants were living with disabilities and impairments. Debra was formerly an award winning gymnast and Psychical Education Teacher, who acquired a disability through a serious accident. In the following excerpt she explains the tension and guilt she associates with her economic circumstances:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

> Before my accident, if my children wanted something, a pair of trainers or a dress or whatever, then if I could facilitate them, I did. After the accident my children were traumatised by my physical problems and my finances changed completely and for teenagers, that's very difficult to cope with. That's where the pressure came from, they put pressure on me and I also felt like I was letting them down.

Although intimate relationships act as a cultural and social resource to help people achieve well-being (Illouz, 2007), the self-interest and power relations experienced intra-household fractured intimate family relationships as participants' capacity to care through consumption was questioned. Indeed, the impact of affective inequality in this study was most clearly seen in the way in which the unequal role of women in the family system reinforced their subordinate position in the marketplace.

Discussion and conclusion

This paper has explored marketplace exclusion from the perspective of economic disadvantage and has traced its impact on relations of love, care and solidarity, to characterise the marketplace as care-*less* – a generative site of structural inequality in the affective domain of life. The care-less marketplace not only excludes but continually creates and reproduces inequalities in women's resources, perpetuating inequalities of power and status and places tremendous strain on their affective relations with others. Although affective inequality remains a multi-faceted and emerging construct, this new conceptual approach encourages a different appraisal of what constitutes marketplace exclusion within the context of economic disadvantage, framed around structured inequality, based on relational conditions and emotional injustices. As this study has demonstrated, those who live on the margins of social structures with limited economic resources, are restricted in making active and enjoyable

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

consumer choices, and are furthermore sanctioned and scrutinized within this context. With scholars continuing to stress how impoverished consumers receive less attention in marketing and consumer scholarship than their more affluent counterparts (Martin and Hill, 2012), this paper not only develops additional insights on the nature of imposed exclusion though poverty but articulates a unique set of affective insights which might be called the destructive counterpart of affective equality – discrimination and relational antagonism.

As the findings demonstrate there is nothing inevitable about care, i.e. mutuality, trust and respect in the marketplace, or within the affective domain, as each provides a context where care can occur but also a context where it can be destroyed. The outcome for women engaging with the market on limited incomes is best understood in terms of the affective inequalities it generates. In this regard, affective inequality is generated and reinforced through disrespect, relational carelessness and emotional disconnections.

The paper surfaces the contradictory requirements placed on women who are financially restricted and socially vulnerable. These affective burdens make it difficult for participants to establish a place in the economic market system and at the same time, the very economic conditions in which participants live severely disrupt their affective relationships (Fanning, et al., 2002). Those with low social status, recognise more clearly who is afforded high esteem and who is not (Baker et al., 2009), consequently, marketplace exclusions often exacerbate structural economic injustices and affective deprivations. The study also demonstrates how participants' concerns are driven by disconnections, stemming from the erosion of empathy and the disappearance of solidarity – these render relationships difficult to maintain. Yet participants' voices carry a sense of connection, of living and acting in a web of relationships which goes against the grain of the detached, autonomous consumer (Gilligan, 1995).

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

By extending the lens of affective inequality to our understanding of marketplace exclusion, the conventional distinctions between the public and private realities of consumption are dissolved. There is a need to redefine our understanding of the active consumer from one that centres on the public persona, the economic, political and cultural actor in the public sphere of the marketplace, to one that recognises consumers as endemically dependent and interdependent. Attention to both the everyday life experiences of pain, suffering and compassion – and to the wider context that generate these - can create the possibilities for intervention in the structural conditions that promote suffering (Singleton and Mee, 2017). If we are concerned about the well-being of individuals in general, and marketplace inequality in particular, we can no longer afford to ignore the significance of the affective dimensions of human experience as they relate to and interact with marketplace and consumption dynamics.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the participating women for sharing their experiences so candidly. The author also wishes to thank the reviewers for their helpful and insightful comments in the development of this paper.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest is reported by the author.

Funding

This work was supported by the Irish Research Council for the Humanities and Social Sciences.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

References

Baker, John., Kathleen Lynch, Sara Cantillon, and Judy Walsh. 2004. *Equality: from theory to action,* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Barker, Drucilla K. 1998. "Dualisms, Discourse and Developments." Feminist Economics, 13(30; 83-94.

Benhabib, Seyla. 1992. *Situating the Self*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bennett, A, Stacey Menzel Baker, Samantha Cross, J.P. James, Gregory Bartholomew, Akon E. Ekpo, Geraldine Rosa Henderson, Martina Hutton, Apoorv Khare, Abhijit Roy, Tony Stovall, and Charles Ray Taylor. 2016. Omission and Commission as Marketplace Trauma, *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing,* 35(2), 280-291.

Blocker, Christopher. P., Julie A. Ruth, Srinivas Sridharan, Colin Beckwith, Ahmet Ekici, Martina Hutton, Jose Antonio Rosa, Bige Saatcioglu, Debabrata Talukdar, Carloe Trujillo and Rohit Varman. 2011. "Applying a Transformative Consumer Research Lens to Understanding and Alleviating Poverty." *Journal of Research for Consumers*, 19, 1-9.

Blocker, Christopher. P., Julie A. Ruth, Srinivas Sridharan, Colin Beckwith, Ahmet Ekici, Martina Hutton, Jose Antonio Rosa, Bige Saatcioglu, Debabrata Talukdar, Carloe Trujillo and Rohit Varman. 2013. "Understanding Poverty and Promoting Poverty Alleviation through Transformative Consumer Research". *Journal of Business Research*, 66, 1195-1202.

Bone, Sterling A., Glenn L. Christensen and Jerome D. Williams. 2014. "Rejected, Shackled and Alone: The Impact of Systemic Restricted Choice on Minority Consumers' Construction of Self." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41, 451-474.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

Brown Lynn, M., Elizabeth Debold, Mark B. Tappan and Carole Gilligan. 1991. "Reading Narratives of Conflict and Choice for Self and Moral Voices: A Relational Method" in M.Williams and J.L. Gerwitz (eds). *Moral Behaviour and Development Volume 2: Research*. Hilldale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brown, Lynn M and Carole Gilligan. 1992. *Meeting at the Crossroads: Women's Psychology and Girl's Development*. Cambridge, M.A: Harvard University Press.

Bubeck, Diemut E. 1995. *Care, Justice and Gender.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Byrne, Anne, John Canavan and Michelle Millar. 2004. "Developing inclusive research methodologies: testing the voice centred relational method of qualitative data analysis in a collaborative research project on early school leaving". Political Science and Sociology, NUI Galway: Child and Family Research and Policy Unit.

Byrne, Anne, John Canavan and Michelle Millar. 2009. "Participatory research and the voice-centred relational method of data analysis: is it worth it?" *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 12, (1): 67-77.

Cantillon, Sara and Kathleen Lynch. 2017. "Affective Equality: Love Matters." *Hypatia*, 32: 170-186.

Cantillon, Sara and Brian Nolan. 2001. "Poverty within Households: Measuring Gender Differences Using Non-Monetary Indicators". *Feminist Economics*, 7, 5-23.

Cappellini, Benedetta, Alessandra Marilli and Elizabeth Parsons. 2014." The hidden work of coping: Gender and the micro-politics of household consumption in times of austerity." *Journal of Marketing Management*, 30(15–16): 1597–1624.

Connell, Raeyn. 1995. *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

Connell, Raeyn. 2002. *Gender.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cook, Deborah. 2001. "Critical Perspectives on Solidarity." *Rethinking Marxism*, 13 (2); 91-108.

Costa, Janeen. 2005. "Empowerment and Exploitation: gendered Production and Consumption in Rural Greece." *Consumption, Markets & Culture*, 8 (3): 313-323.

Davies, Andrea, Susan Dobscha, Susi Geiger, Stephanie O'Donohoe, Lisa O'Malley, Andrea Prothero, Elin B. Sørensen, and Thyra U. Thomsen. 2010. "Buying into Motherhood? Problematic Consumption and Ambivalence in Transitional Phases." *Consumption, Markets & Culture* 13 (4): 373–397.

DeVault, Marjorie. 1990. "Talking and Listening from Women's Standpoint: Feminist Strategies for Interviewing and Analysis," *Social Problems*, 37, (1): 96-116.

Dwyer, Daisy and Judith Bruce (eds.). 1988. *A Home Divided. Women and Income in the Third World*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Fanning, Bryan, Angela Veale and Dawn O'Connor. 2001. *Beyond the Pale: Asylum Seeking Children and Social Exclusion in Ireland.* Dublin: Irish Refugee Council.

Fineman, Martha. 2004. *The Anatomy of Myth: A Theory of Dependency*. New York: New Press.

Fischer, Eileen. 2015. "Towards more Marketing Research on Gender Inequality." *Journal of Marketing Management*, 31 (15-16): 1718-1722.

Folbre, Nancy. 1986. "Cleaning House: New Perspectives on Households and Economic Development." *Journal of Development Economics* 22: 5–40.

Folbre, Nancy. 1994. *Who Pays for the Kids? Gender and the Structures of Constraint*, London: Routledge.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

Folbre, Nancy. 2004. ‘A Theory of the Misallocation of Time’, in Folbre, N. and Bittman, M. (eds), *Family Time: The Social Organization of Care*, London: Routledge.

Gibson, Julie and Graham, Katherine. 2002. A Feminist Critique of the Political Economy. (In) Bridge, G. & Watson, S. (Eds), *The End of Capitalism (as we knew it): The Blackwell City Reader*, Blackwell Publishing.

Gilligan, Carole. 1982. *In a different voice,* Cambridge; Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, Carole. 1995. “Hearing the difference: theorizing connection.” *Hypatia,* 10 (2): 120–127.

Gopaldas, Ahir. 2014. “Marketplace Sentiments”. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41, 995-1014.

Hamilton, Kathy, Maria Piacentini, Emma Bannister, Andreas Barrios, Chris P. Blocker, Catherine A. Coleman, Ahmet Ekici, Helene George, Martina Hutton, Francoise Passerard, Beige Saatcioglu. 2014. “Poverty in Consumer Culture: Towards a Transformative Social Representation.” *Journal of Marketing Management*, 30, 1833-1857.

Hamilton, Kathy. 2012. “Low-income Families and Coping through Brands: Inclusion or Stigma?” *Sociology*, 46, 74-90.

Hamilton, Kathy and Caterall, Miriam. 2006. “Transitions into Poverty: An exploratory study into how families cope when faced with income restriction and limited consumption opportunities.” *The Marketing Review*, 6, 123-136.

Hamilton, Kathy. 2009. “Consumer decision-making in low-income families: The case of conflict avoidance,” *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 8, 252-267.

Hamilton, Kathy. 2009. “Those Left Behind: Inequality in Consumer Culture.*” Irish Marketing Review*, 20(2); 40-54.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

Harrington Meyer. 2000. "Introduction: The Right to-or- Not to-Care" in M. Harrington Meyer (ed) *Care Work: Gender, Class and the Welfare State*. New York, London: Routledge.

Held, Virginia. 1995. "The Meshing of Care and Justice, *Hypatia*, 10, 128-132.

Hill, Ronald Paul. 1991. "Homeless Women, Special Possessions, and the Meaning of "Home": An Ethnographic Case Study." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18, 298-310.

Hill, Ronald Paul and Debra Lynn Stephens. 1997. "Impoverished Consumers and Consumer Behaviour: The Case of AFDC Mothers". *Journal of Macromarketing,* 17, 32-48.

Hill, Ronald Paul and Kelly D. Martin. 2014. "Broadening the Paradigm of Marketing as Exchange: A Public Policy and Marketing Perspective". *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 33, 17-33.

Hill, Ronald Paul. 2015. "Materializing poverty: how the poor transform their lives." *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 18 (5): 474-478.

Hill, Ronald Paul, Justine Rapp, Michael L. Capella and the Gramercy Gentlemen. 2015. "Consumption Restriction in a Total Control Institution: Participatory Action Research in a Maximum Security Prison." *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 34 (2): 156-172.

Hobson, Barbara. 2000. *Gender and Citizenship in Transition*. London: Macmillan.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1989. *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home*. New York: Viking.

Hogg, Margaret, Carolyn Folkman Curasi and Pauline Maclaran. 2004. "The (Re)configuration of Production and Consumption in Empty Nest Households/Families." *Consumption, Markets & Culture* 7 (3): 239–259.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

Hutton, Martina. 2015. “Consuming Stress: Exploring Hidden Dimensions of Consumption-related Strain at the Intersection of Gender & Poverty. *Journal of Marketing Management,* 31. (15-16). 1695-1717

Illouz, Eva. 2012. *Why Love Hurts: A Sociological Explanation*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Illouz, Eva. 2009. “Emotions, Imagination, and Consumption: A New Research Agenda,” *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 9(3); 377-413.

Illouz, Eva. 2007. *Cold Intimacies: The Making of Emotional Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Iversen, Vegard. 2003. “Intra-Household Inequality: A Challenge for the Capability Approach?” *Feminist Economics*, 9, 93-115.

Jordan, Judith V. 1993. “The relational self: a model of women’s development.” In J. Van Mens-Verhulst, K. Schreurs and L. Woertman (eds). *Daughtering and Mothering: Female Subjectivities Reanalysed*. London: Routledge.

Kittay, Eva F. 1999. *Love’s Labor*. New York: Routledge.

Langley. Paul. 2014. “Consuming Credit.” *Consumption, Markets & Culture*, 17 (5): 417-428.

Layte, Richard, Brian Nolan and Christopher Whelan. 2000. Targeting Poverty: Lessons from Monitoring Ireland’s National Anti-Poverty Strategy. *Journal of Social Policy*, 29, 553-575.

Leonard, Madeline. 2004. “Bonding and bridging social capital: reflections from Belfast.” *Sociology,* 38, 927–944.

Lister, Ruth. 2004. *Poverty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lynch, Kathleen. 1989. “Solidary labour: its nature and marginalisation.” *Sociological Review,* 37, 1–14.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

Lynch, Kathleen. 2007. “Love labour as a distinct and non-commodifiable form of care labour.” *Sociological Review,* 55 (3): 550–570.

Lynch, Kathleen, Maureen Lyons and Sara Cantillon. 2007. “Breaking silence: educating citizens for love, care and solidarity.” *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 17, 1-19.

Lynch, Kathleen, John Baker and Maureen Lyons. 2009. *Affective equality: Love, care and injustice* London; Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lynch. Kathleen and Walsh, Judy. 2009. “Love, Care and Solidarity: What is and is not commodifiable.” In, Lynch, K., Baker and M. Lyons. 2009. *Affective equality: Love, care and injustice* London; Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Martin, Kelly D. and Ronald Paul Hill. 2012. “Life Satisfaction, Self-determination and Consumption Adequacy at the Bottom of the Pyramid.” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 38, 1155-1168.

Martin, Kelly D. and Ronald Paul Hill. 2015. “Saving and Well-being at the Base of the Pyramid.” *Journal of Services Research.*

Masschelein, Jan and Martin Simons. 2002. “An adequate education in a globalised world? A note on immunisation against being-together.” *Journal of Philosophy of Education,* 36 (4): 589 608.

Mauthner, Natasha and Andrea Doucet. 1998. “Reflections on a Voice-Centred-Relational Method: Analysing Maternal and Domestic Voices.” In *Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research*, Eds. Edwards, R. and Ribbens, J. Sage, USA & London.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

Mauthner, Melanie. 1998. "Bringing Silent Voices into a Public Discourse: Researching Accounts of Sister Relationships." In *Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research*, Eds. Edwards, R. and Ribbens, J. Sage, USA & London.

McRobbie, Angela. 2002. 'A Mixed Bag Of Misfortunes?: Bourdieu's *Weight of the World*', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19 (3): 129–138.

Molander, Susanna. 2017. "Not just a mother: embodied and positional aspects of consumer learning from a practice perspective." Consumption Markets & Culture, 20:2, 131-152,

Noddings, Nel. 2001. "The care tradition: beyond 'add women and stir" *Theory into Practice,* 40(1): 29–34.

Nussbaum, Martha. 2001. *Upheavals of thought: The intelligence of emotions.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Brien, Maeve. 2009. The Impact of Economic, Social, Cultural and Emotional Capital on Mothers' Love and Care Work in Education. In, Lynch, K., Baker, J. and Lyons, M. (Eds.), *Affective Equality: Love, Care and Injustice*. Palgrave Macmillan

O'Loughin, Deirdre. 2006. *Credit Consumption and Debt Accumulation Among Low-Income Consumers: Key Consequences and Intervention Strategies*, Dublin: Combat Poverty Agency.

Oliver, Michael. 1990. *The Politics of Disablement*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Pemberton, Simon, Eileen Sutton, Eldin Fahmy and Karen Bell. 2014. "Life on a low-income in austere times". *Poverty and Social Exclusion in the UK Report*: ESRC.

Puttnam, Robert D. 1995. "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital" *Journal of Democracy*, 6 (1): 65-78.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

Ruddick, Sara. 1989. *Maternal Thinking: Towards a Politics of Peace*. Boston MA: Beacon.

Russell, Rachel M. and Melissa Tyler. 2005. “Branding and Bricolage: Gender, consumption and transition”. *Childhood* 12 (2): 221–37.

Saaticioglu, Bige and Canan Corus. 2016. “Exploring spatial vulnerability: inequality and agency formulations in social space.” *Journal of Marketing Management*, 32 (3-4): 230-251.

Saaticioglu, Bige and Julie L. Ozanne. 2013. A Critical Spatial Approach to Marketplace Exclusion and Inclusion.” *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 32, 32-37.

Sayer, Andrew. 2005. “Class, Moral Worth and Recognition” *Sociology*, 39 (5): 947-963.

Singleton, Vicky and Steve Mee. 2017. “Critical compassion: Affect, discretion and policy-care relations.” *The Sociological Review Monographs*, 65(2); 130-149.

Skeggs, Beverly. 2004. *Class, Self, Culture*. London: Routledge.

Strassman, Diana. 1993. “Not a Free Market: The Rhetoric of Disciplinary Authority in Economics”, (In) *Beyond Economic Man, Feminist Theory and Economics* (eds) M. Ferber and J. Nelson. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Tadajewski, Mark. 2016. “Focus groups: history, epistemology and non-individualistic consumer research.” *Consumption, Markets & Culture*, 19 (4): 319-345.

Tronto, Joan C. 1993. *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. New York: Routledge.

Ungerson, Clare. 1997. “Social politics and the commodification of care.” *Social Politics,* 4 (3): 362–381.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.

Webster, Cynthia. 2000. “Purchase decision making in India: A critical ethnographic study of the antecedents of marital power.” *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 4, 145-186.

Williams, Fiona. 2004. *Rethinking Families*. London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in CONSUMPTION, MARKETS & CULTURE on 7 January 2019, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10253866.2018.1561636.