

The Listening Guide: Voice-Centred-Relational Analysis of Private Subjectivities

Abstract

Purpose - This paper focuses on the analytical importance of voice and the value of listening and representing voices in private contexts. It highlights the under-theorised position of relationality in family research. The paper introduces the Listening Guide as a unique analytical approach to sharpen researchers' understanding of private experiences and articulations.

Design/methodology/approach - This is a conceptual and technical paper. It problematises voice, authority and analytical representation in the private location of family and examines how relational dynamics interact with the subtleties of voice in research. It also provides a practical illustration of the Listening Guide detailing how researchers can utilise this analytical approach.

Findings – The paper illustrates how the Listening Guide works as an analytical method, structured around four stages and applied to interview transcript excerpts.

Practical implications – The Listening Guide bridges private and public knowledge making, identifies competing voices and recognises relations of power in family research. It provides qualitative market researchers with an analytical tool to hear changes and continuities in participants' sense of self over time.

Social implications – The paper highlights how peripheral voices and silence can be analytically surfaced in private domains. A variety of studies and data can be explored with this approach however research questions involving vulnerable or marginal experiences are particularly suitable.

Originality/value – The paper presents the Listening Guide as a novel analytic method for researching family life – one which recovers the importance of voice and serves as a means to address the lack of debate on voice and authority in qualitative market research. It also highlights the under-theorised position of relationality in tracing the multiple subjectivities of research participants. It interrupts conventional qualitative analysis methods, directing attention away from conventional coding and towards listening as an alternative route to knowledge.

Keywords: voice, listening, relational, listening guide, voice-centred-relational-analysis, private subjectivities, I-poems, qualitative data.

Introduction

Who has a voice in research? Moreover, is it possible to identify multiple voices within the same narrative and if so, how do we capture its value and complexity? As voice involves sound, speech, and opinion, researchers interested in surfacing voice in their work should consider being analytically attentive and *listen* for such elements rather than immediately categorising, cutting and aggregating data as they *read*. They might also consider the benefits of being reflexively aware and listening for their authorial voice during the research process to avoid overwriting the expressions, meanings and resonance of their participants. Commentators have long noted the way that analysis is or should be integrally linked to, the knowing of ‘social reality’ or epistemology that informs, shapes and is shaped by the research project (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996; Mason, 2004). Yet, considerable tensions exist over when or at what point data analysis occurs. Some view it as a process that stretches across the entire research project, for others it is a systematic set of procedures for coding data, whilst others view it as the reflexive creation of aggregate patterns (Edwards and Weller 2012). The question therefore of data analysis remains a neglected area of inquiry in the qualitative research literature, both in terms of general methodological scholarship but also within research accounts of specific studies (Mauthner and Doucet, 1998).

Identifying how relatively little attention has been given to the actual process of analysis specifically within market research scholarship, Spiggle, (1994) provides important classifications and descriptions of qualitative data analytic procedures. Focusing on grounded theory, Goulding, (2005) offers a set of principles for analysing and abstracting information,

with Shankar and Goulding (2001) highlighting the potential contribution of narrative and dimensional analysis in qualitative research. Similarly, Thompson (1997) emphasises the role of analysis in developing meaningful insights in narratives, stories and text. This linguistic turn central to hermeneutic processes, has enriched qualitative market research studies through its focus on the personal and symbolic experiences of participants through the analysis of transcripts as texts (Thompson, Locander and Pollio 1989; Thompson, Pollio and Locander, 1994). Such “texts” require interpretation of writings, relating the part to the whole for a holistic understanding of past and present experiences. But “voice” necessitates something different, the counter-intuitive approach of listening for multiple selves, in relation to others, relative to the broader socio-cultural context, whilst also attending to absent experiences (Gilligan et al. 1991; Mauthner and Doucet, 1998). Voice and listening are issues that we infrequently see analysed both within qualitative research literature and more specifically within qualitative market research, with one recent exception of Hutton (2019).

Our paper focuses on the analytical importance of voice and the value of listening for polyphonic voices located in private spaces. Epistemological and methodological discussions do not always address the issues of “private” social worlds in terms of publicly invisible personal subjectivities, relationships and ties. This may be due to the methodological paradox of rapport building within fleeting personal research relationships but also may be because of scholarship’s conventional interest in the public outcomes of family research (Edwards and Ribbens, 1998). Furthermore, we highlight the under-theorised position of relationality and how the interplay between the voice, and the relational, present a unique analytic challenge in tracing the shifting subjectivities of research participants.

To address these interactions, we propose the Listening Guide, an emergent method within qualitative research (Hesse-Biber and Leavy 2006), developed in part as a response to

the analytical frustrations, dissatisfaction and uneasiness with conventional coding schemes used to analyse qualitative data (Gilligan et al. 2011). As an alternative, innovative analytical mode, it interrupts conventional qualitative analysis methods, delaying the reductionistic stage of data analysis, shifting attention away from conventional coding which implies people fit into pre-existing categories or researcher-defined theoretical paradigms (Mauthner 1998). Although every analytical process has its advantages and drawbacks, we contribute the Listening Guide as a novel and emerging interpretive approach for analysing family life – one which recovers the importance of voice and serves as a means to address the lack of debate on voice and authority in qualitative market research scholarship. Also known as voice-centred-relational analysis, the Listening Guide, is a creative and generative analytical technique, theoretically inspired by psychology, literary analysis and music (Raider-Roth, 2014), which demands that researchers listen for voices threaded throughout narratives in qualitative data.

Through this method, our paper highlights how peripheral voices and silence can be analytically surfaced in private domains as an alternative approach, that tunes our ear to the multiplicity of voices that speak within and around us, including voices that speak at the margins (Gilligan and Eddy 2017). Comprising of multiple iterative “listenings” of transcripts, a variety of studies and data can be explored with this approach, however research questions involving private, vulnerable or marginal experiences, are particularly suitable (Sorsoli and Tolman, 2008).

We begin by problematising voice, authority and analytical representation in the private location of family and follow with a discussion on how relational dynamics interact with the subtleties of voice in research. Next, we provide an overview of the epistemological underpinnings of the Listening Guide and its points of distinction from conventional forms of analysis. We then illustrate each “listening” by revisiting an interview transcript to

demonstrate its value as an innovative analytical approach. We conclude with some final reflections on the Listening Guide as a unique tool for sharpening our understanding of private experiences and articulations and as a process for research discovery in both family scholarship and qualitative market research.

Voice, authority and “the private”

In her pioneering book, *In a Different Voice*, Gilligan (1982) asked “Was there ever a time when you wanted to say something but felt you couldn’t?” One of the participants in her study of girls’ and women’s development responded: “All the time, that’s my life” (Gilligan, 2015; Woodcock, 2016). Conventional research ideas of voice revolve around the narrator’s perspective and the process of “giving voice” (Stern, 1998) to those participants, experiences or contexts that have previously been neglected in a body of literature. Opie (1992) argues that we can empower the disregarded by taking their experiences of marginality and making it central in our research and writing efforts. Adding layers of diversity and engaging perspectives that we have not seen or heard before is an important driver for many qualitative market researchers, but what of the process of explicitly tracing voice(s) in interview, focus group, narrative data? Furthermore, if we choose to explore meaning through voice, then how do we analytically “listen” and “hear” these voices and is there one “authentic voice” that more accurately represents participants subjectivity? To date, debates on voice, listening, representation and (researcher) authority in data analysis have been overlooked in studies on family and domestic life and indeed within qualitative marketing research in general. Surprisingly within feminist literature less attention has also been paid to the processes underlying the retention of participant voices in data analysis and representation (Edwards and

Ribbens, 1998). However, attending to voice is an important epistemological conviction for researchers, as voice is a way of constructing meaning (Lawrence-Lightfoot and Hoffman-Davis, 1997; Woodcock, 2016), with voice constructing reality (Brown and Gilligan, 1992) and the reality of research constructing voice (Frost 2008; Mauthner and Doucet, 1998). As a term, voice is often used a shorthand way to refer to the person speaking or even to the accounts used in our writings (Edwards and Ribbens, 1998). However, it is very different from the textual world which neglects its varying nature and how researchers respond to shifts and unspoken meanings. The textual domain overlooks how participants voices are heard analytically through shared gestures, pauses and silence, and our role as researchers in representing this multiplicity. Due to its analysis within structures of hearing and representing and considering its shifting sensibilities, we take the view that there is no one true or authentic voice to which we can gain access (Edwards and Ribbens,1998; Doucet and Mauthner, 2002). Taking these elements into consideration, we therefore define voice as polyphonic expressions of being, experience and representation.

Turning to the specific phase of data analysis, voice and authority present challenges that are rarely acknowledged (Miles and Huberman,1994). Yet, voice as data contributes a transformative edge to our understanding of relationships, the relational and private worlds through the power of listening as a route to knowledge (Gillian and Eddy, 2017). For participants to have a voice, and to be heard, is indicative of being worthy, in control and having agency, what Ross (2003) terms, a voice with a signature. Therefore, several critical epistemological issues arise over the issue of voice and subjectivity including, if the participant's voice is one that can be rendered transparent (Frith and Kitzinger, 1998), and if researchers can access distinctive subjectivity through the narrated self (Doucet and Mauthner, 2008). To this end, we are aligned with Stanley (1993) and Doucet and Mauthner's (2008)

articulation of the narrated self, or subject, as intrinsically relational, who is constituted in relation to other subjects and to the ‘material reality of everyday life’. Through this lens, the self is an untamed story consisting of a heterogeneous collection of divergent story elements that persons tell about themselves, not necessarily synthesised into a coherent narrative (Sermijn, Devileger and Loots, 2008). In their discussions of the voice-centred relational method, Brown and Gilligan (1992) do not provide an explicit definition of self and voice and have been criticised for their assumptions around the idea of one authentic voice that is unproblematic once identified (Mauthner and Doucet, 1998). However, can we ever truly know the voices of our participants in a way that is meaningful, and authentic or are we invited to share their experiences and stories on their terms? Furthermore, within family settings subjectivities are multiple, in transition and defined in relation to the interactions with others or defined by the relational dynamics of personal life.

Regarding the challenge of researcher and representational authority, feminist researchers, cultural psychologists and psychological anthropologists have been concerned about the ways in which a person’s voice can be overridden by the researcher both during the analytical process and in the writing of research texts and literature. The knowledge claims researchers make as authorities or experts in a field have consequences and thus voice, or the absence of it, has a political and ideological implication in how private realities can be structurally excluded from academic work (Luttrell 1992). In particular, qualitative researchers must exercise caution about voicing over the truth of another and risk silencing, mutilating and denigrating voices during analysis and representation (Edwards and Ribbens 1998). By attending to voice during the analytical process it is possible to minimise reinforcing hierarchies of knowledge and power during interpretation (Standing, 1998) by listening for complex and polyphonic voices within individual transcripts. This is particularly important at

the interface of family life and consumption to hear what is narrated about private lives, what goes unnoticed, the mundane, the underappreciated, the distorted and importantly what is not said. Located within these dynamics is how consumption, often central to the functioning of a family, structures, facilitates and complicates family life (The Voice Group, 2010).

When researching private worlds, habitats and subjectivities, Mauthner (1998), outlines how the neglect of private and personal relationships, reflects traditional concerns with public, institutional and structural forms of social life and specifically a lack of interest in private relationships. However, when those private interactions impact well-being and are inherently unjust, it becomes central to examine the private domain, either within family or domestic settings and relationships. For example, feminist theorists have long argued that the family acts as a central mechanism in the reproduction of gender inequality where women are made vulnerable by the unequal division of labour in the family and by assumptions about child-rearing and household responsibilities (Cantillon and Hutton, forthcoming). In short, a false dichotomy exists between public and private domains with research situated within liminal boundaries; “betwixt and between the dominant social and symbolic classifications systems of public knowledge, and less visible and vocal understandings found in the more personalised settings of everyday living” (Edwards and Ribbens, 1998; p.2). So, conventional modes of analysis, although useful in relating the part to the whole and for interrogating texts of relevance, can gloss over or fail to see the private lived realities situated within personal life. It is for this reason that we conceive of “the private” sphere as relationally incoherent and as a vulnerable research context where unity is an illusion. On one hand, it is characterised by togetherness (Edirisingha, Ferguson and Aitken, 2015; Nash, O’Malley and Patterson, 2018) obligation (Morgan, 1996), and transition (Cody and Lawlor, 2011; Hogg, Curasi & Maclaran, 2004); Marchant and O’Donohoe ,2014) and on the other, defined by unequal interactions,

micro-environments and inescapable burdens (Cappellini, Marilli and Parsons, 2014; Hutton, 2015; Kerrane and Hogg, 2013).

Locating the relational in personal and private life

The notion of “relational” and “relationality” are widespread in studies of personal life, yet scholars remain critical of its use as a euphemism for family or intimate relationships (Roseneil and Ketkivi, 2016). Relationality has thus emerged as a challenge to individualism and individualistic methodologies (Ozbilgin, 2005), yet as a concept should not be placed in immediate opposition to the individuality of the person (Gilligan, 1999), as participants are often embedded in a complex web of intimate and larger social relations. Furthermore, people relate to others who are not necessarily kin by blood or marriage, thus relationality should be considered a more flexible and fluid concept for understanding private domains (Mason, 2004; Roseneil and Ketkivi, 2016). Considering the relational aspects of family life, we note that “family” is not a static entity (Morgan; 1996), with collective and relational identities formed through communication and symbolic marketplace resources in the formation of these very identities (Epp and Price, 2008). Within family and consumption literature, relational dynamics appear to be structured around family members exerting influence through adultization and infantilization (Bertol et al. 2017), through negotiation and compromise (Lawlor and Prothero, 2011) and through the sophisticated reading of the relational environment within the family (Kerrane, Hogg and Bettany, 2012). We also note collective efforts to establish family togetherness (Edirisingha, Ferguson and Aitken, 2015; Nash, O’Malley and Patterson, 2018) and the evolving nature of parental care, support and welfare (Bettany and Kerrane, 2016; Epp and Velagaleti, 2014), as productive forms of relational

interaction. Examining more closely parental selfhood, Bettany, Kerrane and Hogg (2014) reveal the economic provider subjectivity important to new fathers, whilst Knibb and Taylor's (2017) study of green motherhood demonstrates the relational nature of their efforts in supporting and benefitting the welfare of all family members.

However, Mason (2004) reminds us that relationality should not be solely understood as a positive good, but should also be seen in open-ended terms, noting the ways relationality drives people away from relationships. Counter perspectives and insights of these family dynamics are provided by Kerrane and Hogg (2013) in terms of micro-environments and family divisions and Marchant and O'Donohoe (2014) who explore the process of family reconfiguration. Further relational imbalances within families are provided by Lindridge, Penaloza and Worlu (2016), exposing gender inequalities and hidden consumption habits of women to honour patriarchal relations and the contradictory, affective tensions and burdens associated with intensive mothering and the intra-familial flow of resources (Cappellini, Marilli and Parsons; 2014; Capellini, Harman, Marilli and Parsons, 2019).

Given the complexity of these arrangements, researchers therefore face the challenge of situating participants' views in the context of these social dynamics to examine multiple relational interactions of family members (Harden et al, 2010). By taking "relationship" as the unit of analysis, a relational approach provides a theoretical way of linking individual, socio-political and cultural levels of analysis (Mauthner 1998). Voice and relationality within private contexts present a unique analytic challenge in tracing moving or shifting subjectivities of participants. This means we must be very careful about the articulation of voice and voices, including the power of silence which exists within relationships (Gillian, 1982; Hamer, 1999) and furthermore as researchers, position ourselves relationally *via-a-vis* our participants

through the process of listening, to surface the subtleties and facets of voice which can be undermined or augmented by these relational elements.

The Listening Guide: epistemological leanings and applications

Originating as a feminist method within relational psychology, the listening guide is a method of analysis that draws on voice, resonance and relationship as ports of entry into the human psyche (Brown and Gilligan, 1992). Initially designed to amplify voices that have been marginalised or silenced by dominant cultural frameworks and to analyse narratives of moral conflict and choice, its emphasis on “care and justice voices” in narrative accounts (c.f. Brown, Debold, Tappan and Gilligan 1991) and “selves-in-relation” (Ruddick, 1989) or the “relational being” (Jordan, 1993), underscores its relational ontology. Developed over several years at the Harvard Project on Women’s Psychology and Girls’ Development (Brown et al. 1991; Brown and Gilligan 1992), it has been used, extended and adapted for a diverse number of multi-disciplinary projects (c.f. Balan 2005; Brown 1998; Doucet 2008; Jack, 1991). On an epistemological level, it is both a method and methodology, framing the research process as a process of relationship, asking the researcher to listen closely and actively respond to data collection and analysis (Gilligan and Eddy, 2017). As different qualitative analytic methods place the interpretive researcher in different relationships to their participant and data (Edwards and Weller, 2012), the Listening Guide enables aspects of connection and disconnection to be traced and explored. It’s particular emphasis on interdependence and relationality supports the development of innovation and adaptation when examining social and marketplace exclusion, a terrain in which the public and private are often blurred (Byrne, Canavan and Millar, 2008; Hutton, 2019).

Used across a wide range of contexts and applied to an array of data, studies involving specific experiences of social stigma, shame or secrecy, have effectively utilised this method (Sorsoli and Tolman, 2008). These include psychological studies of depression, eating disorders, adolescent boys' friendships and socially excluded teenagers (Byrne, Canavan and Millar, 2008; Jack, 1991; Mauthner 2002; Way 2011). It has also transcended disciplines and appears within the areas of education (Raider-Roth, 2005), orthodox religion (Hartman, 2007) adolescent sexuality (Sorsoli and Tolman, 2008) and workplace transitions (Balan, 2005; Paliadelis and Cruickshank, 2008). Most notably it has surfaced women's maternal depression and care experiences within the sociological field (Mauthner 1998; 1999; Montgomery et al. 2015). It is commonly used within narrative or interview data but through various refinements and adaptations has been employed to analyse other data types such as diaries, letters, speeches, educational narratives (Petrovic et al. 2015), creative writing (Lister, 2003) and group interviews (Byrne et al; Gillian and Eddy 2017; Hutton, 2019).

Traditional data analysis proposes a linear process of closely reading the data to form relevant categories and generating themes (Frost 2008). Alternatively, the Listening Guide traces the complexity and relational subtleties of voice through a circular process of analysis. Discovering voices through iterative listenings to individual transcripts, rather than linking themes across interviews, is valuable for understanding the depth and complexity of individual's experiences, as well as differences between respondents' narratives (Mauthner, 1998). Listening therefore can be differentiated from coding in how it avoids researcher-imposed fragmentation of the participant – although the need for categories is important, the researcher must be disciplined to listen without immediately coding to open a space for surprise and discovery (Gillian and Eddy 2017; Shay, 2010). Exploring the extensive literature on family consumption, thematic analysis focusing on holistic, global themes are exemplified by

Bertol et al (2017), Epp and Velagaleti, (2014). Lindridge, et al. (2016), Marchant and O'Donohoe, (2014). However, if themes “reside” anywhere, they reside in our heads from our thinking about our data and creating as we understand them (Braun and Clarke, 2006: p.80) Conversely, the Listening Guide foregrounds the ideas from participants, rather than confirming what the researcher already knows. Its’ multiple readings delay the reductionist stage, maintaining the differences between the participants and the contexts that surround them (Doucet and Mauthner, 2002). Contemporary studies are now embracing more open and naturalistic forms of data analysis in family-related scholarship, such as recurrent readings of individual transcripts (Pavia and Mason 2012), exemplifying family voice through vivid and longer narrations (Edirisingha, Ferguson and Aitken, 2015), via iterative, open readings of biographical narratives (Nash, O’Malley and Patterson, 2018) and by engaging reflexive, hermeneutic approaches to analysing family contexts (Molander and Hartmann, 2018). Notwithstanding these developments, a challenge remains in accounting for multiple, overlapping analysis of the same text to trace complexity and voice in narratives. The Listening Guide takes up this challenge as a different method with a different goal to uncover different voices (Gillian, 1982).

Guiding voice-centred-relational analysis

We begin this section by highlighting the points of similarities and difference between voice-centred-relational analysis (the listening guide) with the established, widely used textual-based analytical processes of narrative analysis and grounded theory.

The first stage of the Listening Guide has several points of convergence with the narrative analysis process outlined by Shankar and Goulding (2001). Both approaches recognise the crucial role narratives play in the construction and maintenance of self- identity, as well as avoiding the fracturing of text, coupled with the shared view that interview data is a

co-construction, between the questions the interviewer asks and the stories that the respondent chooses to share (Edwards and Weller, 2012). Parallel importance is also placed on attending to the broader social and cultural issues that shape and constrain participants' narratives (Moisander et al., 2009; Shankar and Goulding, 2001; Reissman, 1993). Implicitly highlighting how narrative analysis is a form of hearing, Reissman (1993) suggests we implement close and repeated listenings as it is not always clear at the beginning of research what features of speech will prove essential. However a key distinction of the listening guide over traditional forms of narrative analysis is that it counters the assumption that a person's story is ordered, singular, linear and transparent (Sorsoli and Tolman, 2008), rather it defines participants in terms of the temporal structure of the story they tell.

The coding tradition of grounded theory offer researchers an explicit set of principles for analysing and abstracting information, in short, coding *is* analysis (Ryan and Bernard, 2000). Both grounded theory and the listening guide demand a line by line interpretation, however, the reading for the personal pronoun statements distinguishes the listening guide, as the process accesses' meanings in relation to self, rather than creating meaning from data via constant comparison. Grounded theory as proposed by Strauss and Corbin (1990) is less interested in the person and more interested in action and interaction (Mauthner and Doucet, 1998). Rather than aggregating respondents meaning and experiences into generalised patterns (Spiggle, 1994), the listening guide represents the respondent's actual voices in I-poems (the second stage of the listening guide discussed later) consequently, multiple occurrences of a phenomenon are not required to represent significance (Frost, 2008). Whilst the iterative nature of grounded theory requires a balance between drawing on prior knowledge whilst remaining open to concepts as they emerge from the data (Goulding, 2005), the researcher is not required to respond to the data in the form of a systematised reflexivity which is an integral component

of a voice-centred-relational approach. Finally, the listening guide provides opportunities to explore phenomenological research questions regarding the nature of experience, whereas grounded theory is more applicable to the ‘unfolding of social process’ (Charmaz and Henwood, 2008: p.251).

In this next section, we describe and illustrate how the Listening Guide works as an innovative analytical method. Our discussion is structured along each of the four “listening” integral to the voice-centred-relational analysis approach and in practical terms we recommend that researchers use verbatim transcripts to complete these iterative listenings, supplemented by actual listenings of audio interviews. In what follows, we apply the listening guide to a single interview transcript which formed part of Hutton’s (2015) study with low-income women and their experiences of consumption related strain and intra-household inequality. As a polyphonic analytic method, we evidence how the Listening Guide locates the many ways (or voices) with which people speak of their lived experience. Each step highlights a particular facet of appreciation and with each illustration we provide a glimpse of its analytic potential, rather than specifying an explicit set of logistical procedures. In the spirit of revisiting data to try out different analytic angles (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996), we return to Joanne, a Nigerian woman living in Ireland who at the time of interviewing was 40 years old, a homemaker with four children, who was married to a low-income earner.

1. Listening for the plot.

The first step comprises of listening for the main events in participants’ stories. This involves evidencing the trail of recurring words, events, protagonists, the central plot, subplots and key characters within individual transcripts. This step also engages a “reader-response” to the data in terms of reflexively attending to our social location as researchers and our emotional responses to the participant in question. This involves being mindful of reactions and

comments and our feelings about this person. It is during this first listening that we also look for silences within each transcript. These can be evidenced through pauses, lowered voices and trailing off mid-conversation. The dual emphasis on reflexivity and silence as deliberate analytical decisions, differentiates this approach from other modes of analysis such as grounded theory. In examining the conversation with Joanne, we provide an excerpt below to illustrate the core plot and protagonist in Joanne' narrated story, and directly outline our reflexive, reader-response to this central account:

I think for me, before now I really used to be very stressed, I mean, myself and my husband, we're together here in Ireland, we used to have marital issues and its' placed us under a lot of stress, our relationship, but for the past year, things have been much better between the two of us than before and maybe the financial issues added to the stress. So where initially we were like cat and dog, not that we fight physically, you know its mental war, a face off, you know? But it is much better now so I really don't find myself under much stress, unlike before. But sometimes, I am unable to forge ahead, maybe I have a project I am doing and I am unable to get myself together, unable to forge ahead, being uneasy, being unable to plan and have a focus and unable to sleep.

Reader Response (Researcher 1): This is a complex relationship - in one way her husband provides the income to support the family but its minimal for enable her to feel secure. For me, she exemplifies what its like to carry the burden (of poverty). She "manages" it all, has the responsibility of consumption for the family but she has no power. Her uneasiness is powerlessness - she is trapped. This makes me uneasy as she manages scarce resources and the multiple expectations of her family on a daily basis so she is a very skilled, but I hear her frustrations and can't stop hearing how immobilised she is.

Reader Response (Researcher 2): I found myself wondering why Joanne is in Ireland, and who she has other than her Husband to rely on. I question the time period Joanne is talking about

when she says initially. Could this be when her and her husband were first together before the financial pressures and stress, did she enjoy the mental war? What is holding her back now, what feels so wrong that she cannot forge ahead or sleep?

As researchers we must remain aware of our own emotional reactions as detailed above. To steer us in this task, Brown and Gilligan (1992; p.27) suggest we continually ask ourselves: In what ways do we identify with or distance ourselves from this person? Where are we confused? Are we upset, delighted, amused, pleased, disturbed or angered by what we have heard?

2. Listening for the voice of “I”

The second listening involves understanding the first-person voice and how one speaks of him/herself. “I” is the phrase of the self that enables a person to act beyond habits and social expectations, that enables novelty and creativity (Gronow, 2008; Roseneil and Ketkivi, 2016). The I is the creative aspect of the self – how people are part of larger social processes and a way to access meaning in relation to self (Edwards and Weller, 2012). One way to engage with this element of the analysis is to review the transcript and identify “I” phrases sequentially. Although scattered and threaded throughout the transcripts often “I” phrases have a poetic structure, transition and movement to them that is non-linear. In this way the researcher can create I-poems as a way of tracing the changing and/or continuities over the course of the narrated subjects’ sense of self within their individual stories (Edwards and Weller, 2012). Returning to Joanne’s transcript, we rewrite each of the phrases we sequentially identify in their order of appearance, creating an I-poem as a representation of what we hear as researchers when listening to Joanne’s voice:

“I” am unable to forge ahead...

"I" am unable to get myself together...

"I" have so many things to do....

"I" don't know what to do...

"I" get under pressure...

"I" have four children....

"I" really have to think...

"I'm" stressed out!

This distinctive pattern draws attention to Joanne's subjectivity in how she speaks about herself in an anxious, fraught manner. This I-poem reflects her past and present experiences of constraint and at this moment, in how she speaks of herself, she creates an ephemeral context-bounded self (Gillian et al, 2011) that voices her thoughts and relational attachments and obligations.

3. Listening for contrapuntal voices and relationships.

This stage focuses on listening for relationships to identify the broader inter-personal networks and ties that define participants relational or private worlds. At this stage we ask, what is the participant telling us about this relationship? Listening for the voice of "we" relationships and multiple voices in this way is particularly valuable in revealing participants' difficulties linked to perceived obligations, anxieties and concerns within relationships and the associated burdens or joys of caring. In particular this allows us to hear how participants describe their relationships with family, friends and more formal social interactions in the marketplace and how these are compounded by experienced marginality (Hutton, 2019). This listening also recognises the multiplicity and constantly shifting nature of voice and the continual, ambiguous ways participants speak (Sermijn, Devileger and Loots, 2008) within a single transcript.

Inspired from the musical form of counterpoint which comprises of a combination of two or more melodic lines (Gilligan et al. 2011), the contrapuntal voice involves listening for different layers of a person's expressed experience. Resuming our interactions with Joanne's interview, we identified and followed two contrapuntal voices with illustrative excerpts as follows:

Voice of inclusivity:

As mothers we always want our children to be happy...it's one of the most basic human needs...to be happy for a child to be part of the group. To be ostracised in any way is potentially, I don't know, life changing I think for children. In school, children will talk about toys and the things they have.... The importance of being part of their group, from them to believe that they are the same, that they're not different, that they're not poor; these are the stigmas that children can hold on to.....as parents we work hard that that doesn't happen.

Voice of denial:

We are all these things outside of ourselves.We say it comes naturally as Mothers but in truth, we tend to put stuff like that....our needs.....second. At the end of the day that's not actually good, because our children will grow up and they will get jobs and they will move away and we're still ourselves and if we haven't been minding ourselves, just a little bit and if we have nothing else to put our energies into, except our children and our home, then when it's gone are we going to feel empty?

We found these voices interacting and co-existing with one another and as such provided a fuller understanding of Joanne as a parent. These interactions are important as Gilligan et al. (2011) highlight how contrapuntal voices within a single narrative are in a relationship with one another. It is this relationship that is unique, interesting and complex about human subjectivity, thus exemplifying the relational nature of this analytical method.

4. Listening for broader political, social and cultural structures.

The final listening aims to place participants within broader political, social and cultural contexts to hear how participants' relational interactions outside of the private realm construct them in moral and social terms. This step is also an integrative process designed to create analytic synthesis, combining previous listenings and reflexive notes to create an interpretive narrative. This reflects a concern to link micro-level narratives with macro-level processes and structures (Doucet and Mauthner, 2008). In the following illustration of this listening, we hear Joanne's account of discrimination and social antagonism within broader, public arrangements:

Neighbours judge you, a lot of people would use a lot of eye contact when they're out approaching you or seeing you,.....looking you up and down...it's very intimidating, I find it very intimidating like if there is any sort of authoritative figure, calling to the house, like from the council or whatever....they feel ... well I'd still say you are being judged and I feel pressure to have the house looking nice...all the time....in fact I have been out visiting a friend and a young one up the road, she'd be thirteen, turned around and said, my Mum says that you're on social welfare, so you're nothingmy husband is a low-income earner but they just make assumptions....you know even my brother in law because I had a fourth child and we live on a low-income, he said that's disgraceful, you should be ashamed of yourself!

Here we pay attention to a range of structures, social institutions, political and ideological issues, linking narratives to relevant, socio-cultural discourses (Mosiander, Valtonen, Hirsto, 2009). In this way, Joanne's account reflects dominant and normative conceptions of how low-income people are constructed in moral terms by social-cultural actors, in this instance, extended family, neighbours and authorities. Joanne's voice is an interrogated voice, under surveillance for making suspect choices (as defined by others) because she is perceived as a suspect person. The use of; "looking you up and down"; "intimidating"; "you're nothing"; "disgraceful"; "should be ashamed" enables us to explore the inherent sexist, racist and classist factors which constrain her life. Due to the complexity of the psyche and subjectivity, Gilligan

(1999) reminds us how issues of culture such as race, class and sexuality can be seriously addressed through this analytical mode.

Final reflections

If the only true pathway out of silence is voice, then we need space, opportunity and trusting relationships in order to have our voices heard (Woodcock, 2016). In this paper, we have focused on the analytical importance of voice and the value of listening for polyphonic voices located within the private sphere, which we conceive as relationally incoherent and a vulnerable research context. We have also highlighted the under-theorised position of relationality and how the interplay between the voice and the relational present a unique analytic challenge in tracing the shifting subjectivities of research participants. At the outset we asked: is it possible to identify multiple voices within the same narrative and if so, how do we capture its value and complexity? In response we have offered the Listening Guide as an innovative analytical approach to sharpen our understanding of private experiences and articulations. We have endeavoured to offer a glimpse into its potential as a naturalistic form of analysis which can be adapted and altered to suit a range of qualitative market research studies with a relational ontology. As voice and listening as analytical concepts are under-explored in family research and in qualitative market research in general, we encourage researchers to revisit their data to apply this different analytic perspective to generate new insights.

Although different analytical methods can be used to examine different perspectives in family research, a voice-centred-relational approach adds particular value in a number of ways namely, its ability to bridge private and public knowledge making, identify competing voices and recognise relations of power. To elaborate, the challenge of researching family life entails researching publicly invisible relationships with the research process and analytic challenge

located midway between each world (Mauthner 1998, p.42). The listening guide captures a wide spectrum of connections, interactions and relational identities, such as changes in kin and family relationships, new, emerging households and the experience of distributed families due to economic migration. Second, individuals inhabit different but equally valid locations within families, therefore the social realities of individuals and groups within spousal, sibling, and blended relationships are complex and overlapping. A voice-centred-relational analysis can identify multiple perceptions and competing voices within these arrangements. Third, households are spaces for producing and consuming, sites of exchange and sites for the organisation of political and social life more generally (Harding, 2008). But they are also sites of unjust social arrangements, where the idealised notions of solidarity, support and the absence of hierarchical configurations require closer examination. In this way voice-centred-relational analysis offers scholars the qualitative opportunity to generate critical, counterhegemonic analyses of intra-family vulnerabilities and power relations (Fine, 2001).

Because every person has a voice or a way of speaking, the silent and invisible inner world is made audible or visible to others in its application (Gillian, Spencer, Weinberg and Bertsch, 2003). Although we have used the Listening Guide to illustrate its value in surfacing rich accounts of marginalisation and stress located within private (female) narrations, we believe the listening guide is an important framework for analysing family life in the ways we have described above, primarily due to its emphasis on the human traits of voice, silence and communication. As a method, it illustrates movement between voices within the same interview and provides a rich understanding of the nature of voice in trauma, marginality and separateness (Sorsoli and Tolman, 2008), as well as in connection and relatedness.

As an analytical skill, listening requires a more imaginative engagement with the social world of others, offering a contrasting analysis of attention in which hidden connections can

be traced, providing new directions for thought and critique (Back, 2007). Within qualitative market research there is an emerging interest in auditory analysis and the sonic turn (Patterson and Larsen, 2019) providing researchers with alternative, non-linguistic routes to knowledge. The listening guide can facilitate this path in a number of ways. First, it can examine participants' multiple and contradictory subjectivities such as consumers' hedonistic expressions and utilitarian functional requirements or how the self is mobilised in different ways, crafting identities via experiences, entanglements and the hidden life of objects, and places (Chaney et al, 2018; Cova et al., 2018). Second, by providing meaningful representations, the listening guide can reframe debates, influence practice, service provisions and policy responses by animating consumers' emotions, gratifications and relations. As Montgomery et al. (2015) demonstrate, I-poems have played a practical role in health training programmes for improving medics' understanding of patient needs. Consumer authored poetry as a source of data can also illuminate mundane, hidden and anti-consumption sentiments (Tonner, 2019). Through I-poems, voice amplifies the nuances of internal conversations (Raider-Roth, 2000) providing researchers with a conceptual tool to hear changes and continuities in participants' sense of self over time (Edwards and Weller, 2012). Finally, the growing use of diary methods in qualitative research raises issues concerning research participants' personal identity and their agency to both act and to construct private meanings which will be translated into a researcher's account (Bell, 1998). A voice-centred-relational analysis of diary data can bridge the gap between concepts of public and private knowledge and between satisfaction and affect, therefore producing a beneficial joint assessment of activities and subjective experiences (Kahneman et al 2004).

Whilst we acknowledge the complexity and time-consuming nature of a voice-centred-relational analysis, we also suggest that there are no short-cuts for discovering multiple, layered

subjectivities and in particular, the vulnerable nature of private realities that might be less audible through conventional analytical means. If descriptions of how data is analysed is central to the articulation of the epistemological basis of the research (Ribbens and Edwards, 1998; Stanley and Wise, 1993), as a novel analytic method, the Listening Guide recovers the importance of voice and addresses the lack of debate on voice and authority in qualitative market research, demanding epistemological responsibility from researchers.

References

- Back, L. (2007). *The Art of Listening*, London: Bloomsbury.
- Balan, B. N. (2005). "Multiple voices and methods: listening to women who are in workplace transition". *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp.63-86.
- Bertol, K E. Broilo, P, Espartel, L. B. and Basso, K. (2017) "Young children's influence on family consumer behavior", *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp.452-468.
- Bettany S. M. Kerrane, B. A. and Hogg M. K. (2014) "The material-semiotics of fatherhood: The co-emergence of technology and contemporary fatherhood". *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 67 No. 7, pp. 1544-1551.
- Bettany, S. M. and Kerrane, B. A. (2016) "The socio-materiality of parental style: negotiating the multiple affordances of parenting and child welfare within the new child surveillance technology market", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 50 No. 11, pp. 2041-2066.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) "Using thematic analysis in psychology," *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, Vol. 3 No.2, pp 77-101
- Brown L. M., Debold, E., Tappan, M.B and Gilligan, C. (1991). "Reading narratives of conflict and choice for self and moral voices: a relational method" in, Williams, M. and

- Gerwitz, J.L. (Eds), *Moral Behaviour and Development Volume 2: Research*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Hilldale, N.J.
- Brown, L. M., and Gilligan, C. (1991). "Listening for voice in narratives of relationship." *New Directions for Child Development*, Vol. 54, pp 43-62.
- Brown, L.M. and Gilligan, C. (1992). *Meeting at the Crossroads: Women's Psychology and Girl's Development*, Harvard University Press. Cambridge, M.A.
- Byrne, A., Canavan, J. and Millar, M. (2008). "Participatory research and the voice-centred-relational method of data analysis: is it worth it?" *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, Vol.12, No.1, pp.67-77.
- Cantillon, S. and Hutton, M. (fc 2020), "Exploring self-sacrifice, role captivity and motherhood," in Levasseur, K., Paterson, S and Turnbull, L. (Eds), *Mothering and Welfare: Depriving, Surviving, Thriving*. Demeter Press, Canada [In press]
- Cappellini, B, Harman, V. Marilli, A. and Parsons, E. (2019), "Intensive mothering in hard times: foucauldian ethical self-formation and cruel optimism", *Journal of Consumer Culture*, Vol.19, No.4, pp.469-492.
- Cappellini, B. Alessandra, M. and Parsons, E. (2014) "The hidden work of coping: gender and the micro-politics of household consumption in times of austerity", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 30 No. 15-16, pp. 1597-1624.
- Chaney, D., Lunardo, R. and Mencarelli, R. (2018), "Consumption experience: past, present and future", *Qualitative Market Research*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 402-420.

- Charmaz, K., and Henwood, K. (2008). Grounded theory in psychology. In C. Willig & W. Stainton Rogers (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research in psychology* (pp. 240–260). London, UK: Sage.
- Cody, K. and Lawlor, K. (2011) “On the borderline: Exploring liminal consumption and the negotiation of threshold selves”, *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 207–228.
- Coffey, A. and Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making Sense of Qualitative Data, Complementary Research Strategies*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Cova, B., Carù, A. and Cayla, J. (2018), "Re-conceptualizing escape in consumer research", *Qualitative Market Research*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 445-464.
- Doucet, A and Mauthner, N. S (2002), “Knowing responsibly: Ethics, feminist epistemologies, and methodologies” in Miller, T., Birch, Mauthner and Jessop, J. (Eds) *Ethics in qualitative research* pp 123-145, London: Sage Publications.
- Doucet, A. and Mauthner, N.S. (2008). “What can be known and how? Narrated subjects and the listening guide.” *Qualitative Research*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp.399-409.
- Edirisingha, P. A. Ferguson, S. Aitken, R, (2015) "From ‘me’ to ‘we’: negotiating new family identity through meal consumption in Asian cultures", *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp.477-496.
- Edwards, R. and Ribbens. J. (1998). “Living on the edges: public knowledge, private lives, personal experience,” in J. Ribbens and R. Edwards (Eds.), *Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research: Private Lives and Public Texts*, Sage Publications, London, pp. 1-23.

- Edwards, R. and Weller, S. (2012). "Shifting analytic ontology: using I-poems in qualitative longitudinal research." *Qualitative Research*, Vol.12, No.2, pp.202-217.
- Epp, A.M. and Velagaleti, S.R. (2014) "Outsourcing parenthood? How families manage care assemblages using paid commercial services", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 911-935.
- Epp, A. M. and Price, L. L. (2008). Family identity: A framework of identity interplay in consumption practices. *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 35 No 1, pp. 50-70.
- Fine, M. (2001) *Disruptive Voices*, University of Michigan Press.
- Frith, H. and Kitinger, H. (1998). "Emotion Work as a participant resource: a feminist analysis of young women's talk-in-interaction", *Sociology*, Vol.32, No.2, pp.299-320.
- Frost, J. (2008). "Combining approaches to qualitative data analysis: synthesising the mechanical (CAQDAS) with the thematic (a voice-centred relational approach)." *Methodological Innovations Online*, Vol.3, No.1, pp.25-37.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In A Different Voice*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Gilligan, C. (2015). "The listening guide method of psychological inquiry," *Qualitative Psychology*, Vol. 2, pp. 69–77.
- Gilligan, C. and Eddy J. (2017). "Listening as a path to psychological discovery; an introduction to the listening guide." *Perspectives on Medical Education*, Vol 6, No. 2, pp. 76-81.

- Gilligan, C., Spencer, R., Weinberg, K.M. and Bertsch, T. (2011). 'On the listening guide: a voice-centered relational method', in Hesse-Biber, S.N. and Leavy, P. (Eds) *Emergent Methods in Social Research*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Gronow, A. (2008). "The over or the under-socialized conception of man? Practice theory and the problem of intersubjectivity." *Sociology*, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp.243–59.
- Hamer, M. (1999). "Listen to the voice: an interview with Carol Gilligan". *Women: A Cultural Review*, Vol. 10, No.2, pp.173-184.
- Harden, J., Backett-Milburn, K., Hill, M and MacLean, A. (2010). "Oh, what a tangled we weave: experiences of doing "multiple perspectives" research in families". *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, Vol.13, No.5, pp.441-452.
- Harding, S. (2008). *Sciences from Below*. Duke University Press: London.
- Hartman, T (2007). *Feminism Encounters Traditional Judaism: Resistance and Accommodation*, Brandeis University Press, New Hampshire.
- Hogg, M. K. Folkman Curasi, C. and Maclaran, P. (2004) "The (re-) configuration of production and consumption in empty nest households/families", *Consumption Markets & Culture*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 239-259.
- Hutton, M. (2015). Consuming Stress: Exploring Hidden Dimensions of Consumption-related Strain at the Intersection of Gender and Poverty, *Journal of Marketing Management*, 31, 1695-1717.
- Hutton, M. (2019). "The care-less marketplace: exclusion as affective inequality", *Consumption, Markets & Culture*, [In Press].

- Jack D.C (1991). *Silencing the self: women and depression*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge.
- Jordan, J. V. (1993). "The relational self: a model of women's development," in Van Mens-Verhulst, J., Schreurs, K. and Woertman, L. (Eds). *Daughtering and Mothering: Female Subjectivities Reanalysed*, Routledge, London.
- Kahneman D, Krueger AB, Schkade DA, Schwarz N, Stone AA. (2004) "A survey method for characterizing daily life experience: the day reconstruction method", *Science*. Vol. 3, pp. 1776-80.
- Kerrane, B. A. Bettany, S. M. and Hogg, M. K. (2014) "Re-visiting contemporary issues in family consumption" *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 30 No. 15-16, pp. 1527-1532.
- Kerrane, B. A. and Hogg, M. K. (2013) "Shared or non-shared? Children's different consumer socialisation experiences within the family environment" *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 47 No. 3, page 506–524.
- Kerrane, B.A., Hogg, M. K and Bettany, S. M. (2012) "Children's influence strategies in practice: Exploring the co-constructed nature of the child influence process in family consumption". *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 28, No. 7-8, pp. 809–835.
- Knibb, J.N Taylor, K. (2017) "Living "light green": the limits and lived experiences of green motherhood", *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 20 No 3, pp.370-389.
- Lawlor, M-A. and Prothero, A. (2011) "Pester Power – A battle of wills between children and their parents" *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 27 No. 5-6, pp. 561-581.

- Lawrence-Lightfoot, S., and Hoffman Davis, J. (1997). *The art and science of portraiture*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Lindridge, A. Peñaloza, L. Worlu, O. (2016) "Agency and empowerment in consumption in relation to a patriarchal bargain: The case of Nigerian immigrant women in the UK", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 50 No. 9-10, pp.1652-1671.
- Lister, P. (2003). "Feminist dilemmas in data analysis: researching the use of creative writing by women survivors of sexual abuse". *Qualitative Social Work*, Vol.2, No.1, pp. 45-59.
- Luttrell, W. (1992). "Working-class women's ways of knowing: effects of gender, race and class", in Wrigley, J. (Ed), *Education and Gender Equality*. Falmer, London.
- Marchant, C. and O'Donohoe, S. (2014) "Edging out of the nest: emerging adults' use of smartphones in maintaining and transforming family relationships", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 30 No. 15-16, pp.1554-1576.
- Mason, J. (2004). "Personal narratives, relational selves: Residential histories in the living and telling." *The Sociological Review*, Vol. 52, No.2, pp. 162–79.
- Mauthner N. S (2002). *The darkest days of my life: stories of postpartum depression*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge.
- Mauthner, N. S., and Doucet, A. (1998). "Reflections on a voice centred relational method of data analysis: analysing maternal and domestic voices, in J. Ribbens and R. Edwards (Eds.), *Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research: Private Lives and Public Texts*, Sage Publications, London, pp.413-431.

- Mauthner, N.S. (1998). "Bringing silent voices into a public discourse: researching accounts of sister relationships," in J. Ribbens and R. Edwards (Eds.), *Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research: Private Lives and Public Texts*, Sage Publications, London, pp. 39-57.
- Mauthner, N.S. (1998). "It's a woman's cry for help: a relational perspective on postnatal depression." *Feminism & Psychology*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp.325-355.
- Mauthner, N.S. (1999). "Feeling low and feeling really bad about feeling low: women's experiences of motherhood and postpartum depression". *Canadian Psychology*, Vol.40, No.2 pp.143-161.
- Mauthner, N.S. and Doucet, A. (2003). "Reflexive accounts and accounts of reflexivity in qualitative data analysis," *Sociology*, Vol. 37, No.3, pp.413-431.
- Miles, M.B and Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*, Sage, London.
- Moisander, J., Valtonen, A. and Hirsto, H. (2009). "Personal interviews in cultural consumer research – post-structuralist challenges", *Consumption, Markets and Culture*, Vol. 12, No.4, pp. 329-348.
- Molander, S. and Hartmann, B. J. (2018) "Emotion and practice: Mothering, cooking, and teleoaffective episodes", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 371–390.
- Montgomery, E., Pope, C. and Rogers, J. (2015). "A feminist narrative study of the maternity care experiences of women who were sexually abused in childhood." *Midwifery*, Vol. 31, pp.54-60.

- Morgan, D. (1996). *Family connections: An introduction to family studies*. Blackwell Polity Press. Cambridge UK.
- Nash, C. O'Malley, L. Patterson, M. (2018) "Wii are family: consumption, console gaming and family togetherness", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 52 No. 9/10, pp.2005-2025.
- Opie, A. (1992). "Qualitative research, appropriation of the "other" and empowerment", *Feminist Review*, 40, pp.52-69.
- Ozbilgin. M.F. (2005). "Relational methods in organisation studies: a review of the field," in Kyriakidou, O. and Ezbilgin, M. (Eds), *Relational Perspectives in Organisation Studies: A Research Companion*. Edward Elgar Publishing, London.
- Palidelis, P. and Cruickshank, M. (2008). "Using a voice-centred relational method of data analysis in a feminist study exploring the working world of nursing unit managers." *Qualitative Health Research*, Vol.18, No.10, pp.1444-1453.
- Patterson, M. and Larsen, G. (2019). "Listening to consumption: Towards a sonic turn in consumer research", *Marketing Theory*, Vol.19, No.2, pp.105-127.
- Pavia, T. M. and Mason, M. J. (2012) "Inclusion, exclusion and identity in the consumption of families living with childhood disability", *Consumption Markets & Culture*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 87-115.
- Petrovic, S., Lordly, D. Brigham, S and Delaney, M. (2015). "Learning to listen: an analysis of applying the listening guide to reflection papers." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, Vol.14, No.5, p.1-11.

- Raider-Roth, M. (2014). "The listening guide", in Coghlan, D. and Brydon-Miller, M. (Eds.), *The Sage Encyclopedia of Action Research*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 510–512.
- Reissman, C.K. (1993). "Narrative Analysis", in *Qualitative Research Methods*, Volume 30, London: Sage Publications.
- Ribbens, J. (1998). "Hearing my feeling voice? An autobiographical discussion of motherhood." in J. Ribbens and R. Edwards (Eds.), *Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research: Private Lives and Public Texts*, Sage Publications, London, pp. 510–512.
- Roseneil, S. and Ketokivi, K. (2016). "Relational persons and relational processes: developing the notion of relationality for the sociology of personal life." *Sociology*, Vol. 50, No. 1, pp. 143-159.
- Ruddick, S. (1989). *Maternal Thinking: Towards a Politics of Peace*, Beacon, Boston MA.
- Ryan, G. and Bernard, R. (2000), "Data Management and Analysis Methods," (In) Denzin, N & Lincoln, Y, Eds. (2000), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, London: Sage Publications.
- Shankar, A and Goulding, C (2001) "Interpretive consumer research: two more contributions to theory and practice" *Qualitative Market Research*, Vol. 4 No 1, pp. 7-16
- Shay, J. (2010). *Achilles in Vietnam: combat trauma and the undoing of the character*. Simon and Schuster: New York.
- Sorsoli, L. and Tolman, D.L. (2008). "Hearing voices: listening for multiplicity and movement in interview data, in Hesse-Biber, S.N. and Leavy, P. (Eds) *Handbook of Emergent Methods*, The Guildford Press, New York, pp.439-515.

- Spiggle, S. (1994) "Analysis and Interpretation of Qualitative Data in Consumer Research"
Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 491-503
- Standing, K. (1998). "Writing the voices of the less powerful: Research on Lone Mothers", in
J. Ribbens and R. Edwards (Eds.), *Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research: Private
Lives and Public Texts*, Sage Publications, London, pp. 186-203.
- Stanley, L. (1993). "The knowing because experiencing subject: narratives, lives, and
autobiography", *Women's Studies International Forum*, Vol.16, No.3, pp. 205–215.
- Stanley, L. and Wise, S. (1993). *Breaking Out Again*, Routledge: London
- Stern, B.B (1998) "Narratological analysis of consumer voices in postmodern research
accounts" In Stern, B.B. (Eds) *Representing consumers Voices, views and Visions*.
London: Routledge, pp. 55-82
- Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990), *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures
and Techniques*, London: Sage.
- The Voice Group, (Davies, A. Dobscha S. Geiger, S. O'Donohoe, S. O'Malley, L. Prothero,
A. Sørensen, E. B. Thomsen, T. U. (2010) "Motherhood, Marketization, and Consumer
Vulnerability" *Journal of Macromarketing*, Vol. 30 No.4, pp. 384–397.
- Thompson, C.J. (1997). "Interpreting consumers: a hermeneutical framework for deriving
marketing insights from the texts of consumers' consumption stories," *Journal of
Marketing Research*, Vol. 34, No. 4, pp. 438-455.
- Thompson, C.J., Locander, W.B. and Pollio, H.R. (1989), "Putting consumer experience back
into consumer research: the philosophy and method of existential-phenomenology,"
Journal of Consumer Research, Vol.16, pp.133-147.

Thompson, C.J., Pollio, H.R. and Locander, W.B. (1994). “The spoken and the unspoken: a hermeneutic approach to understanding the cultural viewpoints that underlie consumers' expressed meanings,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 432-452.

Tonner, A. (2019) Consumer culture poetry: insightful data and methodological approaches, *Consumption Markets & Culture*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 256-271

Woodcock, C. (2016). “The listening guide: a how-to approach on ways to promote educational democracy,” *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, Vol.15, No.1, pp.1–10.