



LEEDS  
BECKETT  
UNIVERSITY

---

Citation:

Raisborough, J and Ogden, C and de Guzman, V (2019) When fat meets disability in poverty porn: exploring the cultural mechanisms of suspicion in Too Fat to Work. *Disability and Society*, 34 (2). pp. 276-295. ISSN 0968-7599 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2018.1519408>

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record:

<http://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/5277/>

Document Version:

Article

---

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Disability and Society* on 29 December 2018, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/09687599.2018.1519408>

The aim of the Leeds Beckett Repository is to provide open access to our research, as required by funder policies and permitted by publishers and copyright law.

The Leeds Beckett repository holds a wide range of publications, each of which has been checked for copyright and the relevant embargo period has been applied by the Research Services team.

We operate on a standard take-down policy. If you are the author or publisher of an output and you would like it removed from the repository, please [contact us](#) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Each thesis in the repository has been cleared where necessary by the author for third party copyright. If you would like a thesis to be removed from the repository or believe there is an issue with copyright, please contact us on [openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.



**When fat meets disability in poverty porn: exploring the cultural mechanisms of suspicion in Too Fat to Work'**

Journal:	<i>Disability &amp; Society</i>
Manuscript ID	CDSO-2017-0308.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Austerity, benefits, poverty porn, media representations, reality television
Abstract:	There has been a distinct neglect of dis/ability in socio-cultural analysis of poverty porn (Runswick-Cole and Goodley 2015). This paper applies framing analysis to reality TV documentaries that feature larger bodied, disabled, welfare claimants to examine how cultural literacies of fatness and 'obesity' are drawn upon to cast suspicion upon disability welfare claimants in so-called poverty- porn. With a focus on Channel 5's Benefit Britain series, Benefits Too Fat to Work we demonstrate that enduring and harmful representations of 'obesity' are put to the work of securing public consent for a post-welfare society in the UK

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## Points of interest

- We examine how disability welfare claimants are represented in reality television programmes that document the lives of unemployed people in the UK
- We argue that disability welfare claimants are mainly represented as fat and obese
- We argue that obesity serves a specific function in reality welfare programmes: commonsense understandings that weight is controllable can cast doubt on the authenticity of peoples' impairments and on their entitlement to welfare support.
- We argue that these programmes circulate harmful representations of fat and disability and may serve to help secure public support for benefits cuts.

1  
2  
3 **Title** When fat meets disability in poverty porn: exploring the cultural mechanisms of  
4 suspicion in *Too Fat to Work*.

5  
6 Raisborough, J.; Ogden, C.; de Guzman, V.

7  
8  
9 **Key words:** Austerity, benefits, disability welfare, poverty porn, suspicion.

### 10 11 12 13 **Introduction: poverty porn as a site for study**

14  
15  
16  
17  
18 Since the North Atlantic Financial crash in 2008, there has been a recent proliferation  
19 of reality television documentaries that feature people who claim social security in  
20 western countries. Programmes include Australia's *Struggle Street*, Ireland's *Benefit*  
21 *Estate* and America's *My Reality*; *Hidden America*, In the UK *Benefits Street* is  
22 perhaps the best known. It documented the lives of people residing on James Turner  
23 Street in Birmingham where, as it was widely and inaccurately reported, some 90% of  
24 residents were in receipt of social security benefits. *Benefits Street* earned Channel 4  
25 some of its highest viewing figures in 2014, which might explain why similar  
26 programming is now a regular feature on UK television schedules. Channel 5, for  
27 example, aired two series of *Benefits Britain: Life on the Dole* and their fourth series  
28 of *On Benefits* screened its 15<sup>th</sup> episode at the time of writing in July 2017  
29 (<http://www.channel5.com/show/on-benefits/>). The producers of these UK shows  
30 consider them to be of public interest because they offer a 'voice to the  
31 disenfranchised' and 'those who have been hit hardest by austerity' while showing the  
32 'reality of life on welfare' (Mirsky 2014: also see De Benedictis, Allen, and Jensen  
33 2017). The *Radio Times*, a leading UK TV listing magazine, classify these  
34 documentaries as 'education'.

35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

Yet, many critics argue that these documentaries are little more than 'poverty porn'

1  
2  
3 because they circulate benefit stigma - the shaming of people who claim social  
4 security support (Jensen 2013a; Allen, Tyler, and De Benedictis 2014). Brooker et  
5 al's (2015) analysis of the twitter streams that accompanied *Benefits Street* found that  
6 the majority of tweets were 'abusive or, perhaps, jokingly pejorative' (p. 3185)  
7 towards the claimants and also mocked the UK social security system itself.  
8  
9 Similarly, Right-wing politicians have cited poverty porn programming as evidence of  
10 a failing benefit system that is in urgent need of radical reform (Deeming 2015). Yet,  
11 benefit shame is not directed with the same vitriol to all of those who draw social  
12 security: representations of the poor are heavily classed and racialized. The white  
13 working class are particularly vilified in this genre for their presumed immoral, work-  
14 shy attitudes and their so-called 'addiction' to lifestyles of welfare dependency  
15 (MacDonald, Shildrick, and Furlong 2014; Morris 2016). This personalization of  
16 poverty is argued to shift the blame for economic hardship from the elite towards  
17 marginalized groups (Wacquant 2008). It also helps to present austerity savings  
18 (benefits cuts) as logical solutions to the 'problem' of welfare dependency (O'Flynn,  
19 Monaghan, and Power 2014). There are good reasons then, why scholars are  
20 concerned about the role of poverty porn in manufacturing public consent for benefits  
21 cuts and for a move to a post-welfare society in the UK (Jensen and Tyler 2015;  
22 Biressi and Nunn 2013).

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 While classed and racialized representations in poverty porn have attracted much  
49 needed critical attention, representations of dis/ability have been neglected as they are  
50 in wider socio-cultural analysis (Runswick-Cole and Goodley 2015). We aim to help  
51 address this neglect but we want to stress that an analysis of representations of  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 dis/ability in poverty porn is not simply a redemptive exercise of *adding* dis/ability  
4 into the analytic mix. Briant, Watson, and Philo (2013) argue that pronounced social  
5 and cultural exclusions of disabled people from wider society mean that negative  
6 media representations can play a major role in influencing public attitudes to  
7 disability and may be internalized by disabled people. Less ‘negative’ representations  
8 are also problematic: in her analysis of American reality television, Clearly (2016,1)  
9 observed that when disabled people *are* represented, it is only ‘specific bodies —  
10 heterosexual, white, gender normative, affluent — are called upon to perform  
11 disability’. She has concerns about the de-politicising consequences when media  
12 representations divorce disabled people from wider material conditions and forms of  
13 stratifying power. Our focus on poverty porn may go some way to reveal differently  
14 classed representations, yet representations of disabled people in a genre implicated in  
15 ‘scroungerphobia’ (Heeney 2015, 652) constitutes a real concern, not least because  
16 disabled people are *actively made* unemployable through disabled prejudice (Bates,  
17 Goodley, and Runswick-Cole\_2017; Flint and Snook 2014).  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 To this important point we wish to add that a focus on dis/ability in poverty porn can  
37 also help us to understand the *cultural mechanisms* used to normalise wider  
38 neoliberal, ablest, austerity logics in the UK. This is because although disabled  
39 people are the hardest hit by the precarity of austerity and its cuts (Bates, Goodley,  
40 and Runswick-Cole 2017; Soldatic and Morgan 2017), there is, at different times, ‘a  
41 great deal of public sympathy and support for disabled people’ (Briant, Watson, and  
42 Philo 2013, 885). Watkins-Hayes and Kovalsky (2017,194) have recently listed  
43 disabled people amongst those regarded as the ‘deserving poor’ because they ‘are  
44 thought to be unable to work through no fault of their own and therefore have a  
45 legitimate claim to resources’. These public perceptions of ‘deserving claimants’ can  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 make explicit threats to disability welfare risky for politicians. They can also make  
4 the accusation of scrounger harder to apply and can even disrupt the manufacture of  
5 public consent for austerity measures aimed at disabled people (Runswick- Cole and  
6 Goodley 2015).  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Just how this potential for disruption is limited or managed can reveal much about the  
13 workings of neoliberal reproduction. Some work has started this project: for example,  
14 Briant, Watson, and Philo's (2013) analysis of newspapers observed how the  
15 deliberate and repeated constructions of a 'fraudulent' disability welfare claimant  
16 allowed cuts to be presented as necessary reforms to protect the tax-payer and those in  
17 'genuine' need of disability support. This strategic deployment of fairness enabled  
18 austerity measures to manifest as being *on the side* of particular disability welfare  
19 claimants, indeed championing their cause and right to welfare, while instigating a  
20 number of punitive, harmful testing regimes and eligibility criteria against the *entire*  
21 claimant population. Additionally, Runswick-Cole and Goodley's (2015) sharp  
22 attention to *Benefits Street* and its media coverage noted how careful distinctions were  
23 constructed *between* impairments: emotional and mental health issues were presented  
24 as suspicious entitlements to welfare whereas learning difficulties attracted more  
25 sympathetic coverage and offered a 'label of forgiveness' (p. 647) for unemployment.  
26  
27 Runswick-Cole and Goodley concluded that different impairments do different  
28 cultural work in the representational space of poverty porn: by foregrounding  
29 purportedly 'suspicious' disabilities, *Benefits Street* provided a 'narrative prosthesis'  
30 (2015, 647) for public perceptions of a widespread corruption of a failing system by  
31 undeserving, notably white working class, welfare claimants. These examples reveal  
32 something of the cultural strategies used to exclude and marginalise groups in the  
33 purported interests of good/ responsible fiscal governance.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 We wish to add to this important work by examining the cultural mechanisms of  
4 suspicion in a recent spate of poverty porn that explicitly feature claimants who are  
5 labeled obese: examples include *Benefits and Bypasses: Billion Pound Patients; Shut*  
6 *ins: Britain's Fattest People; 87 Stone: Fat Chance of Work; Too Fat to Work; 65*  
7 *Stone and Trapped in My Own House*. In what follows we explore the cultural work  
8 performed by representations of obesity in framing illness, impairments and mobility  
9 issues as the consequence of faulty lifestyles and immoral character traits. Our  
10 intention is not to argue that obesity or fatness should be regarded as a form of  
11 disability or as a disability issue (see Aphramor [2009] for this discussion), rather our  
12 work focuses on the *representations* of obesity and those of disability welfare  
13 claimants in the genre of reality television poverty porn documentaries to examine  
14 how public consent for austerity cuts may be procured.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 **Framing in poverty porn**

32  
33  
34  
35 In this paper we focus on *Benefits: Too Fat to Work*, first broadcast in December  
36 2015, which forms part of C5's 'Benefits' series. We selected *Benefits* for two main  
37 reasons. The first is that it is representative of other reality documentaries in what is a  
38 highly formulaic genre. For example, it involves fly-on-the-wall footage of  
39 individuals who live in different geographical areas that are coded as working-class or  
40 poor and features an off-screen narrator whose narration flows in and around carefully  
41 edited quotes from the participants. The second reason for our choice relates to the  
42 wider media attention received by key participants Steve and Michelle Beer, upon  
43 whom we focus in this paper. *Benefits* filmed Steve and Michelle as they planned and  
44 executed their wedding. Dubbed the 'couple with the benefits' wedding', the Beers  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 were interviewed on the UK television breakfast magazine show *This Morning* and  
4 they were guests on ITV's *Jeremy Kyle Show*. They also featured across the tabloid  
5 press. The *Daily Mail* headline on the 20<sup>th</sup> December 2015 'Couple who had their  
6 £3,000 wedding paid for by the tax-payer because they are 'too fat to work' celebrate  
7 their first wedding anniversary with a KFC' is typical of the media coverage as a  
8 whole. Just how the 'wedding paid for by the tax-payer' was framed in *Bene£its* may  
9 give some insight into a deepening of suspicion of disability welfare recipients that is  
10 based both on contesting 'authentic' disabilities and upon 'appropriate' benefit  
11 spending. Additionally, the wider attention received by the Beers is significant  
12 because as Tyler (2008) argues it is through *repetition* across different sites that abject  
13 'grotesque and comic figures' (Tyler 2008,17) can act as 'consensus apparatus'  
14 (2013,25), generating public sympathy for austerity measures, even when these  
15 measures 'frequently curtail the freedoms of all citizens and further impoverish  
16 democracy' (2013,10).

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35 We approached *Bene£its*' representation of the Beers through frame analysis. Frames  
36 are 'schemata of interpretation' (Goffman 1974, 2), that offer simplified  
37 representations of social issues by 'selectively punctuating and encoding objects,  
38 situations, events, experiences, and sequences of action' (Snow and Benford  
39 1992,137). Frame analysis demands attention to patterns, selection and omission  
40 because frames often reproduce moral judgements when they identify who is  
41 responsible for a social problem and who is affected by it (Jenkin, Signal, and  
42 Thomson 2012). Frame analysis is also useful for our purposes because it allows us to  
43 make links between cultural representations and their wider socio-economic contexts.  
44 There are two aspects of this: firstly, Butler (2009) explains that frames are produced  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 through a condensing of current cultural norms and values, making frames not just  
4  
5 'politically saturated' in themselves but in their consequences when highly selective  
6  
7 versions of social issues take hold in the cultural imaginary as a 'perceptible reality'  
8  
9 (2009, 64). Our focus is, then, on how poverty documentaries 'frame' welfare,  
10  
11 claimants and their entitlements in the context of UK austerity with attention to what  
12  
13 values and norms are constituting the frame itself. We did this through multiple  
14  
15 viewings to identify patterns and repetitions in representations. We were also  
16  
17 attentive to what was foregrounded, omitted or muted by following Ghoshal (2009) to  
18  
19 ask what other narratives or accounts might be possible.  
20  
21

22  
23 Secondly, Butler notes how 'to frame' can also refer to 'setting up' someone to  
24  
25 shoulder blame and responsibility: to be framed refers to having 'evidence planted'  
26  
27 which 'proves' guilt, so that a 'guilty status becomes the viewer's inevitable  
28  
29 conclusion' (2009, 8). We used this insight to think about how obese disability  
30  
31 claimants Steve and Michelle may be 'set up' in such ways that bring the welfare  
32  
33 system itself into doubt: we focused on the production and suggestion of accusation  
34  
35 and assumptions of wrong-doing in our repeated viewings of the show.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

### 41 **Why a Big Fat Frame?**

42  
43  
44  
45 **Off screen Narrator:** 'Britain is getting fatter and as our waistline grows so  
46  
47 does the burden on the benefit system'  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 First and foremost, disabled claimants in *Benefits Too Fat to Work* are presented as  
53  
54 'fat'. This is explicit in the title, in the main focus of the show and in its opening line  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

1  
2  
3 above. It may seem a rather obvious starting place to discuss frames, but it is worth  
4  
5 closer examination because fat is not a neutral descriptor of body size: we start then,  
6  
7 by asking *why* this frame.  
8  
9

10  
11 Fat may be an unsurprising focus for poverty porn because overweight people are  
12  
13 already over-represented across reality television, particularly in the glut of weight-  
14  
15 loss makeover shows over the past decade (Raisborough 2014). There is however,  
16  
17 more to say here because, although not consistently so (Jutel 2009), fat bodies have  
18  
19 historically served as a repository for wider socio-cultural anxieties such as class-  
20  
21 corruption (Farrell 2011), uncontrolled consumption (Shugart 2010), poor national  
22  
23 fitness (Monaghan, Colls and Evans 2013) and the ability of middle-class men to  
24  
25 rebuild society after nuclear attack (McPhail 2009). A historical analysis  
26  
27 demonstrates that negative stereotypes of fat endure but take up different expressions  
28  
29 that reflect contemporary concerns (Grant, Mizzi, and Anglim 2016). Our current  
30  
31 climate of neoliberal entrepreneurial individualisation is the context for stereotypes  
32  
33 that regard fat bodies as outward signs of individuals who are ‘lazy, unmotivated,  
34  
35 lacking in self-discipline, less competent, noncompliant, and sloppy’ (Puhl and Heuer  
36  
37 2009, 941). Fat then, readily provides a host of associations with which to  
38  
39 overdetermine the welfare claimant in poverty porn and acts to tie individual body  
40  
41 shapes and sizes into prevailing socio-economic crises and concerns. Yet, more  
42  
43 specifically for our purposes, contemporary meanings of fat are also situated in the  
44  
45 context of the obesity epidemic.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 The obesity epidemic relies on translations of body fat, via the Body Mass Index  
53  
54 (BMI), into a graduated scale ranging from ‘underweight’ to ‘morbidly obese’. These  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 gradients are significant because they serve as risk markers for a range of illnesses  
4 and diseases that are correlated with high weight (cancers, hypertension, diabetes,  
5 heart disease, mobility problems, sleep apnea, dementia, and psychological/emotion  
6 issues). The ‘epidemic’ refers to a population increase in BMI and fuels media  
7 concerns that these increases will lead to unprecedented levels of illness that will  
8 place intolerable demands on the NHS and Social Security provision. Hegemonic  
9 understandings of ‘obesity’ can therefore be linked directly to a biomedical definition:  
10 Koppelman states in her study of University courses and syllabi that the fat person  
11 can be presented as ‘medically disordered, pathological, a patient to be treated,  
12 counseled, and perhaps ‘healed’ (2009, 216).  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 There has been a sustained critique of the BMI, the epidemiological evidence of any  
28 exponential increase in weight, and even of the link of weight to ill health (Campos et  
29 al 2006; Flegal, et al, 2013), but what concerns most critics is the hegemonic status of  
30 ‘calories in, calories out’ energy imbalance models of obesity which lend themselves  
31 to individualised ‘lifestyle’ causes and cures for obesity, namely food intake  
32 (excessive/restrict) and exercise (none/more). There is considerable criticism of these  
33 models (see Campos et al, 2006): the reduction of health status to weight is worrying  
34 because it largely ignores structural determinants of health and there is increasing  
35 evidence for us to question whether anti-obesity measures based on these models  
36 actually *work* (Warin, et al, 2015; Monaghan, Bombak, and Rich 2017). Additionally  
37 a range of complications and challenges that having a chronic illness or disability  
38 might bring are also ignored, including social isolation, reduced mobility, cost of  
39 food, difficulty in preparing food, and difficulty in participating in mainstream  
40 physical activities and classes. Despite these critical concerns, energy-imbalance  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 models have been confidently circulated across the media with the consequence that  
4 weight is understood as *controllable* (Saguy, Frederick, and Gruys 2014).  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 It has been roundly argued that the suturing of weight to health has meant that health  
10 is entering the cultural imaginary as a state that falls within personal control (see  
11 Gurrieri, Previte, and Brace-Govan 2013). As such, prevailing understandings of  
12 obesity complement neoliberal individualism because the focus remains on individual  
13 bodies and the individual blame that can be attributed to them. More specifically, fat  
14 starts to emerge in a socio-cultural landscape characterised by ‘healthism’. Healthism  
15 was coined by Crawford (1980) to refer to the impact of socio-political and economic  
16 changes on how health is defined, understood and experienced. He argued that health  
17 was shifting from a description of an illness-free state to a site of personal  
18 performances and surveillance. Not only has health become something one *does*, but  
19 correct and *visible* performances become markers of mature, moral personhood and  
20 responsible citizenship (Gard and Wright 2005). In this context, the possession of a  
21 fat body is a visible mark of a stigmatised identity (Monaghan, Bombak, and Rich  
22 2017; Aphramor 2005): overweight or obese people are always and already regarded  
23 as ‘health offenders’ (Tischner 2013,5) whose health problems are considered self-  
24 inflicted (Klos et al, 2015). Additionally, in the context of neoliberal rationalities and  
25 particularly austerity, this ‘offence’ is represented as having an impact on the health  
26 care of other citizens because of the ‘burden’ obesity places on already overstretched  
27 (under-funded) welfare services: the fat body then, becomes a concern of us all,  
28 encouraging a degree of social acceptability towards the everyday humiliation and  
29 prejudice towards larger people to ‘encourage’ them into good health practices (Major  
30 et al, 2014). Lee Monaghan concludes that obesity has become so associated with  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 'badness and sickness' that 'fat may as well be a four letter word' (Monaghan, 2007,  
4  
5 605).

6  
7  
8  
9 This goes some way to explain the attraction of fat for poverty porn: the association of  
10  
11 fat with 'badness and sickness' sits well with the reality television genre which has  
12  
13 been likened to a modern-day 'freak show' (Backstrom 2012), but more significantly,  
14  
15 fat bodies offer an acceptable target for ridicule or suspicion in ways other bodies –  
16  
17 say those with heart disease – do not. Yet, the framing of disability by fat achieves a  
18  
19 *specific* function: our discussion so far suggests that fat has a reductive ability: it  
20  
21 reduces a range of complex illnesses, impairments and mobility issues to matters of  
22  
23 weight and, via the logics of the obesity epidemic, to matters of personal control and  
24  
25 responsibility. This is significant because Morrow (2015, 199) argues that in  
26  
27 'fatphobic cultural imaginary, fatness is inseparable from disability' because both are  
28  
29 culturally intertwined with illness and sickness. Our concern here is that as illness/  
30  
31 impairment become subsumed by fat/obesity and associated notions of individual  
32  
33 control, disability as a 'deserving' ground for state support can be more readily  
34  
35 contested on the grounds that (some) disabilities can be reversed through personal  
36  
37 will and determination.

38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 In the remaining sections of this paper we discuss how Steve and Michelle, the stars  
45  
46 of *Benefits Too Fat*, are repeatedly and variously represented as being either reluctant  
47  
48 to apply personal control to their lives and their purportedly 'reversible' impairments  
49  
50 and illness, or being deceitful (to themselves and others) in their attempts to exercise  
51  
52 this responsibility.

### Framing Steve and Michelle

In this section we consider Butler's (2009) observation that to frame involves 'planting evidence' of 'guilt'. We start with the programme's title, *Benefits Too Fat to Work*. State benefits could be understood as a necessary provision for some people in society who need support to live a comfortable and dignified lifestyle. State benefits help a range of different people, young and old, with disabilities or chronic illness and people finding themselves out of work for a range of different reasons. Yet recent media discourse in the UK has focused on the rising cost of benefits which many news outlets deem too extravagant at a time of economic recession (Aleksia 2012). For more than a decade some of the tabloid press have continued to carve out the folk devil of the benefit scrounger who is taking the money off hard-working tax-paying people by fooling the government to believe they are in need of financial help. *Benefits: Too Fat to Work* consolidates the idea of this immoral figure and reduces the complex social issue of health inequalities across class, disability and other factors to the single issue of money. Pound signs are embedded into the word *benefits* to underline an 'out of control' benefits bill.

We now focus on how key participants Steve and Michelle, and the social types they are assumed to represent, are 'guilty' of benefit dependency and poor self-management.

**Off screen Narrator:** 'In Plymouth on the South Coast, 60% of adults are overweight or obese. Two are Steven Beer and Michelle Combe. Steve weighs 31 Stone and Michelle tips the scales at 23 stone.'

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 As we can expect from our discussion so far, the master frame positions Steve and  
6  
7 Michelle in terms of their weight but in particular ways: as the narrator offers us facts  
8  
9 about the number of overweight people in their area, the film footage focuses on a fast  
10  
11 food outlet in their home town to make a clear visual link between obesity and poor  
12  
13 lifestyle choices (in a twist of narrative continuity this will be the same outlet that  
14  
15 Steve and Michelle will be ‘caught at’ celebrating their first anniversary by the *Daily*  
16  
17 *Mail*). The programme then introduces Steve and Michele via their weights (31 and 23  
18  
19 stone respectively). These opening shots neatly position Steve and Michelle within  
20  
21 the wider obesity epidemic by producing a ‘face’ to an otherwise anonymous 60%.  
22  
23 The significance of their weight is made clear to the audience by repeated mention that  
24  
25 their weight *costs* the ‘tax-payer’: we learn, for example, that Steve and Michelle ‘live  
26  
27 in a one-bedroomed flat paid for [by] housing benefits’ that ‘in total they get two  
28  
29 grand a month in handouts’. Later we learn that Steve receives the assistance of a carer  
30  
31 ‘who comes twice a day’ which costs the tax payer ‘about eight thousand pounds per  
32  
33 year so he can be looked after’. In a matter of seconds then, obesity – and the  
34  
35 disabilities it will purport to represent – is folded into a familiar coding of the  
36  
37 unemployed white working class circulating in poverty porn. This reproduces  
38  
39 mainstream media representations of obesity as a ‘white problem’ (Gollust, Eboh, and  
40  
41 Barry 2012,1549), while tapping into familiar visual and narrative tropes in wider  
42  
43 poverty porn that associate the white working class with abject lives and welfare  
44  
45 dependency (Jenson 2013).  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 *Benefits Too Fat* diverts more attention to Steve than Michelle because while both are  
53  
54 unemployed (Michelle ‘hasn’t had a job in two decades’ reports the narrator), it is  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Steve who is 'signed off on the sick' and is in receipt of disability welfare support.  
4  
5 There is early mention that Steve suffered a stroke six years ago. The narrator tells us  
6  
7 that 'since then he's developed a growing list of health problems', which meant he  
8  
9 could no longer work ('Steve used to run a cleaning business') and which led to his  
10  
11 increase in size. Steve's dad reminds his son that five or six years ago, the time of the  
12  
13 stroke, 'you was thin'. There is a potentially disruptive narrative here that contests the  
14  
15 relationship of large weight to illness because Steve may have been thin at the time of  
16  
17 his stroke and his weight gain was a *consequence* of illness not its cause. Yet, any  
18  
19 disruption is limited by framing events onto the present: it is Steve's weight *now* that  
20  
21 is the cause of his unemployment. The shift to the present is achieved by the narrator  
22  
23 immediately following from her mention of his past stroke with a damning statistic,  
24  
25 'Steve is around 12,000 people in Britain who get disability benefit because they are  
26  
27 too fat to work'. This statement sweeps the stroke aside and replaces it with repeated  
28  
29 emphasis that fat/weight are the sole concerns: we see, for example, Steve displaying  
30  
31 his stomach and describing himself as fat and the narrator helps us to understand that  
32  
33 Steve's breathlessness, discomfort and medical distress are all tied to weight; 'Steve's  
34  
35 health problems include diabetes and hypertension caused by his weight'. Diabetes  
36  
37 and hypertension are difficult to represent visually, so fat stomachs and fat legs fill the  
38  
39 screen.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 This shift from stroke to fat allows *Benefits Too Fat* to circulate a wider prevailing  
47  
48 logic that if Steve, and the thousands like him, could 'do' something about his weight,  
49  
50 all his health problems would be resolved as would his work status: Steve's father  
51  
52 claims 'If he loses weight I can't see any reason whatsoever within two years that he  
53  
54 won't be in a fit state to get to work. There is no reason whatsoever'. We see here a  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 reproduction of what Jenson (2013a) identifies as a foundational myth of poverty porn:  
4 that there is full quality work ‘out there’ if only individuals made themselves fit for it.  
5 Steve tries to call this into doubt by asking ‘where's the people out there who will give  
6 me a job?’ and later when he describes how the Job Centre turned him away because  
7 of his weight, Steve asks the camera ‘What can you do? Yet, any potential for a  
8 critique of employment or the impact of weight discrimination on recruitment is  
9 immediately brushed aside by a reproduction of obesity logics that see weight (and  
10 therefore health) as controllable – it seems that Steve *should* be doing something.  
11 What emerges is not a question of what work is available in neoliberal conditions  
12 (Jenson, 2013a) but the start of an investigation into Steve’s character and integrity -  
13 just what kind of person is he?  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

### *Talking the Talk*

30  
31  
32  
33 Narrator: ‘Although Steve struggles to work, he’s keen to talk  
34 the talk’

35  
36  
37 Steve: ‘I was brought up that if you had a family, you look after  
38 them and that doesn’t mean that you sit on your ass and watch  
39 the world go by, you have got to go out there and earn your keep  
40 instead of sponging off the system.’  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 In a genre implicated with the demonization of scroungerphobia (Heeney 2015), it is  
49 interesting that Steve espouses prevailing distinctions of strivers/shirkers (Valentine  
50 and Harris 2014) that suggest that work status is a matter of personal attitude and  
51 agency: those who get off their ass and those who don’t. We might expect this quote to  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 redeem Steve's current worklessness, or at least place him within the category of  
4 claimants who are considered deserving because they demonstrate the 'right' attitude  
5 towards work. Yet, *Benefits Too Fat*, by this incorporation, suggests that even those  
6 who advocate anti-welfare sentiments cannot be trusted. This is achieved by  
7 introducing Steve's words with 'talk the talk' which is a phrase that describes a  
8 mismatch between actions and stated intentions.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15  
16  
17  
18 This mismatch between his words and deeds is repeatedly demonstrated throughout  
19 the documentary, particularly with regard to his eating, a focus, we suggest is enabled  
20 and dramatized by the calories in/out logics of the obesity epidemic. For example, the  
21 audience learns that Steve attends a weekly management class ('paid for out of his  
22 benefits') and a 'compulsory weight-loss programme funded by the tax-payer'. Steve  
23 is confident of losing weight, as he heads for his weigh-in he tells us that 'what I am  
24 trying to do now is lose 3lb to get down to 31 stone'. He manages to lose 1lb and  
25 when congratulated, he explains that he has been 'keeping off the fat stuff' and is  
26 pleased with his success 'well, that's a pound off, I expected more really... that was  
27 really good'. While the audience may be led to question why Steve is so easily  
28 pleased at what is a failure to reach his goal, they, the audience is treated to Steve  
29 celebrating his weight loss by placing a food order to his local fast food outlet. It is  
30 clear he is a regular caller as he says down the phone 'yeah, you've got it [the order]  
31 by now, haven't you?' In addition to his large kebab, the audience is also treated to  
32 Steve eating the very 'fat stuff' he said he was restricting. That Steve does this  
33 knowingly is suggested by his comment 'if anyone comes in, especially Linda [weight  
34 management advisor] and sees me eating this, she'll say "why have you got a  
35 kebab?"'. There is an interesting point that can be made here about visual  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 representation: Obesity helps undermine the trustworthiness of the fat disability  
4 claimant because there is a doubling of visibility. Not only is body fat highly visible  
5 (Tischner 2013) but the types and quantities of food and their consumption are also  
6 readily filmatic in way that other 'bad' behaviours are not (film footage of someone  
7 sitting on a couch or *not* exercising would struggle to make the sensationalized impact  
8 of someone eating their way through what seem to be large volumes of food).  
9 Similarly the cost of take-away food helps to present it as excessive ('1lb lost, £11.50  
10 spent, but best to keep it quiet' reports the narrator). It seems then, that Steve is adept  
11 at playing the system: saying what he needs to say, displaying a willingness to change,  
12 while engaging in the very behaviours that keep him in what is represented as a  
13 lifestyle of idleness and welfare dependency.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

### *Not Walking the Walk*

30  
31  
32

33 At seventeen minutes into the programme there is one fleeting, yet interesting remark  
34 made on Steve's use of a mobility scooter to aid him on a trip into town. Footage  
35 shows both Steve and Michelle on their journey into town alongside the voiceover  
36 that stated 'Steve is getting around on a specially strengthened mobility scooter. Paid  
37 for out of his benefits'. Although no other reference to the scooter was made  
38 throughout the show, that this scene made it to the final edit holds some significance.  
39 The use of mobility-scooters has risen in recent years although there has been little  
40 attention paid to this in academic literature (May, Garrett, and Ballantyne 2010).  
41 There is some ambivalence over mobility scooters in the public domain because they  
42 are simultaneously associated with support for people with mobility difficulties *and* a  
43 sort of luxury vehicle for the elderly to add comfort to their lives: scooters are not  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 then, straightforwardly associated with disability and impairment in the way a  
4 wheelchair is: Jang et al (2017) found that scooter users faced barriers and stigma  
5 partly because of the uncertain status of scooters as both disability signifiers and  
6 mobility devices. *Benefits Too Fat*, true to its title and theme appears to be  
7 concerned wholly in demonstrating the cost of 'being too fat to work' and hence the  
8 cost of the mobility scooter was the only context in which the aid was discussed. It is  
9 unlikely that even a programme like *Benefits Too Fat* would have commented on the  
10 cost of a wheelchair had Steve been using one of these instead. The wheelchair does  
11 not evoke the same degree of suspicion around the user's 'authentic' disability status  
12 as the mobility scooter due to the users of the latter usually having the ability to walk  
13 short distances (and hence calling into question the need for the scooter). For  
14 example, later in the programme Steve is seen walking into town (without his scooter)  
15 and the narrator remarks that he is 'in a spot of bother ... Steve's health problems  
16 including diabetes and hypertension ... caused by his weight means just being on his  
17 feet makes him breathless'. So although *Benefits* finally mentions the impairment  
18 issues that Steve has, this information is given around eight minutes after we have  
19 seen Steve with his scooter. The mobility scooter and its (unnecessary)  
20 purchase/rental from the benefits system has already been established and the list of  
21 health problems are only framed as issues caused by his own journey to obesity. In  
22 conclusion, the image of Steve using a mobility scooter stresses the liminal nature of  
23 Steve's body as being neither disabled or able; as being both dependent (on benefits)  
24 and independent (if only Steve could make the right eating and life choices); as  
25 owning both a worthless body but one with the potential to work and contribute fully  
26 to society. We are left with deepening suspicion of Steve's claims to ill health and we  
27 are possibly left to question whether his dependency both on the state and his scooter

1  
2  
3 is preventing him from getting the much needed exercise that is suggested as the  
4  
5 solution to obesity in medical discourses.  
6  
7

### 8 9 *The Big Benefits Wedding*

10  
11  
12  
13 Questions about the way poor people spend their money have long formed part of the  
14  
15 moralised classifications of deserving and undeserving poor: Rowntree's (1901:5)  
16  
17 report made mention of concerns about 'drink, betting and gambling, ignorant or  
18  
19 careless housekeeping and over improvident expenditure' (cited in Cameron, Smith,  
20  
21 and Tepe-Belfrage 2016,407). It may be expected then, that *Benefits Too Fat* would  
22  
23 provide a regular tally of the Beer's inappropriate spending habits. There has already  
24  
25 been mention of the cost of a take away, but *Benefits Too Fat* reserve its  
26  
27 commentary for what the narrator describes as the Beer's 'big benefits wedding'. We  
28  
29 suggest that the wedding, an event readily understood as costly, encourages audiences  
30  
31 to draw unfavourable conclusions about the ways benefits are spent by extrapolating  
32  
33 from individual, seemingly 'authentic' stories of individuals and specific events  
34  
35 (McEnhill and Bryne, 2016).  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41  
42 From the start of the programme, Steve defends his right to hold a wedding: 'there's  
43  
44 loads of people out there who's on benefits who get married, of course they do, and  
45  
46 they find a venue and have their friends as well, so why can't I'. Steve's assertion of  
47  
48 entitlement is potentially powerful here: Kolarova (2012) has argued that disabled  
49  
50 people have often been forced to redeem self-pride and accept an imposed stigma and  
51  
52 isolation in exchange for their 'rightful' access to welfare. Yet, Steve's claim for  
53  
54 entitlement is immediately undermined by the following exchange:  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Steve: This is wedding number four.

4  
5 Michelle: Six.

6  
7 Steve: Six then, wedding number six.

8  
9 As Steve is seen to be careless even in his memory of what are culturally held to be  
10 significant events, the wedding becomes a site where specific framings can be  
11 reiterated: Steve is aware that he cannot afford a big wedding ‘at the end of the day, if  
12 you want to get married and you are on benefits and stuff then I’m afraid you got to  
13 miss out on things’ yet he later lists his desire for the ‘release of doves’, ‘canopies’,  
14 official photographers, a £200 car, ‘an all day buffet’ and new suit. The wedding then,  
15 allows *Bene£its* to reiterate that Steve might be displaying the correct attitude but that  
16 this is further example of his ‘talking the talk’. The consequence is that the tax-payer  
17 picks up the ‘lion’s share of the cost’ and the narrator gestures towards the waste by  
18 pointing out that the pizza buffet (the Beer’s ‘favourite’ fast food) cost a thousand  
19 pounds.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 The wedding and pizza is significant because it goes against the wider austerity  
36 message of careful household economics. Cultural ideals about constrained household  
37 spending circulate through a political rhetoric that forges strong parallels between the  
38 ‘greed, consumption and profligacy of both the State and the household’ (Cameron,  
39 Smith, and Tepe-Belfrage 2016). These links help circulate understandings of  
40 austerity as a commonsense and logical strategy of cutting spending to reduce debts  
41 while embedding the notion that indebtedness is a problem shared by all citizens. The  
42 complexity of State economics is reduced to models similar to those we have already  
43 observed in the obesity epidemic to explain health - money/ calories in and money/  
44 calories out. Restriction on spending, in common with a disciplined restriction of  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 food, has a performative and aesthetic dimension. Jensen (2013b) observes how  
4 recent thrift programming repositions hardship has a site of fun, creative challenges of  
5 up-cycling, foraging and mending. This 'new thrift' draws more surveillance onto  
6 household spending habits (not, notably, upon those of the rich elites) and it deftly  
7 abstracts the brutal struggle of those surviving in economic restraints with little to no  
8 relief. In contrast then to the Superscrimpers, and the fashionably frugal, sits Steve's  
9 sixth wedding - a wedding characterized not by the new 'aesthetics of austerity'  
10 (Jensen, 2013b, 64) but by an abundant consumption coded as unhealthy by obesity  
11 discourses and as tasteless by the sensibilities of the 'new thrift'. As audiences are  
12 encouraged to regard Steve as a representative of a wider social type (one of the 60%  
13 of overweight people in Plymouth, one of 12,000 who are on benefit because they are  
14 'too fat to work'), Steve's spending gestures towards the profligacy of others who are  
15 also regarded as having a doubtful claim on the State.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 33 **Discussion**

34  
35 This paper is not suggesting that the construction of deserving and undeserving poor  
36 is new (see Stone 1984), nor does it argue that the association of poverty with  
37 character or milieu is unique to poverty porn (see Korte and Zipp 2014). Our  
38 intention is to demonstrate that these constructions and associations are aggressively  
39 reproduced within the context of neoliberal austerity with specific consequences for  
40 disability claimants. To reiterate, we are not simply witnessing a 're-run' of a moral  
41 panic over welfare claimants, rather austerity is a strategic restructure of 'welfare to  
42 refashion economic and social relations on a grander scale' (Morris 2016,101). The  
43 key mechanisms for this refashioning are argued to be social division, stigmatization  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 (Hayes 2017, 23) and scapegoating (O’Flynn, Monaghan, and Power 2014) which we  
4  
5 argue can be observed in poverty porn.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Our analysis suggests that it is possible and critically desirable to regard the framing  
11  
12 (‘setting up’) of disability claimants as central to what Wacquant (2008) terms as  
13  
14 *advanced* marginality, which, amongst other processes, proceeds to penalize urban  
15  
16 poverty through a series of ever more targeted social exclusions. In particular,  
17  
18 Wacquant makes two arguments: the first is that poverty is the consequence of  
19  
20 structural violence from above and not something that can be explained away by  
21  
22 personalised accounts of lifestyle (despite what *Benefits Too Fat* may suggest).  
23  
24 Secondly, that the chances of class solidarity, collective action and resistance are  
25  
26 drastically reduced when marginalised populations are encouraged to distance  
27  
28 themselves from those rendered *more* object: in simple terms, he argues that the  
29  
30 conditions of advanced marginality encourage the urban poor to turn against each  
31  
32 other in order to lay claim to their own worth. Returning to our earlier discussion of  
33  
34 Briant, Watson, and Philo (2013) analysis of news media, we observed how a  
35  
36 narrowing of focus firstly brings the *disabled* claimant population into specific view,  
37  
38 by distinguishing them from a wider claimant population, and then fragmenting this  
39  
40 group into smaller demographics of authentic and fraudulent claimants. Additionally,  
41  
42 in Runswick-Cole and Goodley’s (2015) analysis of *Benefit Street*, there is evidence  
43  
44 of a more targeted attempt to *drill down* into disability categories themselves in order  
45  
46 to foreclose the very means by which people can claim on social security (learning  
47  
48 disabilities seem to offer stronger ‘authenticity’). Our reading of Wacquant (2008)  
49  
50 suggests that disability claimants are caught up in the repeated construction of  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60 ‘authentic-not-fraudulent’ as part of their performance of legitimacy. If this is the

1  
2  
3 case then the circulation of obesity logics in poverty porn (which render fat/ health as  
4  
5 controllable) help to frame those who attempt to claim authenticity as being  
6  
7 potentially duplicitous (discussed above as ‘talking the talk’). Additionally, as obesity  
8  
9 folds into the class dynamics of poverty porn, disability becomes associated with the  
10  
11 ‘unhealthy lifestyles and excessive consumption’ stereotypes which have been  
12  
13 attached to the white working class (Heeney, 2015, Gollust, Eboh, and Barry 2014) to  
14  
15 reemphasize the notion that worklessness is a voluntary choice reflecting a personal  
16  
17 ‘preference for idleness and a life of welfare benefits’ (MacDonald, Shildrick, and  
18  
19 Furlong 2014, 31).  
20  
21

22  
23 The consequence is an overdetermination of suspicion that is fuelled by commonsense  
24  
25 and tacit knowledge of weight, the personal character deficits exhibited by fat bodies,  
26  
27 and of classed Others (Heeney 2015). We regard this as a necessary strategy to silence  
28  
29 any structural explanations for poverty and replace them with accounts of personal  
30  
31 idleness and wastefulness (Cameron, Smith, and Tepe-Belfrage 2016; Runswick Cole  
32  
33 and Goodley 2015), while encouraging a hardening of public opinion towards Others  
34  
35 and a suspicion over their right to claim welfare (Valentine and Harris 2014). As  
36  
37 suspicion is widely and repeatedly cast, public opinion can be orientated to support  
38  
39 ‘solutions’ to the threats posed by Others: work-fare, benefit reductions, increased  
40  
41 state-surveillance, harsher eligibility tests, and privatization of the welfare system  
42  
43 (Morris 2016; Piven 2015).  
44  
45  
46

## 47 **Conclusion**

48  
49 In this paper we have asked what cultural work fat achieves within the context of  
50  
51 poverty porn. Our focus on the abjection of larger disabled people has allowed a  
52  
53 sharper sociological critique into the specificity of the scapegoats paraded in poverty  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 porn: we have demonstrated how the utilization of existing ‘commonsense’  
4  
5 knowledge relating to obesity can overdetermine the disabled welfare claimant as  
6  
7 suspicious in this reality television genre. In particular, we have argued that while  
8  
9 anti-welfare commonsense may be disrupted by exceptional cases and notions of the  
10  
11 ‘deserving poor’ (Watkins-Hayes and Kovalsky 2017), obesity may be used to  
12  
13 undermine the credibility of those exceptional cases by casting doubt on authentic  
14  
15 hardship. Disability provides a particularly useful site for this application of obesity  
16  
17 because to be regarded as ‘legitimate’ the disabled person it seems, needs to be  
18  
19 recognized as ‘authentically’ disabled by the public to avoid stigmatisation.  
20  
21  
22 Freidson’s (1988) seminal work demonstrated the importance of lay legitimization of  
23  
24 the sick role that, if granted, permitted the ill person access to the rights and  
25  
26 obligations that the role granted. Applied to more current day ‘scrounger’ discourse, it  
27  
28 appears that the process of disability legitimization is similarly subjectively applied and  
29  
30 those with disabilities that might not be visible, or are regarded in some way as  
31  
32 ‘caused’ by ‘immoral’ practice (e.g. by having obese bodies that may cause  
33  
34 impairment) are primed for stigmatization and distrust. Furthermore, obesity as a  
35  
36 *lifestyle* casts further doubt on the systems that classify need and deservedness in the  
37  
38 first place: the framing in *Benefits Too Fat* suggests that the welfare system is itself  
39  
40 easily duped through its own lax gatekeeping. The overall thrust of such messaging is  
41  
42 that poverty is displaced from critical and political attention by figures of suspicion  
43  
44 and threat. We suggest that representations of fat allows the further contestation of a  
45  
46 number of impairments while avoiding the politically-risky work involved in directly  
47  
48 challenging the status and entitlement of disabled welfare claimants.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

## 54 **References**

1  
2  
3 Aleksia, A. 2012. *Why We're Not Benefit Scroungers: Life with Chronic Illness or*  
4 *Disability in Modern Britain*. Oxford: Aleksia Publishing Writers World.  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 Allen, K., I. Tyler, and S. De Benedictis. 2014. "Thinking with 'White Dee: The  
10 Gender Politics of 'Austerity Porn'". *Sociological Research Online* 19 (3) 2  
11  
12 <<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/19/3/2.html>>  
13  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 Aphramor, L. 2009. "Disability and the anti-obesity offensive". *Disability and Society*  
19 24 (7): 897-909  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 Aphramor, L. 2005. "Is a Weight-centred Health Framework Salutogenic? Some  
25 Thoughts on Unhinging Certain Dietary Ideologies". *Social Theory & Health* 3 :315–  
26 340  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 Backstrom, L. 2012. "From the Freak Show to the Living Room: Cultural  
33 Representations of Dwarfism and Obesity". *Sociological Forum* 27 (3): 682–707  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 Bates, K., D. Goodley, and K. Runswick-Cole. 2017. "Precarious Lives and Resistant  
39 Possibilities: The Labour of People with Learning Disabilities in Times of Austerity  
40 *Disability and Society* 32 (2): 160-175.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 Biressi, A., and H. Nunn. 2013 *Class and Contemporary British Culture*.  
48 London: Palgrave  
49  
50

51  
52 Briant, E., N. Watson, and G. Philo. 2013 "Reporting Disability in the Age of  
53 Austerity: The Changing Face of Media Representation Of Disability And Disabled  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

1  
2  
3 People In The United Kingdom And The Creation Of New ‘Folk Devils’”. *Disability*  
4  
5 *and Society* 28 (6): 874-889  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Brooker, P., J. Vines, S. Sutton, J. Barnett, T. Feltwell, and S. Lawson. 2015  
11  
12 “Debating Poverty Porn on Twitter: Social Media as a Place for Everyday Socio-  
13  
14 Political Talk” Paper presented at the 33<sup>rd</sup> Annual ACM Conference on Human  
15  
16 Factors in Computing Systems. Seoul, Republic of Korea, April 18 - 23, 2015  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 Butler, J. 2009 *Frames of War: When Life is Grievable?* London, New York: Verso  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Campos, P., A.Saguy,P. Ernsberger, E. Oliver, E, and G. Gaesser. 2006. “The  
29  
30 Epidemiology of Overweight and Obesity: Public Health Crisis Or Moral Panic?”.  
31  
32 *International Journal of Epidemiology* 35(1): 55–60.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 Cameron, A., N. Smith, and D. Tepe-Belfrage. 2016 “Household Wastes:  
40  
41 Disciplining The Family In The Name Of Austerity” *British Politics* 11 (4):  
42  
43 396-417  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 Cleary, K. 2016. “Misfitting and Hater Blocking: A Feminist Disability  
49  
50 Analysis of the Extraordinary Body on Reality Television “ *Disability Studies*  
51  
52 *Quarterly* 36 (4): <http://dsq-sds.org/issue/view/153>  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Crawford, R. 1980. "Healthism and the Medicalization of Everyday Life",  
4 *International Journal of Health Sciences* 10: (3): 365-388  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Deeming, C. 2015 "Foundations of the Workfare State – Reflections on the  
11 Political Transformation of the Welfare State in Britain" *Social Policy*  
12 *& Administration*. 49(7): 862-886.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 De Benedictis, S., K.Allen, K. and T. Jensen. 2017. "Portraying Poverty: The  
20 Economics And Ethics Of Factual Welfare Television". *Cultural Sociology* 11 (3):  
21 337-358/  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Farrell, A.E 2011 *Fat Shame: Stigma and the Fat Body in American Culture* New  
29 York: New York University Press.  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Flegal, K.M., B.K,Kit, H. Orpana, and B.I. Graubard. 2013 "Association of All-Cause  
35 Mortality With Overweight and Obesity Using Standard Body Mass Index  
36 Categories: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis" *Journal of the American*  
37 *Medical Associatio*, 309 (1):71-82.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Flint, S.W., and J, Snook. 2014 "Obesity And Discrimination: The Next 'Big Issue?'"  
46 *International Journal of Discrimination and The Law* 14 (3): 183-193.  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Freidson, E. 1988. *Profession on Medicine: a study of the Sociology of Applied*  
52 *Knowledge*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

1  
2  
3 Gard, M., and J. Wright. 2005 *The Obesity Epidemic: Science, Morality And Ideology*  
4  
5 London: Routledge.

6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Ghoshal, R. 2009 “Argument Forms, Frames, and Value Conflict: Persuasion in the  
11  
12 Case of Same-Sex Marriage” *Cultural Sociology* 3 (1): 76–101.

13  
14  
15 Gollust, S.E., I. Eboh, and C.L. Barry. 2012 “Picturing Obesity: Analysing The  
16  
17 Social Epidemiology Of Obesity Conveyed Through US News Media Images”  
18  
19 *Social Science and Medicine* 74:1544-1551

20  
21  
22  
23  
24 Grant, S.L., T Mizzi, and J. Anglim. 2016. “Fat, Four-Eyed And Female’ 30 Years  
25  
26 Later: A Replication Of Harris, Harris, And Bochner's (1982) Early Study Of Obesity  
27  
28 Stereotype” *Australian Journal of Psychology* 68 (4): 290–300

29  
30  
31  
32  
33 Gurrieri, L., J. Previte, and J. Brace-Govan. 2013. “Women’s Bodies As Sites Of  
34  
35 Control: Inadvertent Stigma And Exclusion In Social Marketing” *Journal of*  
36  
37 *Macromarketing*, 33 (2): 128-143.

38  
39  
40  
41  
42 Heeney, J. 2015 “Disability Welfare Reform And The Chav Threat : A  
43  
44 Reflection On Social Class And ‘Contested Disabilities” *Disability and Society*  
45  
46 30 (4): 650-653

47  
48  
49  
50  
51 Jang, S., B. Mortenson, L. Hurd, and R.L. Kirby. 2017. “Blurred Lines: The  
52  
53 Liminality Of Mobility Scooters” *Abstracts, Poster Presentations for Qualitative*  
54  
55

1  
2  
3 *Health Research Conference. International Journal of Qualitative Methods. Vol 16*  
4  
5 pp.1-21.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 G. L. Jenkin, L. Signal and G. Thomson 2011 Framing Obesity: The Framing Contest  
12  
13 Between Industry And Public Health At The New Zealand Inquiry Into  
14  
15 Obesity *obesity Reviews* (2011) **12**, 1022–1030  
16  
17

18  
19 Jensen, T 2013a “A Summer of Television Poverty Porn” *Sociological Imagination*,  
20  
21 <http://sociologicalimagination.org/archives/14013>.  
22  
23

24  
25 Jensen. T 2013b “Austerity Parenting” *Soundings* 55: 60-70  
26

27  
28 Jensen, T. and I. Tyler. 2015 “Benefits Broods’: The Cultural And Political  
29  
30 Crafting Of Anti-Welfare Commonsense’ *Critical Social Policy*, 35(4):1–22.  
31  
32

33  
34 Jutel.A. 2009.” Doctor’s Orders: Diagnosis, Medical Authority And The Exploitation  
35  
36 Of The Fat Body.” In *Biopolitics and the ‘Obesity Epidemic* edited by Wright.J., and  
37  
38 V.Harwood, 60-77. London: Routledge.  
39  
40

41  
42 Klos, L.A., C. Greenleaf, N. Paly., M.M Kellser, C.G .Shoemaker, and E.A. Suchla,  
43  
44 2015 “Losing Weight On Reality TV: A Content Analysis Of The Weight Loss  
45  
46 Behaviours And Practices Portrayed On *The Biggest Loser*”. *Journal of Health*  
47  
48 *Communication* 20:639-646  
49  
50

51  
52  
53 Koppelman, S. 2009 “Fat Stories in the Classroom What and How are the They  
54  
55 Teaching About us?” In *The Fat Studies Reader*, edited by Rothblum, E. and S.  
56  
57



1  
2  
3 Solovay , 213-220. New York: New York University Press.  
4  
5

6  
7 Major, B., J.M. Hunger, D.P. Bunyan, and C.T. Miller. 2014 “The Ironic Effects Of  
8  
9 Weight Stigma”. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 51: 74–80.  
10  
11

12  
13 May, E., R. Garrett, and A. Ballantyne. 2010. Being Mobile: Electric Mobility-  
14  
15 Scooters And Their Use By Older People. *Ageing and Society* 30: 1219-1237.  
16  
17

18  
19 McDonald, R., T. Shildrick and A. Furlong. 2014. “Benefits Street And The Myth Of  
20  
21 Workless Communities” *Sociological Research Online* 19 (3):  
22  
23 <<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/19/3/1.html>>  
24  
25

26  
27  
28 McPhail, D. 2009 ““What Do To With The ‘Tubby Hubby’? :The Crisis Of  
29  
30 Masculinity And The Nuclear Family In Early Cold War Canada”. *Antipode* 41 (5):  
31  
32 1021-1050.  
33  
34

35  
36  
37 Mirsky, N 2014. “Benefits Street struck a nerve – exposing how vital a documentary  
38  
39 it is”. *The Guardian* Friday 10 January 2014 10.30 GMT  
40  
41 [https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/jan/10/benefits-street-](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/jan/10/benefits-street-documentary-reality)  
42  
43 [documentary-reality](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/jan/10/benefits-street-documentary-reality)  
44  
45

46  
47  
48 Monaghan, L.F., A. E. Bombak, and E. Rich. 2017. “Obesity, Neoliberalism And  
49  
50 Epidemic Psychology: Critical Commentary And Alternative Approaches To Public  
51  
52 Health” *Critical Public Health* Pages 1-11 |Aug 2017, Published online: 05 Sep 2017  
53  
54  
55

- 1  
2  
3 Monaghan, L .F. 2007. “Body Mass Index, Masculinities And Moral Worth: Men’s  
4  
5 Critical Understandings Of ‘Appropriate’ Weight-For-Height” *Sociology of Health*  
6  
7 *and Illness* 29 (4): 584-609.  
8  
9  
10  
11 Monaghan. L.F., R. Colls, and B. Evans. 2013. “Obesity Discourse And Fat Politics:  
12  
13 Research, Critique And Interventions” *Critical Public Health* 23 (3): 249-262  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 Morris, L. 2016 “The Moral Economy Of Austerity: Analysing UK Welfare Reform”.  
19  
20 *The British Journal of Sociology* 67 (1): 97-117/  
21  
22  
23  
24 Mollow, A. 2015. “Disability Studies Gets Fat “ *Hypatia* 30 (1): 199- 216  
25  
26  
27 O’Flynn, M., L.F. Monaghan., and M.J. Power. 2014. “Scapegoating During a Time  
28  
29 of Crisis: A Critique of Post- Celtic Tiger Ireland” *Sociology* 48(5):921–937  
30  
31  
32 Puhl, R.M and C. A. Heuer .2009. “The Stigma of Obesity: A Review and  
33  
34 Update” *Obesity* 17 (5) : 941–964  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39 Raisborough, J .2014. “Why we should be watching more Trash TV: Exploring  
40  
41 the value of an analysis of the makeover show to Fat Studies Scholars” *Fat*  
42  
43 *Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Body Weight and Society* 3(2)155-165  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 Runswick-Cole, K and D. Goodley. 2015 “Dispovertyporn: *Benefits Street* And The  
49  
50 Dis/Ability Paradox” *Disability and Society* 30 (4) 645-649  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Saguy, A., Frederick, D and Gruys, K. 2014 “Reporting Risk, Producing Prejudice:  
4 How News Reporting On Obesity Shapes Attitudes About Health Risk, Policy And  
5 Prejudice”, *Social Science and Medicine*.111: 125-133.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10  
11 Soldatic, K ., and H. Morgan. 2017 “The Way You Make Me Feel’ Shame And The  
12 Neoliberal Governance Of Disability Welfare Subjectivities In Australia And The  
13 UK” in *Edges of Identity: The Production Of Neoliberal Subjectivities*, edited by  
14 Louth, J and M. Potter, M, 106-133. Chester: University of Chester Press.  
15  
16  
17

18  
19  
20  
21  
22 Stone, D.A. 1984 *The Disabled State* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.  
23  
24

25  
26 Shugart, H.A. 2010 “Consuming Citizen: Neoliberating the Obese Body”.  
27  
28 *Communication, Culture, and Critique* 3(1): 105-126.  
29  
30

31  
32  
33 Tischner, I. 2013 *Fat Lives: A Feminist Psychological Exploration* .London:  
34  
35 Routledge.  
36  
37

38  
39  
40 Tyler, I. 2013 *Revolting Bodies: Social Abjection and Resistance in Neoliberal*  
41  
42 *Britain*. London: Zed Books.  
43  
44

45  
46  
47 Tyler, I 2008 “Chav Mum Chav Scum” *Feminist Media Studies* 8(1): 17-34  
48  
49

50  
51  
52 Wacquant, L . 2008 *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology Of Advanced*  
53  
54 *Marginality* Oxford: Polity  
55  
56

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Warin, M., T. Zivkovic, V. Moore, P.R.Ward, and M. Jones. 2015. "Short Horizons  
6  
7 And Obesity Futures: Disjunctures Between Public Health Interventions And Everyday  
8  
9 Temporalities". *Social Science and Medicine* 128:309-315.  
10

11  
12  
13  
14 Watkins-Hayes, C., and E. Kovalsky, E. 2017 "The Discourse of Deservingness:  
15  
16 Morality and the Dilemmas of Poverty Relief in Debate and Practice" in *The Oxford*  
17  
18 *Handbook of the Social Science of Poverty* Edited by David Brady and Linda M.  
19  
20 Burton, 194-220.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60