



LJMU Research Online

Ogden, CA, Raisborough, J and de Guzman, V

When Fat Meets Disability in Poverty Porn: exploring the cultural mechanisms of suspicion in Too Fat to Work

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/9461/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Ogden, CA, Raisborough, J and de Guzman, V (2018) When Fat Meets Disability in Poverty Porn: exploring the cultural mechanisms of suspicion in Too Fat to Work. Disability and Society. ISSN 0968-7599

LJMU has developed **LJMU Research Online** for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>

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

Journal:	<i>Disability & Society</i>
Manuscript ID	CDSO-2017-0308.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Austerity, benefits, poverty porn, media representations, reality television
Abstract:	<p>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</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
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

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
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 15th 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 Yet, many critics argue that these documentaries are little more than 'poverty porn'
57
58
59
60

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

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

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

30 *Talking the Talk*

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
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

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 *BeneFits* 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* abject: 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 creditability 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**

55
56
57
58
59
60

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

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

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

22
23
24 Aphramor, L. 2005. "Is a Weight-centred Health Framework Salutogenic? Some
25
26 Thoughts on Unhinging Certain Dietary Ideologies". *Social Theory & Health* 3 :315–
27
28 340
29

30
31
32 Backstrom, L. 2012. "From the Freak Show to the Living Room: Cultural
33
34 Representations of Dwarfism and Obesity". *Sociological Forum* 27 (3): 682–707
35

36
37 Bates, K., D. Goodley, and K. Runswick-Cole. 2017. "Precarious Lives and Resistant
38
39 Possibilities: The Labour of People with Learning Disabilities in Times of Austerity
40
41 *Disability and Society* 32 (2): 160-175.
42
43

44
45
46 Biressi, A., and H. Nunn. 2013 *Class and Contemporary British Culture*.
47
48 London: Palgrave
49

50
51
52 Briant, E., N. Watson, and G. Philo. 2013 "Reporting Disability in the Age of
53
54 Austerity: The Changing Face of Media Representation Of Disability And Disabled
55
56

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 33rd 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

52 Freidson, E. 1988. *Profession on Medicine: a study of the Sociology of Applied*
53 *Knowledge*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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 Gurrieri, L., J. Previte, and J. Brace-Govan. 2013. “Women’s Bodies As Sites Of
33
34 Control: Inadvertent Stigma And Exclusion In Social Marketing” *Journal of*
35
36 *Macromarketing*, 33 (2): 128-143.
37
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
56
57
58
59
60

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
58
59
60

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
56
57
58
59
60

- 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 Stone, D.A. 1984 *The Disabled State* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
22
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
57
58
59
60

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