Wealth inequality and the super-rich
how talk about psychological concepts are used to legitimise extreme wealth

Carr, Philippa

Award date:
2019

Awarding institution:
Coventry University

Wealth Inequality and the Super-Rich: How Talk About Psychological Concepts are Used to Legitimise Extreme Wealth

By

Philippa Carr

Psychology (PhD)

September 2018

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the University's requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Certificate of Ethical Approval

Applicant:

Philippa Carr

Project Title:

Utilising Discursive Psychology to explore the construction of 'super-rich' identities

This is to certify that the above named applicant has completed the Coventry University Ethical Approval process and their project has been confirmed and approved as Low Risk

Date of approval:

27 May 2016

Project Reference Number:

P43950

Abstract

Wealth inequality is a social issue that is exacerbated by the practices of the super-rich. Extremely wealthy people have limited social visibility as they can use their wealth to live separately from other groups. Some theoretical approaches such as individual differences do not acknowledge how inequality is socially constructed. As a result, there is a lack of recognition of the individualistic ideology underlining psychological approaches that legitimise wealth inequality in society. In this thesis, I explore how the super-rich account for their extreme wealth using discourse about psychological concepts in television programming. Forty-one and a half hours of non-subscription terrestrial UK television data was gathered throughout 2016 that included the term, 'super-rich' in the title, programme summary or subtitling transcript. Discursive Psychology was used to analyse the corpus which allowed for the exploration of how individuals draw upon lived ideology in their talk to manage their accountability for their wealth acquisition and expenditure. This research demonstrated how a discursive and rhetorical approach can be used to analyse television documentaries. It was found that super-rich individuals legitimise their wealth acquisition and spending by presenting themselves as psychologically superior to the less affluent and as a result, deserving of their extreme wealth. By drawing upon meritocratic ideology, individuals managed their moral identity as their wealth and consumption is warranted as earned. The presentation of wealth as earned extends to wealth gained as a result of inheritance as heirs present their privilege as earned due to their enhanced work ethic. Super-rich people present their ostentatious consumption as normal

and construct themselves as reticent to discuss costs to comply with societal norms. The presentation of the super-rich on television uses talk about psychological concepts that presents wealth distribution as an individual issue indirectly resulting in the collective effect of wealth inequality being ignored. Consequentially, psychology is used to provide an individualistic rationale to sustain wealth inequality in society.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to Simon Goodman, Adam Jowett and Jackie Abell, my supervisory team for advising and supporting me through this process. Simon for encouraging me since I first asked to get involved in the Benefits Street research and asked many, many questions. Adam for being an exemplary second supervisor and encouraging me to unpack my points. Finally, Jackie for asking ‘so what?’ and providing memorable advice about feature spotting. I would say more nice things but supervision is like Fight Club and we all know the first rule!

A big thank you to John Somers, the key stakeholder in my research. You have supported me throughout this process even when my own confidence wobbled and I wanted to get a ‘proper’ job. In a funny way, I will miss you telling complete strangers that I need cake or pens to do my PhD.

Thanks to everyone at the former purple palace for providing a welcoming research environment. There has always been someone to listen and to laugh with me at my rant of the day. In particular to Danielle, Mairi and Maria who have the dedication to be in the office regularly. Amongst other things, I have learnt who steals the tea bags.

I would also like to thank my siblings and non- PhD friends for being understanding. Thanks to Vic for ensuring that we met for lunch to tell me the latest about Jeremy Corbyn the goldfish and Thena. Plus, Graham and Rebekah for providing stationary and initial advice. Margaret for providing a space for me. Sarah for sending happy post and ensuring that I had chocolate. Donna who is ‘dangerous with brains’ but one of the cleverest people I know for

telling me to get on with it. Philip who I have sat and discussed ideas with over many cups of tea.

Finally, I would like to thank Lionel for being once, twice, three times a hamster.

Contents

Thesis Structure

My previous research exploring wealth inequality highlighted the focus psychology has placed on poorer people in society and the limited focus on the rich. The construction of just world arguments in televised debates about the benefits system in the UK involves constructing the unemployed as undeserving and public spending as controversial. Further research examining a radio discussion found that talk about increased tax for wealthy individuals was presented as unfair penalising harder workers. This work identified the importance of the media in public debates about wealth inequality. Given the increased wealth inequality in the UK, this identified an opportunity to explore how the super-rich are constructed in the media and how this contributes to public arguments about wealth distribution.

Chapter one examines existing research to establish that wealth inequality is a social issue with a global impact that is exacerbated by the super-rich. In this chapter, it is shown that wealth inequality has a negative impact on social mobility as poorer groups cannot generate capital in the same way in a society that is claimed to be meritocratic. The super-rich are socially separate from other groups yet visible through television programming emphasising the need for an exploration of how the rich are presented in this medium. Whilst media studies research and other disciplines have analysed the presentation of the super-rich there are limitations to our understanding that can be addressed via the use of a psychological approach.

Existing psychological research reviewed in chapter two identifies a need to examine the social practices of the super-rich and how extreme wealth is

legitimised in their discourse. Psychological approaches such as individual differences and social cognition are critiqued for ignoring the presence of the ideology that assumes that economic inequality is inevitable. Instead, this requires an approach that can demonstrate how acceptance of wealth inequality is socially constructed by the wealthy and how psychological talk is used to account for super-rich privilege. This chapter proposes that Discursive Psychology (DP) can be used to explore how the super-rich talk about psychological concepts to account for their extreme wealth in television media. This will overcome the limitations to media studies research identified in chapter one and acknowledge the issues regarding prior psychological research that has neglected the presence of ideology.

Chapter three discusses how using DP in inequality research allows for a focus on both individual agency and the wider context. Television broadcasts as a form of media data provide an opportunity to explore public arguments for the super-rich, an inaccessible group to the majority of the UK population. Due to the visual nature of this data, a multi-modal approach to DP is required and the challenges presented by this are discussed.

Chapter two critiques how traits are used in psychological literature to justify the extreme wealth of the super-rich. In this first analytic chapter the focus is on the mainstream psychological concept of traits, where it has been argued that super-rich are harder working and more resilient. However, following the DP approach, the focus of this talk about traits shifts to what it can do to legitimise the problematic wealth of the super-rich. By drawing upon their increased work ethic, those with extreme wealth are able to present their

position as available to all through the use of a ‘rags to riches’ interpretative repertoire. The findings from this chapter underline the importance of individualistic ideology in discourse about wealth in the media.

In the previous findings chapter, individuals present themselves as self-made. Given the role of family in the transfer of wealth as discussed in chapter one, chapter five explores how heirs of extreme wealth are presented. In particular, this focuses on how heirs legitimise their financial privilege in a society that claims to be meritocratic. Privileged individuals are found to construct a worker identity as they counter potential claims of nepotism and vulgar displays of wealth. Speakers use a ‘work hard, play hard’ interpretative repertoire to present themselves as deserving of their privilege. Both chapters four and five present wealth as the result of individual effort presenting the UK as a meritocratic society.

Building on the previous analysis, chapter six focusses on the strategies used by the super-rich to account for their ostentatious spending. Chapter six demonstrates how speakers construct their identity through accounting for their wealth. An ideological dilemma that orients to norms around not talking about spending and the construction of spending as normal for the super-rich is examined. Like the previous results chapters, here wealth is presented as a result of enhanced individual effort resulting in ostentatious spending as being deserved.

Chapter seven builds upon the findings from the previous chapter by attending to talk about spending by the global super-rich. The super-rich congregate in global hubs as mentioned in chapter one. Unlike poorer migrant groups, governments offer visa inducements to attract wealthy individuals into a country. Super-rich migrants’ impact on the UK has been shown to be negative

whereas non-super-rich migrants, who are commonly presented as damaging to the UK bring a positive impact. However, it is these non-super-rich migrants that face harsher border restrictions than super-rich migrants. Talk about spending in London, a global hub, is examined to study how wealthy individuals account for their presence in the capital city. Super-rich migrants present themselves as 'Anglophiles' who can integrate into society and are harder working than British people. These wealthy individuals use human rights arguments to present London as a safe haven.

The key findings of this research are discussed in the context of existing literature and research on wealth and inequality. In particular, how super-rich individuals accounts for their wealth by presenting themselves as psychologically superior is considered in relation to the concepts of psychologisation and individualism as noted in chapter one. A contribution to psychological literature that overcomes issues in prior research exploring wealthy individuals is acknowledged. Additionally, this doctoral research provides a methodological contribution as to how television broadcasts can be analysed using DP. The need for future research to address how audiences engage with media presentations of wealthy individuals is mentioned. Future research is outlined to overcome the limitations mentioned by examining how the general public construct extremely wealthy people.

Chapter 1: Introduction to Wealth Inequality and the Super-Rich

Chapter 1 establishes that there is no clear definition of the super-rich as a result of a lack of transparency in reporting wealth and individual's wealth management practices. Wealth inequality has a detrimental impact on society such that the behaviours of the super-rich exacerbate and impede social mobility. Positive arguments for those with extreme wealth such as philanthropy and the trickle-down effect have been critiqued by researchers yet still persist as myths. The super-rich have a disproportionate influence on the media and media studies research has found that they are represented positively. Thus, this chapter demonstrates a need for further research to explore how the super-rich are constructed in the media and how their talk is used to legitimise extreme wealth in an unequal society.

Difficulties in Defining the Super-Rich

Sociological research has been criticised due to differing terms and definitions being used for the super-rich (Medeiros and de Souza 2015). However, the use of differing terms is reflective of the super-rich not being a homogenous group. Defining the super-rich in regards to their wealth is difficult due to issues of conceptualising wealth and economic inequality. There is a lack of clear categorisation about the wealth needed for an individual to be defined as super-rich (Hay and Muller 2012). Even those who are deemed to be super-rich are affected by wealth inequality (Beaverstock and Faulconbridge 2013) as there is a large differential between the worth of the top 1% and 0.1% (Dorling 2014). Extremely wealthy individuals have been found to experience 'relative

disadvantage' where the top 1% are aware of the wealth discrepancy between their wealth and that of the top 0.1% (Hecht 2017:7). In London, wealthy residents are being displaced by the super-rich and their extreme levels of wealth (Glucksberg 2016). Wealth inequality within the super-rich is the consequence of the origins of their wealth. The working rich are less affluent than individuals whose status is derived from capital or assets such as through inheritance (Medeiros and de Souza 2015). Wealth derived from capital as opposed to employment is less transparent and these individuals are termed the 'hidden rich' (Firth et al. 2014). Assets and earnings can be channelled through trusts as part of complex tax arrangements (Beaverstock and Faulconbridge 2013). The complexity of such arrangements means that there are difficulties in separating the worth of the super-rich from their business and taxation arrangements. Defining the super-rich in regards to wealth is complex and includes vastly different levels of net worth. Thus, there is a need to explore how the super-rich are constructed in terms of their wealth and privilege given the lack of transparency.

Research on the super-rich has explored their enhanced global mobility and ability to move freely (Atkinson 2007). They congregate in locations such as London (Dorling 2014) as a result of attractive tax policies such as having non-domiciled status (Taylor 2010). Super-rich individuals can place their wealth in multiple locations (Beaverstock and Faulconbridge 2013) and their movement is an important aspect of their categorisation as an elite group. In particular, super-rich mobility is more for leisure than employment purposes (Urry 2007). Travel is an everyday necessity for the super-rich (Beaverstock

and Faulconbridge 2013) and their free movement has been termed ‘oysterisation’ as they demand access to locations (Birtchnell and Caletrío 2014). The mobility of the super-rich and their concentration in particular places raises an interest in how these locations are constructed as hot spots for the wealthy.

Whilst the super-rich are mobile and concentrated in some locations, the super-rich have differing levels of visibility. They have the ability to be visible or separate from others within the community (Urry 2007; 2014) that is dependent on the level of their wealth. For example, the super-rich can use private aeroplanes that bypass conventional airport passenger channels. Less affluent groups do not have this type of choice regarding their visibility in society. The level of isolation chosen by the super-rich is dependent on their level of wealth as more affluent individuals have a more separate lifestyle (Beaverstock and Faulconbridge 2013). Even when super-rich individuals choose to be isolated from other groups within society, they have a cultural impact on society that influences other groups (Bottomore 2006). The super-rich have a visible impact through practices such as ‘iconification’, the development of high-rise statement addresses in prime locations (Kaika 2011). These buildings are often unoccupied yet form a permanent representation of the presence of the wealthy. Statement buildings act as modern architectural symbols similar to religious buildings historically (Kaika and Thielen 2006) and celebrate their owners’ wealth (Kaika 2011) such as Donald Trump’s multiple tower developments globally. The super-rich are able to use their wealth to purchase their way into areas and to model the residence to meet their preferences

whether that is on a yacht, in a high-rise building or through the use of basement extensions (Baldwin, Holroyd and Burrows 2018). In London, the super-rich are displacing those who are moderately wealthy (Burrows and Knowles 2018) and from 2008-17, 4650 basements were built into properties in London's 7 most affluent local authority areas (Baldwin, Holroyd and Burrows 2018). Basement extensions allow owners to overcome planning restrictions on extending above ground and allow value to be added to their properties. The increase in basement extensions provoked concern about their impact on inner London and resulted in a consultation by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG 2016). The super-rich's ability to use air travel means that they are more mobile and as a consequence, their properties may be empty (Birtchnell and Caletrío 2014). There is a need to explore how the super-rich account for their spending in places such as London that are adversely affected by their presence.

Therefore, the issues in relation to defining the super-rich are reflective of the complexity of exploring a heterogeneous group. Additionally, the enhanced mobility of the super-rich presents difficulties to existing economic and geographic approaches. Given the issues with defining the super-rich, a different approach to exploring and constructing identity is required.

Arguments Presenting the Super-Rich as Beneficial to Society

When studying the super-rich, researchers form a position in relation to whether they view the wealth of the super-rich as having a positive impact upon society or as a social problem (Piketty 2015; Schervish 1994). One argument that claims that the super-rich are beneficial is that of philanthropy which is defined

as ‘practical benevolence, now esp. as expressed by the generous donation of money to good causes’ (OED 2006). Breeze and Lloyd (2013) claim that the wealthy donate to charity as a result of their wealth leading them to feel a sense of duty towards others. Philanthropic arguments present charitable giving as providing the super-rich with autonomy to help others (Breeze 2013) particularly as since the 1970s tax has been seen to discourage the wealthy from generating wealth and contributing to society (Cunningham 2016). Philanthropy from the super-rich as a form of wealth distribution and public goods delivery is problematic for numerous reasons particularly as it supports the interests of the wealthy over poorer groups. Funding public resources in this manner means that those with extreme wealth have more influence than other groups in deciding what is delivered even if wealthy people are not in need (Pharoah 2016). As a result, the super-rich give to causes that reflect their personal interests (Breeze 2013; Ostrower 1995) resulting in third sector organisations supporting groups such as refugees and travellers being disadvantaged (Body and Breeze 2015). In addition to the super-rich favouring specific causes, they donate less than other groups in proportion to their income (Cowley et al 2011). Breeze and Lloyd (2013) claim that the super-rich do not donate because they feel financially insecure. Instead, 32% of philanthropists are motivated by tax reasons questioning their claims regarding financial insecurity restricting donations. The advantages of philanthropy to extremely wealthy people reflect an increase of giving to personal foundations that allow their founders to brand and influence their legacy in addition to being part of a tax planning strategy. Philanthropy for the super-rich can act as a social activity reflected in their

participation in group donations (Breeze and Lloyd 2013) that provides a platform to showcase success in generating wealth (Ostrower 1995). Whilst it may be claimed that the super-rich have a sense of responsibility towards others that is enabled through philanthropy, this form of wealth distribution is heavily influenced by individuals desire to avoid tax and generate goodwill for their personal brand.

A further argument used to legitimise extreme wealth is the trickle-down effect, also known as trickle-down economics. The increased wealth of the super-rich is presented as beneficial to society as other groups benefit from their spending on goods and services (Aghion and Bolton 1997; Taylor 2010). Developed to legitimise British colonialism in India, the trickle-down effect was claimed to improve living conditions for the lower classes in the UK through the availability of cheaper goods (Nehru 1937). This concept has been misappropriated (Arndt 1983) as the trickle-down effect was not meant to refer to flows of capital and is refuted as a myth (Arndt 1983; Taylor 2010; Thornton, Agnello and Link 1978). Akinci (2018) found no evidence to support the trickle-down effect in a study of 65 countries. The misappropriation of the trickle-down effect is further evidenced in the increase in economic inequality in the UK since 1975 (OECD 2012) that occurred while pursuing policies in favour of attracting the super-rich. Therefore, the wealth of the super-rich does not benefit other less affluent groups as a result of the trickle-down effect and talk that supports these myths needs to be explored.

Super-Rich as a Problem

In this section, it will be shown that the super-rich have a negative impact on society through the consequences of how the super-rich choose to utilise their wealth. The super-rich have a negative impact in the following: creating an environment that supports inequality, producing a high carbon lifestyle and having a negative impact on localities.

Super-Rich Create an Environment that Supports Inequality

The super-rich create an environment that supports inequality as a result of their activities in the financial and media sector. Wealthy people play an active role in maintaining inequality as a result of their role in the financial sector (Dorling 2014; Medeiros and de Souza 2015). People from wealthy backgrounds are more likely to enter parts of the financial sector such as investment banking which is associated with high levels of pay and bonuses (Social Mobility Commission 2016). 40% of people earning over £120,000 a year in UK are based in investment banking (Sutton Trust 2014) meaning that barriers to the financial sector impede social mobility for poorer individuals and maintain inequality. As the financial sector controls the flow of investments, barriers to working in the sector for poorer group's means that wealthy individuals have an increased influence over economic growth (Mankiw 2013). In addition to this, the backing of high-risk investments by the super-rich has been criticised as contributing to increased inequality as higher risk financial products are needed for increased returns on their surplus capital (Medeiros and de Souza 2015; Lysandrou 2011). Thus, the recruitment of privileged

individuals into the financial sector by other wealthy individuals and investment activities of the super-rich supports continuing inequality.

In addition to the wealthy's impact on recruitment in the financial sector, the super-rich can engage in controversial financial practices such as the use of tax havens and offshore banking that undermine the function of the State and maintain inequality in society. Globalisation permits the super-rich to undermine the State (Bauman 2013) by moving their wealth to nations that offer the opportunity to lower their tax contributions. Wealthy individuals use wealth managers who can advise them on how to minimise their tax burden (Harrington 2016). In the UK, people can be non-domiciled for tax purposes so that they are only required to pay tax on their UK earnings (HMRC 2017). Globally in 2007, $5.6 trillion was placed offshore in tax havens (Alstadsæter, Johannesen and Zucman 2018). The use of trusts and shell companies camouflages who owns wealth (Damgaard and Elkjaer 2017; Gadhoum, Lang and Young 2005). There are difficulties in calculating the wealth of the super-rich even prior to the consideration of other assets such as art and property (Alstadsæter, Johannesen and Zucman 2018; Alvaredo, Atkinson and Morelli 2018). Despite the tax planning behaviours of the extremely wealthy, nation-states compete against each other to provide tax arrangements that will attract the super-rich. Attracting the super-rich is beneficial for the financial sector that has a close relationship with national governments (Short 2013). The super-rich affect the redistribution of wealth through tax in society as a result of using wealth management practices.

The media is another sector that is affected by the presence of the super-rich due to the tendency for extremely wealthy people to own media outlets (Petrova 2008). In the UK, media moguls are seen to have an impact on democratic processes. Rupert Murdoch claimed to influence the outcome of general elections (Barnett and Townend 2014). Silvio Berlusconi in Italy used his media ownership to consolidate his political power (Baker 2007), examples of wealthy owners directing editorial decisions to staff (Chomsky 2006). Exposés such as the 'Panama papers', highlighting the use of offshore shell companies in tax havens are an example of journalism that questions the practices used by the super-rich. However, critical media articles have not resulted in great transparency for off shore wealth as rich individuals can still use tax havens such as Nevis that do not require the transparent ownership of shell companies (Bullough 2018). In addition to this, Obermayer and Obermaier (2016) state that exposes about the use of tax havens involved journalists placing their lives and livelihoods at risk questioning the freedom of the media to investigate the practices of the super-rich.

Declining newspaper sales have resulted in a recent rise of super-rich media owners (Schlosberg 2017) disputing the argument that newspaper content is driven by sales (Freedman 2014). The super-rich are able to influence government and other groups in society to support policies that are in their interest regardless of their cost to society and disadvantaged groups. For example, whilst individuals support the idea of the welfare state, it is more controversial to support increased public spending (Gilens 2009; Goodman and Carr 2017). The super-rich are a problem due to their undermining of policies

encouraging wealth distribution through tax as a consequence of their ability to influence the media. In summary, the super-rich are able to create an environment that supports inequality that is achieved through tax avoidance practices that other groups cannot access; activity in the financial sector both in the investments made by those with extreme wealth; gatekeeping recruitment in an employment sector with higher pay; and ability to influence media reporting to reflect the interests of the more affluent.

Super-Rich Have a High Carbon Lifestyle

The super-rich have a disproportional environmental impact that produces a higher carbon footprint (Birtchnell and Caletrío 2014). Their use of private jets has been identified as having a negative impact on the environment (Cohen 2010). Whilst data for the carbon footprint of the top 1% is not available, it is of interest that the most affluent 10% of British households have a carbon footprint that is triple that of the 10% with the lowest incomes (Dorling 2014). The increased carbon emissions produced by the super-rich are not publicly questioned (Beaverstock and Faulconbridge 2013). However, less affluent groups are criticised for purchasing mass produced goods and for utilising budget air travel (Hilton 2004). Therefore, the super-rich's high carbon lifestyle can be considered to be controversial as a result of its detrimental impact on the environment and lack of public accountability.

Super-Rich Have a Negative Impact on Localities

In addition to contributing to climate change, the super-rich have a negative impact on localities (Taylor 2010) as a result of their separateness from other groups in society and property ownership practices. In places such as London

where the super-rich congregate, there are significant issues in relation to the supply of affordable housing (JRF 2016b). Purchasers view London properties as having a higher rate of return compared to other parts of the UK and can be resold more quickly (Fernandez, Hofman and Aalbers 2016). Housing supply is exacerbated by super-rich practices such as 'iconification' whereby the super-rich invest in buildings as status symbols that are frequently unoccupied as a result of their global lifestyle (Kaika 2011). Increased development restricts the movement of people within localities as more land is placed under private ownership (Birtchnell and Caletrío 2014) having a negative impact on poorer groups due to the increased cost of accommodation and further restrictions on housing supply. London local authorities are increasingly temporarily housing households outside the city disrupting poorer individuals support networks, employment and healthcare (Rugg 2016). Thus, the super-rich are a social problem as a result of their negative effect on communities in relation to housing and the restrictions placed upon land access.

To conclude, the super-rich arguably have a detrimental impact on society as a result of their recruitment practices in the financial sector, ownership of the media, disproportionate high carbon lifestyles contributing to climate change and negative impact on local communities particularly in London. The lack of social mobility and poor wealth distribution requires a discussion about the legitimisation of the super-rich and wealth inequality.

Balancing Ideology and Agency When Discussing the Super-Rich

When considering the super-rich as a problem, there is a need to discuss the role of wealthy individuals and whether they can be constructed as part of the

solution. Central to this argument is whether individuals are socialised to conform irrespectively to norms or whether individuals are responsible for their actions and able to change. An ongoing debate within the social sciences that relates to their development as disciplines, sociology is seen to place an emphasis on ideology whilst psychology is concerned with agency (Billig et al. 1988). When discussing the super-rich, both agency and ideology need to be included within research.

The concept of agency is perceived as central to psychological research and usually takes a Western centric definition that is focused on individual freedom (Frie 2008). Individuals' ability to act freely is presented as innate and the result of their cognition (Klein 2014; Moore 2016). The focus on individual freedom is limiting as it ignores how individuals are living within a social environment with access to differing resources affecting their choices. From this approach, agency is socially conditioned (Bandura 1977) and highlights the importance of language in constructing agency for individuals (Potter 1996a) as they manage their accountability for their actions (Moore 2016). Agency can be defined as constructed by the individual whilst situated within a social context. This definition can be applied to examine whether wealthy individuals present themselves as being autonomous in relation to their everyday practices and account for their resulting privilege.

Ideology forms part of an individual's social context and can be defined as 'shared patterns of belief that function to maintain relations of inequality' (Weltman and Billig 2001:369). These patterns are constructed through talk and as such, ideology is fluid and modifiable as individuals draw upon differing

ideologies within their talk. Billig et al. (1988) state that there are two types of ideology, 'intellectual' and 'lived' (p. 27). Formal ideology is formed from theory whilst lived ideology is present within everyday assumptions or common sense. In relation to the media, lived ideology is present within programming that is not presented as scientific or containing experts. Billig et al.'s (1988) ideological distinction is important as individuals have to negotiate the two differing types of ideology within their talk. Lived ideology can impact upon intellectual ideology and vice versa. Therefore, when exploring an issue such as wealth inequality, there is a need to explore how individuals draw upon lived ideology within discourse to account for extreme wealth.

The Role of Individualism and Neoliberalism in Maintaining the Super-Rich

Ideologies are not fixed and individuals draw upon differing ideologies within their talk yet individualism is the dominant form of ideology in modern developed societies (Billig et al. 1988). Individualism can be defined as placing the need of the individual ahead of the collective in the form of the nation-state (Abercrombie 1980). Individualism is used to legitimise the interests of the wealthy over the collective needs of poorer groups (Carr, Goodman and Jowett 2018). Individualistic ideology places a focus on the individual presenting people as being autonomous and not constrained by their social environment. Individualism is a core tenet of neoliberal ideology that became dominant from 1979 onwards in the UK. Neoliberalism can be defined as the extension of free market economics into other spheres (Brown 2003) and more specifically, the needs of corporations (Crouch 2011). An emphasis is placed on individual responsibility and the shrinking of the welfare state (Brown 2003). Neoliberalism

is pervasive due to its use as ‘common sense’ or as a form of lived ideology (Sugarman 2015:103). The focus on market values and individual responsibility within neoliberal ideology results in those who perform well and generate wealth are considered successful. By announcing the end of ideology (Harvey 2000), neoliberalism permits ideological ignorance preventing the consideration of more equitable ideological positions (Walsh-Bowers and Gokani 2014). The concept of ideological dominance is questionable given that ideology is dilemmatic and individuals draw upon and negotiate differing ideologies within their discourse. Equality is also drawn upon as an ideology in individual’s talk and is viewed as being historically significant since the eighteenth century (Billig et al. 1988). To manage the ideological tension with individualism in developed Western societies, the ideology drawn upon is negotiated to present ‘an equality which allows the successful to be more equal than the rest’ (Billig et al. 1988:36). To consider how extreme wealth is accounted for in society, there is a need to explore how individuals are presented as agentic and how differing forms of ideology are drawn upon.

Wealth Inequality as a Social Problem

The rest of this chapter establishes how wealth inequality is a global problem that is exacerbated by the practices of the super-rich. Measures to decrease wealth inequality can alleviate poverty, improve social mobility plus improve people’s educational attainment and wellbeing. Meritocratic ideology in society is used to maintain wealth inequality in society. Wealth inequality has a greater detrimental effect on economic distribution than income inequality in society. Finally, the limitations of the current literature on the super-rich are explored

arguing the need for an approach that examines how the super-rich are socially constructed in the media.

The wealthiest 1% of people have 50.1% of total global wealth (Credit Suisse 2017) compared to the bottom 50% consisting of 3.7 billion people owning 0.96% of the world's wealth (Oxfam 2018). Wealth inequality is a geographical problem as countries such as the USA with higher levels of inequality are more affected by issues such as lower life expectancy and reduced social mobility than more equal countries such as Japan (Wilkinson and Pickett 2010). The UK has the 5th highest levels of inequality in the OECD (Keeley 2015) as the top 1% of the wealthiest individuals have over £3.2 million each. Wealth inequality is also present within nations and in the UK, the super-rich are geographically concentrated in London and the South East (ONS 2018). The damaging effects of economic inequality are reflected in the UN's commitment to the reduction of inequality through their Sustainable Development goals (UN 2016). However, the British government has been criticised for its lack of action in pursuing these goals (House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee 2017). A lack of action presents a need to explore why wealth distribution is not being targeted as an urgent area of concern in the UK and how the super-rich are being presented in relation to this issue given their extreme share of wealth.

There is an argument which claims that the current focus on wealth inequality is misleading and the focus needs to be on poverty as an issue (Frankfurt 2015; Watson 2015). This argument views the discussion about wealth inequality as misguided as it diverts policy attention from alleviating

poverty (Watson 2015). However, the focus on poverty prevents a discussion from taking place about wealth distribution in society and how the super-rich circumvent mechanisms such as tax to fund public spending for people in need (Kapoor 2016). Poverty and wealth inequality are not separate issues and measures to address wealth inequality such as tax rates for higher earners can help to alleviate poverty (Peterson 2017). Inequality prevents social mobility that moves people out of poverty but the practices of the super-rich prevent upward mobility from occurring by preventing the fair access to resources such as education (Taylor 2010). Additionally, there is compelling evidence to demonstrate the damaging effects of wealth inequality in relation to a range of social problems. For example, Wilkinson and Pickett (2010) found that health in developed nations is related to income differences within countries and not differences between them.

Increases in overall wealth at a national level does not increase happiness yet increased inequality creates social problems. In relation to happiness, the Easterlin paradox, based on US research from 1945-1970, found that an increase in national wealth did not necessarily result in an increase in overall national happiness (Easterlin 1974). Further studies have stated that once basic needs are met in poorer countries, further increases in wealth do not lead to increased happiness (Di Tella and MacCulloch 2010). The Easterlin paradox is argued to be of continued importance due to increases in wealth inequality and contemporary research supporting the concept (Oishi and Kesebir 2015). Societies that reallocate wealth through taxation are happier as they are less unequal (Oishi, Schimmack and Diener 2011).

Economic inequality is recognised as having a negative impact on public health (Siegrist and Marmot 2004) to the extent that wealth inequality is shown to affect individual life expectancy (Pickett and Wilkinson 2015). Life expectancy from birth in the UK between 2007-11 ranges from 82.5 for men with the highest SES to 76.6 for men with the lowest SES. Traditionally, women live longer than men but for the first time, from 2007-11 reports men from the highest SES group living longer than women from the lowest SES background who have a life expectancy of 80.8 (ONS 2015). It could be argued that these averages are due to changes in the number of people affected by poverty. However, levels of people affected by poverty have changed minimally between 2004 and 2015 from 12 million (21% of the UK population) to 13.5 million (21% of the UK population) (JRF 2016a). The level of pensioner poverty over this period has decreased and the number of people in working poverty has increased. Economic inequality also affects morbidity as individuals with a lower SES are more likely to be affected by a health condition (Siegrist and Marmot 2004) throughout their lifetime. Inequality is not only damaging for society as a whole but has a worse impact on poorer people who have less resources to address its negative effects. Those on lower incomes are more likely to be affected by housing deprivation (Fusco 2015), an important determinant in lowering life expectancy (Buck and Maguire 2015). Economic inequality can also be seen to have an impact on mental health which has resulted in increases in mental illness in more affluent, but unequal, nations (Pickett, James and Wilkinson 2006). Wilkinson and Pickett (2018) develop this research further finding that people in more unequal nations are more likely to

experience status anxiety and problematic behaviours such as gambling. There is a range of evidence that economic inequality is a social problem in relation to its impact on individual wellbeing and affecting poorer people more adversely.

Economic inequality as a social problem can be argued to affect society further in regards to its impact on education and social mobility. Wilkinson and Pickett (2010) found that countries with the highest levels of social mobility such as Finland and Sweden had low levels of inequality compared to the UK and the USA who have among the highest levels of inequality and the lowest social mobility. In the UK, the relationship between economic inequality and educational performance is demonstrated through the diversity of Oxbridge entrants. One in five pupils in the UK receive free school meals yet 1 in 100 of these pupils will be admitted to Oxford or Cambridge universities (Dorling 2014). These institutions are considered to be routes to positions of government in British society and highlighting the relationship between economic inequality and social mobility (Stiglitz 2012). Social mobility is related to meritocratic conditions that has been recently defined as the ‘equality of opportunity’ (Martin et al. 2014:5). Merit was defined in Young's (1958) satire of the British educational system as the outcome of 'intelligence' and 'effort' (p.84). At the time, children were selected on merit to attend differing educational institutions which affected their subsequent access to employment and further education. By its very nature, a meritocracy results in some people being more successful than others (Littler 2013). Despite the lack of social mobility in the UK, the British government has claimed that establishing meritocratic conditions is a priority. Theresa May, the current British Prime Minister, in her speech 'Britain,

the great meritocracy' (2016) claimed that establishing a transparent meritocracy is an aim of the current Conservative government: 'I want Britain to be the world's great meritocracy – a country where everyone has a fair chance to go as far as their talent and their hard work will allow' (May 2016). Yet the government has been criticised for not addressing rising wealth inequality (House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee 2017) that affects people's social mobility. Instead, meritocratic ideology is drawn upon to present social mobility and the accumulation of wealth as possible. However, a meritocratic position is criticised for maintaining inequality and holding the poor accountable for their low incomes and the impact of disadvantage (McNamee and Miller 2014). Given the restricted social mobility in the UK and its relationship with wealth inequality, it is necessary to explore how meritocratic ideology is used to legitimise the super-rich and their extreme privileges. Additionally, economic inequality has been isolated as the cause of the 2008 Global Financial Crisis (Stockhammer 2015). Therefore, economic inequality is a social problem that adversely affects all groups in society on a range of differing social issues.

Distinctions between Income Inequality and Wealth Inequality

Whilst it has been established that economic inequality is a social problem, there is a lack of clarity as to the differing impacts of income inequality and wealth inequality. Wealth inequality is considered to have more of a negative impact upon society (Cragg and Ghayad 2015), yet research and policy has previously focused more upon income inequality as an issue (Alvaredo, Atkinson and Morelli 2016). There are issues in relation to defining wealth and

how it is measured as a concept (Alvaredo, Atkinson and Morelli 2016). Wealth in psychological research has been conceptualised as the 'total value of everything someone owns minus any debt that he or she owes' (Norton and Ariely 2011:9). The usage of the definition in psychological research is problematic as it suggests that a person with a mortgage is more disadvantaged even though this involves the ownership of an asset that can be utilised to generate income (Headey and Wooden 2004). In contrast, income cannot be moved easily as it is generated over time and is more sensitive to issues such as individual ill health and technological change affecting the market. It is argued that wealth can be defined as an asset that produces a financial return (Piketty 2015). Wealth can be used to further entrench inequality in society and to generate further income than can be transformed into wealth. There is a general agreement amongst researchers that wealth inequality in society is at a higher level than that of income inequality (Doss et al. 2014; Piketty 2015; Wilterdink 1995). Thus, wealth inequality is a greater issue for society.

Wealth obtained through inheritance is problematic as it prevents its redistribution in society (Piketty 2015) and further entrenches inequality. As wealth is not constrained by national boundaries due to globalisation, individuals can move their wealth through financial markets to achieve the best return on their capital (Goudsblom 1990). Globalisation places nations into competition with each other to offer incentives to wealthy individuals to attract their capital for investment (Wilterdink 1995). In the US, the concentration of the top 1% of earners results in local tax policies that are less redistributive

(Hayes and Dennis 2014) and on the adoption of international economic policies that favour the super-rich (Winters and Page 2009).

The influence of the super-rich on a nation's economic policy has a detrimental effect on the State's ability to encourage redistribution as a result of lower tax receipts from wealthy individuals. For example, wealthy individuals can arrange to be paid partly in shares that can be sold later to lower their tax contributions (Goolsbee 2000; Medeiros and de Souza 2015). Through these practices, the super-rich pay proportionately less tax than those on lower incomes (Dorling 2014). Less wealthy individuals have less access to tax avoidance strategies as their income is taxed at source. Resulting in less funds available for public resources such as health care and education that reduce the damaging effects of inequality.

Super-Rich Visibility in the Media

Given the social problems caused by wealth inequality and a lack of action addressing the practices of the super-rich preventing further wealth distribution, there is a need to explore how the super-rich and wealth inequality are presented in the media. The super-rich are increasingly visible as a result of the proliferation of 'wealth porn' (Poole 2000:22). Wealth porn programming lauds and glorifies the extreme wealth of the super-rich (Martin 2003). Unlike the 'poverty porn' (Hester 2014) or 'Factual Welfare Television' (De Benedictis, Allen and Jensen 2017:337) genre, there has been no high-profile criticism of programmes featuring the super-rich. In contrast, Channel 4's Benefits Street series received complaints but was found to be within Ofcom's guidelines as 'the programmes were in line with audience expectations for a series of this

nature' (Ofcom 2014:18-19). Media professionals accounted for the production of poverty porn by drawing upon talk about diversity on screen (De Benedictis, Allen and Jensen 2017). Like the financial sector discussed earlier, there is an overrepresentation of people from wealthier backgrounds within the media industry (Social Mobility and Child Poverty Commission 2014). The more affluent are using their privilege to present poorer individuals in a questionable manner.

Littler (2018) uses a cultural studies approach to media analysis to research ‘plutocratic elites’ (2018:14). A plutocrat is defined as a ‘member of a plutocracy; a person whose power derives from wealth’ (OED 2006). She found that plutocrats on television have been portrayed as three differing characters; 'normcore plutocrat', 'kind parent' and 'luxury flaunter' (p.115). These representations draw upon neoliberal meritocratic values that are advantageous to the wealthy. The 'normcore plutocrat' is presented as ordinary onscreen. In contrast, the 'kind parent' is characterised as a well-meaning philanthropist. Littler's (2018) third archetype is that of the 'luxury flaunter' and is represented by programmes such as the *Rich Kids of Instagram* that feature excessive spending. Marwick (2015) describes The *Rich Kids of Instagram* as 'both a critique of income inequality and a celebration of it’ (p.154). She suggests that the construction of heirs on television is dilemmatic as they are positioned as both being aspirational figures and caricatures for the audience’s amusement. The individuals featured are heirs but their self-presentation focuses on their heightened work ethic to suggest that their purchases are the result of their labour (Littler 2018; Marwick 2015). Heirs’ use of Instagram involves presenting

themselves as celebrities through the use of staged photographs with their purchases (Marwick 2015). Other groups who are more affluent such as business people use a self-made narrative to demonstrate their deservingness (Guthey, Clark and Jackson 2009). Overall, it has been found that television representations of individuals use narratives to highlight their individual responsibility when accounting for differing individual's wealth positions (Grisold and Theine 2017). Thus, media representations of the wealthy are more complimentary than poorer people's and more aligned with societal values.

These insights from cultural studies research require further exploration using contemporary data featuring individuals who present themselves or are presented by others as super-rich. For example, Littler's (2018) 'kind parent' representation uses *Downton Abbey*, a historical drama to construct the wealthy as philanthropists. Cultural studies research has been critiqued for its approach to psychological talk (Billig 1997c) as a result of its focus on structure (Hall 1980). Billig (1997c) states that focusing on the macro level results in an approach that views talk as representative of an individual's cognition. Cultural studies research misses how individuals are socially constructed through their own and others discourse (Barker and Galasiński 2001; Billig 1997c). By being more focused on the macro level of analysis, cultural studies acknowledges the presence of ideology. This acknowledgement ignores how cultural representations are constructed and used ignoring how super-rich identity is constructed and managed. There is a need for further research on the construction of economic inequality on television (Grisold and Theine 2017), particularly to examine how the construction of the super-rich in the media is

used to account for inequality. Further research can build upon existing media research in cultural studies by exploring how psychological concepts are constructed by the super-rich to negotiate their privilege.

Limitations to the Understanding of the Super-Rich

There are significant limitations to current research about the super-rich in relation to its quantity and focus. The need for more super-rich research (Aguiar 2012) is exacerbated by the lack of a clear definition for this group (Birtchnell and Caletrío 2014). This is the result of differing theoretical approaches (Medeiros and de Souza 2015) and a reflection of the super-rich not being a homogenous group. The funding of research is contentious as some super-rich research is funded by financial institutions and philanthropic organisations (Schervish 1994; 1997; Schervish and Havens 1998; 2001). The super-rich enjoy an enhanced status as they can influence research agendas as a result of their wealth (Aguiar 2012). Although the super-rich have received limited academic attention, historically they have been documented through property records (Bottomore 2006) and are currently subject to heightened media exposure (Beaverstock and Hay 2016). This thesis presents an opportunity to overcome issues in current research by utilising media coverage of the super-rich and by recognising that an approach is required that can accommodate the plurality of the super-rich.

Current research on the super-rich is from a range of disciplines including geography, sociology and economics (Beaverstock and Hay 2016; Medeiros and de Souza 2015). Geographers have contributed to our knowledge of the super-rich in how wealthy individuals can influence the use of

space and planning of global hubs such as London (Burrows and Knowles 2018). Sociologists have presented differing arguments regarding the use of philanthropy by the super-rich (Breeze 2013) and how charitable donations are used to legitimise their position (McGoey 2015). Additionally, social researchers exploring the media have examined how the super-rich are represented on television (Littler 2018). Finally, economists have examined the distribution of wealth in society (Piketty 2015) and how the wealthy use tax havens and shell companies to obscure their wealth (Damgaard and Elkjaer 2017; Gadhoum, Lang and Young 2005). However, there is a noticeable gap in regards to psychological approaches to the super-rich.

Psychological research that considers wealth reduces social class to a measure of income and education by substituting SES (Socio- Economic Status) (for example Carvacho et al. 2013). The substitution of SES is claimed to be the result of issues in defining class, a complex theoretical construct, particularly as modern employment practices have eroded traditional categories (Manstead 2018). Manstead's (2018) review of psychological literature on social class focused on studies that approximated class with SES. His review did not include those with extreme wealth and culminated in a theoretical model that focused on how class affected the cognition and behaviour of the working and middle classes. Manstead's (2018) model does not consider how social class is constructed and is questionable given that it is developed from SES research. The substitution of SES ignores how social class is a fluid social construct used by people to access resources and to perform interactional work (Gibson, Crossland and Hamilton 2018). As discussed earlier in this chapter,

investment banking has restricted employment access to lower class groups as they are presented as lacking ‘polish’ (Social Mobility Commission 2016). Thus, a theoretical approach that considers class to be innate is questionable. The British Social Attitudes survey found that 60% of individuals self-identify as working class and 30% as middle class (Heath, Savage and Senior 2013) yet a recent class survey by the BBC found that only 14% of respondents could be categorised as working class by the traditional category (Savage et al. 2013). Similar to wealth, identifying an individual’s social class is complex and cannot be reduced to their financial status. There is a need to explore how individuals present their social class and what this is used to achieve. In particular, there is a need to explore if and how the super-rich categorise themselves in terms of social class.

Similar to psychology, other disciplines are affected by an over- reliance on national boundaries which ignores the ways that the super-rich and wealth inequality are global issues (Medeiros and de Souza 2015). The need to categorise the super-rich in relation to their wealth (Beaverstock and Faulconbridge 2013) is limiting as it does not consider how wealthy identities are constructed interactionally and how their construction is used to legitimise their privilege. The measurement of wealth alone does not explore the fluidity of identity and how individuals use differing categories within their talk. Thus, future research needs to consider the social construction of the super-rich (Koh, Wissink and Forrest 2016). To overcome current limitations to research on the super-rich, an approach is required that can accommodate the use of media data and has the ability to explore the discursive construction of the super-rich.

There is a need to explore how individuals account for their extreme wealth given that their financial management practices exacerbate wealth inequality in society that has a social and environmental impact for all. Given the limited visibility of the super-rich, there is a requirement to explore how they are presented in the media and how this indirectly supports wealth inequality in the UK.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Chapter 1 identified how wealth inequality is a social problem and the role of the media in maintaining inequitable wealth distribution in society. In this chapter, the psychological literature will be reviewed in how it is applied to wealth inequality and the super-rich. It is established that there is an issue in the ideology underlying psychological research and how this maintains inequality in society. In particular, theoretical approaches such as individual differences and social cognition ignore how inequality is socially constructed. By using Discursive Psychology (DP), a social constructionist approach allows this research to acknowledge the presence of ideology and to explore how the discourse of the super-rich is used to account for extreme wealth in the media.

Issues Regarding Values in Mainstream Psychology

There has been a rise of individualistic discourse (Stenner and Taylor 2008) in psychology to justify the exploration of issues that have previously been considered the reserve of sociology and public policy (for example Goodman and Carr (2017)). However, the use of psychology to explore economic inequality and the super-rich involves questioning the values present in mainstream psychology and how they are deployed. It is alleged that psychology is neutral in relation to its underlying values (Arfken and Yen 2014). Neutrality involves removing psychology from the context of its environment (Prilleltensky 1997) ignoring the ideological environment (Tileagă 2013) and the dominance of neoliberalism (Sugarman 2015). Neoliberalism can be defined as the extension of free market economics into other spheres (Brown 2003) and more specifically, the needs of corporations (Crouch 2011). An emphasis is

placed on individual responsibility and the shrinking of the welfare state (Brown 2003).

The neoliberal ideology underlying mainstream psychology is problematic due to the importance placed on individualism particularly as politicians favour the allocation of funding for projects with a neoliberal bias (Hall 2011). Individualism is used to legitimise the interests of the wealthy over the collective needs of poorer groups (Carr, Goodman and Jowett 2018). Psychological research requires more awareness of the ideology present within its theoretical constructs and the influence of neoliberalism upon its outputs. In psychological research, positive psychology has been criticised for over emphasising the role of the individual in ensuring their wellbeing as a result of its neoliberal influence (Binkley 2013). Neoliberalism is pervasive due to its use as ‘common sense’ (Sugarman 2015:103) that results in psychologists being unaware of its presence in research and practice.

The Influence of Psychologisation on Wealth Inequality

The pervasiveness of neoliberalism coupled with psychologisation means that psychology has a significant reach beyond the academic sphere. The concept of psychologisation argues that the field’s influence is wider than originally intended and is accepted as a result of psychology’s academic legitimacy (De Vos 2012). The pervasiveness of mainstream psychological knowledge is entrenched through globalisation (Parker 2007a) which places the US at its core (Pettit 2015; Sue 1999) and permits the dominance of the English language (Draguns 2001; Parker 2007a). The neoliberal bias within the field is not

acknowledged and psychological research is disseminated without this acknowledgement.

The claim that psychology has a neoliberal bias allows the discipline to be charged with being a resource to further the business interests of the wealthy (Parker 2007a; Rose 1990). For example, organisational psychologists focus on individual performance, seeking to reduce work stress without questioning the neoliberal consensus present as any problems require individual change to be resolved (Islam and Zyphur 2009). Organisational psychology is criticised as a tool for business to coerce staff (Dashtipour 2015). The prevalence of neoliberalism and psychologisation mean that the wealthy are corporations which have an influential status that prevents wealth inequality from being questioned (Hayter and Hegarty 2015). The focus on market values and individual responsibility results in those who perform well and generate wealth are considered successful. In contrast, low incomes are considered the consequence of individual failure (Jo 2013) highlighting the importance of psychologists being aware of ideology within their research (Hegarty 2007). The use of psychometric testing by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) on the unemployed (Friedli and Stearn 2015) is psychology being used as a 'tool of oppression' (McGrath, Walker and Jones 2016:411). Individuals were forced to complete these tests to receive benefits (Friedli and Stearn 2015). The psychometric testing forms part of a process for unemployed people engaging with DWP where they are required to exhibit specific behaviours and attitudes to receive benefit payments (Cromby and Willis 2014; Friedli and Stearn 2015). As a result, this places the blame for unemployment

on the individual and not external market forces (Friedli and Stearn 2015) due to neoliberalism's use of individualism and the co-option of psychology to uphold these principles in the delivery of the welfare state. When researching the super-rich there needs to be an awareness of ideology underpinning mainstream psychological approaches and how this acts to further wealth inequality.

Individual Differences as an Approach to Explaining Wealth Inequality

In this section, a range of traits are examined that have previously been used to explain people's acceptance of wealth inequality in society. For example, the Matthew Effect will be discussed as an example of how SES is used to account for inequality in educational outcomes (Merton 1968). Trait based approaches are critiqued for ignoring their social construction and issues in regard to their measurement and resulting ecological validity. Instead, it is demonstrated that traits are used as a resource in individual's talk to legitimise inequality. This will be achieved through discussing traits based on people's beliefs such as the following: Belief in a Just World that is used to legitimise inequality; Social Dominance Orientation that demonstrates individual support for inequality; Right Wing Authoritarianism that stigmatises poorer people; and Protestant Work Ethic that places an emphasis on an individual's effort and consumption.

Personality traits have been used to demonstrate a relationship between individual differences and wealth. Baguma and Furnham (2012) have demonstrated that people use three types of explanation for an individual's financial status: chance, environmental and individual factors. Individuals are perceived to have differing levels of traits depending on their level of wealth

(Leahy 1981). For example, it is claimed that higher income earners have increased self-esteem (Goldsmith, Veum and Darity 1997) and more affluent individuals are less negative (Shackman et al. 2016). Research into the 'Matthew Effect' questions the relationship between traits and wealth. The Matthew Effect was initially used to explain how higher profile scientists gained more credit for their research than their less established colleagues and the impact on funding (Merton 1968). The phenomenon is named as a result of a biblical reference from the gospel of Matthew: 'For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath' (25:29-30, New International Version). In relation to wealth, the Matthew Effect is interpreted as an explanation for children from a higher Socio-Economic Status (SES) environment benefitting more from their traits in terms of increased educational outcomes (Walberg and Tsai 1983). In contrast, children from less affluent backgrounds do not receive the same level of advantage from their traits due to the counter-effect of their lower SES environment (Damian et al 2014). The Matthew Effect demonstrates an issue with individual difference approaches neglecting the role of the environment (Billig 1976). Using trait-based approaches results in wealth inequality to be taken for granted (Billig 1995) rather than an injustice that is damaging to society. In addition to the Matthew Effect, there are trait-based approaches that attempt to measure people's beliefs that allow them to accept inequitable situations such as wealth inequality.

Belief in a Just World

Belief in a Just World (BJW) is used to legitimise wealth inequality and its negative impact. Belief in a Just World was initially developed as a metaphor by Lerner (1980), that individuals “get what they deserve” (p.11), to explain victim blaming and people's acceptance of social injustices such as inequality. In psychological literature, the Just World Hypothesis can be applied as a trait to measure people’s belief in the hypothesis, attribution or more recently as a discursive resource. The trait can be applied in three differing ways: to the individual, to others and universally where people generally believe that the world is just (Christandl 2013). At these differing levels, BJW is utilised as a perception filter (Christandl 2013) that allows individuals to tolerate inequality. In particular, BJW for others is associated with negative views about poor people (Sutton and Douglas 2005). Individuals score more highly for BJW when presented with an example of success by a person with a high SES and participant’s rate lower SES individual success as a fluke (Iatridis and Fousiani 2009). BJW allows people to justify the negative effects of wealth inequality and decreased social mobility. BJW facilitates individuals from wealthier backgrounds into fostering a sense of entitlement (Ng and Allen 2005) that results in activities such as tax avoidance becoming acceptable (Kirchler 2007). Thus, BJW presents a ‘negative illusion’ (Jost 1995:397) that is used to legitimise damaging practices such as tax avoidance for affluent groups and to restrict welfare benefits to the unemployed (Reichle, Schneider and Montada 1998). Goodman and Carr (2017) argue that BJW is used as a resource in arguments against State benefits as a result of the unemployed being

presented as undeserving. As a result, further research is required to explore how talk about traits such as Belief in a Just World are used by people to argue for inequality and more specifically, to account for super-rich people's extreme wealth.

Social Dominance Orientation

Similar to BJW, Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) is related to measuring people's support for inequality. Social Dominance Orientation is a trait used to measure people's stratification of social groups and predilection for inequality in intergroup relations (Pratto et al. 1994). As such, SDO as an individual difference variable can be used to measure people's acceptance of inequality in society. In particular, SDO allegedly demonstrates 'the value that people place on nonegalitarian and hierarchically structured relationships among social groups' (Sidanius and Pratto 1999:61). People use 'legitimising myths' (Sidanius and Pratto 1999:45) to account for unequal social relations. Pratto et al. (1994) stress that legitimising myths are not factual and are used as arguments to legitimise inequality. SDO as a trait takes the forms of SDO-Dominance that is more oppressive towards lower status groups and SDO-Egalitarian that involves inequitable wealth distribution (Ho et al. 2015). Individuals with a higher SES score lower in SDO as more affluent individuals are claimed to be less prejudiced (Carvacho et al. 2013). Yet, in a differing study SDO is positively correlated with high status groups (Küpper and Zick 2011). SDO is a protective strategy for high SES groups (Pratto et al. 1994) as SDO is correlated positively to individual causes of wealth (Bobbio, Canova and Manganelli 2010). Individuals who measure highly for SDO have negative

views about the welfare state (Bobbio, Canova and Manganelli 2010; Ho et al. 2012; Pratto et al. 1994; and Rodriguez- Bailon et al. 2017). SDO- Egalitarian draws upon ideology in the form of legitimising myths to support the status quo (Ho et al. 2015; Wilson 2003) and is related with conservatism (Ho et al. 2012; Pratto et al. 1994).

Criticism of SDO as a trait questions the underlying assumptions present and how it is measured. Research exploring the redistribution of wealth and SDO uses allocation games. For example, Rodriguez- Bailon et al. (2017) provided participants with $100 to donate to different charities, some of whom were considered to be more redistributive than others. However, it is problematic to suggest that charitable donations are reflective of wider views regarding individual's egalitarian beliefs. Furthermore, Zhao, Ferguson and Smillie (2017) found that allocation games were more effective for measuring agreeableness as a trait. Their work emphasised the role of social norms around politeness in fair allocations about agreeableness disputing the use of allocation games as a means for measuring SDO. However, Tileagă (2013) critiques the presentation of SDO as an outcome and not as something that individuals negotiate through talk. As stated previously, social dominance is negotiated through talk as speakers draw upon legitimising myths to justify their position (Pratto et al. 1994). Inequality is presented as an inevitable result and does not provide a rationale for variations across society and history. As such, SDO is a resource for normalising inequality and stigmatising individuals and/or groups from lower SES backgrounds.

Right Wing Authoritarianism

Right Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) can be used to stigmatise poorer individuals and normalise inequality similarly to SDO. RWA was developed by Altemeyer (1981) in response to criticism of Adorno et al.'s (1950) F scale for authoritarian personalities. Altemeyer's approach stems from the assumption that individuals require certainty in a menacing world (Carvacho et al. 2013) and are subservient as a result (Hodson, MacInnis and Busseri 2017). Thus, individuals who score highly in RWA are more drawn to fascism as it provides them with stability in a fluctuating environment (Bobbio, Canova and Manganelli 2010). The assumption that wealthier people have a less authoritarian personality has persisted over time (Adorno et al. 1950; Carvacho et al. 2013). In relation to wealth inequality, RWA is related to individuals who perceive themselves as less affluent supporting conservative policy (Jost 1996) that maintains inequality.

RWA is challenged by Mols and Jetton (2017) in relation to its stigmatisation of less affluent individuals and whether it can be defined as an individual difference variable. As a variable, RWA measures an individual's political ideology and is not a personality trait (Reynolds and Turner 2001). However, RWA is viewed as a trait within the psychological literature and has been used in research with SDO (for example Bobbio, Canova and Manganelli 2010; Carvacho et al. 2013). SDO and RWA are together seen to encapsulate authoritarianism (Hodson, MacInnis and Busseri 2017). It is interesting to consider how RWA is used and achieves. RWA stigmatises working class individuals by suggesting that they are more likely to endorse extremist views.

Mols and Jetten (2017) state that there is no evidence of causation between RWA and working-class prejudice. This critique highlights a need to explore the presentation of affluent individuals being less prejudiced and what this achieves in relation to maintaining the privileged status of the super-rich.

Protestant Work Ethic

The Protestant Work Ethic (PWE) like SDO and RWA is formed of conservative values and can be used as a trait to measure people's belief about their work ethic and consumption. As a result, PWE provides an opportunity to examine the relationship between work practices, consumption and wealth. PWE originates from the Protestant Ethic conceptualised by Weber to explain the development of industrialised capitalism in Northern Europe (Weber [1930] 2013). Despite the popularity of PWE as a concept, its presentation as a driver of industrialised capitalism is disputed (van Hoorn and Maseland 2013). PWE is not unique as the Islamic Work Ethic places a similar focus on individual effort (Yousef 2001). Work has been incorporated with religiosity since the practices of St Benedict in the sixth century (Benefiel, Fry and Geigle 2014). In the US, the presentation of work as having a spiritual value is related to the arrival of European settlers in the US, is present in the writings of Benjamin Franklin and has remained a key aspect of American values (Lipset 1990). However, the meaning of PWE in an US context has changed over time to be more focused on the acquisition of wealth as it has become aligned with the concept of the American Dream (Ghosh 2013). PWE's meaning has been fluid over time and has similarities to other religious work based beliefs so caution is needed in relation to its operationalisation as a trait and how this is interpreted.

As a variable, Furnham (1987) defines PWE as 'a dispositional variable characterised by a belief in the importance of hard work, rationality, and frugality which acts as a defense against sloth, sensuality and religious doubt' (p. 93). Despite its conceptual origins, PWE has been found to exist internationally and is not confined to Protestant nations (Furnham et al. 1993). Research exploring people's beliefs around PWE have been focused on the differences between the employed and unemployed. Despite high levels of PWE indicating a person has a high work ethic, the unemployed have been found to have higher levels of PWE than the employed (Furnham 1990; Hassall et al. 2005). People with low educational attainment score higher in PWE are more likely to be unemployed (Dunn 2010). This contradicts common-sense assumptions that employed people are harder working and policy discourse about the unemployed choosing not to work (Dunn 2010). Given the finding that PWE is related to high levels of individualism and more prevalent in countries with high levels of inequality (Furnham et al. 1993), there is a need to explore further how PWE is used. Additionally, there are concerns about what PWE measures as a trait as individuals may be affected by demand effects to provide more socially acceptable responses about their work ethic (Furnham et al. 1993). In a similar vein, Dunn (2013) states that PWE confuses an individual's beliefs about work with their moral principles. Other critics suggest that the PWE has evolved into a 'wealth ethic' (Kelvin and Jarrett 1984) that prioritises individual self-sufficiency and not being dependent on the welfare state over work. Unlike PWE, individuals with higher educational attainment have an increased wealth ethic. Given the confusion regarding how PWE is operationalised as a trait,

there is a need to explore how PWE is present within the media and whether it is drawn upon by the super-rich.

The Use of Attributions for Extreme Wealth

From a social cognitive perspective, wealth inequality is the consequence of unconscious psychological processes (Gaucher and Jost 2011). Social cognition encompasses many different approaches so this section will focus on the use of attributions to explain wealth inequality. Building on the work of Heider (1958), attribution models consider how: 'people interpret behavior in terms of its causes and that these interpretations play an important role in determining reactions to the behavior' (Kelley and Michela 1980:548). As a result, individuals make rational judgements based on the perceived causation of others actions.

Attribution research has found that people attribute wealth to internal causes whilst poverty is the result of external causes (Hunt 2004). Lower status groups have been found to draw upon ideology such as meritocracy when attributing causes for wealth (Godfrey and Wolf 2016). Iatridis and Fousiani (2009) found that individuals are more likely to attribute the success of more affluent individuals to internal causes such as ability that is stable over time. In contrast, poorer individuals are perceived to gain wealth through effort, an attribute that can fluctuate over time questioning their ability to maintain wealth. Talk about attributions has been found to be underlined with neoliberal ideology placing an emphasis on individual responsibility (Halpin and Guilfoyle 2004). Groups such as Australian farmers draw upon neoliberal ideology in their discourse when attributing their productivity levels to individual effort in times of

increased competition, an external cause (Pyysiäinen, Halpin and Guilfoyle 2017). Attribution models are underlined with neoliberal ideology placing a focus on individual effort.

Attribution research states that stereotypes position the super-rich as being competent and cold to account for their privileged position (Cuddy, Fiske and Glick 2007; Cuddy et al. 2009; Fiske, Cuddy and Glick 2007). As mentioned earlier, just world beliefs can be used as an attributional style. Ramos, Correia and Alves (2013) state that BJW provides psychological benefits to individuals in an unjust and inconsistent world. In situations where a person's BJW is threatened and may reduce their self-esteem, people have been found to make explanations to safeguard their wellbeing (Schlenker, Pontari and Christopher 2001). As a result, individual reasons are attributed to people's poverty in developing nations (Campbell, Carr and MacLachlan 2001). In contrast, Cuddy et al. (2009) argue that attributing the super-rich as more competent results in wealthy people being perceived as deserving of their wealth in a meritocratic environment. Thus, attribution models demonstrate that wealthy individuals are perceived to be more able to obtain and maintain their wealth.

Attribution research has been criticised for the methodology used and their understanding of language (Potter and Edwards 1990). Attribution models present language as reflective of individual cognition and ignore its action orientation and rhetorical function (Potter and Edwards 1990). By ignoring the situated nature of discourse, attribution research assumes that its findings can be generalised to differing cultural environments (Billig 1978). Attribution

models are underlined with individualistic ideology that are arguably ignored by the researcher (Billig 1982). By collecting data through surveys, participants are responding to questions that have been stripped of their context, can only provide limited answers and they are not required to account for their answers (Gibson 2009; Godfrey and Wolf 2016). The flaws in attribution research highlight a need for an approach to wealth that considers the role of language and how individuals account for inequality in society.

Perceptions and Framing of wealth inequality

Social cognitive research focuses on people's perceptions of wealth inequality and how they differ depending on how issues are framed, emphasising the need to explore the use of language and media representations. In the US, people underestimate levels of wealth inequality (Kiatpongsan and Norton 2014; Norton and Ariely 2011) and wealthier individuals underestimate inequality more (Norton and Ariely 2011). Social cognitive researchers have suggested that these underestimates are the result of individuals being influenced by media reporting on negative economic events (Chambers, Swan and Heesacker 2013). Framing wealth inequality in different ways has an impact on how participants perceive it to be legitimate. Bruckmüller, Reese and Martiny (2017) demonstrated that participants legitimised inequality more if the focus was placed on the wealthier group. Individuals placed less concern on the outcome if the salient group benefits (Kahneman and Tversky 1979). However, Bruckmüller, Reese and Martiny (2017) use a scenario that involves a €2 per hour wage differential. It is difficult to interpret this scenario as evidence of individual support for economic inequality when this cannot be applied to

current levels of inequality and extreme wealth. Yet, research on people's perceptions does highlight the need to explore the use of media and how individuals legitimise their wealth. In particular, the use of an applied approach that explores the language used about extreme levels of wealth and the super-rich within its context.

Ethical Behaviour and the Super-Rich

Social cognitive research exploring the relationship between status and behaviour suggests that affluent individuals behave more unethically than less affluent ones. In particular, experiments have found that wealthier people are more likely to cheat and violate driving rules (Piff et al. 2012). Increased unethical behaviour is allegedly the result of higher status individuals being more focused on self-advantage. Research on emotional responses replicates this focus on the self as high-status individuals score higher for feelings such as pride and contentment which drive wealth acquisition (Piff and Moskowitz 2017). In contrast, poorer individuals have higher scores for emotions directed at others such as love and compassion as less affluent individuals need support from others (Dubois, Rucker and Galinsky 2015; Piff et al. 2010; Piff et al. 2012; Piff and Moskowitz 2017). Research has demonstrated that priming for egalitarianism (Piff 2014) and being in public results in higher status individuals behaving more pro-socially (Kraus and Callaghan 2016). Piff, Kraus and Keltner (2017) have developed an 'Inequality Maintenance Model of Social Class' that presents the self-focus of the wealthy as a means of maintaining the status quo (p.9). The model claims that wealthy individuals experience 'inequality blindness', a lack of knowledge of others poverty as a result of

differing income groups living separately (p.80). This research suggests that inequality in society is a consequence of super-rich people being more self-focused and less aware of others disadvantage.

Similar to the other experimental research discussed, the measures used in Piff et al. (2012) are questionable in terms of their application. It is difficult to interpret the theft of sweets from a table during an experiment as being applicable to issues that affect the super-rich such as opportunities to evade tax. A further study from Piff et al. (2012) research did involve real life interaction when considering compliance with driving laws. However, car value is not an effective measure of wealth and it would be difficult to remove other variables that may affect an individual's driving behaviour. Studies exploring ethical behaviour and status assume participants are consistently rational. The assertion that extremely wealthy people are unaware of inequality in society is a particularly contentious assertion given that differing SES groups are visible to each other particularly through the media and for the super-rich through their use of staff. Whilst research into pro social behaviour attempts to mimic everyday life and social context in its studies, the variables used are concerning and rely upon questionable assumptions about inter group relations. Thus, an approach to examining wealth inequality is required that can explore social context in a situated manner.

Social Identity Theory and Pro Social Behaviour

Applying Social Identity Theory (SIT) to the super-rich and wealth inequality involves exploring how groups legitimise themselves and justify the promotion of their self-interest (Tajfel 1981). SIT argues that people act to increase the

positive identity of their social group (Tajfel and Turner 1986) using myths to allow poorer groups to accept social injustice (Brown 2000; Tajfel 1984). Wealth inequality is maintained through its legitimisation resulting in increased ingroup favouritism (Scheepers 2017) despite groups such as the super-rich being in less need than others. Mols and Jetten (2017) call this the wealth paradox: 'the notion that it is at times those who are best off who are least generous when it comes to helping others in need or when it comes to welcoming newcomers' (p.16). According to Moscatelli et al. (1994), the super-rich have an aversion to being deprived of their enhanced status. Mols and Jetten (2017) state that the super-rich are focused on their future levels of affluence and have a greater fear of becoming impoverished. They claim that in times of greater social mobility, the super-rich act to restrict access to enhanced wealth and status to others. Increased social mobility diminishes their positive social identity as more people become wealthy (Jetten et al. 2017). SIT claims that the super-rich act to maintain their group's positive social status providing an explanation for the decreased pro-social behaviour of wealthy individuals.

SIT provides a theoretical development as proponents such as Reicher (2004) state that context is at the core of its approach. In addition to this, SIT acknowledges the importance of the role of culture (Tajfel 1981). However, when applying SIT to the super-rich there is a question as to whether the wealthy are a social group and whether their group categorisation can made on their wealth alone. An individual may have acquired wealth but this does not mean that they identify as upper class or have a sense of psychological belonging with other wealthy individuals. Social identification provides

difficulties when exploring wealth inequality in an experimental context particularly when participants are assigned to groups based on wealth. For example, Jetten, Mols and Postmes' (2015), used Bimboola, a fictional society to create a virtual context for their experimental scenarios. Undergraduates were assigned to different wealth categories, the highest being ‘above average, wealth of 100,000 to 1 million Bimboolan dollars’. However, the undergraduates were not assigned to an additional category where individuals had over 1 million Bimboolan dollars meaning that this study did not attempt to explore extreme wealth. From this study, it is difficult to claim the importance of context to SIT based on an arbitrary categorisation in a virtual environment. A fictional scenario also removes the opportunity to explore how ideology is drawn upon in talk that is socially produced in a particular cultural and historical context (Billig 2002; Tileagă 2007). Additionally, there is no requirement for participants to account for their choices within the experiment. Thus, SIT is positive as it acknowledges the importance of context and culture when exploring prosocial behaviour. However, SIT has not been explicitly applied to those with extreme wealth and if it was, it is uncertain that the super-rich could be identified as a social group.

In summary, mainstream psychological approaches adopt a logical positivist approach to wealth inequality. Logical positivism ‘require[s] that a theory be capable of being "rationally reconstructed" into a deductive form’ (Toulmin and Leary 1985:605). This approach to knowledge has shaped fields within experimental psychology and affects this research’s aims. An individual differences approach relates a person’s wealth to their traits. The acceptance

of inequitable wealth distribution such as through RWA is presented as an individual's need for consistency. Attribution theory claims that inequality is legitimised through cognitive biases leading to the wealthy being perceived as more able and thus, deserving. Finally, SIT infers that the wealthy act to maintain the positive position of their own group resulting in limited wealth redistribution as a form of group protection. There are several issues with these approaches to wealth inequality and the justification of the privilege of the super-rich. The main limitation of these approaches is the removal of the social context of inequality and claim that their research is generalisable. In addition to this, the focus on individuals being consistent in their responses is problematic (Billig 1978) as it assumes that people do not provide contradictory answers. This ignores the role of discourse as having a social function and the social historical construction of the legitimisation of wealth inequality. Inequality is warranted as inevitable as these approaches reflect the status quo. The following section proposes an approach for overcoming the limitations of failure to acknowledge context.

Critical Psychology

Critical psychology is an alternative psychological approach that can be drawn upon to address the limitations identified in mainstream approaches' explanation for how people accept the super-rich and wealth inequality. Specifically, Critical Psychology argues that mainstream psychology can be complicit in the maintenance of the status quo, even when the status quo can have damaging social effects (Fox, Prilleltensky and Austin 2009) such as those caused by wealth inequality. Critical Psychology questions the role of

psychology in maintaining damaging practices and puts an emphasis on social problems as its area of interest (Parker 2007b). As a result, critical psychology has an interest in politics and ideology (Fox, Prilleltensky and Austin 2009) that can be used to challenge dominant paradigms as a result of its wide range of influences (Parker 2007a; Teo 2015) and can highlight alternative egalitarian ideologies (Prilleltensky 1997). There is also a focus on the role of identity in challenging the dominant ideology that maintains inequality (Louis et al. 2014). Thus, Critical Psychology requires a balance between acknowledging the wider social environment and the role of everyday social interactions in the construction of inequality in society (Day, Rickett and Woolhouse 2014). This approach has been credited with challenging other forms of inequality such as race and gender as it explores the use of dominant ideology (Jowett 2015). Therefore, Critical Psychology can be utilised as an alternative to mainstream approaches that have been criticised for their lack of awareness regarding ideology and agency. This approach provides an opportunity for further research to deconstruct the ideology drawn upon in talk to support the super-rich to maintain their problematic position and to explore the construction of their identities.

Critical Discursive Psychology and its Critique of Capitalism

One issue within Critical Psychology is with the categorisation of approaches within the discipline as researchers can use similar labels to describe theoretical approaches that have differing epistemological positions (Fox, Prilleltensky and Austin 2009). Critical Discursive Psychology (CDP) as advocated by Parker (2015) is not to be confused with Wetherell's CDP (for example Wetherell and

Edley 2009) that evolved from Discursive Psychology (Edwards and Potter 1992). In his version of CDP, Parker merges post structuralism, Marxism and psychoanalysis to discuss how psychology supports capitalism, and as a result, wealth inequality and the position of the super-rich.

The influence of Marx emphasises the importance of structural relations in society in the form of class (Parker 2007a). From a Marxist perspective, a person's position in society is related to their ownership of the means of production:

> By bourgeoisie is meant the class of modern capitalists, owners of the means of social production and employers of wage labour. By proletariat, the class of modern wage laborers who, having no means of production of their own, are reduced to selling their labour power in order to live (Engels (1888) cited in Marx and Engels [1888] 2012:74).

Parker (2015) argues that psychology is used to support capitalism and to enforce structural relations that have an economic basis. CDP as a critical approach can explore the economic context and social structures when analysing how wealth inequality is constructed.

Parker (2007a) draws on Foucault's work to explore how social relations are constructed and maintained. He draws upon Foucault's (1975) concept of the Panopticon to argue that in a capitalist society, individuals self-regulate and are also monitored through the 'psy-complex' (Ingleby 1985); a network that is formed of care professionals with psychological knowledge. The psy-complex supports the status quo (Parker 2015) and this is achieved as the result of the influence of neoliberal ideology in psychology that promotes competition

amongst individuals and as a result, wealth inequality is acceptable. CDP argues that power relations in society produce actions (Parker 2015) and are socially constructed to exclude people (Parker 2005) who are critics of the established order (Mentinis 2010). CDP provides an approach to wealth inequality that considers the role of psychology in maintaining inequality.

Whilst CDP offers a critique of psychology and its use to maintain inequality, there are some issues with its theoretical construction and lack of use. However, the inclusion of psychoanalysis in CDP is problematic as Parker (1997) presents talk as reflective of individual cognition that does not align with the anti-cognitivist approach of discursive approaches. There are further concerns regarding the incompatibility of the dual influences of Marx and Foucault (Hepburn 2003) particularly as Foucault's writings reject Marx's conception of power (Potter, Edwards and Ashmore 1999), consciousness and historical materialism (Poster 1984). Thus, CDP as a theoretical approach is internally inconsistent (Hepburn 2003; Potter, Edwards and Ashmore 1999). Potter, Edwards and Ashmore (1999) are very critical of Parker's approach and suggest that he attempts to police other critical social psychologists through the 'Parker complex' (p. 80). As a result of CDP's issues, a differing Critical Psychological approach is required that can explore how inequality is socially constructed and individuals draw upon ideology to support unequal distribution in their talk.

Feminist Critical Psychology and Social Class

Feminist approaches to Critical Psychology can vary but when used to examine social class, Holt and Griffin (2005) describe this approach as

‘critical/discursive’ (p. 250) and can be incorporated with Discursive Psychology (DP). They acknowledge that talk is a form of social action, a key component of DP but do not engage in a detailed analysis choosing to focus on the wider structure by engaging in Foucauldian discourse analysis as discussed by Willig (2001). Feminist approaches criticise the substitution of SES for class as it is too individualistic and does not appreciate how class impacts on everyday life (Day 2012). Day, Rickett and Woolhouse (2014) argue that middle class values are presented as banal whilst the working class are presented as failures. Individuals use codes (Holt and Griffin 2005), ways of speaking, such as the category of single mother being assumed to be working class (Day, Rickett and Woolhouse 2014). The representation of working-class people is constructed in reality television programmes that offer transformations and are presented as aspirational (Ringrose and Walkerdine 2008). In contrast, wealthy people are presented as successful and their privileged social status as earned (Kendall 2005). Day (2012) argues that more psychological research about wealthier groups is required and that by examining the more privileged this would result in wealth inequality and the social practices that allow it to be maintained to be questioned (Rickett 2016). Feminist critical psychology offers an interesting insight to the representation of class on television media and how people use codes in talk. This approach presents an opportunity to explore how the super-rich are presented on television, whether they are presented as belonging to a specific social class and how this representation is constructed. Unfortunately, the Foucauldian Discourse Analysis commonly used by feminist critical psychologists attends to broader structures and is less focused on how talk

about psychological concepts is used. Given the influence of psychologisation and the need to explore whether super-rich individuals are constructed as agentic (Chapter 1), an alternative critical approach is needed to examine the presentation of wealth inequality.

Introducing Discursive Psychology as an approach

DP is a social constructionist approach to discourse whose tenets are present in the work of Edwards and Potter (1992). In addition to social constructivism and relativism, Edwards and Potter (1992) question the modernism in psychology that states that talk is reflective of individual cognition. Potter (1996a) uses the metaphor of 'the mirror and the construction yard' to represent the difference between the cognitivist and social constructionist approach (p.97). Within the construction yard, discourse becomes active, a resource that individuals can utilise to perform acts and manage their own and others accountability. Early DP explored the use of psychological concepts (Tileagă and Stokoe 2016) such as identity and emotion. Edwards (1999) stated that emotions are used to perform social actions such as managing accountability for events questioning the view of emotions as being irrational (Edwards 1997). Instead a focus is placed on how individuals draw upon emotional talk to support their accounts of events. As a result, emotions are constructed as natural reactions that are fluid. Thus, DP is a social constructionist approach that can be used to explore how talk about psychological concepts are used by the super-rich to legitimise their wealth.

Importance of Identity

A DP approach allows for the examination of how people's identity construction is used to achieve outcomes in talk. Discursive and rhetorical approaches are different from mainstream approaches that view identity as being internal and something that is the property of the individual requiring management (Antaki and Widdicombe 1998; Benwell and Stokoe 2006; Wiggins 2014). Instead, researchers are interested in how identity is constructed and managed through discourse (Antaki and Widdicombe 1998). Identities are constructed socially through people's interactions (Billig 1995). Classical philosophy influences DP's approach to identity as Aristotle stated a need to consider how speakers manage their identity within their talk (Billig 1987). This was termed as 'ethos' and referred to how speakers used the presentation of their character to persuade the audience (Condor et al. 2013:27). A discursive and rhetorical position on discourse permits the inclusion of both agency and the use of ideology simultaneously which highlights the importance of the wider context (Billig 1991a; Wetherell 2007). Discourse about identity is used to achieve a variety of outcomes including negotiating accounts of behaviour (Stokoe 2010), managing motives (Edwards 1998) and minimising problematic categories within individual identity (Condor 2000).

DP has not specifically been used to examine how the super-rich construct their identity and how their identities are used. However, existing research considers how speakers produce high status identities. Andreouli and Howarth (2013) examined how migrants present themselves as higher status to account for their presence in the UK. By building higher status identities

through their talk, migrants can account for their British naturalisation and enhanced mobility being the result of their skills. An ‘elite’ migrant construction (p. 378) that is used to present more affluent people as being more integrated into British society. There is potential to explore how the super-rich use their identity to account for their increased mobility. Additionally, Wetherell and Potter (1992) found that dominant groups constructed themselves as being more rational. Roma, a disadvantaged group who are traditionally more mobile are presented as irrational to justify prejudicial actions (Tileagă 2006a). By being warranted as irrational, Roma people’s ability to access resources and mobility is restricted. There is a need to examine how the enhanced mobility of the super-rich is accounted for and how their identity is constructed to legitimise their movement. In relation to wealth inequality, the examination of identity construction by the super-rich means that this research can explore how the super-rich compose their enhanced position as rational and how they position others.

Discursive Psychology and the Accountability of the Super-Rich

Speakers use psychological concepts such as identity in their talk to manage their accountability (Buttny 1993). Accountability is regularly negotiated in talk (Edwards and Potter 1992; Tileagă 2010a; Tileagă 2010b) when producing identity (Edwards 2006) and to demonstrate a moral position (Tileagă 2011). When managing their accountability, individuals are required to manage their stake (Edwards and Potter 1992) and to mitigate accusations of self-interest (Potter 1996a; Tileagă 2010b). Tileagă (2010b) demonstrates that individuals present themselves as ‘being fair’ (p.233) placing an importance on individual

rights. In relation to wealth, Carr, Goodman and Jowett (2018) found that arguments by high profile people on a radio discussion programme for higher tax rates for wealthier individuals are presented as being unfair. Culminating in a speaker forming a contrasting argument using an ideological dilemma presenting increased tax for the more affluent as fair. Their argument warranted wealth as the product of a collective effort in a meritocratic environment where society provides services such as health care and education. The construction of tax as unfair in the media allows more affluent people to account for their less proportionate tax contributions that prevent public resources being available to address inequality in society. This is partly achieved through the use of an 'effortfulness' interpretative repertoire (Gibson 2009:400). An interpretative repertoire is a discursive resource that can be defined as a way of talking about a topic that is familiar to others (Wetherell and Potter 1988). Effortfulness is also used to question the legitimacy of benefit claimants and by individuals in precarious forms of employment (Gibson 2009; Goodman and Carr 2017; Kesisoglou, Figgou and Dikaiou 2016). DP has been used to explore how the disadvantage experienced by poorer people is legitimised by drawing upon their work ethic. However, there is a gap in relation to how more affluent groups such as the super-rich account for their status. Research on how wealthy individuals are presented as deserving of low tax rates means that DP can be used to explore the positions of more affluent people. Accountability management is a key tenet of DP and as such can be used to explore how super-rich individuals both legitimise their wealth acquisition and how they use their increased affluence.

Role of Ideology in Legitimising the Super-Rich

Given the discussion in Chapter 1, there is a need to explore how individuals draw upon ideology when accounting for extreme wealth. The application of DP to the construction of the super-rich would allow for the identification of how ideology is constructed and embedded in talk on wealth and inequality. Media studies research identifies the presence of ideology underlying talk about wealth inequality and distribution in the media. DP recognises how individuals draw upon ideology in their talk due to being shaped by post structuralism in particular Derrida. The role of deconstruction, a key aspect of Derrida's writings is central to the development of DP and the analysis of everyday assumptions in talk (Hepburn 1999). Hepburn (1999) demonstrates how discursive approaches can incorporate deconstructivism in regards to how talk is constructed as dilemmatic. Derrida's (1990) work on violence differs from the work of other philosophers as conflict is not presented as extraordinary or events that result in peaceful long-term resolutions. For Derrida, conflict is a constant feature of society (Bennington 2002). This tension is dialectical and acknowledges that not all discourses are equal with the presence of a dominant discourse (Hepburn 1999). DP permits researchers to explore the presence of ideology in talk that is not examined by less critical forms as it may not be explicitly referred to by participants (Edley 2001). Ideology is presented as common sense, an everyday assumption that does not require questioning. Yet, ideology is dialectical and can appear in individual talk in the form of an ideological dilemma; two competing interpretative repertoires in the talk of one person (Billig et al 1988). Therefore, DP permits the exploration of how

ideology is used to maintain the status of affluent groups as a result of its critical stance.

In his research on the British monarchy, Billig (1992) found that individuals constructed ideological dilemmas that accepted inequality through the presence of the royal family and viewed society as meritocratic. The Queen was constructed as harder working than other members of the British monarchy and as a result, warranted to be more deserving. Speakers used double declaiming, a rhetorical device to present inequality as fair that was used by interviewees to present their own lives as preferable to the lives of the monarchy. Speakers warranted aspects of the royal family's life as undesirable such as the press attention, to construct their own less affluent position as more advantageous. Whilst monarchies exist as a special category, they provide an insight to the use of ideology in talk that supports the excessive wealth of the super-rich. Just world beliefs can present benefit claimants negatively as they involve the use of individualistic ideology (Goodman and Carr 2017). Speakers involved in debates about the welfare state presented the poor status of the unemployed as 'just' by presenting them as lazy. In contrast, workers were warranted as having a work ethic. Unemployed speakers presented themselves as 'effortful' (Gibson 2009) to manage their accountability for being jobless by referring to activities such as job hunting and being in education (Goodman and Carr 2017). When applied to the super-rich, this suggests that wealthy individuals will be required to present their more affluent status as earned due to the presence of individualistic ideology.

Research Question: How do the super-rich use psychological concepts to account for their wealth on television media?

Given the detrimental impact of wealth inequality and the damaging effects of the practices of the super-rich, there is a need to examine how the status quo is presented as inevitable and normal. By analysing how the super-rich use talk about psychological concepts in television programming, there will be a greater understanding of how this inequality is constructed as inevitable allowing for wealth inequality to be maintained. The super-rich are separate to other groups in society and wealth porn programming provides an opportunity for those with extreme wealth to legitimise their privilege to less affluent groups. Through focusing on the justification of super-rich consumerism, wealth transfer through inheritance and enhanced mobility of the super-rich, the legitimisation of damaging practices by the super-rich that contribute to declining social mobility and environmental degradation, will be explored. The use of DP will address gaps in existing research limitations that focus on the wealth of the super-rich and individualistic ideology. In particular, this research will address calls from research to address the need for a discursive approach to explore the presentation of the super-rich (Koh, Wissink and Forrest 2016). A DP lens will explore how the super-rich account for their wealth and privilege in an unequal society. As a result, this research will focus on the following aims:

- How do super-rich individuals use talk about psychological concepts to legitimise their wealth?
- How do privileged individuals present their wealth as earned?
- How do super-rich individuals manage problems with ostentatious spending?

- How do the super-rich present their spending in global hubs?

Focusing on these aims will provide a greater understanding of how the extreme wealth of the super-rich and wealth inequality is maintained despite its detrimental consequences. This research will also address how the super-rich account for their wealth and the underlying ideology present in their talk that maintains extreme levels of wealth inequality.

Chapter 3: Method

This chapter demonstrates how Discursive Psychology (DP) is used to explore how the super-rich use talk about psychological concepts to account for their extreme wealth in television media. In particular, how the researcher must balance the analytical process between exploring how individuals construct themselves as agentic and draw upon ideology through the presence of devices such as interpretative repertoires. Information is provided about the corpus, television programmes and establishes how DP can be used in a multi-modal analysis. Additionally, the analytic procedure for each chapter is discussed.

The Development of Discursive Psychology

The differing theoretical influences on DP result in a method that is balanced to explore individual's use of talk and the wider context. This section will discuss the development of discursive and rhetorical approaches affect the researcher's approach to data collection and the analysis particularly in relation to ideology and agency. As discussed in chapter 1, there is a need to explore how the super-rich draw upon ideology in their talk to account for inequality and whether they are presented as agentic in the maintenance and acquisition of their wealth.

DP exists on a spectrum with Conversation Analysis (CA) influenced DP on one end and DP influenced by post-structuralism or 'critical' DP on the other (Tileagă and Stokoe 2016:4). Critical DP is closer to DP in its original form given its interest in context and critical nature (Wetherell 1998). The other DP pathway is more influenced by CA that is less focused on rhetoric and claims that individuals talk is directed towards forming agreement (Edwards 2014).

The two types of DP have resulted in differing research outputs with CA influenced DP being focused on the micro level of talk whilst 'critical' DP examines how people use their talk within a wider social environment (Tileagă and Stokoe 2016). Despite these differences, both types of DP are:

> concerned with particular claims in particular settings that have particular consequences. DP offers particularistic answers to general questions and reframes debates around psychology's central quandaries (experience, mindbody, the nature of self and identity, categorisation, prejudice, and so on) (Tileagă and Stokoe 2016:5).

To understand DP's 'particularism' (Tileagă and Stokoe 2016:5), there is a need to explore both the development of DP and its influences in more detail below to understand their impact. These influences result in DP permitting the examination of how talk is used by speakers to achieve outcomes in a social context.

DP was influenced by CA, Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA), Sociology of Scientific Knowledge (SSK) and post-structuralism. When constructing a building, CA is envisaged to bond the materials together through language and post-structuralism provides the materials through repertoires individuals draw upon in talk (Potter 1996a). Both are required for DP as an analysis that ignores either the text or its context is limited. Whilst CA as a method is wide ranging, it is generally considered to have developed at the University of California in the 1960s from the work of Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (ten Have 2007). CA focuses on participant's action orientation which relates to how talk is utilised to perform activities (Schegloff 2015) and social

relations (Duranti and Goodwin 1992). The emphasis placed on the importance of detail (Sacks 1992) such as turn-taking within the transcript is related to advances in technology in capturing discourse (Schegloff 1979). As a result, CA differs from an approach such as Rhetorical Psychology that does not have a defined method (Edwards 2014).

MCA developed from CA and explores the formation of normative groupings (Sacks 1992) placing an emphasis on how categories are utilised and how they relate to other categories (Widdicombe 2016). MCA arose from a division occurring in CA on the focus of the analysis: categories (MCA) or sequences (CA) (Abell and Stokoe 2001; Stokoe 2012). Categories were developed to catalogue individuals (Sacks 1972) to order relations and are regulated in regards to their application (Schegloff 2007). A DP approach that incorporates aspects of MCA provides an awareness of how categories are raised in talk as a resource for speakers (Billig 1995) and can be applied to both groups and individuals (Billig 1987). CA and MCA provide DP with methodological insight and an opportunity to consider speaker's action orientations and use of categories.

In contrast, post-structuralism examines the wider context of discourse. Post-structuralism places an emphasis on the discourses present as opposed to the individual as a site of interest to the researcher (Burr 2015; Hollway 2011). Originating in the work of French philosophers from the 1960s onwards, post-structuralism is interested in how positions are constructed within the discourse (Foucault 1972) and how discourses become dominant (Derrida 1976). Post structuralism emphasised the importance of talk as situated (Edwards and

Potter 1992). SSK was one of the factors involved in the crisis in social psychology that resulted in the evolution of critical approaches such as DP (Wiggins 2017) and Rhetorical Psychology. SSK is inspired by the writings of Kuhn (1977) who stated that science is a 'group product' (p.xx) questioning the presentation of science as a continuum of neutral factual discoveries. SSK highlights the role of scientists in the production of science and identified the use of interpretative repertoires in how scientists manage their accountability for their findings (Gilbert and Mulkay 1984; Potter and Mulkay 1985). Interpretative repertoires are the 'building blocks' of conversation that are easily recognisable to others, used to construct topics under discussion (Wetherell and Potter 1988:172). Post- structuralism and SSK allow DP to explore the context where talk is situated and to be able to consider how psychology is socially and historically constructed.

In summary, the multiple influences on DP have resulted in its central tenets of how individuals use language as a form of social action, the construction and use of psychological concepts in talk and how people use their discourse to manage their accountability (Edwards and Potter 1992). As a consequence, DP can be used to explore how inequality is legitimised through people's talk, and how psychological concepts are used to account for individual wealth.

Influence of Rhetorical Psychology

Rhetorical Psychology and Discursive Psychology were developed in close proximity at the Discourse and Rhetoric Group (DARG), Loughborough University (Edwards 2014). The two approaches share commonalities in how

they view language as a form of social action and critique cognitive psychology. Rhetorical Psychology particularly influences the critical strand of DP in how an emphasis is placed on how rhetoric and ideology are treated by the analyst. Billig (1990) was inspired by the work of ancient philosophers, Judaism and post-structuralists to view rhetoric as 'the discipline of good communication' (p.49). As a result, language has a persuasive function and arguments are a social form of thinking as each side of a conversation can present a differing viewpoint (Billig 1987). Both DP and Rhetorical Psychology are influenced by classical philosophy, viewing language as a form of social action and in its approach to how arguments are formed. Rhetoric in ancient philosophy differs from a modern understanding that presents rhetoric as being superficial and devoid of substance (Billig 1987; Condor et al. 2013). Instead, rhetoric is about forming a convincing argument (Plato [5 BC] 2008) and more interestingly for DP, finding the different arguments present within the debate (Aristotle [4BC] 2008). Aristotle draws upon Heraclitus' conceptualisation of 'logos' ([4BC 2008:33) that has been crudely interpreted as an 'account' or 'discourse' (Hülsz 2013:286). Logos is more nuanced as it refers more to relativeness of language as Heraclitus is referred to using the metaphor of a watercourse to refer to the fluidity of talk (Plato [5BC] 1998). Rhetorical Psychology views talk as dialectical (Billig 1987) and as a result, dilemmatic as individuals present their position on a subject whilst orienting to others' views (Billig 1991b) including potential positioning's that are absent (Billig and Marinho 2017; Gibson, Crossland and Hamilton 2018). Rhetorical Psychology is influenced by Gramsci who discussed the dilemmatic nature of ideology (Weltman and Billig

2001). Rhetorical Psychology is part of a critical approach that critiques CA for ignoring the role of ideology (Billig 1999; Parker 2005; Wetherell 1998). CA's focus on participant's orientations means that the social context of talk and in particular, ideology cannot be examined as part of the analysis (Schegloff 1997; 1999). This approach is problematic when analysing the talk of the super-rich due to their considerable privilege in an unequal society. As a result of Billig's influence the critical form of DP includes the context of talk and ideology (Augoustinos 2013; Edley and Wetherell 1997). Talk is situated within a social context that needs to be included within the analysis (Wetherell 1998; Billig 1999). The situatedness of talk can include speakers drawing upon ideology through the use of interpretative repertoires.

In summary, DP benefits from multiple influences including CA, Rhetorical Psychology, SSK and postructuralism. The effect of these influences has resulted in DP's particularism exploring how talk is situated and uses psychological concepts. Given the need to explore how the super-rich are constructed as agentic and how they draw upon lived ideology in their talk, DP at the more critical end of the spectrum will be used for the analysis.

Using Discursive Psychology to Analyse Data

One of DP's main features is how talk about psychological concepts is conceived as being constructive as opposed to reflective of an individual's cognition (Potter 1996a). As a result, the analyst is required to examine what individuals are trying to achieve with their discourse. Given the role of psychologisation in entrenching inequality as discussed in chapter 2, a social constructionist approach provides an opportunity to explore how psychological

concepts are used in talk about the super-rich and to accounts for unequal distribution. Conversation Analysis (CA) influences DP's methodological procedure and this provides the analyst with a range of discursive resources that can be drawn upon to conduct the analysis (Wiggins 2017). Membership Categorisation Analysis (MCA) developed from CA and is focused on categories as opposed to speakers turns (Abell and Stokoe 2001; Stokoe 2012). Care needs to be taken by the analyst as categories are fluid and do not have fixed boundaries meaning that a categorisation is not necessarily clear or definitive (Stokoe 2012). Despite this, MCA can provide DSP with a different facet to exploring super-rich identities and the categorisation of the super-rich in talk. Given there is no clear definition for the super-rich as discussed in chapter 1, MCA provides an opportunity to explore how the super-rich are categorised within the data both by themselves, the production process and less wealthy individuals. When analysing the data, the researcher is required to draw upon the discursive resources available through MCA and CA whilst ensuring a balance is maintained by attending to people's talk.

DP takes care to acknowledge the role of individuals in constructing their talk that is advantageous when researching inequality (Billig 1999; Hepburn and Wiggins 2007). Particularly when exploring the identity of the super-rich whose actions have a disproportionate impact compared to less affluent people in society. DP acknowledges that individuals draw upon the wider context to use discursive resources within their talk (Wetherell 2008). When analysing the data, the analyst needs to be aware of differing forms of lived ideology present in society such as meritocratic as discussed in chapter 1. By being aware of the

situated nature of the data, the analyst is able to identify the presence of ideology when it is drawn upon in talk through the use of interpretative repertoires. A DP analysis exploring the psychological talk of the super-rich needs to attend to the differing lived ideology that is drawn upon, how this is accounted for and challenged. Individual's draw upon lived ideology through the use of interpretative repertoires and question differing ideological positions within their turn in the interaction. The analyst is also required to be aware of how the editing of the programmes draw upon the lived ideologies present in everyday talk as part of their construction. Thus, there is a need to examine how speakers use rhetoric to manage their identity and account for their wealth. DP can be used to explore how rhetoric is used to present extreme wealth as legitimate in the corpus and how super-rich identities are constructed to achieve the presentation of wealth inequality as just.

To conclude, DP requires a nuanced approach for the analysis incorporating the use of categories in peoples talk and how lived ideology is drawn upon through the use of interpretative repertoires. Given the presence of wealth inequality, using DP allows for the analysis of differing ideology speakers may draw upon as identified in chapter 1. Secondly, this research will involve identifying how individuals use talk about psychological concepts to construct their identity particularly when accounting for their wealth. DP presents an opportunity to explore how super-rich individuals persuade others of the legitimacy of their privilege and how they orient to other arguments through the use of ideological dilemmas during their interactions.

Materials/Data

DP places an emphasis on using natural data, a corpus obtained without the researcher's intervention. A concept verified using Potter's (1996b) 'dead social scientist test' (p.135) where the research can be defined as natural if the researcher no longer exists. DP's initial focus on natural data makes a clear distinction from other social psychological approaches (Potter 2012). By ensuring that people's responses were not a demand effect as they reacted to the researcher (Shotter 1993) which were described as 'got up materials' (Potter 2002:1). The natural data used in this research provides a suitable corpus for this study and television programmes have previously been used as materials for analysis (for example Abell and Stokoe 2001). Whilst television broadcasts pass Potter's (1996b) test, they are edited and produced meaning that programmes need to examined as a cultural product in their entirety.

Prior to deciding on the inclusion criteria for data collection, different types of media were considered to form the corpus such as print media and social media platforms. It was found that the term 'super-rich' appeared most within television data. In 2015, the BBC2 had a super-rich season of programming (Mumford and Wardell 2015) establishing the common usage of the term to describe individuals with extreme wealth. It is distinct from other categories such as elites found within the literature (Andreouli and Howarth 2014; Littler 2018) and others such as millionaire or billionaire. By analysing this data, there is an opportunity to explore the visibility of those with extreme wealth in the media and how they talk about psychological concepts to account for their privilege.

The corpus was formed of 41.5 hours of free to air terrestrial television broadcast during 2016 featuring the term, 'super-rich'. The data was found using BoB (Box of Broadcasts) that is provided by Learning on Screen's portal through the British Universities Film and Video Council (2018). A search was conducted for any programme aired on a terrestrial channel during 2016 with the term super-rich within the title, programme description or subtitling transcript. Programmes that did not refer to the super-rich in relation to their wealth in a contemporary context were removed such as historical documentaries about the Roman Empire. Programmes that referred to the super-rich in relation to environmental diversity were also excluded. Fictional programmes about the wealthy were removed from the corpus such as the children's programme, *Bananas in Pyjamas*. Details of the programmes included can be found in Appendix 1 providing further details about date of broadcast, programme duration, repeat transmissions and audience viewing figures. For the analysis, extracts were selected that focused on talk by the super-rich themselves that included talk by a narrator or presenter. This selection ensured that the analysis was compatible with a DP approach as it allowed for the examination of how the super-rich used psychological talk when managing their accountability for their wealth. Editing features were included such as narration to examine how the programmes were constructed as a cultural representation of wealth in the UK. The editing indirectly explores how wealth inequality is supported, exhibited and negotiated in television media in the UK. Synopses' of programmes and/or series featured within the analysis are provided below.

Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives

Channel 5 has broadcast four series and a Christmas special of *Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives* to date on Channel 5 since 2015. The programme is produced by Spun Gold TV. Eamonn Holmes and Ruth Langsford present the programmes; a married couple who are well-known British television presenters. In the programmes, Eamonn and Ruth examine how the super-rich, 'the other half', spend their money. The programmes attract over 1 million viewers on their first airing and are regularly featured in the weekly BARB (Broadcasters Audience Research Board) top 30 for Channel 5 (see Appendix 1).

The Millionaire's Gift Guide

This programme aired on 3rd January 2016 on BBC2 and received over 1.5 million viewers resulting in its presence in the BARB top 30 for the channel. *The Millionaire's Gift Guide* is narrated by Rebecca Front, a British actress particularly known for her role in comedies. The programme focuses on the activities of the suppliers to the super-rich and was produced by the BBC's Religion and Ethics department.

Lagos to London: Britain's New Super-Rich

Broadcast on Channel 4 on 7th June 2016, *Lagos to London: Britain's New Super-Rich* follows super-rich Nigerians living in both Lagos and London. The programme received nearly 800,000 viewers and features in the BARB weekly top 30 for the channel. *Lagos to London: Britain's New Super-Rich* is narrated by Michael Obiora, a British actor of Nigerian heritage and was produced by Minnow Films.

Rich Kids of Instagram

This series broadcast in 2016 after a one-hour documentary on Channel 4 with the same name in 2015. *Rich Kids of Instagram* broadcast on E4, a channel aimed at young people, and produced by PopKorn TV. Suzanne Abbott-Lee narrates the programmes. No information is publicly available about the series viewing figures. The programme followed the mobile lifestyles of super-rich heirs who display themselves on Instagram.

The World's Most Expensive Food

Four episodes of *The World's Most Expensive Food* are in the corpus, broadcast on Channel 4 in 2015 and repeated in 2016. The programmes received up to 2 million viewers on their first airing. *The World's Most Expensive Food* was made by Indus Films and narrated by Tracy Ann Oberman, a British actress who is well known from being in a soap opera. The episodes feature food suppliers and caterers to the super-rich.

Britain's Billionaire Immigrants

Produced by Avanti Media for Channel 4, this programme was first broadcast on 4th May 2016. The programme was watched by over one million people and featured in the BARB weekly top 30 for the channel. *Britain's Billionaire Immigrants* focuses on the experiences of wealthy Chinese people in London. Dominic Frisby narrates the programme.

Million Pound Motors

This programme was first shown in 2015 and repeated on 2nd January 2016 on Channel 4. On being repeated in 2016, *Million Pound Motors* was in the BARB weekly top 30 for Channel 4 and had an audience of 1.1 million. The

programme shows the activities of a vintage car dealer and his garage as he sells classic cars. *Million Pound Motors* is narrated and directed by Emma Hughes for Sundog Pictures.

The Millionaire's Holiday Club

The Millionaire's Holiday Club shows the goings-on at a company selling of luxury holidays alongside wealthy people on their vacations. This two-part series was shown on BBC2 and featured in the channel's BARB weekly top 30 with an audience of 1.68 million for the first episode and 2 million for the second episode. The programme is narrated by Eve Best, an actor and produced by Plum Pictures.

Britain's Biggest Super Yachts: Chasing Perfection

The programme follows the selling of super-yachts to the super-rich by one company on BBC2 on 16th April 2016. Tuesday's Child Television produced the programme that received 1.4 million viewers and according to BARB was in BBC2's top 30 programmes by viewing figures that week. Toby Jones, an actor, narrates the programme.

Sold! Inside the World's Biggest Auction House

Broadcast on BBC2, this two-part series shows business taking place at Christie's auction houses across the world. The programme is narrated by Sally Phillips, an actress and comedian. No information is publicly available about the series viewing figures. Matchlight produced the programme.

Using Discursive Psychology to analyse visual data in television media

When researching the super-rich and wealth inequality, media data is significant due to its role in reproducing inequality in society (Tileagă 2005; Tileagă and

Stokoe 2016). By using data from the wealth porn genre, there is an opportunity to explore how arguments for a minority having extreme wealth are presented to the public. Given the limited accessibility of the extremely wealthy, television broadcasts are a major channel for the dissemination of arguments for the privilege of the super-rich and the resultant wealth inequality caused by a skewed distribution of money in society.

Reavey (2011) states that the lack of visual analysis using discursive approaches is the result of a misinterpretation of post-structuralism that has resulted in an emphasis on textual data. Similarly, Attenborough (2016) claims that there is a lack of media research using a discursive approach and instead, Critical Discourse Analysis is more commonly used. This involves the issues discussed in chapter 1 as cultural studies research over-emphasises structural concerns and places less emphasis on agency. There are concerns regarding how multi-modal forms of analysis incorporating Critical Discourse Analysis approach psychological concepts. For example, Norris' (2016) multimodal (inter)action analysis claims to incorporate both cognitive and social psychology taking individuals talk and facial expressions as reflective of their cognition. Multimodal (inter)action analysis is incompatible with a DP social constructivist approach to analysis. Evans and Stasi (2014) identifies methodological issues with cultural studies around visual analysis and the current under analysis of visual sources that are not produced by individuals. The methodological debate in cultural studies is part of a wider discussion with cultural and media studies about the lack of discussion about methodology and how this has evolved from this field's critique of other disciplines (Evans 2015). There are issues in

looking further to cultural and media studies for insight in developing DP's approach to visual analysis.

When using television data, concerns are raised regarding its basis in reality (Harris 2006) and the role of editing (Childs 2011; McMullen 2005). However, this argument neglects the role of television broadcasts as a cultural representation and the bias present in all forms of interaction as individuals manage their presentations (Speer 2002). With a discursive approach, editing and narration becomes a feature of the interaction to be analysed as opposed to a problem. MacMillan and Edwards (1999) examined how newspaper reporting is edited exploring how third-party statements are used to account for their journalistic activities and their approach can be extended to television data. Rather than taking reporting at face value, media materials can be analysed to examine what is being achieved through the editing process (Attenborough 2016). Additionally, when exploring visual data there is a need to explore how this mode provides additional context in which the text is situated (Reavey 2011). Due to the separateness of the super-rich in everyday life for most people (Urry 2007; 2014), television programmes provide a representation groups in society that are not otherwise available (Abell and Stokoe 2001). Television broadcasts have a role in forming public opinion and despite the rise of online media sources, more people watch television news programmes (69%) than via the internet (48%) (Ofcom 2017a). 91% of viewers watch television at least once a week and two thirds of viewing is based on the main five terrestrial channels and their subsidiaries that are available without subscription (Ofcom 2017b). Media representations influence public opinion

(Attenborough 2016) and form part of everyday discourse (LaMarre and Sutherland 2014). The use of television data provides an exploration into a cultural representation of the super-rich that is accessible to a wide audience and the corpus is aligned with the theoretical approach of DP.

The visual nature of television data requires an analysis that can incorporate a flow of visual sequences. There are issues in relation to how the analysis of sequences is managed and the need for the development of a clear analytic procedure. Due to the influence of CA, the data that can be analysed by DP researchers can expand with technological advances (Schegloff 1979). Existing research using television data with a discursive approach is largely based on political discussion programmes (for example Gibson and Booth 2017; Goodman and Carr 2017). These research examples largely do not consider the visual aspects of the analysis and the speaker's movements are often limited with the programmes. Political discussion programmes differ to other formats such as documentaries that can include voiceovers, titles to differentiate different segments of the programme and the individuals featured doing different activities and moving between locations. Research using documentaries such as Abell and Stokoe (2001), acknowledges the edited nature of the programmes but still focuses on the interview segments of the programme that are mainly static in terms of speaker's movements. Cultural studies research provides an interesting perspective on the use of editing and narration that can add to the analysis of television data using DP. Smith (2010) draws upon Goffman's (1974) use of 'frames' whereby the presenter is constructed in differing positions as they move between orienting to the

speakers and the audience. The use of frames offers an opportunity to explore how programmes are structured and what is achieved through the differing frames used. In particular, Goffman's approach can be used to look at the programme segments as products in their own right and not questioned as highly edited extracts. By exploring the use of narration and presenter's voice overs, a new aspect to a DP analysis is provided that asks how the editing of the programmes constructs the identity of the super-rich.

One issue is capturing the visual nature of the programmes within the transcription. Unlike the verbal aspect of the transcript, the visual elements cannot be transcribed verbatim and require interpretation by the analyst (Reavey and Johnson 2008). The use of interpretation presents issues in relation to which aspects of the visual image are mentioned in the transcription and how are they described. A crowded transcript would result in too much detail and affect the researcher's ability to acknowledge the situated nature of talk and the underlying lived ideology present. For example, Forrester (2011) develops an example of a visual transcript using CA when filming his own child. In this version of transcription, every second line provides a few words of the child's movements. However, it is debatable whether Forrester's version is a suitable style of transcription for DP using television documentaries where the editing style of the programmes means that there is a fast flow of titles, narration, speaker's actions, differing shots and movement between different segments of the programme. A highly detailed transcript is unsuitable for critical strands of DP (Wiggins 2017). As a result of these deliberations around the need for a suitable visual transcript for a DP analysis, information about the

titles, narration and detail about what is occurring when necessary to make sense of the text will be provided. This compromise will provide a multi-modal transcript that allows the analyst to maintain a balance between speakers talk and the additional layer of the production process.

Ethics

Ethical approval was obtained from the Coventry University ethics committee (see Appendix 3) that complies with British Psychological Society guidelines (2009). The programmes used were publicly broadcast and are free to watch for people in the UK with a television licence. As the British Psychological Society (2009) does not require consent for publicly available data, individual speakers have not been approached for their consent. The programmes featured received audiences of up to approximately 2 million viewers for their initial viewing and have been subject to repeat broadcasts (Appendix 1; BARB 2018). The programmes featured were also subject to reviews in online and print media. On this basis, it is reasonable to expect that the speakers do not expect their comments to be private.

Analytic Procedure

Initially, the programmes in the corpus were watched and transcribed to ensure that they were suitable for the corpus. A basic form of Jeffersonian transcription was used that is suitable for use with DP as a critical approach. The amount of detail within the transcript is reduced to avoid affecting the researcher's ability to consider the overall environment in which the speaker's discourse is being produced (Wiggins 2017). As previously discussed, there is not an established procedure for the handling of visual data in DP. A full visual transcription results

in the researcher being selective when including descriptions in the transcript resulting in a questionable analysis and the flow of the transcript being overwhelmed with detail. This issue was resolved with the provision of visual information about participants actions where needed for the verbal transcript to be readable. In addition to this, information about the editing process such as titles and narration were provided. A guide to the transcription is in Appendix 2.

The initial reading of the transcripts involved notes for each programme describing interesting discursive features and social actions. In line with the research aims, the initial notes focused on how super-rich individuals used talk about psychological constructs and individuals managed their accountability for their privilege. Talk was identified containing interpretative repertoires to explore how individuals drew upon lived ideology. Following from the initial analysis and aims identified from the literature review, the analysis was focused on identifying extracts in four different areas that addressed the research questions and overall aim of exploring how super-rich people use psychological concepts to account for their wealth on television media. From this initial analysis, a focus was placed on the talk of super-rich individuals. The extracts chosen were exemplars of recurrent themes that were present across the dataset. The analytic procedure for each findings chapter is discussed below.

- Chapter 4: Talk constructing the super-rich psychologically

The aim of this analytic chapter is to examine how super-rich individuals use talk about psychological concepts to legitimise their wealth. The first step of analysing the data for the chapter involved identifying any examples of talk about psychological concepts within the data and what was achieved through

the use of this discourse. By examining how individuals account for their wealth, speakers were required to construct their identity. The examples of talk found were scrutinised to find how speakers constructed their identity and presented their agency when legitimising their wealth. Followed by a further analysis that specified how super-rich individuals used talk about traits. Interpretative repertoires were examined as part of this process and how they drew upon ideology. The analysis addressed how talk about traits drew upon ideology present to legitimise the wealth of the super-rich.

- Chapter 5: How heirs construct their identity to account for their privilege

In the previous chapter, some speakers present their wealth acquisition as self-made. As discussed in chapter 1, the majority of wealth is inherited resulting in the need for a focus on how the heirs featured in the programmes account for their privilege. The analysis of this section began by identifying examples of talk by heirs and exploring how the speakers constructed their identities. In particular, this analysis focused on how super-rich heirs managed their stake when talking about their privilege. This involved examining how speakers used psychological language and interpretative repertoires to manage their accountability for their inherited wealth. Given the findings from chapter 4, there was an interest in whether heirs used similar rhetorical strategies such as talk about traits to present their wealth as earned. The analysis examined the use of narration and voice-overs and how they were used to support or challenge speakers accounts. A deviant case was analysed to explore variation in speaker's accounts of their privilege and to strengthen the analysis.

- Chapter 6: Discourse used by the super-rich to manage their accountability for their spending

Initially, examples of discourse about ostentatious spending by the super-rich were located. Examples included one extract that presented a deviant case by an extremely wealthy individual being interviewed about not spending. Given the use of the trickle-down myth as a justification for the super-rich, some time was given to finding examples in people's talk. Then the extracts were analysed for how the speakers presented their identity when accounting for their spending. Followed by looking more specifically at how traits and interpretative repertoires from the previous chapters were used. Consideration was given to how speakers oriented to social norms about spending and how this orientation challenged in relation to the deviant case identified by the presenter. This involved examining the construction of the presenter's identity as a representative of the audience.

- Chapter 7: How the super-rich talk about global hubs.

There was a subgenre of programmes within the corpus that focused on super-rich mobility. Given the discussion in chapter 1 on the impact of the concentration of the international super-rich in global hubs such as London on less affluent groups, there was a need to explore how the super-rich presented their residence in differing locations. Examples of talk were selected that included the international super-rich talking about their spending in differing locations. The extracts were then analysed for how the speakers constructed themselves as migrants to account for their presence in London. There was an

examination of how individuals used rhetorical strategies of poorer migrant groups identified in the literature. The analysis included examining concepts such as place-identity. Next, the examples were identified to how speakers identified places, their country of origin and London. The role of editing within the examples was also explored to examine how the narration was used to support or undermine claims made by speakers.

Chapter 4: Psychological Construction of the Super-Rich

This chapter provides a critique of the definition, measurement and use of traits to explain wealth inequality in society. Given the socially constructed nature of traits, this chapter examines how super-rich individuals use psychological talk about their individual traits to legitimise their wealth. It was found that super-rich individuals present themselves as having increased resilience and drive to account for their extreme wealth acquisition. Speakers talk draws upon individualistic ideology to present themselves as deserving of their privilege. Additionally, just world arguments are used to present others as accountable for their status as they lack the work ethic of the super-rich.

Economic inequality in society and the status of wealthy individuals have been explained through psychological research into individual differences (Hunt 2004). Explanations for differences in individual status draw upon the concept of traits (Iatridis and Fousiani 2009). For example, it has been claimed that the top 1% of wealthy individuals have higher intelligence levels than the financially less well-off (Wai 2014).

Critique of Individual Differences Approach to Wealth

There are limitations to the concept of traits, which cast doubts on their ability to explain inequality. The historical evolution of intelligence testing is problematic (Parker 2007a), initially tests were amended based on teacher's judgements as to whether test scores correlated with participant's intelligence (Block and Dworkin 1977). One of the first recognised IQ tests, the Stanford- Binet test (Binet and Simon 1916) involved the revision of scales after girls scored 2-4% higher than boys as these results contradicted the assumption that IQ was not

affected by gender (Terman et al. 1917). However, tests were not adjusted so that individuals scored the same based on their ethnicity or socio-economic status (Block and Dworkin 1977). Despite this use of adjustments to meet social norms, controversial research such as Eysenck's (1975) has made claims regarding the relationship between socio economic status and intelligence. These claims persist as researchers claim that Eysenck's findings have been proven through the use of modern techniques (Gottfredson 2016). Despite more recent findings demonstrating that children from lower SES households had lower general intelligence scores, the cause of this relationship cannot be proven and are surmised to be an interaction between genetics and inheritance (von Stumm and Plomin 2015). However, trait approaches are presented as being factual (Edwards and Potter 1992) even though the relationship between traits and their outcomes is unclear. The presentation of traits as objective ignores their social construction and flaws in their development.

The wealthy and poor are perceived to have differing traits (Leahy 1981). For example, Wai (2014) notes that wealthy individuals have superior abilities: 'many of the individuals in this study may have been granted head starts in wealth but also in personal traits such as intelligence, energy, drive' (p.66). In contrast, Chomsky (1977) provides an alternative commentary of the superior traits of the wealthy:

> Wealth and power tend to accrue to those who are ruthless, cunning, avaricious, self-seeking, lacking in sympathy and compassion, subservient to authority and willing to abandon principle for material gain, and so on (p.290).

Given the social historical construction of individual differences, the superiority of the more affluent reflects everyday assumptions in society (Iatridis and Fousiani 2009). Research that alleges the superior traits of the super-rich does not acknowledge the detrimental impact of poverty on individual outcomes such as educational attainment or the access wealthier individuals have to educational opportunities. Attempts to correlate traits with wealth are affected by the separation of the trait from its external environment (Zhao, Ferguson and Smillie 2017), similarly to the difficulties in separating low socio-economic status from intelligence as mentioned previously. Individual difference models of wealth are limited due to the lack of recognition of their social historical construction and attempts at measurement that do not acknowledge their wider social context. Trait approaches are influenced by dominant ideology that reflects existing economic inequality and acts as a resource to maintain the status quo.

The bias inherent in the definition and measurement of traits means that their use is flawed. Differences in individuals are used to stigmatise poorer groups and to present the practices of wealthier groups as more socially acceptable. As a result, stagnating social mobility can be justified as the result of innate differences in poor people and not the result of a flawed meritocracy. The interest in individual differences from the late nineteenth until the mid-twentieth century in the US (Benjamin 2014) was used to justify inequality by providing a biological cause (Billig 1982). Individual difference models are part of the psychologisation of society defined as the ‘dissemination of the language of psychology into everyday life’ (De Vos 2008:2). The pervasiveness of trait

approaches in everyday language requires a discursive approach to explore how they are constructed and used. Using DP allows for the examination of how the presentation of individual differences is used as a form of social action to legitimise inequality as opposed to a reflection of individuals internal traits within research.

Discursive Psychology and the psychological construction of the super-rich

As discussed in chapter 1, ideology is of importance when constructing wealthy individuals. Discursive Psychology (DP) acknowledges the role of ideology in talk and its role in maintaining inequality that allows individuals to preserve their wealth and status (Billig 1992). For example, arguments for high tax rates are contentious as people present them as an attack on their individual wealth (Carr, Goodman and Jowett 2018). These arguments involve drawing upon individualistic ideology by the speaker to present their wealth as earned solely by them and not the result of a collective effort and/or economic conditions. Lerner (1980) developed the concept of a belief in a just world to explain how people's outcomes are presented as 'what they deserve' (Lerner 1980:11). Individuals utilise Just World arguments to legitimise limited redistribution in the form of welfare benefits (Goodman and Carr 2017). These arguments use Just World ideology to justify inequality in society on the basis of economic productivity presenting unemployment benefits as unfair to workers. Individuals are held to account as opposed to market conditions as rhetoric about individual responsibility legitimises the monitoring of unemployed people's search for employment. Individualised discourse is also present in talk about tax where inequality is warranted as normal and the product of individual effort (Carr,

Goodman and Jowett 2018). Thus, individualistic ideology underlines talk about wealth inequality in society and positions individuals as responsible for their status.

DP can examine how inequality can be legitimised through talk about individual's psychological construction Talk about individual differences becomes a discursive resource to draw upon in rhetoric legitimising inequality. Thus, DP can be used to explore how wealth inequality can be legitimised by the super-rich through talk about their personality. This provides the opportunity to use DP to address the following question, how do the super-rich use psychological talk about their individual traits to legitimise their wealth?

Findings

In the programmes analysed, super-rich individuals present themselves as psychologically superior as a result of their enhanced resilience and drive. The extraordinariness of the super-rich in talk about themselves positions them as deserving of their status. Yet, speakers also present super-rich status as accessible to all if they are effortful enough. This involves the use of individualistic ideology such as a just world to legitimise inequality as others are deserving of their diminished status.

The following extract involves Eamonn Holmes (E) and Ruth Langsford (R) as presenters talking to Rodger Dudding (RD) a super-rich inventor, about his work practices as he shows them his car collection. This was featured on *Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives* (series one, episode three), a Channel 5 series where Eamonn and Ruth examine the lifestyles of the super-rich. By referring to the top 1% of people with wealth as the 'other half', the

programme's title downgrades the skew of wealth distribution in the UK. Ruth is sat in the backseat of one of Rodger's classic cars and Eamonn is stood by the car on Ruth's side. This following extract considers how the super-rich present themselves as being psychologically superior to others.

Extract one:

1. E: You've got your foot to the floor in business terms. Do you ever
2. think about easing on the gas a little bit?
3. RD: No, uh if God willing keeps my health, I shall carry on and I still
4. do a seven-day week. I normally start about nine in the
5. morning and finish at nine, ten at night.
6. R: What would you do if that money was gone suddenly?
7. RD: Oh start all over again. What else is there to do in life?
8. E: (h)
9. RD: Any fool can go and play golf all day. Any fool can sit on the
10. beach. I'd rather create a business.

Eamonn constructs Rodger as being extremely effortful ('You've got your foot to the floor' (1)). Rodger builds on Eamonn's presentation of his level of activity as having a superior level of drive ('I still do a seven-day week' (3-4)) that is conditional on his health. The use of 'still' presents this as sustained behaviour that allows Rodger to address Eamonn's question which suggests his work practices are unnecessary ('Do you ever think about easing on the gas a little bit?' (1-2)). Rodger notes his own super-rich status as being the result of his own motivation and superior drive in his response to being asked by Ruth

('What would you do if that money was gone suddenly?' (6)). Ruth highlights the importance of being motivated to be economically productive in his response ('What else is there to do in life?' (7)). He presents himself as psychologically superior in comparison to other groups and their leisure activities ('Any fool can go and play golf all day' (9)). The term 'fool' allows Rodger to present himself as outstanding as a result of his ability to be successful in business which requires not only his increased drive but also his superior intelligence as he is not a 'fool'. The editing of this interview involves the presenter's reactions and in particular, that of Eamonn's laughter (8), to this comment. An everyday assumption about laughter is that it is a positive response. However, laughter can be used to undermine individuals (Billig 2005) and in this situation offers the contrast of Rodger's superior drive to others who spend their time engaging in leisure activities. The featuring of Rodger results in the super-rich being constructed as having superior drive that is not presented as part of the psychological construction of other groups.

Rodger presents himself as having more drive than others which results in him being more economically productive. Through Rodger constructing himself as more driven and not interested in leisure activities, Rodger uses this talk to accentuate himself as having a superior work ethic. The super-rich individuals featured use talk about their drive to legitimise their wealth. In *The Millionaire's Gift Guide* a one-hour documentary broadcast on BBC2, Tom Bolt (TB), a watch dealer is selling his Rolls Royce Phantom to Trevor Eve (TE), an actor. Tom's talk about his drive to acquire wealth allows for the exploration of how he justifies his status. The extract involves two separate clips spliced

together, one featuring Tom selling the car to Trevor and the other filmed later with Tom talking directly to the camera.

Extract two:

1. TE: ((present)) We can do a good deal.
2. TB: ((later)) This deal's been done. I should be going, "Oh, my God,
3. that's just amazing."
4. ((present)) ((TB throws keys to TE)) Don't drop them. Go on,
5. then, take me home. *But I won't as soon as this deal's done*,
6. ((later)) I'll be thinking about right what's the next deal. What's
7. on? Not because of (.) greed, but because (.) perhaps a chronic
8. lack of self-worth and I need the deal to make me feel better
9. about me, I guess. I don't know.

Similar to the previous extract, Tom presents himself as more driven. A contrast is provided in this extract between Tom's business activities and the psychological construction of himself that involves humour when negotiating the car deal (4). He uses a footing (Goffman 1981) to present a rhetorical commonplace (Billig 1987), a more typical level of motivation as experienced by others ('I should be going, "Oh, my God, that's just amazing"' (2-3)). The use of separate footage with Tom talking directly to the camera in a confessional style to the audience is used to emphasise Tom's negative presentation of himself as having superior levels of motivation. This is followed by Tom and Trevor constructing a humorous exchange as Trevor pretends to drop the car keys (4) that contrasts with the negative construction of Tom's personality. Unlike extract one, where laughter is used to challenge Rodger's talk about his

superior work ethic, here humour is used to present Tom more positively as a likeable person who can engage in banter with others. The use of humour further emphasises the contrast used by Tom to present himself as being more motivated (‘*But I won’t as soon as this deal's done*, ((later)) I'll be thinking about right what’s the next deal (5-6))’. This helps to manage Tom’s accountability for his enhanced wealth in an unequal society (‘Not because of (.) greed, but because (.) perhaps a chronic lack of self-worth’ (7-8)). This involves the use of double declaiming (Billig 1992) as Tom warrants the drive that allows him to maintain his wealth as having an undesirable foundation through the negative construction of his ‘self-worth’ (8). Tom uses 'stake inoculation' (Potter 1996a:125) to orient to potential criticism about greed as an explanation for his increased drive particularly when supported by his alternative presentation as a likable person through the editing of this extract. This allows Tom to dismiss everyday assumptions about the super-rich being greedy. Earlier in the extract his deal making activities are presented as being positive through the construction of his perception of others’ views of his work and Trevor and Tom’s humour. Tom’s talk about his drive provides a negative psychological construction that legitimises his wealth.

In addition to being presented as having increased drive, super-rich individuals work to present themselves as having superior levels of resilience to others. Featured on *Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives* (series one, episode three), Kate Stewart (K), a businesswoman talks to Eamonn Holmes (E) and Ruth Langsford (R) about her background and image in a £1000 suite in the W hotel, London after a segment with Ruth where Kate tries on new outfits. This

extract considers how the super-rich use their discourse to account for their wealth through the presentation of their increased resilience.

Extract three:

E: Come and sit down. *Clearly, Kate's image is very important to her. I want to know why* just give us an insight into who you were

K: Mmm

E: And who you are now and what you do.

K: I left school with no qualifications

R: ((Nods))

K: I had like a normal dead-end job. Like £2.50 an hour. That's what I was on. I got pregnant at 17 and the destiny written for me was you know. 'You're going to claim benefits. You're going to have more kids and that's the end of you.' Everyone had wrote me off, and I thought 'No, no-one will write me off.' And you come back fighting. That's what gives you the drive to achieve.

R: ((Nods))

K: It's hard to get people to give you a chance. So I started off as a secretary and then I went and done me education as well at the same time. I was a single mum, I was working full-time, and I was doing you know a degree as well

R: ((Nods))

21. K: and I ended up running the company and then I invested me
22. money correctly and then you built up your own empire.
23. *((zoomed out of focus)) Kate eventually made her millions by*
24. *building up a series of markets, tanning shops, and beauty*
25. *salons*.

Kate uses her talk to present her resilience and drive as internal forces that allowed her to become socially mobile. Her response involves recounting her past circumstances when she was not wealthy (‘I left school with no qualifications’ (6)). Kate presents her previous lifestyle as being both conventional and negative, ‘normal dead-end job’ (8). Reported speech is used to position her previous social status (Leudar and Antaki 1996) as a single parent on a low income ('You're going to claim benefits. You're going to have more kids and that's the end of you' (10-11)). Kate’s talk involves the use of psychological language as she discusses her cognition (‘I thought “No, no-one will write me off”. And you come back fighting. That's what gives you the drive to achieve’ (12-14)). This constructs Kate’s cognitive processes resulting in her having more resilience, ‘come back fighting’ (13) and this is emphasised through the prior talk about her socio-economic position. Like the previous extracts, Kate presents herself as being more driven, ‘drive to achieve’ (13-14). Kate orients to these extraordinary characteristics to justify the accumulation of her wealth and her current status as a super-rich individual.

In Kate’s construction of her pursuit of wealth, she presents herself as having increased resilience which she evidences through her increased levels of activity over a long-term period. She presents herself as being hardworking

(‘So I started off as a secretary and then I went and done me education as well at the same time’ (16-18)). Whilst this involves the use of an ‘effortfulness’ interpretative repertoire (Gibson 2009), Kate has an increased level of effortfulness that results in her becoming super-rich which is built up through the extract (‘I was a single mum, I was working full-time, and I was doing you know a degree as well’ (18-19)). Whilst the category of 'single mother' can be used to present women as having poor moral standards (Stokoe 2003), here it is used to construct a 'super mom' who has both a paid working and unpaid mothering role (Jackson and Gee 2006). The use of a gender role in talk allows Kate to present her moral position (Stokoe and Edwards 2012). This constructs Kate as being more than effortful as she carried out three roles when in everyday talk one of these roles would be considered a sufficient use of time for a person. This demonstrates her resilience and drive to the audience justifying her wealth through her superior traits. The change in pronouns from ‘I’ to ‘you’ allows Kate’s activities to appear as natural and every day, the result of her psychological construction and possible for others to achieve (‘then I invested me money correctly and then you built up your own empire’ (21-22)). This also allows Kate through the use of 'you' (22) to warrant her wealth generation as something that anybody could achieve. Eamonn reinforces Kate’s presentation by using a three-part list that is more specific than Kate’s description of an ‘empire’ (22) (‘Kate eventually made her millions by building up a series of markets, tanning shops, and beauty salons’ (23-25)). By being more specific, Eamonn upgrades Kate’s attempts to manage the modest construction of herself as having superior psychological abilities naturally. Eamonn’s statement

is not delivered to Kate directly. His talk is delivered via a voiceover and the camera is zoomed out and out of focus emphasising his statement to the audience about Kate's success as a result of her increased resilience. Kate's accumulation of wealth to her super-rich status is presented as the outcome of a natural progression given the use of a 'rags to riches' interpretative repertoire.

Kate uses talk of her achievements as the result of her increased resilience and drive to justify her super-rich status that allows her to be constructed as deserving of her wealth. In the next extract, the speakers talk about resilience being needed to maintain wealth. Unlike the previous extracts where Kate required resilience to acquire her wealth, here resilience is needed for the maintenance of wealth. The following extract is also taken from *Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives* (series two, episode two), a Channel 5 series featuring in this episode Eamonn Holmes (E) and Ruth Langsford (R) as presenters talking to David Sullivan (D) who is introduced as a 'billionaire who lives like a King'. This segment takes place in David's office with Ruth and Eamonn sat talking to him around his desk. This provides the opportunity to examine the talk of the super-rich to examine how the super-rich talk about their resilience in relation to maintaining their wealth.

Extract four:

1. D: This is my little office, have a sit down.
2. R: Your little office!
3. D: No, it is little. It isn't very big.
4. R: It's as big as my downstairs!

5. E: *((footage of Oxford Street)) It's from here David oversees*
6. *countless employees, his vast property portfolio and an eye-*
7. *watering amount of investments.*
8. D: This is where I try and make some money every day.
9. E: Yeah. Do you make money every day? Do you set out to make
10. money?
11. D: Not every day. I've had some terrible days. When things
12. crashed in 2007, you know, that was scary times. It was like the
13. end of the world. There was days I was losing £10 million a
14. day.
15. R: Wow.
16. D: And your family say, "Oh, you're a bit down today, Dad." I said,
17. well, you know
18. R: Just lost ten million quid.
19. D: You drop 100 million quid in a month, it's going to depress you,
20. so it's good days and bad days.

Prior to discussing David's resilience, the extract highlights David's position as super-rich and presenting him as being driven. His position is established using a three-part list by Eamonn ('*It's from here David oversees countless employees, his vast property portfolio and an eye-watering amount of investments*' (5-7)). The use of a three-part list by Eamonn highlights David's 'effortfulness' (Gibson 2009) and by being provided through a voiceover presents a clear contrast to David's downgrading of his efforts with the use of 'I try' (8). David constructs himself as being active in the generation of further

wealth. Yet, this presentation is managed by David as he ignores Eamonn's second question (Yeah. Do you make money every day? Do you set out to make money? (9-10)). Whilst the speakers present super-rich drive as acceptable, the active pursuit of wealth is more problematic and is dealt with by David not responding to the second question resulting in a rhetorical absence. This is not a shared rhetorical absence due to Eamonn's question, however this allows David to manage his accountability for his wealth through this absence as he does not have to reveal his stake (Potter 1996a). Billig and Marinho (2017) state that rhetorical absences can be as revealing as what is mentioned through talk. Here, David ignoring the question reveals that there is a norm against being openly motivated to acquire wealth.

This extract demonstrates that David requires resilience to maintain his wealth, which differs from extract three where this trait was used for its acquisition. By referring to the Global Financial Crisis, David draws upon a shared experience that requires resilience ('Not every day. I've had some terrible days. When things crashed in 2007, you know, that was scary times' (11-12)). This is differentiated from others' experiences by a specific reference to the amount of his losses ('There was days I was losing £10 million a day' (13-14)). By specifically referring to a large amount of money being lost daily, David highlights the risks of being super-rich and the superior resilience required to manage this type of loss as an entrepreneur. However, by drawing upon his role as a father, David is able to orient to his resilience in addition to a shared experience that is relatable to the audience ('And your family say, "Oh, you're a bit down today, Dad." I said, well, you know' (16-17)). The use of this places

David as requiring resilience to manage not just his wealth but his role as a parent which is an everyday presentation. The use of talk about parenting allows David to be presented as an ordinary person with everyday issues. David continues to present himself as resilient using psychological language by referring to depression (‘You drop 100 million quid in a month, it's going to depress you, so it's good days and bad days’ (19-20)). David presents himself as being resilient to the challenges of being super-rich. By orienting to resilience, David can negotiate the controversial aspects of being super-rich in addition to the use of rhetorical absences.

Discussion

The findings demonstrate that super-rich individuals present themselves as being psychologically different due to their increased resilience and drive. Speakers claims of psychological superiority allow them to legitimise the acquisition and maintenance of their wealth. Examples of drive are present throughout the extracts and are used to argue that speakers are more effortful (Gibson 2009) than others. Yet, speakers must orient to a norm against being motivated to acquire wealth. Instead, wealth inequality can be viewed as a rhetorical absence (Billig 1997a) within the corpus as people warrant their super-rich status as the natural consequence of their psychological superiority. Given the speakers extreme levels of wealth, it could be assumed that there would be some talk about economic distribution and the resulting inequality in society. However, there is no talk by the super-rich within the corpus about inequality highlighting a potential rhetorical absence given its relevance regarding the impact of skewed wealth distribution. The use of rhetorical

absences by the super-rich can be viewed as a strategy to account for their continued acquisition of wealth that is contentious given the detrimental impact of inequality. This differs from other strategies where speakers use psychological talk about self-esteem to account for their continued wealth generating activity that involves revealing their stake. Creating a one-sided rhetorical absence by ignoring the presenters question, highlights what is not being mentioned (Billig and Marinho 2017). In extract three, the earning of wealth is constructed as achievable by anyone. Talk about parenthood allows super-rich individuals to present themselves as ordinary. These opposing arguments warrant talk about super-rich individuals as extraordinary and thus, deserving of their wealth and accessible to anyone to legitimise inequality in society as others are not effortful enough. This draws upon just world arguments in talk (Goodman and Carr 2017) as the super-rich are presented as deserving their privileged status due to their increased skills and work ethic.

Using resilience to legitimise wealth

The construction of the super-rich as being psychologically different allows them to be presented as deserving of their extreme wealth. As a result, talk about super-rich identity legitimises wealth inequality despite its negative consequences. In the data, superior resilience is used in talk to legitimise their position and to claim that super-rich levels of wealth as attainable for others. Resilience is currently a popular and pervasive concept in everyday talk and within policy (Olick 2016; Tierney 2015) as reflected in its inclusion in the educational curriculum (Clarke 2015). Whilst the employed use an 'effortfulness' interpretive repertoire (Gibson 2009), the super-rich are presented

as being more than effortful in relation to their levels of economic activity. This justifies the wealth and status of super-rich individuals despite its negative impact on society. Individuals who are not as economically active due to their lower levels of resilience are considered to have failed (Windle 2010) and must accept a diminished economic outcome (Clarke 2015). Talk about resilience allows economic inequality in society to become an everyday assumption (Clarke 2015). Therefore, the presentation of the super-rich by themselves and by others as resilient legitimises wealth inequality.

Drive: Wealth acquisition as innate

Talk about drive by super-rich individuals legitimises their wealth by drawing upon individual differences that are both innate and extraordinary. Individual differences are socially constructed and are used by speakers to justify their position in presenting their wealth as deserved. As a result, talk about drive uses individualistic ideology formed of everyday assumptions that is difficult for individuals to challenge (Billig 1997b). Yet, speakers orient to others' negative orientations for their drive such as greed. By presenting their drive as innate, super-rich people can challenge arguments that criticise the accumulation of extreme wealth. This provides the super-rich with the opportunity to present their drive to be economically active as natural.

The super-rich present themselves as having an innate drive to acquire wealth as the motive behind the achievement of their status and to legitimise their economic activity in an unequal society. Motives are discursive devices that are used in everyday talk (Roth and Hsu 2008). People use talk about motives to manage their discourse with others (Fogarty and Augoustinos 2008).

In extract two, drive is presented as the result of low self-worth that allows the speaker to orient to negative claims about greed. Edwards (1998) states that individuals can orient to their identity to negotiate their accountability within talk. Kate in extract three positions herself as a disadvantaged single parent who is driven to improve her circumstances. The use of a 'rags to riches' interpretative repertoire is drawn upon to present this as a natural response to adversity that others could emulate. This allows super-rich speakers to present their drive as positive and the negative effects of inequality as the responsibility of the poor for being inactive due to their lack of drive. However, speakers do not explicitly mention economic inequality in their talk. Thus, by not orienting to inequality super-rich individuals are able to justify their drive and to legitimise their wealth in the context of wealth inequality and its negative impact upon others.

Conclusion

The super-rich construct themselves as being psychologically superior to others to legitimise their wealth. Talk about resilience and drive as individual differences as part of the psychologisation of everyday talk. The super-rich are able to present themselves as being innately different to others. The wealth of the super-rich is legitimised as being natural as a result of their differing psychological construction. The presence of economic inequality in society is common sense as less affluent others are constructed as having different traits to the super-rich.

Chapter 5: Examining the talk of privileged individuals and the role of inheritance in wealth

The role of inheritance in maintaining wealth inequality challenges the presentation of the super-rich in chapter 4 that constructs wealth as accessible to all in a meritocracy. This chapter will examine how privileged individuals present their wealth as earned and how heirs account for the status. It was found that heirs construct a worker identity and downplay the benefits of their privilege. This involves the use of meritocratic arguments to orient to potential criticism of nepotism and to warrant their privilege as deserved.

When considering how the super-rich legitimise economic inequality in society, the role of inheritance must be considered. The previous chapter examined how the super-rich use meritocratic ideology to account for their position. However, family inheritance accounts for a significant proportion of wealth transfer in UK society which has been rising since the 1980s (Piketty and Zucman 2015). The ONS Wealth and Assets Survey (2013) found that: 'Individuals living in households which already had the highest levels of wealth showed an increased chance of inheriting'. Of the £75bn that was inherited between 2008-10, the wealthiest 20% in society received £57bn, 75% of the total (ONS 2013). The super-rich may also benefit from complex financial arrangements to avoid inheritance tax. Inherited wealth arguably acts as a form of favouritism; ensuring affluence is retained within the family and as a result challenges the existence of social mobility. Clark and Cummins (2014) demonstrate that most wealth is kept within families, rather than earned, casting doubt on some claims that the wealth of new generations is earned through hard work or effort as claimed by super-rich speakers in the previous chapter.

The maintenance of family wealth is also illustrated by between 60- 90% (depending on the research used) of businesses managed by families in Europe (Corbetta and Salvato 2012) and from 85% of entrepreneurs in the US receiving assistance from family members as investors (Astrachan and Shanker 2003). The benefits of inherited wealth and privilege violate the assumption that societies like the UK are meritocratic. Meritocracy is defined as the 'equality of opportunity' (Martin et al 2014:5) and has been criticised for maintaining inequality and holding the poor accountable for their status (McNamee and Miller). Yet, meritocratic ideology is dominant and used to present societies such as the UK as fair (Allen 2011). Therefore, it is necessary to explore how individuals account for their privilege given that the presence of inherited wealth may contradict constructions of super-rich wealth as deserved in a meritocratic society.

Exploring inheritance using Discursive Psychology

Discursive and rhetorical approaches have demonstrated how non-meritocratic transfers of wealth are legitimised through talk about monarchies (Billig 1992; Kondo 2000). Individuals justify inequality in relation to the monarchy as common sense (Billig 1992; Kondo 2000). Speakers present the position of the monarchy as a dilemma where their privilege is acknowledged but seen as undesirable as it impacts upon individual agency and privacy (Billig 1992). However, royal families exist as an exceptional case and their wealth is dwarfed by that of the super-rich. Monarchies are also part funded through taxation and have a role in government. This presents a need to explore how non-meritocratic transfers of wealth through family inheritance and privilege are

legitimised. In particular, given the negative impact of wealth inequality in society and the role of inheritance in maintaining this, it is imperative to explore how those positioned as super-rich account for inequality resulting from inheritance. The analysis will examine how privileged individuals present their wealth as earned and will address how heirs legitimise their wealthy position in an unequal society.

Findings

Within the programmes analysed, privileged individuals from super-rich families presented themselves as workers. By orienting to a working identity, speakers position themselves as deserving of their wealth. In contrast, privileged individuals downgraded their role as a child of the super-rich to downplay the positive benefits of their status. This minimisation was achieved through talk about the disadvantages of being wealthy and privileged. Speakers' use meritocratic arguments to orient to criticism about nepotism and vulgar displays of wealth.

Speakers within the corpus explore how their wealth and privilege is acquired. The following extract is from the Channel 5 series *Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives* (series two, episode one). Eamonn Holmes (E) and Ruth Langford (R), the presenters, talk to Vikram Chatwal (V), who is introduced as a '44-year-old playboy and hotel empire heir', about his art collection and lifestyle. Eamonn and Ruth interview Vikram whilst sitting on sofas in his living area in his apartment. This extract involves Vikram constructing how he gained

his current status, which allows us to explore how his self-presentation is used to legitimise his privilege.

Extract one:

1. E: Tell us about your experiences as (.) a very rich, privileged
2. (.) playboy. How good is it?
3. V: It's very flirtatious, it's very er (.) you know, attractive, and it
4. just falls upon you. I think if you ask anyone who's gone
5. through it, they'll also tell you that there's another side to it,
6. a darker side.
7. R: And did it have a dark side for you?
8. V: I would work hard, play even harder (h). At the end, you
9. kind of settle into what you think is a more realistic lifestyle
10. for you.

Vikram manages to present his status as being both unintentional and earned. Initially, Eamonn positions Vikram as a ‘very rich, privileged (.) playboy’ (1-2) which Vikram does not challenge (‘it’s very flirtatious it's very er, you know, attractive, and it just falls upon you’ (3-4)). This response allows Vikram to present his current position as being unintentional, which allows him to downplay the negative connotations of being talked about as a ‘playboy’. A playboy is defined as: ‘A person, usually a wealthy man, who leads a life of pleasure, esp. one who behaves irresponsibly or is sexually promiscuous’ (OED 2006). He does this by emphasising the disadvantages of his status (‘I think if

you ask anyone who's gone through it, they'll also tell you that there's another side to it, a darker side' (4-6)) which further distances him from the benefits as mentioned by Eamonn. Yet by referring to 'another side to it' (5), Vikram does acknowledge that there are benefits to his position. Vikram refers to unidentified others to support his position (I think if you ask anyone who's gone through it (4)). Despite Vikram presenting his status as unintentional, it is still presented as being earned ('I would work hard, play even harder' (8)). This downgrades Eamonn's construction of Vikram's irresponsible playboy identity as he has earned his status. The use of a 'work hard, play hard' idiom by Vikram allows him to justify benefitting from his hard work as his playtime is his reward. Despite more emphasis being placed on his leisure, ('play harder' (8)), Vikram's talk represents a work life balance and warrants his status as being deserved.

Speakers in both the previous and the following extract orient to potential criticism about nepotism. Extracts two and three feature the narrator (N) and Cuppy (C), who is introduced as an 'heiress to a billion-dollar fortune' on the Channel 4 documentary, *Lagos to London: Britain's New Super-Rich* that explores the lives of super-rich Nigerians residing in London. In extract two, Cuppy is DJing at a televised show in Nigeria and her voiceover is used about the difficulties in establishing her own identity. From lines 6-11, Cuppy talks directly to the camera. This extract is immediately followed by a commercial break and is followed by the scene that includes extract three. In extract three, Cuppy is featured after returning to London and is reflecting on her career

progression. A voiceover is used while she is shown DJing at a club and driving around London.

Extract two:

1. N: *Watching tonight's show is Cuppy's dad, Femi Otedola.*
2. C: *I just want to go on stage as DJ Cuppy, but, of course, the*
3. *fact that people feel like, "Why is she DJing?" or, "oh, you*
4. *know, this DJ is blah-blah's daughter." It is annoying but I*
5. *don't think it hurts me any anymore, because I love what I*
6. *do. I just worry that I'm not going to make this impact I want*
7. *to make (.)* or I'm scared of (.3) I'm scared of always being
8. Femi Otedola's daughter. Like not getting sort of past that,
9. that's like a fear of mine. And, for me, that means not being
10. successful enough (.) to cos I can be successful, but, you
11. know, let's be honest, at the moment, I'm still, you know, a
12. little bit masked by my dad's success. *If I didn't try and make*
13. *it outside Nigeria, I would be unhappy.*

Extract three:

1. C: *I'm really optimistic, actually. I think that I'm a great DJ.*
2. *I think that's what it comes to. And I've already been*
3. *asked back to one of the clubs. Um, you know,*
4. *networking comes into it but, actually, you know, if I*
5. *don't play well, I wouldn't get asked back no matter who*

6. *I know and whose daughter I am. Actually, it's a good*
7. *feeling, it is a fair, fair chance.*

Cuppy presents inherited wealth as a barrier to establishing her own identity as she is presented as a daughter by others ('*This DJ is blah-blah's daughter*' (2:4)). Similar to extract one, Cuppy justifies her position as unintentional and unasked for in the same way Vikram presents his status as something that he did not request. In this extract, Cuppy's privilege is unintended as it results from her family status as a daughter. This allows Cuppy to talk about the disadvantages of her position which is difficult given her privileged status ('*It is annoying but I don't think it hurts me any more anymore, because I love what I do*' (2:4-6)). Cuppy presents the disadvantages in relation to her work, which is significant as it enables Cuppy to present herself as being worthy of recognition in her own right and as possessing a quality that has allowed her to overcome the '*hurt*(s)' (2:5). Yet, the benefits to being an heir to a super-rich individual for Cuppy and the advantages of her upbringing in a super-rich environment are a rhetorical absence within the extract (Billig 1987). By stating '*I love what I do*' (2:5-6), Cuppy uses psychological talk to talk about the personal advantages of her work that allow her to continue despite accusations of nepotism by others.

Cuppy minimises her status as a child of the super-rich in extract four by talking about her position in relation to meritocratic conditions. This differs from extract three where Cuppy uses psychological language to justify her position. In extract three, she is required to obtain her position through her ability ('*I think that I'm a great DJ. I think that's what it comes to*' (3:1-2)). Yet, Cuppy is

required to acknowledge the privileges of her position as an heir and its benefits concerning her career development (‘*Um, you know, networking comes into it*’ (3:3-4)). However, Cuppy's hesitation prior to her response indicates the difficulties of acknowledging the increased privilege her position provides because of her family networks.

In contrast, Cuppy does not directly address the role of nepotism in her acquiring her position despite its underlying presence in extract two. Instead, Cuppy orients to her work and the barrier created as a result of her father’s wealth using psychological language (‘*I just worry that I’m not going to make this impact I want to make (.)* or I’m scared of (.3) I’m scared of always being Femi Otedola’s daughter’ (2:6-8)). Cuppy presents herself as an individual who is deserving of recognition rather than the daughter of a super-rich individual. Cuppy uses 'stake confession' (Potter 1996a) to orient to claims of nepotism. It is not possible for her to omit that her father is rich so by acknowledging or ‘confessing’ this she appears honest. The presentation of her omission as a confession is emphasised to the audience as they are shown Cuppy talking directly to the camera. Cuppy using the concept of fear to present herself as deserving of recognition (‘Like not getting sort of past that, that’s like a fear of mine’ (2:8-9)). This is stressed further by the use of a disclaimer and honesty tag by Cuppy to separate herself from her father in her talk (‘cos I can be successful, but, you know, let’s be honest, at the moment, I’m still, you know, a little bit masked by my dad’s success’ (2:10-12)). Although this is downgraded by ‘a little bit masked’, Cuppy, as the daughter of a super-rich individual

presents herself as being deserving through constructing herself as having the potential to be successful in her own right. Cuppy achieves this construction through presenting herself as a DJ and not just a daughter.

The above extract explores how Cuppy minimises her status as a child of the super-rich. This is further demonstrated in extract four taken from the *Rich Kids of Instagram* (episode two), a series broadcast on E4 that explores the lifestyle of super rich heirs who identify as 'the Rich Kids of Instagram'. Instagram is a social media platform where users share images and reports having 800 million users (Instagram 2017). Hashtags are used to identify and search for terms such as #richkidsofinstagram. Extract four involves the narrator (N), Tim (T), a '23-year-old heir to an American fortune' also introduced as 'Trust Fund Tim' and Dor (D) who is introduced as a new friend discussing Dor's wardrobe. From line 9, Tim is talking directly to the camera in a room on his own. These extracts allow for the examination of how heirs talk about their work ethic. It appears that there is an interactional necessity for the children of the super-rich to present themselves as deserving their privileged lifestyles.

Extract four:

1. N: *Tim and Dor are discovering that not all rich kids are*
2. *alike.*
3. D: I'll tell you the truth. I am not wealthy at all. I'm working
4. very hard, I have my business, I started from nothing.
5. I'm getting somewhere, it's starting. Starting to feel it.
6. But I'm not wealthy. Not yet. I live a good life, I work

7. hard to play, to play but I work harder than I play. So
8. yeah, it is family money. I'm working for it, right?
9. T: Right. *Apparently, according to my followers, I don't*
10. *work*. ((alone)) I'm just like a best-dressed homeless
11. person (h) I don't know.

The children of the super-rich account for the privileges of their position by presenting themselves as individuals who have worked for their status. In extract three, the narrator presents Tim and Dor as '*rich kids*' who have differences (1), Dor uses his talk to construct himself as not being rich ('I'll tell you the truth. I am not wealthy at all. I'm working very hard, I have my business, I started from nothing' (3-4)). Dor is required to use an honesty tag to support his claim about his lack of wealth presenting himself as being deserving as a result of his 'effortfulness' (Gibson 2009) and drawing upon the idea of meritocratic conditions. Unlike Cuppy in extracts two and three who does not present herself as reliant on her family to generate wealth, Dor claims he is working for family money. Dor provides a skewed version of a meritocracy where his wealth will be earnt although it will originate from the family unit. Yet both Cuppy and Dor use an individualistic argument to legitimise their position and draw upon their work ethic as a discursive resource.

The reliance on individualistic arguments by the speakers is challenging to manage as this needs to negotiate the wealth and privilege that is provided by their respective families. Whilst Dor does not explicitly acknowledge the benefits of being in a wealthy family, he does present himself as privileged ('I

live a good life, I work hard to play, but I work harder than I play' (6-7)). Similarly, to extract one, Dor uses talk about play to downgrade the extravagance involved in his leisure activities and to emphasise the importance of his work. However, Dor places more of an emphasis on work unlike Vikram in extract one who emphasises play. This allows Dor to constructs his status as an heir as being earned, talking about inheritance as being worked for as opposed to being received ('yeah, it is family money. I'm working for it, right?' (8)). Wealth for Dor does not belong to an individual but to the family as a unit.

Similar to the previous extracts, Tim orients to others' negative constructions of inherited wealth ('*Apparently, according to my followers, I don't work*. ((alone)) I'm just like a best-dressed homeless person' (9-11)). Tim uses sarcasm to place himself as 'a best dressed homeless person' (10-11) a contradiction in terms to suggest that his position is earned. This line of talk is delivered directly to the camera opposing his account of how his followers view him in the voiceover. His talk is in contrast with the program's editing of Tim as the product of a trust fund. Dor and Tim reject the perception of them as heirs, meaning that they are rich and unemployed and present themselves as hard working and deserving, which will be ultimately rewarded with their inheritance.

Whilst speakers in the extracts above use their talk to downplay privilege and present their status as earned, this is not the case in the extract below. Extract five is from the *Rich Kids of Instagram* (episode two) series shown on E4 that explores the lifestyle of the rich kids of Instagram. A narrator (N) introduces this section that features Bryan (B); a 22-year-old heir to a Latin

American fortune, discussing his night out in Frankfurt with Bunny (BF), his best friend and a former Playboy model. The extract demonstrates the negative associations of the super-rich that the speakers in other extracts are rhetorically distancing themselves from by orienting to their skills and work ethic.

Extract five:

1.	N:	*There's only one thing that Brian loves more than Bunny.*
2.	B:	The love for champagne within us is just insane. *It's very*
3.		*classy and glam to have always a glass in your hand* (h)
4.		(.4) ((Footage of Bryan and Bunny drinking from a
5.		champagne bottle))
6.		Well, we had about
7.	UP:	18
8.	B:	18
9.	BF:	We love it now.
10.	B:	18 bottles of champagne. We had maybe 12 of Veuve
11.		Clicquot and we had the rest of Dom Perignon.
12.	BF:	Yes
13.	B:	Plus, the six Litres of Belvedere. I'm very blessed [to have
14.		the]
15.	BF:	[I know.]
16.	B:	wealth that I have and I love to share it. To share it with
17.		the people that I love the most. The only thing that
18.		bothers me the most is when people just see me without

19. knowing to get me. They think, 'Oh, this arrogant kid,

20. [stupid kid]

21. BF: [Baby, baby,] baby, listen.

22. B: But then [they get to know me]

23. BF: [These are haters]

24. B: No.

25. BF: These are haters

The topic of this extract is focused on Bryan's consumption of alcohol ('The love for champagne within us is just insane' (2)). Bryan's talk is accompanied by clips of footage of Bryan and Bunny drinking in a nightclub up to line 6 where Bryan and Bunny are featured talking directly to the camera. This use of editing places an emphasis on their consumption to the audience and the amount of alcohol and brands are displayed on the screen in writing to further highlight their ostentatious spending. Bryan uses this talk to present himself as being 'blessed' as he is able to distribute his wealth, however this is conditional so that the sharing only occurs with his friends (I'm very blessed to have the wealth that I have and I love to share it. To share it with the people that I love most (13-16)). Whilst Bryan orients to gratitude for the benefits of being an heir, he does not attempt to justify it through his own traits or behaviours and does not acknowledge that others may find his alcohol consumption gaudy, particularly as it involves expensive products. Yet Bryan acknowledges others' critical views about children of the super-rich ('The only thing that bothers me the most is when people just see me without knowing to get me. They think, 'Oh, this

arrogant kid, [stupid kid]' (16-19)). Bryan presents this burden as the exception to the positives of his position particularly as these views are constructed as being the result of ignorance. Although Bryan orients to negative constructions of the super-rich and their dependents, like the speakers in the other extracts, he does not refer to wealth inequality in society. In this extract, others who question the wealth and activities of Bryan are presented as unreasonable, as no justification is provided for their objections. In contrast to the construction of fairness in extract three where Cuppy presents herself as earning her job as a DJ, Bryan talks about himself as being unfairly judged as an heir because of the misguided assumptions of others.

Discussion

This analysis demonstrates that privileged individuals, with the exception of the last extract, downgrade the advantages they receive through birth by using meritocratic arguments to justify their privilege. The strategies used in the extracts (except for the final one) are designed to distance themselves from the problematic super-rich identity that is not based on the speaker's work ethic and/or abilities. In societies that people claim to be meritocratic, such as the UK, individuals are deemed to succeed as a result of innate factors such as effort and ability, as opposed to external indicators such as their socioeconomic status (Smith and Skrbiš 2017). By utilising a meritocratic argument that emphasises their effortfulness (Gibson 2009) and their level of skill, speakers use their talk to legitimise their privileged status as this is presented as earned and not an accident of birth. As a result of constructing their status as based on merit, through their skills and/or hard work, individuals in the corpus are able to

utilise talk about 'being fair' (Tileagă 2010) as their wealth and privilege is earned.

Play as work

Speakers utilise a popular idiom about being able to 'work hard, play hard' which is used as a 'common place' (Billig 1987; 1988) to justify their status and use of leisure time as it is earned. Common places act as discursive devices to allow individuals to appeal to their audience (Billig 1998). Organisational discourse has demonstrated that this idiom functions to normalise work cultures with long working hours and to place leisure activities such as drinking alcohol as a payoff for working hard (Anderson-Gough, Grey and Robson 1998; Dryburgh 1999). Speakers appropriate the 'work hard, play hard' idiom from employment sectors with long working hours to present themselves as deserving of their wealth as they appeal to their audience and to challenge constructions of heirs as being idle. The use of the idiom allows privileged individuals to justify their non-meritocratic position which is the result of their birth and not their merit. However, this presentation is not entirely consistent when considering the nature of work for the super-rich. The boundary between work and play can be questioned in relation to professions such as DJing which involve drinking and socialising. As demonstrated in the extracts, the leisure activities of privileged people require wealth and as much effort as their work. By presenting play as hard work, privileged individuals downplay the enjoyment they receive in an attempt to manage their accountability for a lifestyle that is difficult to justify in a society that is based on meritocratic ideology.

Minimising the role of family

The construction of the family as a mechanism for transferring wealth and privilege is an everyday assumption (Billig 1992). Privileged individuals are required to negotiate this in their talk by constructing themselves as hard working. By drawing upon their family's privileged position as being detrimental to their identity as a worker, speakers can position themselves as wanting a meritocratic environment. This allows privileged people to downgrade the advantages of the affluence and privilege they benefit from because of birth.

Psychological language legitimises the employment choices of the children of the super-rich and to present their critics as unreasonable. Previous research demonstrates that monarchies are popular despite their non-meritocratic position (Billig 1992; Kondo 2000). Presentations of individual members of the British royal family are based upon whether they are viewed as effortful with members such as the Queen being talked about more positively (Billig 1992). Privileged individuals are not in the same position as the monarchy, yet they draw upon their effortfulness to legitimise the financial and social capital that they have because of birth.

Similar to the previous chapter where super-rich individuals use psychological language to construct their wealth acquisition as earned, heirs use this to legitimise their privilege. However, unlike speakers in the previous chapter, privileged individuals are required to orient to talk about nepotism due to meritocratic values. Heirs use talk about emotions to present their arguments as well thought out and evaluative as opposed to reflecting an internal state of mind (Edwards 1997). Psychological language allows privileged individuals to present themselves as deserving because of their superior qualities. ‘Fear’ is

used by speakers to present themselves as active and assertive (Kitis 2009). Privileged people to orient to being driven similarly to those in the previous chapter who earned their wealth. Whilst individuals who have earned their wealth can use a ‘rags-to-riches’ interpretative repertoire, the speakers in this chapter use psychological language to minimise the role of privilege and family wealth in their current status. By using fear as a discursive resource, speakers are constructed as being driven to be effortful downgrading the benefits they have received as through birth. Privileged individuals use psychological concepts such as jealousy when talking about ‘haters’ to present others as irrational despite the incongruity of their status in a society where meritocratic ideology is dominant. By recognising the presence of criticism by “haters”, privileged individuals present themselves as being 'tolerant' and reduce the need for explanation of this position as they construct themselves as superior (Wetherell 2012: 166). Thus, the use of emotional talk allows heirs to present themselves as superior to others and deserving of their privilege.

Conclusion

The children of the super-rich draw on meritocratic arguments to legitimise their wealth and to downplay their privilege that has been obtained as a result of birth. While the concept of inheritance is difficult to challenge, because of everyday assumptions about the family, privileged individuals are nevertheless required to manage accountability for nepotism. This dilemma is managed through the construction of a worker identity that presents their privilege as earned and downgrades the advantages received from their family.

Chapter 6: Ostentatious spending and the super-rich

The previous analytic chapters examine how speakers account for the acquisition and maintenance of extreme wealth. This chapter develops this analysis to explore how the super-rich account for their spending. It was found that wealthy people present themselves as deserving of their ostentatious spending, warrant spending as beneficial to others and as an investment. As a result, speakers construct their identity in talk about their consumption. Talk about spending involved the construction of an ideological dilemma where individuals talked about ostentatious spending as normal and displayed reticence about talking about costs. By using discourse about their identity when talking about spending, the super-rich use talk about psychological concepts to account for their extreme wealth and how their riches are used in an unequal environment.

Previous research has found that consumption is used by individuals to construct their identity in a globalised world (Billig 1995). In this chapter, this will be expanded upon to examine how wealthy people construct their identity through talk about their spending. Chapter 4 found that super-rich people presented themselves as deserving of their increased affluence as a result of their psychological superiority. This took place while the individuals featured talked about their expensive purchases such as car collections and tailored suits. The talk of heirs in chapter 5 more overtly placed an emphasis on spending as they used a ‘work hard, play hard’ interpretative repertoire borrowed from professions with a long working hours culture to legitimise their spending on expensive alcohol as part of their leisure time. Wealthy people

featured in the corpus managed their accountability for their wealth and resultant spending as being fair through talk about their work ethic.

Talk legitimising extreme wealth within the programmes is situated in ostentatious locations such as luxury hotels and expensive properties. Yet, the majority of heirs orient to vulgar displays of wealth when presenting themselves as workers to account for their privilege. As a result, the spending of the super-rich is contentious and individuals must negotiate this when accounting for their consumption. Not all privileged individuals account for their position and this was evidenced in an example of a deviant case in chapter 5, where one heir presented a vulgar display of wealth. Unlike the other extracts, the heir did not orient to their work ethic and individuals who challenged his privilege were categorised as 'haters'. Talk about the British monarchy, a distinct wealthy group, found that members of the public accounted for Princess Diana wearing designer clothes by constructing them as ambassadors for British products (Billig 1992). Whilst the royal family's spending is subsidised by the taxpayer, people constructed this as earned through their public work as other royals were warranted as less deserving. Carr, Goodman and Jowett (2018) found that speakers talking about tax for wealthy individuals drew upon individualistic ideology to present higher tax rates as unfair. This was the result of wealthy individuals being presented as deserving of their wealth and the autonomy to spend it as they wished. Thus, further work is required to examine how extremely wealthy people account for their spending and how they negotiate talk about ostentatious purchases.

If the funds of the super-rich are not being used redistributed through tax and the resulting inequality in society results in a range of social problems as discussed in chapter 1, then there is a need to examine how the wealth of the super-rich is being used and how this is legitimised. Thus, there is a need toexplicitly examine how super-rich individuals manage problems with ostentatious spending? Focusing on this research question will address how wealthy individuals account for their spending given its detrimental environmental impact in addition to the other negative effects of wealth inequality in society.

Findings

Ostentatious consumption is presented as a normal activity by super-rich individuals in talk about the spending practices of the super-rich. Speakers construct increased spending as necessary by presenting themselves as deserving, an investment and of benefit to others. Some super-rich individuals may present themselves as reticent to mention specific costs. The final extract explores how a super-rich individual who does not spend is presented as problematic and an exceptional case.

Super-Rich Individuals Presenting Themselves as Deserving of their Expenditure

Talk in previous chapters involves the super-rich presenting themselves as deserving of their wealth as a result of their psychological superiority and enhanced work ethic. Whilst this talk is set in ostentatious surroundings, super-rich individuals are not specifically talking about their spending. Examples of talk about super-rich spending involve constructing themselves as deserving. In

extract one, Tony Barney (TB), a caravan park owner, the narrator (N) and an unseen person from the production team (U) are talking. Tony is talking about his purchases on *Million Pound Motors* broadcast on Channel 4. The programme begins with Tony's wife buying him a car as a birthday present. Tony's talk about his spending provides an opportunity to explore how he uses his consumption to construct his identity.

Extract one:

1. N: *Tony Barney has amassed a multi-million-pound fortune*
2. *buying and selling caravan parks.*
3. TB: You see?
4. U: *Where did you buy this piano from?*
5. TB: Harrods. Al Fayed was actually walking around the floor and
6. he gave my wife a teddy bear and said to her, you know
7. "You're beautiful." So he gave her a teddy bear and let me
8. have the piano! This is some of the sort of stuff that you
9. might catch me in one evening when I'm out. They've got
10. red soles, they're Louis Vuittons. You've got to be quite
11. unique to wear those sort of shoes. ((tries on coat)) (.4) (h)
12. N: *But fashion isn't Tony's favourite way to spend his cash.*
13. TB: Those set of plates cost me £500,000. Erm If somebody
14. offered me a million pounds for them today, I wouldn't take it
15. because I think they're exceptional. On the Wraith is 2TB,
16. on the Phantom is 1TB and on the Range Rover is 3TB, and

17. I think it's fair to say those are the best collection of number
18. plates in the UK at the moment.
19. U: *What do you like about cars so much?*
20. TB: I just think it's a man's thing, a status symbol and er, being
21. able to share what you've achieved in business, in life. If
22. you've been through a journey and you come from nothing,
23. it's nice to own a nice vehicle and it's a statement.

Tony's talk about his spending is prompted by a question from the production team (4). Tony's spending is first presented as ostentatious through the use of brands by referring to 'Harrods' (5). However, this is accounted for as a gift due to Mohammed Al Fayed, the former owner seeing his wife in the shop ('he gave my wife a teddy bear and said to her, you know "You're beautiful" so he gave her a teddy bear and let me have the piano!' (6-8)). The use of luxury categories continues to evidence his spending continues by referring to Louis Vuitton shoes (9-11). Tony presents himself as 'quite unique' (10-11) to provide himself with an extraordinary self-construction similar to speakers in chapter 4. Following this the narration is used to continue the presentation of Tony as an ostentatious spender ('*But fashion isn't Tony's favourite way to spend his cash' (12)).* Tony's talk about his purchase of personalised number plates is accounted for by being 'exceptional' (15) adding on his previous talk about his purchases as special. However, the use of 'erm' prior to this discourse indicates the difficulty for Tony in negotiating this account for an everyday item ('Those set of plates cost me £500,000. Erm If somebody offered me a million pounds for them today, I wouldn't take it because I think they're exceptional'

(13-15)). After further talk about his collection that involves referring to luxury cars, Tony continues his construction of the number plates as special (‘I think it's fair to say those are the best collection of number plates in the UK at the moment’ (17-18)). This is warranted by his evaluation that uses ‘it’s fair’ to justify the expense involved due to the number plates being ‘the best… in the UK’ (18) presenting them as good value. Tony constructs his identity through his ability to have extraordinary items. Although he is required to account for his purchases through their value.

The responses from super-rich individuals that involve them legitimizing their wealth on the basis of their ability to share with others is the result of their response to questions from the production team. Tony orients to the unseen person's question, ‘*What do you like about cars so much?*’ (19) as a request to justify his spending on cars. Initially, Tony presents his ostentatious spending as part of expressing his gender identity (‘I just think it's a man's thing, a status symbol’ (20)). He also warrants his spending as being beneficial to others although onscreen the objects shown are for his own consumption, (‘being able to share what you've achieved in business, in life' (20-21)). Finally, Tony uses a ‘rags to riches’ interpretative repertoire as seen in chapter 4 to present his wealth as earned and as being deserving of his excessive spending (‘If you've been through a journey and you come from nothing, it's nice to own a vehicle and it's a statement’ (21-23)). Tony again talks about his spending as a form of identity construction (‘it’s a statement’ (23)). Thus, speakers present their consumption as being deserved and something they can legitimise through their sharing with others.

Constructing Super-Rich Spending as Beneficial to Others

In addition to presenting their spending as beneficial to family, super-rich speakers present their spending as having a wider economic benefit. Extract two features Mervyn (M) and Heather (H), both fruit farmers are featured with their daughter, Samantha who is a nurse, exploring the area around their hotel in Jamaica on BBC2's *The Millionaires Holiday Club* (series one, episode one). This extract also involves the narrator (N), an unseen person (U) from the production team and a local driver (D) who is unnamed. The family are being taken for a drive and from line 22; footage is used of Mervyn and Heather talking directly to the camera in their room after their drive. This extract provides the opportunity to explore how the super-rich present their spending as beneficial to others and draw upon the trickle-down effect.

Extract two:

1.	N:	*Sam has persuaded her parents to leave the hotel grounds.*
2.	M:	Now you salute.
3.		(h)
4.	S:	Oh, it's lovely and cool.
5.	H:	Wow!
6.	U:	*You've left the hotel.*
7.	M:	Yes. It's the first time for (.) five years?
8.	S:	We're having a tour of the local area. Yeah. Family outing.
9.		That's an impressive place.
10.	H:	It is, isn't it?
11.	S:	Mm. It's huge!

12. D: A house like that used to be, like, a plantation house. We
13. call them great house in Jamaica.
14. M: Is there still a lot of hardship in Jamaica?
15. D: Yes, sir. *We have extremely rich and extremely poor. Very,*
16. *very little middle class*. Sometimes the poor people are
17. much more happier than the rich people.
18. S: Yeah. Yeah, they really are.
19. D: *Because they don't have nothing to lose* and they'll have a
20. drink and make themselves happy.
21. H: Mervyn will drag me out.
22. U: *Does it ever sort of make you think, "We're quite lucky"?*
23. M: ((later)) No. No. That's the beauty of the place.
24. H: We work bloody hard here and we earn what we earn and
25. we don't waste a penny of it. *And if we didn't go there,*
26. *who's going to employ them?* It's (.) it's all wheels within
27. wheels.

Similarly, to extract one, extract two involves speakers orienting to a production question as a request to legitimise their spending. Here speakers draw upon the trickle-down myth to present their spending as of benefit to those employed to provide them with goods and services. The family are talking to an unnamed local person in Jamaica about inequality that is initiated by Mervyn (Is there still a lot of hardship in Jamaica? (14)). While the group do not orient to their own family's financial position, the local person draws on an interpretative repertoire of 'more money, more problems'. This presents the poor as 'happier' (17) and

requiring less resilience, '*they don't have nothing to lose'* (19). This isaccompanied by footage of a basic wooden property at the side of the road to emphasise the poverty present within the area. The presentation of the super-rich as deserving of their excessive wealth by using discourse about their enhanced resilience is presented in chapter 4. The family do not discuss how this relates to their personal financial situation and Heather changes the subject ('Mervyn will drag me out' (21)). However, the editing does attend to the family's financial situation as the later part of the extract is formed of separate footage of Mervyn and Heather talking directly to the camera in their room. This is prompted by the member of the production team's question ('*Does it ever sort of make you think, 'we're quite lucky'*? (22)). Mervyn rejects this claim and Heather draws upon their more than effortful work ethic in support of his response ('We work bloody hard here' (24)). Despite the family's spending being presented as ostentatious particularly in relation to the poverty present in their surroundings, Heather warrants the expense as being of value ('we don't waste a penny of it' (25)). This is similar strategy to extract one; however in extract four, the super-rich speakers are in the presence of less affluent individuals. Heather uses the trickle-down effect in her talk to justify the family's presence and excessive consumption in an environment with high levels of poverty ('*And if we didn't go there, who's going to employ them?* It's (.) it's all wheels within wheels' (25-27)). By drawing upon the trickle-down effect through the use of a rhetorical question, Heather is able to claim that their presence and spending is beneficial to others through as us and them construction (25-26). Her talk is further warranted by the use of footage of the family walking around

the hotel as this is voiced over the clip. However, this warranting of their spending is difficult for Heather to negotiate as a pause and repetition of 'it's' are used (27). The presence of the staff serving the super-rich allows them to draw upon the trickle-down effect in their talk thereby justifying their spending although this is a difficult argument for speakers to construct.

Spending presented as an investment

In contrast to presenting spending as being of benefit to others, an alternative claim is to talk about ostentatious consumption as an investment. The following extract is from *Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives* (series two, episode one). This programme is broadcast on Channel 5 featuring Eamonn Holmes (E) and Ruth Langsford (R) as presenters. Extract five involves Vikram Chatwal (V), '44-year-old playboy and hotel empire heir' who is also featured in chapter 5 talking about his privilege as an heir. In this extract, Vikram is showing Eamonn Holmes his art collection while Ruth Langsford narrates. Extract three provides the opportunity to explore how the super-rich present their spending as an investment.

Extract three:

1. R: *Vikram's 4,000 square foot penthouse is worth a cool $15.5*
2. *million, but that's nothing compared to what he's splashed*
3. *out on his personal art collection.*
4. V: This is a Julian Schnabel portrait of me
5. E: *Even small Schnabels can fetch nearly half a million dollars,*
6. *but this one was a million.*
7. V: This is a Jackie Kennedy done by Andy Warhol.

8. E: *And Warhol Jackie Kennedys definitely don't come cheap.*
9. *This is an amazing two and a half million bucks*.
10. V: (points to picture of self) This one was on the cover of
11. Forbes.
12. E: *Very striking. Now, as an avid collector myself...*
13. R: *Yeah, of beer mats.*
14. E: *I'd like to offer a considered opinion*. Very nice, very nice.
15. Very plain, but to the point. What are we seeing here,
16. Vikram?
17. V: Well, what you're seeing is the painting of Picasso's 1952 (.)
18. You know, I think it's worth about $2 million.
19. E: That's a sound investment, that is a well-known, recognised
20. name (.) Picasso.
21. R: *This Picasso masterpiece was so sought-after that Vikram*
22. *outbid big spender P Diddy back in 2014.*
23. E: You see, this one I understand, I who totally get
24. V: Right
25. E: Recognised name of a master, Picasso
26. V: Correct
27. E: I understand why you paid big money for that.
28. V: Correct

Vikram's spending is presented as ostentatious by the presenters and this is initially achieved through the narration of the segment by Ruth ('*Vikram's 4,000 square foot penthouse is worth a cool $15.5 million, but that's nothing compared*

to what he's splashed out on his personal art collection' (1-3)). Whilst an exact figure is not provided for Vikram's art works, '*but that's nothing*' is used to upgrade the presentation of this spending as ostentatious. This is developed further by Ruth referring to this spending as '*splashed out*' (2) emphasising the amount spent. When Vikram's turns are used to name the famous artist, Eamonn's voiceover turns are used to provide information about Vikram's spending ('*And Warhol Jackie Kennedy's definitely don't come cheap. This is an amazing two and a half million bucks*' (8-9)). This builds upon the previous narration to highlight the costs involved although this does not involve Vikram. This establishes Vikram's spending as being excessive while Vikram uses his talk to emphasise the desirability of his purchases.

The narration of the extract is used to subvert Vikram's presentation of himself and his art. When Vikram points to the framed Forbes magazine cover of himself, Eamonn's voiceover uses sarcasm in its response ('*Very striking'* (12)). Ruth questions Eamonn's art knowledge which challenges Eamonn's ability to comment and presents him as being more similar to the audience than to Vikram ('*Yeah, of beer mats'* (13)). Despite this challenge to Eamonn's position through the narration, Eamonn uses his talk to account for Vikram's purchase of a Picasso painting ('That's a sound investment, that is a well-known recognised name' (19-20)). Eamonn's construction of Vikram's excessive spending on art as an investment is further undermined by Ruth's narration ('*This Picasso masterpiece was so sought-after that Vikram outbid big spender P Diddy back in 2014*' (21-22)). By referring to P Diddy, a rapper, the shrewdness of Vikram's investment becomes questionable. As a result,

Vikram's spending is presented as being both ostentatious and impressive by drawing upon the audience's knowledge of P Diddy's excessive and gaudy spending.

Presenting art as an investment can involve differing identity constructions for the super-rich. Extract four is taken from *Sold! Inside the World's Biggest Auction House* and features the narrator (N), Christian Levett (C), a former 'city commodities trader' and an unknown person (U). The extract forms two clips that have been edited together; it begins at Christian's home and is followed by footage of him viewing lots at Christie's auction house. This extract provides the opportunity to explore further how art is constructed as an investment and contrasted to purchases for the less affluent.

Extract four:

1. C: *I think to myself, if you're paying £10,000 or more for*
2. *something then you know you're starting to compete*
3. ((to camera)) with the cost of a car, for example. And my
4. working-class background still brings me back (h) to those
5. numbers. So, when I'm paying £10,000 or more for
6. something, I like to think that it's going to hold its value.
7. ((at Christie's)) who knows what it will end up going for at
8. auction? The estimate on it right now is 1.2 to 1.8 million.
9. U: (Indecipherable)
10. N: *So, Christie's New York sales in May are all about finding a*
11. *serious investment for Christian*.
12. C: *Yeah, I want to try and find*

13. ((at Christie's)) blue-chip artworks (.) great provenance erm
14. by blue-chip artists
15. U: 1.8 to 2.9
16. C: *When you're spending that amount of money you want to*
17. *feel comfortable that you own an asset that's going up in*
18. *value in the future.*

The extract begins with Christian's talk as a voice over while footage is shown of Christian's extensive art collection (1-2). While this is occurring, Christian presents his spending in contrast to the purchases of the less affluent ('*if you're paying £10,000 or more for something then you know you're starting to compete* ((to camera)) with the cost of a car' (1-3)). The construction of Christian as self-made uses a rags to riches interpretative repertoire as seen in chapter 4 when he refers to his class origins ('And my working-class background still brings me back (h) to those numbers' (3-4)). The use of laughter indicates his difficulty in reconciling the different costs involved. This contrasts from Vikram's construction in the previous extract as a playboy when discussing the cost of his art and Eamonn undermines his talk about Vikram's purchases. Christian presents his purchases as an investment by referring to the art as 'going to hold its value' (6). He also minimises the cost of his consumption by warranting their value as 'paying £10,000 or more for something' (5). However, the editing of the extract challenges this construction of his spending by the use of footage from Christie's where Christian is viewing more expensive lots ('who knows what it will end up going for at auction? The estimate on it right now is 1.2 to 1.8 million' (7-8)). This is developed further through the narration as he is

presented as seeking a '*serious investment'* (11). Christian's talk at Christie's is used to emphasise this presentation ('blue-chip artworks (.) great provenance erm by blue-chip artists' (13-14)). The term 'blue-chip' is used to describe art that is likely to hold its value long term and through economic instability. The repetition of the term 'blue-chip' is used to warrant Christian's purchases as an investment. However, the use of a pause and 'erm' indicates a difficulty in the interaction. The cost of Christian's art is reiterated by the unknown person with Christian stating a price on a lot ('1.8 to 2.9' (15)). However, Christian's talk in the voiceover is unspecific although the use of 'that amount of money' (16) presents his spending as ostentatious (*'when you're spending that amount of money you want to feel comfortable that you own an asset that's going up in value in the future' (16-18)).* Christian uses a footing (Goffman 1981) to present his ostentatious spending on art as an investment. This is negotiated by accounting for his feelings about his spending ('*you want to feel comfortable that you own an asset' (16-17).* Here psychological talk is used to account for his spending as an investment particularly as this contrasts with his earlier talk when he downgrades his spending by making a comparison to the purchase of a £10,000 car. Both of the extracts above present ostentatious spending on art as an investment. However, the speakers differing identity constructions result in differing presentations of the value of their consumption. Christian presents the downgrading of his expenditure as the result of his less affluent background where ostentatious spending is not the norm.

The Super-Rich Being Reluctant to Discuss Costs

In some of the extracts above, super-rich people present themselves as reticent to talk about the costs of their consumption. Extract five allows us to explore this reticence further as the speakers attempt to avoid talking about their wealth. In extract five, Max Cooper (M) who is described as 'worth an estimated 50 million quid' and founder of the Gumball 3000 talks to Eamonn Holmes. This extract is from *Eamonn and Ruth: Blowing a Fortune* that forms episode six of series two of *Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives* that is broadcast on Channel 5. The use of '*Blowing a Fortune'* indicates the high level of spending involved and its wasteful presentation. This episode involves Eamonn Holmes playing Max's pinball machine and looking at his art. By examining this extract, we can explore how super-rich individuals construct an ideological dilemma when talking about the cost of their spending. In particular, this requires further analysis of how speakers orient to talking about ostentatious expenditure.

Extract five:

1. E: *Max's fortune has given him a playboy lifestyle and just like the*
2. *people who join the rally, the ability to blow his cash on the most*
3. *extraordinary things.* ((to pinball machine)) Rubbish. Rubbish.
4. Rubbish
5. M: (h)
6. E: I will tell you what I have had my eyes on since I've come in here,
7. I can't tell if this is a poster, er if it's a photograph, if this is a
8. painting, but it's certainly very, very shiny.
9. M: It's diamond dust, it's all made out of.
10. E: It's what?

11. M: Diamond dust. Yeah.
12. E: Like as in...
13. M: As in diamonds.
14. E: Not as in glass or fake
15. M: No, not as in glass or yeah
16. E: Can I touch that?
17. M: Yeah
18. E: Can you touch it?
19. M: You have to be careful
20. E: If it comes off on my hand, I don't mind.
21. M: Exactly! But it certainly makes it sparkle, doesn't it?
22. E: Well it must make it worth a lot.
23. M: Yeah
24. E: How much would that be worth?
25. M: Ah I don't like telling the price of one of these.
26. E: (h)
27. M: It's got a few zeros on for sure.
28. E: And it's well-insured?
29. M: It's well-insured.
30. E: It's very well-insured.

Max presents himself as reticent to discuss the actual cost of his spending. This begins when Eamonn makes a statement about the cost of the items ('Well it must make it worth a lot' (22)). Whilst Max agrees, he does not provide any further information resulting in a follow up question from Eamonn ('How much

would that be worth?' (24)). Here Max explicitly orients to the norm against talking about spending in contrast with some of the extracts above ('Ah I don't like telling the price of one of these' (25)). Eamonn questions Max's position here through laughter that is less challenging in his role as a presenter. However, Max provides an indication of the amount involved despite his initial reluctance ('It's got a few zeros on for sure' (27)). By providing some idea of the amount involved and initially refusing to answer, Max is able to flaunt his consumption and orient to the norm against talking about spending. Therefore, speakers do orient to norms against spending although they do not fully comply with the requirement to be modest. This is reinforced at the end of the extract where Eamonn upgrades his own question (28) and Max's response, 'it's well insured' (29) to 'very well insured' (30) resulting in an ideological dilemma. Max's ideological dilemma about talking about spending resulting in him eventually talking about cost is prompted throughout by Eamonn allowing Max to present himself as reluctant about talking about costs.

Unlike earlier extracts, Max's purchases are not presented as investments or as essential items. Eamonn's narration introduces Max as an ostentatious spender ('*Max's fortune has given him a playboy lifestyle and just like the people who join the rally, the ability to blow his cash on the most extraordinary things'* (1-3)). As discussed in chapter 5, the term playboy has negative connotations and referring to his outgoings as '*the ability to blow his cash*' (2) develops this point further. Eamonn's narration at the start of the extract take place over footage of Max's home with many items or art and memorabilia. Max's talk forms an ideological dilemma about talking about

spending as he avoids talk about the specific costs involved but provides indicators of items expensiveness and mention costs in response to Eamonn's turns. However, unlike extracts three and four where spending on art is presented as an investment Max does not refer to a specific amount. This is similar to previous extracts where the narration is used as a tool to highlight the costs involved.

Not spending

Unlike the previous extracts where the wealthy avoid explicitly stating the costs involved in their spending but provide indications, extract six provides a deviant case where a super-rich person talks about not spending. John Elliott (J) who 'built up the manufacturing giant Ebac' talks to presenter, Eamonn Holmes (E). This extract is from series two, episode 4 of *Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives* which is broadcast on Channel 5. This extract allows us to examine how the super-rich construct not spending.

Extract six:

1. E: *Not only is John not passing on his wealth to his children, he*
2. *is a bit (.) How should I say it? (.) tight.* Is it nice being rich?
3. J: (.2) Yes. Yes, it's nice having more money than you need.
4. E: Do you actually enjoy it? Because a lot of folk would think,
5. what is the point of having it if you are not splashing it?
6. J: Look I travel on Ryanair, you know?
7. E: Why? Why on earth, if you had the choice
8. J: Because I hate waste.
9. E: (h)

10. J: I hate waste. I work it out. I could do ten journeys in
11. economy for the price of first class. It isn't worth it. It is bad
12. value. I was stood in a bus stop. One of my daughter's
13. friends came and said, 'Why are you standing at the bus
14. stop?' She was amazed that I was at a bus stop. Why were
15. you at a bus stop? To catch the bus. It's nice to stay in a
16. nice hotel. It's nice to have a nice holiday. It's nice to live in
17. a lovely house and have a nice car. It's nice to live in a
18. lovely house but it's not absolutely essential.
19. E: My worry is that you have got all this money and are you
20. enjoying it? Are you spending it to the level that you should
21. be? Are you spending it to the level that I would like to
22. spend it? No.
23. J: I was once advised by an accountant that I'm making more
24. money than I'm spending, and that's when he advised me to
25. go into horse racing.
26. E: (h)

Super-rich individuals not spending their wealth is constructed as being an exceptional case. Eamonn Holmes' narration constructs John Elliott as 'tight' and this is emphasised through the use of pauses in his speech ('*he is a bit (.) How should I say it? (.) tight*' (2)). Eamonn's narration is with a photo of John outside his company. However, their discussion takes place in a public house by the bar, a more affordable and everyday context for the audience. This contrasts to other extracts within the chapter where super-rich individuals are

talking in luxurious environments. By situating their talk in a public house, this works to account for Eamonn's presentation of John as '*tight*'. To emphasise John's presentation as a deviant case of super-rich spending, Eamonn uses the reported speech of others to question John's spending practices ('Because a lot of folk would think, what is the point of having it if you are not splashing it?' (4-5)). John's response involves the flagging of a low-cost brand, 'Ryanair' (6) that contrasts with other speakers use of luxury brands in their talk to indicate their level of spending. The use of an extreme case formulation (Pomerantz 1986) by Eamonn is used to demonstrate the distinctiveness of John's approach to spending compared to the other super-rich people featured ('Why? Why on earth, if you had the choice' (7)). However, John warrants his spending as rational ('Because I hate waste' (8)). Eamonn does not directly question John's response but undermines it through his use of laughter (9) in response (Billig 2005). John emphasises his position by repeating his statement and providing evidence in support of his choice ('I hate waste. I work it out. I could do ten journeys in economy for the price of first class. It isn't worth it. It is bad value' (10-12)). He also uses reported speech to draw upon the careful use of his wealth and to demonstrate others' questioning of this ('One of my daughter's friends came and said, 'Why are you standing at the bus stop?' (12-14)). Thus, the speakers orient to a norm of ostentatious spending for the super-rich and use reported speech to demonstrate this in their talk.

The repetition of the word, 'nice' (15-17) is used by John to present the benefits of excessive wealth. Yet this does not reflect the talk about ostentatious spending used by other speakers and acts to downgrade the

consumerism of the super-rich. John presents ostentatious spending as being 'not absolutely essential' (18). Eamonn's response orients to the norm of excessive consumerism for the super-rich by presenting himself as worried ('My worry is that you have got all this money and are you enjoying it?' (19-20)). His use of an emotion category here is used to add credibility to his questioning of John's limited spending. Eamonn again orients to the norm for ostentatious spending by upgrading 'you should' to 'I would' ('Are you spending it to the level that you should be? Are you spending it to the level that I would like to spend it? No' (20-22)). This allows Eamonn to position his talk about ostentatious spending as normal not only for John but for super-rich people in general. This alludes to previous extracts where the spending of the super-rich is used to construct their extraordinary identity.

Discussion

Talk about super-rich spending involves a reticence in places to mention the exact costs of items. However, speakers flag items in their talk such as luxury brands as a means to indicate their level of expenditure. This allows super-rich people to construct their identity through talk about their consumption. The legitimisation of spending by the super-rich is achieved through discourse about their deservingness, how their expenditure benefits others and as an investment. As demonstrated in chapter 4, the super-rich are presented as deserving of their wealth because of being presented as psychologically superior, here this is used to manage their accountability for their spending. Super-rich individuals who do not engage in ostentatious spending are questioned as they deviate from the norm of excessive spending by the super-

rich. Talk about super-rich consumption involves speakers negotiating an ideological dilemma about being reticent to discuss costs and being expected to spend ostentatiously.

Identity, morality and consumption

Consumption has been found to be used by individuals to construct their national and gender identity (Billig 1995; Duffy 2013). In the current findings, the purchase of a car is used to talk about super-rich male identity and the importance of exhibiting economic status. Brands and luxury goods are used by the super-rich in their talk to demonstrate their level of spending while allowing them to be reticent about the exact costs involved. Talk about spending can be used to construct and manage individual morality (Berta 2013). This can involve drawing upon Protestant Work Ethic to present spending as irresponsible (Autio 2005). As seen in the final extract, the super-rich speaker presents excessive spending as being wasteful drawing upon the Protestant Work Ethic to construct his position and to manage his accountability for not spending. Despite the norm of excessive spending for the super-rich, individuals are also required to negotiate a norm to not talk about the costs involved and ideology such as the Protestant Work Ethic that is oriented against irresponsible spending. Thus, talk about consumption involves the construction of moral identity that requires the negotiation of an ideological dilemma. Talk about spending as an investment draws upon the Protestant Work Ethic as spending is on assets that will accumulate value and not wasteful. However, the editing of the programmes challenges this construction by undermining super-rich speakers discourse about their collections through the narration and

footage of the extent of their consumption. As a result, super-rich individuals attempt to present their spending or not spending as moral. However, this involves negotiating an ideological dilemma in their talk and is challenged through the editing process.

The legitimisation of spending

The spending of the super-rich is legitimised in a number of ways by wealthy people. This includes presenting ostentatious spending as deserved as a result of hard work; as an investment to generate further wealth and beneficial to others. One of the ways in which super-rich spending is legitimised is through talk about their deservingness. This draws upon a 'rags to riches' interpretative repertoire. This highlights the importance of individuals presenting themselves as 'being fair' (Tileagă 2010b) as their spending is presented as earned. This is achieved through their presentation of their work ethic and resultant success as demonstrated in chapter 4 where super-rich individuals present themselves as being more driven than others. In the findings, speakers orient to this increased drive. Talk about tax has outlined the importance placed on individuals having autonomy to choose how their wealth is spent (Carr, Goodman and Jowett 2018). By super-rich individuals being constructed as hard working, their wealth is constructed through their efforts and this results in talk about consumption drawing upon individualistic ideology. Yet, consumerism does not exist within a political and social vacuum (Berta 2013; Hilton and Daunton 2001). One extract presents the spending of the wealthy as being beneficial to others when asked to legitimise their spending and draws upon the trickle-down effect. An alternative argument for presenting ostentatious spending as beneficial to

others draws upon the discursive strategy used to heirs in chapter 5 to account for their privilege where wealth is presented as belonging to the family. As a result, spending on luxury goods can be accounted for by being advantageous to family members. The ostentatious expenditure of the super-rich is constructed as deserved as a result of their psychological superiority due to their increased drive and resilience.

Conclusion

Talk about super-rich consumption involves negotiating an ideological dilemma about spending; being reluctant to discuss the cost of items and excessive spending as normal for the wealthy. This is managed in their discourse by mentioning luxury goods to indicate the level of expenditure involved. Speakers present the ostentatious consumerism of the super-rich as deserved due to their superior work ethic. Wealthy individuals who do not spend ostentatiously are challenged due to their behaviour being presented as deviating from the excessive spending norm.

Chapter 7: How the Global Super-Rich Talk About their International Hubs

In chapter 6, super-rich people presented their spending in the UK as beneficial to others. Yet, there is a lack of evidence demonstrating the benefits of migration by extremely wealthy people to the UK. As discussed in chapter 1, the congregation of the super-rich in global hubs has a negative impact upon other residents within the locality. Additionally, their increased mobility has a detrimental environmental impact. Given this contradiction, this chapter will explore how the global super-rich talk about their mobility. It was found that speakers present themselves as classy people who integrate well into London society. Speakers account for their presence in London through warranting as good migrants who are beneficial to the community. This highlighted the importance of talk about class when discussing immigration in the UK. Speakers drew upon individualistic ideology when talking about their presence in London highlighting the importance of free will as a social norm.

Constructing migrants using discursive and rhetorical approaches

Discursive and rhetorical approaches have been used to research the construction of poorer groups of refugees and migrants in relation to obtaining residence and citizenship. This research has focused on poorer groups and not individuals who travel more frequently or have the means to access investor visas. Talk about immigration presents a distinction between good and bad migrants who are costly to the state (van Dijk 2000). Goodman et al. (2015) found that migrants are presented as a risk to British society in relation to their alleged cost to the welfare state and culturally as they are constructed as non-

English speaking. This results in arguments where poorer migrants are presented as not integrating into society and as a cultural and economic risk. Citizenship is constructed as earned through work (Lynn and Lea 2003) particularly in relation to access to the welfare state (Gibson 2011). As a result, there are:

> deserving new citizens (who have earned their right to citizenship) and undeserving new citizens (who have not earned their right to citizenship) (Andreouli and Dashtipour 2014:104).

By presenting migrants as being undeserving of citizenship or residence arrangements on the basis of their work status, people are able to avoid appearing racist (Goodman and Burke 2010). Super-rich individuals are not required to evidence their role as workers but allegedly contribute to the economy in the form of investment. Therefore, there is a need to explore how the super-rich construct themselves as migrants particularly given the evidence presenting the wealthy as less beneficial to society than other groups. This raises the question of whether extremely wealthy people use arguments about integration and their positive contribution to account for their residence.

Talk categorizing migrants as deserving or undeserving also involves discourse about place, as individual's identity is situated (Dixon and Durrheim 2000). Place and identity form an important part of individuals belonging to their local community (Korpela 1989). As such, place becomes a discursive resource in people's talk (Dixon and Durrheim 2000) allowing individuals to account for their presence and to deny access to others. Refugees have used place identity in their talk to present their host nation as comfortable and their

nation of origin as unsafe (Kirkwood, McKinlay and McVittie 2013). This forms an argument drawing upon human rights (van Dijk 2000) that presents refugees as requiring a safe haven (Every and Augoustinos 2008). Talk about locations forms an important part of individual identity and arguments to cross national borders legally. Given super-rich individuals movement not necessarily being focused on their personal safety, there is a need to explore how they construct their home nation and country of origin.

The use of public policy to attract the super-rich

Despite the negative effects of wealth inequality, countries compete to attract super-rich individuals with investment visa opportunities (Migration Advisory Committee 2014). It is commonly claimed that others benefit from the presence of wealthy individuals spending their wealth in what is known as the trickle-down effect (Arndt 1983). In chapter 6, speakers drew upon the trickle-down effect to account for their ostentatious spending on travel as people were employed as a result of their expenditure. In the UK, a tier 1 (investor) visa requires a minimum of £2m in the applicant's bank account (Home Office 2017). However, a previous review of tier 1 (investor) visas found there was no benefit to the UK economy from the activities of visa recipients except to professional services from providing investment advice and independent schools (Migration Advisory Committee 2014). This contrasts with the evidence for migration as a whole that states that immigration has a positive effect on the economy (OECD 2013) and reduces the need to increase the national debt (OBR 2013). This is due to the majority of migrants being of working age and able to contribute to the economy through tax (Vargas-Silva 2016). Arguments presenting poorer

groups such as asylum seekers being attracted to the UK for welfare payments, labelled the pull factor, have been discredited as migrants lack knowledge of the availability of public funds and are drawn by other factors (Mayblin 2016). In the US, refugees have been found to pay more in taxes over a 20-year period than they receive in public services (Evans and Fitzgerald 2017). Similar to the pull factor for poorer groups of migrants, the trickle-down effect of the super-rich has also been discredited (Thornton, Agnello and Link 1978). Thus, there is a need to explore how super-rich migration and policy aimed to attract the super-rich is legitimised despite the lack of evidence for the overall benefits to society. Even arguments such as the super-rich contributing to society through philanthropy as discussed in chapter 1 have been discredited. This is due to the lack of a fair means of distribution resulting in more disadvantaged groups receiving less donations as the super-rich donate to causes that are more relatable to them. In contrast, other groups contribute more to society through tax and their labour to deliver public services (Vargas-Silva 2016) yet are negatively constructed and are confronted with more barriers in accessing the UK.

Impact of super-rich migration to London

Unlike other groups who have been found to be beneficial to society, the enhanced mobility of the super-rich is particularly damaging on the availability of housing for other groups due to their spending on real estate. Property prices in London increased in the 2008 Global Financial Crisis and this was claimed to be the result of super-rich purchases in the media (Badarinza and Ramadorai in press). London has been identified as a central location for wealthy individuals

who are attracted to international cities (Fernandez, Hofman and Aalbers 2016). In addition to this, London real estate is used by the super-rich to protect themselves from political and economic risks in other countries (Badarinza and Ramadorai in press). Purchasers view London properties as having a higher rate of return compared to other parts of the UK and can be resold more quickly (Fernandez, Hofman and Aalbers 2016). Whilst the super-rich can afford to mitigate risk to their capital by purchasing property in London, poorer groups are under increasing pressure as rents become less affordable and local authorities have less resources (Rugg 2016). Given the pressure placed on the availability of affordable housing, there is a need to explore how the super-rich account for their concentration in locations such as London.

Contrasting talk about groups with enhanced mobility

The construction of Roma people, who traditionally have enhanced mobility, in public discourse provides a distinct comparison to the super-rich. Whilst the extremely wealthy are presented more positively as a result of their superior psychological construction as discussed in chapter 4, the Roma are dehumanised (Tileagă 2006a) and their mobility is used to legitimize their exclusion from society and access to resources (Barnes, Auburn and Lea 1998). Language used to construct the Roma is derogatory which results in them being categorised as other (Tileagă 2005). This is achieved through presenting the Roma as being innately different (Tileagă 2006a). As a consequence of this discourse, Romanies are constructed as a social issue (Tileagă 2014) which results in their exclusion from mainstream society being legitimised (Tileagă 2006a; 2014). Similar to the Roma, the super-rich are

presented as having different psychological traits as discussed in chapter 4. The exclusion of Roma people draws upon sedentary ideology in talk that presents residing in one place as the norm (Barnes, Auburn and Lea 1998). As a result of Roma people's degradation based on their movement, there is a need to explore how super-rich mobility is constructed and used. Given that talk about the Roma's psychological construction is inherently negative, this raises how questions about how talk about super-rich mobility uses psychological language to account for their enhanced freedom of movement.

Within the data corpus, there are programmes with a specific focus on the mobility of the global super-rich and their presence in the UK. This provides the opportunity to explore how the international super-rich talk about their congregation in global hubs. This allows for the examination of how the super-rich use place-identity to legitimize their presence despite the evidence questioning the benefits for local economies. Additionally, this enables super-rich arguments for their mobility to be contrasted with other groups such as refugees whose talk about integration has been more extensively researched.

Findings

The super-rich use talk about their mobility to account for their presence in London and to present themselves as good migrants. This involves constructing themselves as 'Anglophiles', English speaking and contributing to the economy; qualities that allow speakers to present themselves being integrated into British society. Talk by super-rich speakers about living in London uses place-identity constructions used by other groups to present themselves as a benefit to the community and their country of origin as

dangerous (Kirkwood, McKinlay and McVittie 2013). Additionally, the super-rich draw upon common places about upper class locations to present themselves as posh and classy. The editing and narration are used to present the global super-rich in London as having newly acquired wealth and harder working to account for their presence in the UK.

The global super-rich presented as Anglophiles

The first extract is taken from *Lagos to London: Britain's New Super-Rich* broadcast on Channel 4, a programme that explores the lifestyle of super-rich Nigerian people who live in both capital cities. This features sisters, Temi (T) and Cuppy (C) with a narrator (N) discussing their mobility that provides an opportunity to explore how the sisters are presented as Anglophiles and in particular, the appeal of London to the super-rich. The extract includes footage of the sisters in their apartment overlooking Tower Bridge and separately talking directly to the camera. The narration and voiceovers are accompanied with footage of Harrods, the Knightsbridge area and the family's social media posts.

Extract one:

1. N: *We follow a new generation of Nigerian elites as they live,*
2. *work and party between Lagos and London.*
3. Titles
4. C: ((in apartment)) I don't think I'm used to opening champagne
5. by myself. Close your eyes a minute, ok? Oh. It's happening.
6. Uh, ow!

N: *Educated at one of England's most expensive private schools, 23-year-old Cuppy and 19-year-old sister, Temi are heiresses to a billion-dollar fortune*

T: Health and wealth

C: Health and wealth and happiness

T: Oh look at that

C: *((to camera)) London for me is one of the best cities in the world*. I love love love being in places around Knightsbridge which is where our family home is *we go to Harrods a lot in there. They sell cars in there which is crazy. We go to the arts club a super amazing private members club great food, great atmosphere*

T: ((to camera)) We go to Dubai, we go to Paris but we always come back to London. *Here you have the luxury shopping, the luxury cars, you have luxury homes so it's really like a playground here.* You spend the money you worked hard making

N: *Both Dad Femi and Mum Nana are wealthy entrepreneurs. He's a multi-million-dollar oil tycoon and she's big in dry cleaning. The family live what Nigerians call the shuttle life getting between properties in New York, Dubai, Abuja and Lagos. And when they're in London they're just a stone's throw away from Harrods living in a £35 million two storey apartment*

Similar to the previous chapter, the activities of the super-rich as presented as ostentatious as seen in the sisters drinking champagne and the opening narration use of a three-part list including partying to describe wealthy Nigerians lifestyle ('*they live, work and party between Lagos and London*' (1-2)). Cuppy and Temi are presented as being educated in the UK ('*Educated at one of England's most expensive private schools*' (7)). This serves to present the sisters as Anglophiles and good migrants as they have a privileged status and are able to integrate into society. Cuppy's Anglophilia is centred on London ('*one of the best cities in the world*' (13-14)). This is accounted for by the high-end shopping and leisure activities available that involves the repetition of 'love' for emphasis (14-16). Cuppy's talk is delivered directly to the camera to emphasise her statement about her love of Knightsbridge. By talking about Knightsbridge and Harrods, Cuppy is orienting to specific places that are known to be posh thereby presenting her Anglophilia as sophisticated. The use of editing to show footage of Harrods towards the end of this talk evidences her claim. Cuppy builds on this presentation by discussing her trips to a '*super amazing private members club*' (17). Temi supports Cuppy's construction of the family as Anglophiles through the use of a disclaimer that includes their hypermobility ('We go to Dubai, we go to Paris but we always come back to London' (19-20)). Temi's talk emphasizes the sister's high-end lifestyle through the use of a three-part list repeatedly referring to luxury ('*Here you have the luxury shopping, the luxury cars, you have luxury homes*' (20-21)). Temi also draws upon talk about play that is used by heirs to present their status as earned as seen in chapter 5 and is delivered directly to the camera ('*so it's*

really like a playground here. You spend the money you worked hard making' (21-23)). Thus, the sister's talk is used to present themselves as sophisticated Anglophiles who deserve to be in London as a result of their work ethic. However, the narration downgrades Temi and Cuppy's status by referring to their parent's wealth ('*Both Dad Femi and Mum Nana are wealthy entrepreneurs. He's a multi-million-dollar oil tycoon and she's big in dry cleaning*' (24-26)). The narrator presents the family as hypermobile, '*the shuttle life*' and this is demonstrated through a collection of the family's social media posts in various locations. Additional narration emphasizes the ostentatiousness of their residence by referencing the property price and showing the sisters walking through an opulent apartment whilst holding champagne flutes ('*just a stone's throw away from Harrods living in a £35 million two storey apartment*' (28-30)).

In addition to the super-rich presenting themselves as Anglophiles due to the leisure attractions in the UK, wealthy individuals also warrant their British education and use of English as a lingua franca. In the next extract, 28-year-old Ozee Mbadiwe (O), from 'one of Nigeria's most prominent families' discusses his school experience in a segment with his twin Ocee Mbadiwe. Like extract one, this extract is also from the Channel 4 documentary, *Lagos to London: Britain's New Super-Rich*. The extract features Ozee on camera after visiting his old school reflecting on his experience and looking at an old school photograph. This extract examines how super-rich individuals warrant the use of English in talk about their Anglophilia.

Extract two:

1. O: We moved over to England to be English, you know
2. because you end up having the best of both worlds. I'm
3. Nigerian. That would never change but I'm also English you
4. know. Everything that we've learned from being in England,
5. not just education-wise but being around people of different
6. nationalities, just living and growing with people from all
7. parts of the world. It prepares you for the rest of the world,
8. you know, you can put me in any situation and I feel
9. comfortable.

Ozee presents his private British education as being beneficial ('you end up having the best of both worlds' (2)). This draws upon arguments used about London being a common location for the super-rich ('being around people of different nationalities, just living and growing with people from all parts of the world' (5-7)). Due to the cost of Ozee's education, the diverse experience that he constructs would be with other wealthy children and not representative in terms of the class composition of the UK. Ozee warrants the benefits of his education as allowing him to feel at ease ('It prepares you for the rest of the world, you know, you can put me in any situation and I feel comfortable' (7-9)). By accounting for his comfort as the result of his education, Ozee highlights the importance of English and the private education system for the international super-rich. As a result, the global super-rich in programmes about their immigration to the UK are presented as Anglophiles.

Talk about London as a hub for sophisticated individuals

Presenting the super-rich as Anglophiles involves talk about class, this involves presenting London as a sophisticated hub for the wealthy and drawing upon liberal norms about individual freedom. In extract three, an introduction from the narrator (N) is followed by Mahtab Jamali (M), an Iranian fashion designer discussing life in London. The mobility of the super-rich and residing in London is a key feature within the corpus despite the programmes having a UK wide focus. This extract was part of series one episode one of *The World's Most Expensive Food* that was broadcast on Channel 4 which examined the luxury food industry. Extract four features Ozee Mbadiwe (O) from extract two in the Channel 4 documentary, *Lagos to London: Britain's New Super-Rich*. Ocee and Ozee Mbadiwe are attending the launch for a shopping service aimed at the Nigerian super-rich that was described earlier in the programme by Ocee as an 'Argos catalogue for the super-rich'. This extract edits together footage of the twins socialising at the event and Ozee talking to the camera whilst sitting behind a table at the venue. These extracts provide an opportunity to explore how talk about super-rich mobility presents London as sophisticated for those with extreme wealth.

Extract three:

1. N: *To entice this new breed of clientele to her business, Laura's*
2. *hosting a caviar tasting at Russian-owned, Jewellery Theatre*
3. *specialising in luxury diamond couture*
4. M: Nice seeing you again. How are you? Good.

5. N: *It's a magnet for new, young, foreign wealth. Mahtab Jamali*
6. *is an Iranian fashion designer now residing in London.*
7. M: The fact that there are a lot of billionaires or like fine kind of
8. living people living in London and in England *erm it's just*
9. *normal in a way.*
10. N: *And they aren't afraid to flaunt it*
11. M: Money comes, money goes, you know? But if you are living
12. in a way that makes you truly happy, then do whatever you
13. would like to do.

Extract four:

1. O: *London is one of the most major cities in the world. It has*
2. everything you could be looking for whether it is business
3. whether it is pleasure whether it is luxury *whether it is*
4. *relaxation so there is always going to be that link between*
5. *our family and England and it's important because that link*
6. *between London and Lagos has become part of our fabric*
7. *over the years.*

Similar to the previous extract, the use of '*new breed of clientele*' (3:1) by the narrator signifies that the international super-rich featured do not have aristocratic or established wealth. The initial narration of the extract is accompanied by footage of recognisable designer and luxury brands to present London as offering an ostentatious shopping experience. The narrator uses a 'magnet' metaphor to present London as attractive to rich people (*'It's a magnet for new, young, foreign wealth'*. (3:5)). By drawing on the concept of a magnet,

there is an emphasis placed on the appeal of London to the super-rich. This also repeats the category of ‘new’ to re-emphasise the status of the recently acquired wealth of the global super-rich. Mahtab warrants the presence of the super-rich as normal (3:7-9). However, Mahtab amends 'billionaires' to the vaguer 'fine kind of living people' that suggests that London is appealing to sophisticated people and not just those with money. This presents London as attractive not just to the wealthy but to those with class. This negotiates the narration’s emphasis on the ‘new’ categorization by presenting wealthy individuals living in London as classy. The editing of the last part of this section referring to the conventional nature of billionaires living in London is accompanied by footage of a tray full of champagne flutes creating a contrast to what the audience may consider to be normal (‘*erm it's just normal, in a way’* (3:8-9)).

Similar to Mahtab, Ozee presents London as attractive without specifically mentioning wealthy people. This begins by positioning London as ‘*one of the most major cities in the world*’ (4:1). Ozee then begins to account for his position by presenting London as a place that has something for everyone (4:1-2). He then draws upon a ‘work hard, play hard’ interpretative repertoire used in chapter 5 to construct the super-rich as hard working. Here this is used as a contrast (‘whether it is business whether it is pleasure whether it is luxury *whether it is relaxation’* (4:2-4)). The editing of the first part of the extract where Ozee is positioned in front of the camera when he is indirectly referring to their work ethic builds on his account for warranting the super-rich as deserving of access to London and the benefits that they receive. This works to present

London as appealing but also as a place of work. London is also warranted as a classy location by presenting it as luxurious (4:3). 'So' is then used as a transitional marker for Ozee to construct the UK as a normal place for him as a super-rich individual to be located ('*there is always going to be that link between our family and England*' (4:4-5)). By drawing upon the notion of family, Ozee constructs his access to London as generational and ongoing. This is warranted as ingrained and by the use of 'our', Ozee presents his mobility between the two cities as assumed for his family group ('*it's important because that link between London and Lagos has become part of our fabric over the years*' (4:5-7)). The presence of the super-rich in London is accounted for by presenting their residence as deserved and as a right through familial ties.

In extract three, Mahtab also draws upon talk about wealth as transient to legitimise ostentatious spending ('Money comes, money goes, you know? But if you are living in a way that makes you truly happy, then do whatever you would like to do' (3:11-13)). Her talk prioritises individual happiness and authenticity as a means to account for the presence of the international super-rich in London. This piece is delivered directly to the camera with a close up of Mahtab's face that differs from the rest of the extract where the camera is further back adding to the construction of authenticity. Mahtab also draws upon individualistic ideology emphasising the importance of free will that is difficult to challenge due to norms about individual freedom. London is presented as a centre for the international super-rich who are present due to their sophistication.

London as a safe place for the wealthy

In the earlier extracts, speakers are presented as being attracted to the UK for comfort. In the next extracts, super-rich people present this appeal as being due to the British political system. Extract five features Wendy Yu (W), a 'billionaire heiress', an unseen member of the production team (OC) and the narrator (N) in *Britain's Billionaire Immigrants* broadcast on Channel 4. The programme follows the Chinese super-rich and shows their lives in London. Wendy is shown in different clips walking to her flat in central London, using her phone in the back of a car and in her flat. In extract six, Emin Agalorov (E), 'heir to a property empire' talks to Ruth Langsford (R) in *Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives* broadcast (series one, episode one) on Channel 5. The extracts allow us to explore how super-rich individuals present the UK as appealing to the wealthy due to its safe status.

Extract five:

1. N: *China (.) The meteoric rise of a superpower in the last 30*
2. *years it has quickly become one of the world's richest*
3. *countries and now has more billionaires than anywhere else*
4. *on earth. Ten years ago only a trickle of Chinese visitors*
5. *came to the UK but this year will see around 330,000*
6. *heading to these shores. Most are tourists but some are*
7. *among the wealthiest people on earth and they're keen to*
8. *stay.*
9. W: ((to camera)) I think maybe I'm an interesting person and I
10. have something special to say and to tell.

N: *Billionaire heiress Wendy Yu is the 26-year-old daughter of a Chinese door manufacturer. She was born in China and her family still live there but Wendy has chosen London as her new home.*

W: ((to camera)) I just love the atmosphere here, and I love the people I meet here and I love the events happening here. I love the things I can do here. I just love this city, and it's my it's my home now so (.) ((moving toys)) *In China I can't log on to Instagram or Google or gmail so it's like in terms of communication, I think yeah it's better to communicate*

OC: *Why why can't you get onto Instagram in China?*

W: I think there is er censorship, yes but let's not talk about politics! (h) yeah (h)

Extract six:

R: So many Russians, Eastern Europeans, especially wealthy ones, seem to congregate in London, they love London. What is it about this place? Why not Paris, New York or Madrid?

E: First of all, English is the common language. The tax issues (.) the comfort. A lot of Russians fled here that have problems with the Russian government and er it just became I think the place where people wanna reside. Although I think London on one hand is overrated because it's very expensive and I think that's because the richest people gathered in London.

In extract six, Ruth focuses on the national origins of the super-rich in London ('So many Russians, Eastern Europeans, especially wealthy ones, seem to congregate in London' (6:1-2)). This works to construct the super-rich as international and this is also achieved through the introductory narration in extract five ('some are among the wealthiest people on earth and they're keen to stay' (5:6-7)). Similar to the previous speakers Wendy in extract five presents herself as an Anglophile through the use of a three-part list that uses 'love' repetitively (5:14-16). This involves a focus on London and Wendy presenting the UK as her place of residence ('I just love this city, and it's my it's my home now' (5:16-17)). Wendy's talk involves a pause to indicate the difficulties in talking about difficulties around censorship in China ('so (.) *in China I can't log on to Instagram or Google or gmail*' (5:17-18)). This is emphasized through this being voiced over footage of Wendy rearranging toys and the intervention of the production team in pressing Wendy for more detail ('*Why why can't you get onto Instagram in China?*' (5:20)). She uses hedging through the use of 'I think', a disclaimer and humour to respond to this question ('I think there is er censorship, yes but let's not talk about politics! (h) yeah (h)' (5:21-22). Unlike, Wendy's previous talk in line 17, Wendy is shown talking to the camera to further present her response as difficult for her to manage. As a result, Wendy warrants the UK as more preferable due to less restrictions around freedom of speech. Thus, the UK and more specifically London is presented as a desirable place for the super-rich due to its liberal politics.

Emin in extract six also presents the UK as a safe place for wealthy people as a result of its political governance. He accounts for the presence of

super-rich Russians in the UK through the use of a three-part list ('First of all, English is the common language. The tax issues (.) the comfort' (6:4-5)). By presenting the super-rich as English speakers, Emin orients to arguments against the migration of other groups in relation to cultural integration. However, the presence of a pause indicates that accounting for super-rich migration on the basis of tax policy is more controversial. Emin refers to 'comfort' (6:5) and legitimizing the presence of wealthy people by presenting them as political refugees (6:5-7). However, Emin does not present himself as an Anglophile like the previous speakers as he questions the desirability of the location on the basis of its expense ('Although I think London on one hand is overrated because it's very expensive and I think that's because the richest people gathered in London' (6:7-9)). As seen in chapter 6, wealthy individuals who do not spend are presented as odd and problematic. This type of talk is contentious for migrants as demonstrated in the talk of refugees who avoid talking negatively about their host (Kirkwood 2012). Extract six provides a contrast to extract five where Wendy presents herself as an Anglophile. Despite the costs, super-rich people are presented as being attracted to the UK and London as a result of its political climate and the freedom of expression that this offers.

In addition to presenting the UK as safe politically, super-rich individuals also construct the UK as safer for their personal safety. Cuppy (C) discusses her personal safety arrangements whilst being a passenger in a car in Lagos in *Lagos to London: Britain's New Super-Rich* in a segment that also features the narrator (N). Extract seven examines how the super-rich construct London as

appealing due to its reduced crime rate and safer environment. The footage shows clip of the road outside being edited with Cuppy talking in the car.

Extract seven:

N: *Cuppy is heading home to prepare for tonight's live performance on national TV.*

C: Yeah, I'm almost there. Ok ok all right Bye. I don't think Lagos roads are created for sports cars. Even in the jeep it's a bit of a bump. This is a bulletproof car you know, you're in a box and it's (.) There's something a bit (.) about it you know? A lot of security (.3) ((close up)) You know, it is one of those situations where you never know, and it just stems from my dad, you know (.) my dad is one of those better to be safe than sorry people and at least you know you're safe. You know you're in here and Nigeria did have a big crime problem we had a burglary problem kidnapping problem was absolutely huge. *In London it's absolute bliss because I can walk down Brompton Road not a worry in the world*. In Lagos, I can't just be like, 'Guys, I'll be back in two hours'. No. I've got to go with people I've got to have security. My Dad's got to know where I am. It's a lot no other one of my DJ friends needs security so it's kind of his fault. Pay for it! (h)

The risk to Cuppy's personal safety in Lagos is constructed through her talk about her car (5-7). 'You know' as a discourse marker indicates that the audience are already aware of the speaker's claims (Östman 1981). Cuppy

uses this to present the risk to herself in Nigeria as an everyday assumption. She evidences this by talking about the previous crime rates in Nigeria ('Nigeria did have a big crime problem we had a burglary problem kidnapping problem was absolutely huge' (11-13)). By using a close up of Cuppy from line 7 onwards featuring her rubbing her eyes, the editing of this section presents Cuppy as emotional and affected by the risk of crime. This is then followed by a contrast that presents London as safer accompanied by footage of the view of Lagos outside the car ('*In London it's absolute bliss because I can walk down Brompton Road not a worry in the world*' (13-14)). Cuppy's use of contrast allows her to present London as safer and is evidenced through her experience referencing a specific place in Knightsbridge, 'Brompton Road'. Cuppy's talk involves a further contrast to her experience in Lagos ('In Lagos, I can't just be like, 'Guys, I'll be back in two hours'. No. I've got to go with people I've got to have security' (14-16)). Cuppy's use of contrast within her talk draws upon discourse used to present refugees as requiring safety (Goodman, Sirriyeh and McMahon 2017). This type of talk draws upon norms of safety and freedom of movement to account for Cuppy's life in London. Super-rich individuals present wealth as a burden as discussed in chapter 4. Here, wealth is presented as a burden to personal safety that can be negotiated through residing in London.

Super-rich migrants as harder working

In addition to talk about personal safety, discourse about general migration can examine people's work ethic. In extract eight, Wendy Yu (W) with the Narrator (N) discuss Wendy receiving an award for her work in *Britain's Billionaire Migrants* shown on Channel 4. This segment edits clips of Wendy at the award

ceremony and going home before showing footage of China during the final turn by the narrator and the people featured in the programme. The extract examines how super-rich migrants are presented as being harder working to legitimize their presence in the UK.

Extract eight:

1. N: *Wendy tells her father she's the Young Achiever of The Year*
2. *(.) but his response is typical.*
3. W: My dad said to me, 'It's just a (.) very small thing in your
4. lifelong journey (h) you should be more focused on what
5. you're going to achieve. *It's just a very small thing in your life'*
6. *(.) Yeah.*
7. N: *It looks like Wendy may never get the praise she craves from*
8. *her father but perhaps this is the Chinese way (.) to keep*
9. *striving for more.*
10. W: Oops, sorry, you've stepped on (.) It's all right.
11. N: *The new Chinese super-rich have certainly not adopted the*
12. *British sense of entitlement for some this relentless quest to*
13. *succeed has lifted China out of extreme poverty to make it an*
14. *economic superpower in only a few decades. Now more and*
15. *more Chinese are heading to Britain not just to enjoy the social*
16. *freedom the West offers but like many before them to grow*
17. *their fortune and bring more money into our own coffers.*

The extract presents Wendy's father's reaction to her award as being underwhelming (3-5). This uses Wendy's father's reported speech to downplay

her achievement. By using a pause and laughter, Wendy constructs this as being an unconventional parental response. The narration of this segment is used to warrant Wendy's father's response as being '*the Chinese way*' (8). This uses a disclaimer to introduce an 'effortfulness' interpretative repertoire (Gibson 2009) ('*but perhaps this is the Chinese way (.) to keep striving for more*' (8-9)). As demonstrated in chapter 4, super-rich individuals present themselves as more effortful than others to legitimize the acquisition of their wealth. Here, the narration is used to present the global super-rich as having an enhanced work ethic. This argument is continued by providing a contrast to British people ('*The new Chinese super-rich have certainly not adopted the British sense of entitlement*' (11-12)). The narrator' talk uses a category of 'new' to distinguish the Chinese super-rich from other groups of wealthy people such as the British aristocracy. Again, Chinese super-rich people are presented as more effortful due to their '*relentless quest to succeed*' (12-13). This section of narration also draws on previous arguments on the UK as a safe place ('*not just to enjoy the social freedom the West offers*' (15-16)). However, this forms a disclaimer that draws on Chinese super-rich individuals drive to acquire wealth ('*but like many before them to grow their fortune and bring more money into our own coffers*' (16-17)). This is evidenced visually by showing the wealthy Chinese individuals within the programme as being active, for example using their telephone. A reference to the trickle-down effect is used to legitimize Chinese people's profitable activities in the UK as a result of the positive benefit to the economy. Thus, the Chinese super-rich are presented as desirable to the UK as a result of their superior work ethic and wealth.

Discussion

Super-rich people's talk about London is used to construct themselves as classy people and good migrants. This takes the same structure used by refugees constructing place-identity to legitimize their presence in the UK by the more affluent presenting themselves as beneficial to their host country and their country of origin as hazardous (Kirkwood, McKinlay and McVittie 2013). Wealthy individuals warrant themselves as beneficial to the UK through talk about their Anglophilia and enhanced work ethic. In contrast their nation of origin is constructed as unsafe and the super-rich being at an increased risk. Speakers present themselves as 'Anglophiles' and English speakers to highlight their ability to integrate that indirectly challenges anti-migrant discourse focused on migrants as a cultural risk to society. Whilst the super-rich draw upon standard arguments for migration that are used by refugees, their construction is not challenged and the editing of the programmes strengthens their argument. In particular, the narration highlights the construction of wealthy individuals as being more effortful than British people. Overall, these arguments result in discourse about super-rich mobility on television that is more positive than talk about poorer groups in need of asylum.

Super-rich people as beneficial to the UK

Extremely wealthy individuals' construction of London allows them to present themselves as good migrants who are of benefit to society. The use of positive talk about London draws upon their identification as Anglophiles to counter immigration discourse that presents migrants as a risk to society (Goodman et al. 2015). Foreign wealthy people in London are presented positively

throughout the corpus and this differs from negative talk in the media about poorer migrant groups (Goodman, Sirriyeh and McMahon 2017). This is achieved through the use of categorization in how they talk about their residence in London. By referring to common places such as Knightsbridge, a location that is publicly known to be sophisticated and frequented by the wealthy, the super-rich construct themselves as people with class. Categories allow groups to access resources (McMahon 2015) and are used to legitimize informal segregation (Dixon and Durrheim 2003) as poorer groups cannot afford to join private members clubs. The positive presentation of the super-rich in relation to their residence in the UK and the potential result of being granted naturalization highlights the importance of class in talk about citizenship (Gibson, Crossland and Hamilton 2018). For the super-rich, talk using categorization that presents London as sophisticated involves constructing themselves as people who can integrate well into society.

Talk about the superior work ethic of the super-rich is used to account for their presence in the UK. As seen in chapter 4, discourse about the super-rich's superior work ethic is used to account for their extreme wealth. This argument presents the international super-rich as deserving enough to enter the UK and draws upon interpretative repertoires presenting migrants as effortful and British people as idle (Gibson, Crossland and Hamilton 2018). This negotiates anti-immigration talk that presents migrants as a drain on the economy (van Dijk 2000). The use of metaphors in talk about migrants differs in relation to the super-rich. Instead of talk about immigration being 'described as an invasion, a flood, or a plague' (van Dijk 2000:100), super-rich migrants' attraction to London

involves the use of a magnet metaphor. This emphasizes the super-rich's presentation as Anglophiles. In addition to this, talk about English as a lingua franca for extremely wealthy people indirectly negotiates arguments about migrant integration whereby poorer migrants are assumed to be unable to participate in society as a result of their English language abilities (Goodman et al. 2015). Unlike poorer migrant groups, the super-rich are presented as Anglophiles who are beneficial to the UK. This challenges dominant arguments that present migrants as dependent on the welfare state and unable to integrate due to their poor English speaking ability. In contrast, the global super-rich are constructed as classy people who can integrate and contribute to the UK economy. This argument for the international super-rich contradicts dominant arguments about migrants by not presenting wealthy individuals as a risk to society.

Wealthy people's places of origin as unsafe

Super-rich individuals use place-identity to construct their nation of origin as unsafe and as a result draw upon arguments used by other groups seeking refuge that construct the UK as safe. This draws upon positive talk about immigration that emphasizes the importance of human rights (van Dijk 2000) and results in the super-rich being presented as ordinary people with everyday concerns about their safety. Talk constructing London as safe and their nations of origin as unsafe draw upon individualistic ideology in regards to freedom of movement as a liberal ideal. As seen in chapter 4, individualistic ideology is drawn upon in talk to legitimize the extreme wealth of the super-rich as a result of their greater abilities. Autonomy is a recognized norm and talk about high tax

rates for the wealthy emphasizes the importance of their free will in their role as wealth generators (Carr, Goodman and Jowett 2018). The presentation of a deviant case where a wealthy individual criticizes London in relation to tax and cost contrasts with normal migrant talk that is complimentary of its host (Kirkwood, McKinlay and McVittie 2013). However, this highlights the super-rich's ability to access multiple global hubs that meet their needs. In this respect, the super-rich have extraordinary freedom of movement as they can meet differing visa requirements as a result of their wealth. Therefore, the super-rich can use arguments about risks to their personal safety in their country of origin to legitimize their residence in London and mobility by drawing on norms about autonomy.

Conclusion

Talk about the mobility of the super-rich on British television is unsurprisingly focused on their presence in London, a global hub for the extremely wealthy. This utilizes common places and place-identity to present the international super-rich as having 'class'. tThe super-rich have enhanced options to access the UK despite their use of arguments used by poorer groups whose mobility is restricted and the evidence supporting their negative impact. This situation questions the fairness of immigration policy and the bias to meeting the needs of those with extreme wealth despite the negative consequences of their activities. The super-rich use place-identity to construct themselves as good migrants who are beneficial to their host society and talk about their country of origin as dangerous. However, a deviant case was found where a speaker presented London negatively in relation to its expense. Talk about the UK as a

safe place constructs the super-rich as ordinary drawing upon individualistic arguments about autonomy that are difficult to challenge. However, discourse on television about super-rich mobility differs to discourse about poorer groups as they are presented positively. Talk about the super-rich as English-speaking Anglophiles with a superior work ethic does not present them as a risk and indirectly highlights their ability to integrate in society. The editing of the programmes supports this construction and does not contradict the positive arguments used by the super-rich about their mobility. Those with extreme wealth are presented as extraordinary as a result of their work ethic and as a result, deserving of entry to the UK. A contradiction occurs as poorer migrants who contribute positively to society and in need of a safe haven are constructed as a risk. Whilst wealthier individuals who offer no positive benefits are welcomed to the UK as a result of the complimentary use of talk about the super-rich and their misappropriation of rhetoric used by those in need of asylum.

Chapter 8: Discussion

This chapter draws upon the analytic findings on how the super-rich use their talk in television broadcasts to legitimise extreme wealth. As introduced in chapter 1, research about wealth distribution involves exploring how individuals construct themselves as agentic and the drawing upon of ideology in people's talk. The super-rich manage their accountability for their wealth by presenting themselves as having a strong work ethic yet minimise the presentation of themselves as agentic for acquiring and maintaining extreme wealth and privilege. The super-rich use categories in their talk and present themselves as psychologically superior by drawing upon individualistic ideology. 'Rags to riches' and 'work hard, play hard' interpretative repertoires draw upon individualistic ideology and warrants the position of the extremely wealthy as meritocratic. The implications of this research are explored in terms of the need for critical psychology to challenge how the field supports individualistic explanations that maintain inequality. This research highlights the importance of media data to researching wealth inequality and discusses how DP can be used to analyse edited broadcasts.

Summary of Findings

The aim of this thesis was to explore how super-rich individuals use psychological concepts to account for their wealth. It was found that extremely wealthy people use psychological talk about traits such as drive and resilience to present their wealth as deserved. The super-rich also construct a worker identity that allows their extreme wealth to be presented as earned. They use a 'rags to riches' interpretative repertoire to emphasise their role in the

accumulation of their extreme wealth. In addition to this, a ‘work hard, play hard’ idiom was used to account for their leisure time and ostentatious consumption in an unequal society. The use of talk about psychological concepts by wealthy individuals drew upon individualistic ideology that presented wealth distribution in society as an individual issue despite its impact for all. Whilst the programmes were mostly situated in the UK, the super-rich are constructed as international using the rhetorical strategies of poorer migrant groups to account for their presence. Talk about place-identity was used to warrant the extremely wealthy as classy and deserving of their presence in London, a hub for the global super-rich.

Original Contribution to the Literature

This research provides an original contribution to the literature by demonstrating how DP can be used to examine the talk of the super-rich and how this is used to account for their privilege. Given how psychologisation maintains wealth inequality in society and the presence of the super-rich, this thesis evidences how a critical approach can challenge the position of the super-rich and their presentation on television. By building upon existing research by critical feminist psychologists (chapter 2) and media studies (chapter 1), the thesis identifies rhetorical strategies used by the super-rich to account for their extreme wealth. Super-rich people draw upon interpretative repertoires that draw upon lived ideology to warrant their privilege and to present extreme wealth as accessible to everyone. For example, drawing upon a ‘rags to riches’ interpretative repertoire presents super-rich speakers as agentic in the accumulation of their wealth in a meritocratic environment. By being aware of

the rhetorical strategies of the super-rich and how they construct their agency to manage their accountability, there is an opportunity for psychologists to provide a more developed critique of arguments for wealth inequality in television broadcasts. This research contributes to the methodological literature by discussing how DP can be used to examine edited television broadcasts and the role of non-political programming in maintaining inequality.

Implications for the Literature

The use of talk about psychological concepts by the super-rich to account for their wealth requires individuals to draw upon talk about differing categories, individualistic ideology and presenting themselves as both ordinary and extraordinary. The three aspects of discourse identified are used by the super-rich to legitimise their position and to present their wealth acquisition as potentially achievable by others. By using this rhetorical strategy, the super-rich are able to negotiate potential challenges to their status as other people could be wealthy too if they had a superior psychological construction and work ethic.

Super-Rich Talk Draws Upon Individualistic Ideology

The super-rich use psychological concepts to display their extreme wealth as an individual acquisition. Individuals portray themselves as fair (Tileagă 2010b) and this involves drawing upon individualistic ideology. As psychologically superior (chapter 4), the super-rich account for their extreme wealth as a consequence of their increased drive and resilience. This is the result of psychologisation (De Vos 2012) allowing academic concepts such as traits becoming part of everyday talk. Psychologisation is linked to neoliberalism that presents the individual as an asset and emphasises the importance of an

increased work ethic (Sugarman 2015). As such, the super-rich are meritocratic as they are rendered deserving of their wealth due to their superior abilities.

Wealthy individuals also draw upon the interpretative repertoire of effortfulness (Gibson 2009) to display themselves as being harder working than others. This not only constructs their wealth as fair but their ability to spend ostentatiously (chapter 6) and the residency of super-rich migrants in London (chapter 7), is also considered reasonable. Whilst the unemployed deserve their poverty due to their constructed lack of effort (Gibson, Crossland and Hamilton 2018), those with extreme wealth account for their privilege through being more effortful than others. The rags to riches interpretative repertoire is more challenging for heirs who orient to claims of nepotism in their talk (chapter 5). These individuals use stake confession (Potter 1996a) when accounting for their position. However, whilst heirs construct their privilege as family owned, their talk draws upon individualistic ideology to legitimise their position as they need to earn their wealth. A super-rich individual who does not spend ostentatiously is presented as odd (chapter 6) as the super-rich present their spending as well deserved. Heirs refer to qualities that others lack to account for this imbalance (Billig 1992). Thus, the legitimisation of wealth inequality occurs indirectly through the positive presentation of the super-rich and draws upon individualistic ideology in talk.

Super-Rich as both Ordinary and Extraordinary to Present Extreme Wealth as Accessible to All

Talk about inequality involves presenting those with privilege as being both ordinary and extraordinary (Billig 1992; Dyer 2003; Harvey, Allen and Mendick

2015; Kondo 2000). The presentation of the super-rich as psychologically superior is part of their extraordinary construction. Additionally, the ostentatious spending practices of the super-rich are also used to warrant their extraordinariness as they need items such as trophy homes that go beyond the basic needs exhibited by less affluent people (chapter 6). Given that the programmes often do not inform the audience of individuals net worth, the construction of their spending is used to evidence their extreme wealth. This construction of the super-rich uses place-identity (Dixon and Durrheim 2000), as London is constructed as a sophisticated and classy place. Being talked about as extraordinary allows the super-rich to legitimise their presence in a sophisticated location. The dominance of a sedentary ideology that underlines talk to denigrate other transient groups such as Roma people (Dixon and Durrheim 2000) can be negotiated due to the extraordinary construction of the super-rich. However, the super-rich also draw upon everyday categories such as family roles to present themselves as ordinary. Talk about ordinariness draws upon meritocratic ideology to present the super-rich as deserving everyday people and that their success is available to all. Inequality can be accounted for as part of a competitive economic system that highlights the importance of an individual's work ethic (Sugarman 2015). Thus, the contradictory construction of the extremely wealth as both ordinary and extraordinary legitimises their status and presents their privilege as available to all on a conditional basis.

Fine Kind of Living People, Haters and Challenges to Extreme Wealth

There is not a clear definition for the super-rich (Medeiros and de Souza 2015) and this research explores the complexity of their identity through their use of psychological talk. However, the super-rich use differing categories in their talk to construct their identity, legitimise their wealth and account for their spending. Super-rich individuals use talk about parental categories to identify themselves as ordinary as discussed above. In addition to this, a speaker can draw upon a single mother category (chapter 4) presenting themselves as working class (Day, Rickett and Woolhouse 2014). This can be used with a rags to riches interpretative repertoire to emphasise both their superior psychological construction and ordinariness. In contrast, the #richkidsofinstagram is used as an extraordinary category to construct young heirs. Talk about brands and products is a further example of how super-rich individuals use categories to construct their own identity. By flagging brands in their talk, wealthy speakers can present themselves as deserving of excessive consumption whilst complying with social norms about not talking about their spending. This use of luxury goods categories allows the opportunity for speakers to present themselves as classy individuals. Ostentatious spending is presented as the norm for the super-rich and this is enhanced by the majority of speakers being in opulent environments. Wealthy people construct a sophisticated and classy identity. It is claimed that the media presents class conflict as a historical issue (van Dijk 1995). The interactional work by the super-rich to present themselves as sophisticated in the media contradicts this view and suggests instead that the construction of class has changed. This is reflected in programme titles

such as *Lagos to London: Britain's New Super-Rich*. The titles acknowledge that those who form wealthier classes in the UK has changed from traditional class structures and this is intersectional and fluid.

Challenges to extreme wealth indicate that arguments about its distribution and the concept of class conflict are not historical. Whereas 'haters' are not visually present within the programmes; super-rich individuals orient to the rhetorical presence of arguments against wealth. The use of a deviant case where haters are mentioned in chapter 5, requires the super-rich to use a 'tolerant' identity (Wetherell 2012: 166) that allows them to portray themselves as benevolent and yet psychologically superior. Billig (1992) stated that talk about the monarchy involved a 'paradox of desire' where royal status was both desirable and a burden and this has also been found in talk about celebrities and entrepreneurs (Harvey, Allen and Mendick 2015). Extremely wealthy individuals construct a similar paradox whereby their wealth enables ostentatious spending and enhanced mobility but involves a risk to personal safety and requires enhanced resilience to maintain their privilege. Thus, talk about inequality is not prevalent in the accounts of the super-rich on television. However, it is implicitly present through the use of a hater category and the burden of wealth as a result of inequitable wealth distribution in UK society.

Contribution to Understanding the Super-Rich

This research builds upon our existing knowledge of how the super-rich are constructed in the media by establishing how they are constructed as psychologically superior, use class categories and draw upon existing arguments for the super-rich. Marwick (2015) found that the heirs featured in

the Rich Kids of Instagram heirs are both vilified and admired. This dilemmatic counstruction is present throughout the wealth porn genre as demonstrated in the programmes within the corpus. In particular, this research finds that the production of the programmes is used to critique the super-rich to undermine their superior construction. This representation of the super-rich on television is dependent on the use of individual narratives (Grisold and Theine 2017). By exploring the use of psychological talk by the super-rich, this thesis has found that the super-rich warrant themselves as psychologically superior in their talk to account for their extreme wealth. For the heirs in chapter 5 this involved orienting to potential claims of nepotism by using talk about their enhanced work ethic to legitimise their privilege.

This research contributes to our understanding of how the super-rich use talk about categories. Super-rich individuals talk about class uses code to discuss class (Holt and Griffin 2005) by wealthy people referring to sophisticated practices around their consumption. Whilst the working class are presented as failures through the use of single mother talk (Day, Rickett and Woolhouse 2014), the super-rich construct an upper-class status to warrant themselves as aspirational. Thus, the finding that wealthy people present themselves as psychologically superior to others and use sophisticated categories to account for their privilege contributes to our knowledge of the super-rich. This also adds to our knowledge of wealth inequality, as the legitimisation of the skewed distribution of wealth impacts negatively on less affluent individuals.

Contribution to Psychology

By exploring the psychological talk of the super-rich, this research highlights the importance of using a critical lens in how psychological concepts are constructed and used. In chapters 2 and 5, the use of individual differences that ignores their social historical construction is critiqued particularly in relation to concepts such as intelligence in psychological research (for example Eysenck 1975; Gottfredson 2016; Wai 2014). The emphasis on experimental approaches exacerbates the claim that wealthier individuals are more intelligent. This is due to ignoring how data is situated (Billig 1978) preventing the exploration of the wider structures in society that maintain inequality and how these structures are legitimised through individual's talk. The absence of context results in psychology being presented as neutral (Arfken and Yen 2014) and is accompanied by a rise in individualistic discourse (Stenner and Taylor 2008). By exploring how people use talk about psychological concepts, this thesis has found how psychology is being used to support inequality in society. As a result, 'social psychology should be about changes in the real world' (Parker 1989:1). By highlighting how the super-rich use individualistic talk about wealth distribution in society, a collective problem, there is an opportunity for psychologists to ensure that wealth inequality is explored in a situated manner that is aware of its collective nature.

A contribution to the field is made by critiquing the use of psychology to support economic inequality and extreme wealth. This is present in both academic research and everyday talk due to psychologisation. To date, critical psychology has challenged prejudice in relation to gender, ethnicity and

sexuality extensively (Jowett 2015). However, this critical lens has not fully extended to the area of economic inequality and in particular, the accountability of individuals with extreme wealth (Day 2012). This thesis establishes how the super-rich use talk about psychological concepts to account for their extreme wealth and as an indirect result, legitimise inequality in society as a result of skewed wealth distribution.

Whilst economic inequality is not absent from the literature, it is framed around citizenship. For example, Gibson (2011) found an ideological dilemma in how good citizens are presented as effortful and contributing to society. In contrast, the unemployed were constructed as irresponsible. This doctoral research builds on a developing portfolio primarily focused on the issue of economic inequality in society and how it is presented in broadcast media. Initially, this focused on how talk about unemployed individuals on television deployed just world arguments to support inequality in society (Goodman and Carr 2017). This was achieved by presenting unemployed people as deserving of their poverty due to their poor work ethic and lack of job seeking behaviours. A further study on the exploration of talk about tax by public figures on the radio explored how economic inequality is legitimised for both the employed and unemployed (Carr, Goodman and Jowett 2018). Here, an ideological dilemma presents tax as an individual burden and as a collective responsibility. By presenting higher earners as more meritorious, higher tax rates are warranted as punitive, legitimising inequality due to tax's redistributive effect. A basic foundation has been developed in this thesis that explores how inequality is accounted for in talk about the unemployed, workers and those with extreme

wealth. This provides an opportunity for further research that explores the presentation of extreme wealth further as a theoretical framework for how this can be achieved with Discursive Psychology (DP) has been established.

Implications for Public Debate in the Media and the Involvement of Psychologists

The use of psychological concepts in the discourse of the super-rich allows their wealth acquisition and maintenance to be positioned as an individual issue. Thus, talk about extreme wealth draws upon meritocratic ideology where inequality is acceptable due the imbalance between an individual's abilities and level of effort. The individualistic emphasis on self-reliance upholds a meritocratic ideal in which people have the same starting point in life. Cuts to state provision undermine a meritocratic environment and as consequence there is a shift in responsibility from the state to the individual (Chandler 2012). As a result, individuals economic position becomes a contest (Sugarman 2015) where the poor are presented as losers due to their failed management of resources (Jo 2013). Talk about economic status as the responsibility of the individual prevents the use of collective arguments to redistribute wealth. Rather, alleviating poverty and reducing wealth inequality becomes the responsibility of the individual, including the poor. Resilience has been criticised as a concept for being used to warrant inequality as acceptable (Walker and Cooper 2011). In contrast, the ostentatious spending of the super-rich is presented as deserved as the winners of the meritocratic contest. Thus, the pervasiveness of psychologisation in the talk of the super-rich results in wealth inequality being indirectly constructed as an individual issue preventing a collective response. There is a need for talk about wealth distribution in society

to view this as a collective issue and to challenge the dominance of individualistic approaches to legitimising affluence.

As part of widening the public debate to present wealth inequality as a collective problem, there is a role for psychologists in questioning the use of psychological talk within individualistic arguments. For example, the role of psychologists could critique the presentation of extreme wealth as deserved due to the super-rich being warranted as psychologically superior as found in chapter 4. This involves going beyond the focus of groups such as Psychologists For Social Change (formerly Psychologists Against Austerity) that were initially concerned with the impact of economic inequality and cuts to public services on disadvantaged groups in society (McGrath, Walker and Jones 2016). It has clearly been demonstrated in chapter 1 that the super-rich and their wealth management practices are a social problem that exacerbate inequality and its damaging effects for all. Given the British Psychological Society describe their purpose to 'support and enhance the development and application of psychology for the greater public good' (BPS 2018:1), there is a need for the discipline to tackle wealth inequality by questioning psychologisation. A critical stance from psychologists would prevent psychology from being misused, as a consequence of the general public's understanding of the field is affected by myths and misunderstandings (Banyard and Hulme 2015), to promote individualistic ideology that supports the super-rich's privilege.

Implications for Immigration Policy

The finding of the construction of the super-rich as good migrants (chapter 7) undermines the presentation of migration as a human rights issue and the need to limit access to economically desirable individuals (van Dijk 2000). Despite their lack of a positive contribution to the UK, wealthy people use place identity to draw upon human rights discourse and to position themselves as able to integrate into society easily. Unlike poorer groups they do not present as a risk to society (Goodman et al. 2015). The narration of the programmes featured in chapter 7 is used to support this construction and shows the speakers as having a greater work ethic than British people. This results in people's access to borders being a result of their deservingness as opposed to need. As a consequence, super-rich migrants can account for their enhanced mobility. However, this ignores that the evaluation of tier 1 (investor) visas found no economic benefit except in relation to investment advice firms and independent schools (Migration Advisory Committee 2014). In contrast, immigration as a whole has been found to have a positive benefit to society (OECD 2013) despite the negative rhetoric present (for example Goodman et al. 2015) questioning the rationale of the current system that favours the super-rich. The current immigration debate uses an individualised approach to create barriers to access the UK (Gibson, Crossland and Hamilton 2018) for poorer groups. This research found that the super-rich use arguments about personal safety that are used by poorer migrants. However, unlike poorer migrants, the super-rich do not provide an overall positive contribution to society. Thus, there is a need for a more equitable immigration system (IPPR 2018) that removes targets for

immigration overall and instead, considers the benefits of different types of migrants. This would require a Home Office review that examines the influence of individualistic ideology on arguments about immigration and acknowledges the burden of the super-rich adjusting their privileged visa entitlements accordingly.

Contribution to Media and Cultural Studies Research

A contribution is made to media and cultural studies research by building upon the work of Marwick (2015) and Littler (2018) who identify the underlying meritocratic ideology in televisual presentation of the extremely wealthy. As discussed in Chapter 1, cultural studies research is limited by its approach to psychological talk as being reflective of individual cognition (Billig 1997c). The assumption that people's discourse reflects their mental state is problematic. By using DP, a social constructionist approach is used to analyse the talk of the super-rich, this looks at how the psychological talk of the super-rich is used to construct arguments in the media. The discursive analysis of super-rich talk highlights how talk about psychological constructs is used to maintain wealth inequality in society by supporting the position of the super-rich. Media and cultural studies research on wealth inequality would benefit from an increased focus on how arguments are constructed and used to present the super-rich's superior psychological construction as common sense. A social constructionist approach would also allow for the exploration of how super-rich agency is presented and used to account for their extreme wealth and its detrimental impact.

Using Discursive Psychology to Analyse Television Documentaries

The use of television data provided an opportunity to explore how the super-rich as a group are presented to the general public. Given their separateness from other groups as discussed in chapter 1, television media is an important conduit for transmitting information about those with extreme wealth in the UK. Editing was found to be an important aspect of the wealth porn genre. By incorporating information about the production of the programmes within the analysis, the editing function provides an additional layer of analysis. It was found that the editing and narration of the extracts was used to support and undermine the attempts of the super-rich to account for their wealth within the programmes. In particular, the editing of the segments about heirs in chapter 5 consistently contained narration that undermined their accounts particularly when they presented their wealth as earned. As a contrast to this, the narration in chapter 7 where super-rich individuals present themselves as good migrants is used to support the accounts of the extremely wealthy talking about their residence in London. The examination of the use of editing allowed for a more nuanced analysis to take place that explored how the super-rich are constructed through the medium of television.

The use of psychological concepts in talk by the super-rich is both challenged and supported through the use of the editing and production process in television programming. For example, the production team can ask super-rich speakers questions to direct talk about inequality as seen in chapter 6. When considering how the programmes are produced, there is a need to examine how the producers and speakers manage their performance (Abell and

Stokoe 2001) both visually and verbally. This is achieved through 'face-work' where individuals engage in socially shared repertoires as part of the interaction (Goffman 1967:14). Talk about extreme wealth and poverty results in difficulties for super-rich speakers to account for their privilege. Due to norms around face-saving as being good mannered (Bargiela- Chiappini 2003), this limits the extent to which the production team can challenge super-rich individuals on camera and risk the premature ending of their interaction. As a result, the editing process uses voice overs and narration to provide more direct questioning of the accounts of super-rich speakers as their talk has already been recorded. This is a common feature in programmes such as *Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives* where the presenter's narration is used to undermine speakers spending in chapter 6 and to provide a contrast to the less affluent audience's everyday lives. This enables the programme to engage with both the super-rich speaker, and the audience (Smith 2010). Challenges to the accounts of super-rich speakers are more common in chapter 5 as the privilege of heirs is more questionable than people who are presented as self-made when drawing upon meritocratic ideology. Therefore, the editing process is used to challenge the accounts of super-rich individuals that cannot be achieved in the interaction itself on screen. This allows super-rich individuals to save face in the context of having extreme wealth in an unequal society.

The use of visual images in television is used to build upon super-rich speakers' psychological construction. Memory is considered a key psychological concept in Discursive Psychology (Brown and Reavey 2016; Edwards 2012; Edwards and Potter 1992; Tileagă and Stokoe 2016) that has

influenced DP. A common feature is for speakers to be remembering an event that was filmed previously by editing the two clips together for the audience. On these occasions, the speakers are sat talking to the camera. This warrants wealthy people as honest and authentic, a characteristic that is used to present individuals as successful (Harvey, Allen and Mendick 2015). The majority of speakers are filmed in opulent environments and this warrants their construction as super-rich. However, individual's wealth was acquired in a meritocratic environment, hence they are presented as successful as a result of their superior enhanced work ethic. Incorporating the use of editing within the analysis allows for the exploration of how speakers discourse about psychological concepts is supported and challenged. Thus, this thesis demonstrates how DP can be used to analyse television documentaries and explores how features such as editing can be incorporated into the analysis.

Contribution to Method

A contribution has been made by providing an initial outline as to how media data that is edited such as television documentaries can be analysed with DP. This overcomes issues with previous DP research using television debates that overlooks the editing process (for example Gibson and Booth 2017; Goodman and Carr 2017). However, ignoring the editing process as part of the analysis is similar to Potter and Hepburn's (2005) criticism of interviews where the analysis may not acknowledge the interviewer's role in the construction. From this perspective, the debate regarding whether data is natural or contrived (Goodman and Speer 2016; Potter 2002; Speer 2002) disregards the issue of agency within the production process and how programmes are constructed as

a product for the audience. Potter (2002) states that psychological talk is a key component of everyday talk that is present in natural data. As a form of natural data, television documentaries allow for the exploration of how the super-rich use psychological talk to account for their extreme wealth. Thus, the edited nature of the data can be examined using DP.

Limitations

Whilst there is a good case for analysing media data due to the separateness of the super-rich and the importance of the media in forming public discourse, this research does not explore how audiences interact with media data. People do not just consume television programmes and this research misses how individuals react to these televised images (Billig 1997c). A further limitation concerns the use of a corpus where individuals self-identify as super-rich or are identified as such by the programme makers. Whilst the programmes were being transmitted, there were questions raised in the media as to whether some of the individuals featured were super-rich at all (for example Hyde 2016). As discussed in chapter 1, there is not a clear definition available for categorising a person as super-rich due to the lack of transparency regarding individual wealth.

Chapter 3 identified some of the issues in performing a multi-modal analysis due to the focus of previous research on the discussion part of programmes and the absence of editing as an analytic concern. This research has identified the benefits of a multi-modal analysis and how the editing and visual feeds add to how super-rich individuals legitimise their wealth through the use of talk about psychological concepts. However, the transcription and

analysis of television data still requires further development. Capturing the flow of television data is challenging (Chouliaraki 2004) due to the flow of differing camera angles and use of editing. Research examples that use stills from videos (for example Burke 2018) do not overcome this issue as this misses the dynamics as visuals change and continue to contribute to the verbal construction. An alternative would be to consider an amended version of the toolkit offered by Kress and van Leeuwen (1996) that offers 7 steps for analysts to consider as they conduct their analysis. Kress and Leeuwen's approach developed from social semiotics, which is problematic to use in conjunction with DP (Potter et al 1990). Similar to how discursive resources originating from Conversation Analysis are used in a DP approach to analyse a verbal transcript, Kress and van Leeuwen's 7 steps could be used as a basis for a DP toolkit for visual data. A combined approach that was compliant with DP's central tenets would allow for a visual analysis that explored how people's agency was constructed in visual images. This could potentially overcome the issue of being reliant on stills from footage without overcrowding the transcript as discussed in chapter 3.

Future Research Using Discursive Psychology to Explore Wealth Inequality and the Super-Rich

Given the limited work using a discursive approach to examine wealth inequality and the super-rich, there are ample opportunities for future studies in this area. This research used a corpus where individuals were categorised by television media as super-rich. Super-rich are a specific categorisation and the presentation of these individuals may differ from other terms such as billionaire that could also be used to describe those with extreme wealth. In chapter 1,

philanthropy is a popular area of study for researchers interested in the rich but was absent from the corpus. Philanthropy is considered an alternative method of wealth distribution to tax. Given that a discursive and rhetorical approach has previously been used to explore how talk by public figures is used about tax (Carr, Goodman and Jowett 2018), there is a need to build upon the current research to examine whether extremely wealthy individuals use talk about psychological concepts when talking about charitable donations.

By focusing on media data, there was not an opportunity to explore how members of the public engaged with the programmes. As discussed in chapter 3, individuals do not just consume television programmes. This provides an opportunity to build upon the current research to explore how less affluent groups account for extreme wealth and how wealth porn programming is received. By looking at how people talk about the media, this would also allow for the examination of how the public talk about the edited nature of television programming.

Women experience both lower wealth acquisition and earnings compared to men over their lifetime (Ruel and Hauser 2013). Changes to legislation in the UK has resulted in figures for organisations with more than 250 employees being publicly available (ACAS 2018) resulting in increased media interest (for example BBC 2018). Reflecting this issue, there are less women than men constructed as super-rich in their own right within the corpus. Talk about female celebrities has been found be undermining of their achievements (Harvey, Allen and Mendick 2015). This presents a need to explore how women are constructed within the corpus and how they account for their wealth.

A discursive analysis of the construction of women in wealth porn programming could build upon the contribution of feminist critical psychologists (chapter 2) who acknowledge a need for more research on wealthier groups and questioning of the practices that maintain the super-rich in society (Day 2012; Rickett 2016). By using DP to explore the presentation of privileged women in the media, there will be an opportunity to explore how gender inequality is accounted for and how women are warranted as having agency.

Conclusion

Wealth inequality is a social issue that is exacerbated by the practices of the super-rich resulting in poor wealth distribution and social mobility in the UK. This research contributes to our knowledge of the super-rich and their presentation in the media. The importance of media research is highlighted due to its use in public debate about social issues such as wealth inequality. This thesis has found that super-rich individuals in television media use talk about psychological concepts to warrant themselves as superior to others to legitimise their acquisition and maintenance of extreme wealth. As a result, super-rich individuals are presented as deserving of their wealth in a meritocratic society. By extremely wealthy people presenting themselves as having an enhanced work ethic, increased wealth is constructed as being available to everyone. Consequently, super-rich individuals can account for their ostentatious spending and mobility by using talk about their success in relation to their wealth. The discourse of the super-rich draws upon individualistic ideology particularly the presentation of the UK as a meritocracy preventing wealth from being viewed as a collective issue. This work critiques the use of psychologisation to present

individualistic arguments that legitimise the extreme wealth of the super-rich. Thus, there is a need to examine psychology's role in the endorsement of individualistic explanations to account for collective problems such as wealth inequality in society.

References

Abell, J. and Stokoe, E. H. (2001) 'Broadcasting the royal role: Constructing culturally situated identities in the Princess Diana *Panorama* interview'. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 40, 417–435. DOI: 10.1348/014466601164902

Abercrombie, N. (1980) *Class, Structure and Knowledge*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J., and Sanford, R.N (1950) *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper and Row

Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (2018) *The Gender Pay Gap Explained* [online] available from <https://gender-pay-gap.service.gov.uk/public/assets/pdf/gender-pay-gap-explained.pdf> [20 August 2018]

Aghion, P., and Bolton, P. (1997) ‘A theory of trickle-down growth and development’. *Review of Economic Studies* 64, 151–172. DOI: 10.2307/2971707

Aguiar, L.L. (2012) ‘Redirecting the Academic Gaze Upward’. in *Researching Amongst Elites: Challenges and Opportunities in Studying Up*. eds. by Aguiar, L.L., and Schneider, C. J. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1–27

Akinci, M. (2018) ‘Inequality and economic growth: Trickle-down effect revisited’. *Development Policy Review* 36, 1-24. DOI: 10.1111/dpr.12214

Allen, A. (2011) ‘Michael Young’s The Rise of the Meritocracy: A Philosophical Critique’. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 59 (4), 367-382. DOI: 10.1080/00071005.2011.582852

Alstadsæter, A., Johannesen, N., and Zucman, G. (2018) ‘Who owns the wealth in tax havens? Macro evidence and implications for global inequality’. *Journal of Public Economics* 162, 89-100. DOI: 10.1016/j.jpubeco.2018.01.008

Altemeyer, B. (1981) *Right-Wing Authoritarianism*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Alvaredo, F., Atkinson, A., and Morelli, S. (2016) ‘The Challenge of Measuring UK Wealth Inequality in the 2000s’. *Fiscal Studies* 37 (1), 13-33. DOI: 10.1111/j.1475-5890.2016.12084

Alvaredo, F., Atkinson, A., and Morelli, S. (2018) ‘Top wealth shares in the UK over more than a century’. *Journal of Public Economics* 162, 26-47. DOI: 10.1016/j.jpubeco.2018.02.008

Anderson-Gough, F., Grey, C., and Robson, K. (1998) '`Work Hard, Play Hard': An Analysis of Organizational Cliche in Two Accountancy Practices'. *Organization* 5 (4), 565-592. DOI: 10.1177/135050849854007

Andreouli, E., and Dashtipour, P. (2014) 'British Citizenship and the ‘Other’: An Analysis of the Earned Citizenship Discourse'. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 24, 100–110. DOI: 10.1002/casp.2154

Andreouli, E., and Howarth, C. (2013) 'National Identity, Citizenship and Immigration: Putting Identity in Context'. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 43 (3), 361-382. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-5914.2012.00501.x

Antaki, C., and Widdicombe, S. (1988) ‘Identity as an Achievement and as a Tool'. in *Identities in talk*. eds. by Antaki, C., and Widdicombe, S. London: SAGE, 1-14

Arfken, M. and Yen, J. (2014) ‘Psychology and Social Justice: Theoretical and Engagements’. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology* 34 (1), 1-13. DOI: 10.1037/a0033578

Aristotle ([4 BC] 2008) ‘The Rhetoric’. trans. by Claverhouse Jebb, R. in *Readings in Classical Rhetoric*. eds. by Benson, T.W., and Prosser, M.H. London:Routledge, 53-62

Arndt, H.W. (1983) 'The ‘Trickle-down’ Myth'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 32 (1), 1–10

Astrachan, J.H., and Shanker, M.C, (2003) ‘Family Businesses’ Contribution to the U.S. Economy: A Closer Look’ *Family Business Review* 16 (3), 211-219. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-6248.2003.tb00015.x

Attenborough, F.T. (2016) ‘A forgotten legacy? Towards a discursive psychology of the media’. in *Discursive Psychology: Classic and contemporary issues*. eds. by Tileagă, C., and Stokoe, E. Abingdon: Routledge, 224-240

Atkinson, A.B. (2007) 'Measuring Top Incomes: Methodological Issues'. in *Top Incomes over the Twentieth Century: A Contrast between Continental European and English-Speaking Countries*. eds. by Atkinson, A.B., and Piketty, T. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 18– 42

Augoustinos, M. (2013) ‘Discourse analysis in psychology: what's in a name?’ *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 10 (3), 244-248

Autio, M. (2005) ‘The morality of spending in Finnish youth consumer culture’. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 29 (4), 332-341. DOI: 10.1111/j.1470-6431.2005.00442.x

Badarinza, C. and Ramadorai, T. (in press) ‘Home Away From Home? Foreign Demand and London House Prices’. *Journal of Financial Economics*

Baguma, P., and Furnham, A. (2012) 'Attributions for and the Perceived Effects of Poverty in East Africa: A Study from Uganda'. in *Humanitarian Work Psychology*. eds. by Carr, S.C., MacLachlan, M., and Furnham, A. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 332-350

Baker, C.E. (2007) *Media ownership and concentration: why ownership matters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Baldwin, S., Holroyd, E., and Burrows, R. (2018) ‘Mapping the Subterranean Geographies of Plutocratic London: Luxified Troglodytism?’ [online] available from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325046741_Mapping_the_Subterranean_Geographies_of_Plutocratic_London_Luxified_Troglodytism> [22 August 2018]

Banyard, P., and Hulme, J. (2015) ‘Giving psychology away: How George Miller’s vision is being realised by psychological literacy’. *Psychology Teaching Review* 21 (2), 93-101

Bargiela- Chiappini, F. (2003) ‘Face and politeness: new (insights) for old (concepts)’. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35 (10-11), 1453-1469. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00173-X

Barker, C., and Galasiński, D. (2001) *Cultural Studies and Discourse Analysis: A Dialogue on Language and Identity*. London: SAGE

Barnes, R., Auburn, T., and Lea, S. (1998) ‘Policing New Travellers: The role of space in stories of conflict’. in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Discourse and the Social Order*. eds. by Forrester, R., and Percy, C. Birmingham: Aston University.

Barnett, S., and Townend, J. (2014) ‘And What Good Came of it at Last?’ Press–Politician Relations Post-Leveson’. *The Political Quarterly* 85 (2), 6-10. DOI: 10.1111/1467-923X.12088

Beaverstock, J.V., and Faulconbridge, J.R. (2013) 'Wealth Segmentation and the Mobilities of the Super-Rich'. in *Elite Mobilities*. eds. by Birtchnell, T., and Caletrío, J. Abingdon: Routledge, 40-61

Beaverstock, J., and Hay, I. (2016) 'They've never had it so good: Global wealth and the super-rich'. in *Handbook on Wealth and the Super-Rich*. eds. by Hay, I., and Beaverstock, J. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 1-17

Benefiel, M., Fry, L.W., and Geigle, D. (2014) ‘Spirituality and Religion in the Workplace: History, Theory, and Research’. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality* 6 (3), 175–187

Benjamin, L.T. (2014) *A Brief History of Modern Psychology*. 2nd edn. Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons

Bennington, G. (2002) ‘Derrida and politics’. in *Jacques Derrida and the Humanities: A Critical Reader*. ed. by Cohen, T. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 193-207

Benwell, B., and Stokoe, E. (2006) *Discourse and identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Berta, P. (2013) ‘Classification struggles, moral criticism and the interethnic

trade of prestige goods between two Romanian Roma groups'. *Journal of Consumer Culture* 13 (3), 337–365. DOI: 10.1177/1469540513484322

Billig, M. (1976) *Social psychology and intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press

Billig, M. (1978) *Fascists: A Social Psychological View of the National Front*. London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich

Billig, M. (1982) *Ideology and social psychology: extremism, moderation and contradiction*. Oxford: Blackwell

Billig, M. (1985) 'Prejudice, categorization and particularization: From a perceptual to a rhetorical approach'. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 15 (1), 79-103. DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.2420150107

Billig, M. (1987) *Arguing and Thinking: A Rhetorical Approach to Social Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Billig, M. (1990) 'Rhetoric and Social Psychology'. in *Deconstructing Social Psychology*. eds. by Parker, I., and Shotter, J. Hove: Psychology Press, 47-60

Billig, M. (1991a) *Ideology and Opinions: Studies in Rhetorical Psychology*. London: SAGE

Billig, M. (1991b) 'Rhetorical Psychology, Ideological Thinking and Imagining Nationhood' in *Social Movements and Culture* 4. eds. by Johnston, H., and Klandermans, B. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 64-83

Billig, M. (1992) *Talking of the royal family*. London: Routledge

Billig, M. (1995) *Banal Nationalism*. London: SAGE

Billig, M. (1997a) 'The dialogic unconscious: Psychoanalysis, discursive

psychology and the nature of repression'. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 36, 139-159. DOI:10.1111/j.2044-8309.1997.tb01124.x

Billig, M. (1997b) 'Discursive, rhetorical and ideological messages'. in *The message of social psychology*. eds. by McGarty, C., and Haslam, S.A. Oxford: Blackwell, 36-53

Billig, M. (1997c) 'From Codes to Utterances: Cultural Studies, Discourse and Psychology'. in *Cultural Studies in Question*. eds. by Ferguson, M., and Golding, P. London: SAGE, 205-225

Billig, M. (1998) 'Common-places of the British Royal Family: A rhetorical analysis of plain and argumentative sense'. *Text - Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 8 (3), 191-218

Billig, M. (1999) 'Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in conversation analysis'. *Discourse and Society* 10, 543–558

Billig, M. (2002) 'Henri Tajfel's Cognitive aspects of prejudice and the psychology of bigotry'. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 41, 171–188

Billig, M. (2005) *Laughter and Ridicule: Towards a Social Critique of Humour*. London: SAGE

Billig, M. (2008) 'The language of critical discourse analysis: the case of nominalization'. *Discourse and Society* 19 (6), 783-800

Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M., Middleton, D., and Radley, A.R. (1988) *Ideological Dilemmas: A social psychology of everyday thinking*. London: SAGE

Billig, M., and Marinho, C. (2015) 'Rhetoric and Psychology: Ending the

Dominance of Nouns'. in *The Wiley Handbook of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology: Methods, Approaches, and New Directions for Social Sciences*. eds. by Martin, J., Sugarman, J., and Slaney, K.L. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 117-132

Billig, M., and Marinho, C. (2017) *The politics and rhetoric of commemoration: How the Portuguese parliament celebrates the 1974 revolution*. London: Bloomsbury

Binet. A., and Simon, T. (1916) *The development of intelligence in childre*n. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.

Binkley, S. (2013) *Happiness as enterprise: An essay on neoliberal life*. Albany: State University of New York Press

Birtchnell, T., and Caletrío, J. (2014) 'Introduction: The Movement of the Few'. in *Elite Mobilities*. eds. by Birtchnell, T., and Caletrío, J. Abingdon: Routledge, 1-20

Block, N.J., and Dworkin, G. (1977) 'IQ, Heritability and Inequality'. in *The IQ Controversy: Critical Readings*. eds. by Block, N.J., and Dworkin, G. New York: Pantheon Books, 410-540

Bobbio, A., Canova, L., and Manganelli, A.M. (2010) 'Conservative Ideology, Economic Conservatism, and Causal Attributions for Poverty and Wealth'. *Current Psychology* 29 (3), 222-234. DOI: 10.1007/s12144-010-9086-6

Body, A., and Breeze, B. (2015) *Rising to the challenge: a study of*

philanthropic support for unpopular causes [online] available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/sspssr/philanthropy/documents/Rising_to_the_Challenge.pdf> [3 July 2018]

Bottomore, T. (2006) *Elites and Society*. Abingdon: Routledge

Breeze, B. (2013) 'How donors choose charities: the role of personal taste and experiences in giving decisions'. *Voluntary Sector Review* 4 (2), 165-183. DOI: 10.1332/204080513X667792

Breeze, B., and Lloyd, T. (2013) *Richer Lives: Why rich people give*. London: Directory of Social Change

British Broadcasting Corporation (2018) 'What is the gender pay gap at your company?' [online] available from <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-43632763> [20 August 2018]

British Psychological Society (2009) *Code of Ethics and Conduct – Guidance Published by the Ethics Committee of the British Psychological Society* [online] available from <https://www.bps.org.uk/sites/beta.bps.org.uk/files/Policy%20-%20Files/Code%20of%20Ethics%20and%20Conduct%20(2009).pdf> [9 March 2018]

British Psychological Society (2018) *About Us* [online] available from <https://www.bps.org.uk/about-us> [8 September 2018]

British Universities Film and Video Council (2018) *About us* [online] available from <http://bufvc.ac.uk/aboutus> [9 March 2018]

Broadcasters' Audience Research Board (2018) *Weekly top 30 programmes*.

[online] available from <http://www.barb.co.uk/viewing-data/weekly-top-30/> [5 March 2018]

Brown, R. (2000) ‘Social identity theory: past achievements, current problems and future challenges’. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 30, 745–778. DOI: 10.1002/1099-0992(200011/12)30:6%3C745::AID-EJSP24%3E3.0.CO;2-O

Brown, S.D. and Reavey, P. (2016) ‘Dilemmas of memory: The mind is not a tape recorder’. in *Discursive Psychology: Classic and contemporary issues*. eds. by Tileagă, C., and Stokoe, E. Abingdon: Routledge, 210-223

Brown, W. (2003) ‘Neo-liberalism and the end of liberal democracy’. *Theory and Event* 7 (1). DOI: 10.1353/tae.2003.0020

Bruckmüller, S., Reese, G. and Martiny, S.E. (2017) 'Is higher inequality less legitimate? Depends on how you frame it!'. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 56, 766–781. DOI: 10.1111/bjso.12202

Buck, D., and Maguire, D. (2015) *Inequalities in life expectancy: Changes over time and implications for policy* [online] available from <https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/field/field_publication_file/inequalities-in-life-expectancy-kings-fund-aug15.pdf> [3 July 2018]

Bullough, O. (2018) ‘Nevis: how the world’s most secretive offshore haven refuses to clean up’. *The Guardian* [online] 12 July. available from <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/jul/12/nevis-how-the-worlds-most-secretive-offshore-haven-refuses-to-clean-up> [26 July 2018]

Burke, S. (2018) ‘The discursive “othering” of Jews and Muslims in the Britain

First solidarity patrol'. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*. DOI: 10.1002/casp.2373

Burr, V. (2015) *Social Constructionism*. 3rd edn. Hove: Routledge

Burrows, R. and Knowles, C. (2018) '"Haves" and "Have Yachts": Socio Spatial Struggles in London between the "Merely Wealthy" and the "Super-Rich"'. *Cultural Politics*

Buttny, R. (1993) *Social Accountability in Communication*. London: SAGE

Campbell, D., Carr, S., and MacLachlan, M. (2001) 'Attributing "third world poverty" in Australia and Malawi'. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 31, 409-430. DOI: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2001.tb00203.x

Carr, P., Goodman, S., and Jowett, A. (2018) ''I don't think there is any moral basis for taking money away from people': Using discursive psychology to explore the complexity of talk about tax'. *Critical Discourse Studies*. DOI: 10.1080/1745904.2018.1511440

Carvacho, H., Zick, A., Haye, A., González, R., Manzi, J., Kocik, C., and Bertl, M. (2013) 'On the Relation between Social Class and Prejudice: The Roles of Education, Income, and Ideological Attitudes'. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 43 (4), 272–285. DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.1961

Chambers, J.R., Swan, L.K., and Heesacker, M. (2013) 'Better off than We Know Distorted Perceptions of Incomes and Income Inequality in America'. *Psychological Science* 25 (2), 613–618. DOI: 10.1177/0956797613504965

Chandler, D. (2012) 'Resilience and human security: The post-interventionist

paradigm'. *Security Dialogue* 43 (3), 213 – 229. DOI: 10.1177/0967010612444151

Childs, C. (2011) *''I Want This, I Want That': a discursive analysis of mental state terms in family interaction'*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Loughborough: Loughborough University

Chomsky, N. (1977) 'The Fallacy of Richard Herrnstein's IQ' in *The IQ Controversy: Critical Readings*. eds. by Block, N.J., and Dworkin, G. New York: Pantheon Books, 285-309

Chomsky, D. (2006) ''An interested reader': Measuring ownership control at the New York Times'. *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 23 (1), 1–18. DOI: 10.1080/07393180600570659

Chouliaraki, L. (2004) 'The Moral Spectator: Distant Suffering in Live Footage of September 11, 2001'. in *Discourse and Technology: Multimodal Discourse Analysis*. eds. by LeVine, P., and Scollon, R. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 151-165

Christandl, F. (2013) 'The Belief in a Just World as a Personal Resource in the Context of Inflation and Financial Crises'. *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 62 (3), 486–518. DOI: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2012.00489.x

Clark, G., and Cummins, N. (2014) 'Intergenerational Wealth Mobility in England, 1858–2012: Surnames and Social Mobility'. *The Economic Journal* 125, 61–85. DOI: 10.1111/ecoj.12165

Clarke, C. D. (2015) 'Learning to fail: resilience and the empty promise of

financial literacy education'. *Consumption, Markets and Culture* 18 (3), 257-276. DOI: 10.1080/10253866.2014.1000315

Cohen, M.J. (2010) 'Destination Unknown: Pursuing Sustainable Mobility in the Face of Rival Societal Aspirations'. *Research Policy* 39 (4), 459–470. DOI: 10.1016%2Fj.respol.2010.01.018

Condor, S. (2000) 'Pride and prejudice: Identity management in English people's talk about 'this country''. Discourse and Society 11, 175–205. DOI: 10.1177%2F0957926500011002003

Condor, S., Tileagă, C., and Billig, M. (2013) 'Political rhetoric'. in *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. eds. by Huddy, L., Sears, D.O. and Levy, J.S. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 262-300

Corbetta, G., and Salvato, C. (2012) *Strategies for longevity in family firms: A European perspective*. London: Palgrave Macmillan

Cowley, E., McKenzie, T., Pharoah, C., Smith, S. (2011) *The new state of donation: Three decades of household giving to charity 1978 – 2008* [online] available from <http://www.cgap.org.uk/uploads/reports/The%20new%20state%20of%20donation.pdf> [3 July 2018]

Cragg, M. and Ghayad, R. (2015) 'Growing Apart: The Evolution of Income vs. Wealth Inequality'. *The Economists' Voice* 12 (1), 1–12. DOI: 10.1515/ev-2015-0006

Credit Suisse (2017) *Global Wealth Report 2017* [online] available from

<http://publications.credit-suisse.com/tasks/render/file/index.cfm?fileid=12DFFD63-07D1-EC63-A3D5F67356880EF3> [2 July 2018]

Cromby, J., and Willis, M.E.H. (2013) 'Nudging into subjectification: Governmentality and psychometrics'. *Critical Social Policy* 34 (2), 241 – 259. DOI: 10.1177/0261018313500868

Crouch, C. (2011) *The Strange Non-death of Neo-liberalism*. London: Polity

Cuddy, A.J.C., Fiske, S.T., and Glick, P. (2007) 'The BIAS map: Behaviors from intergroup affect and stereotypes'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 92, 631–648. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.92.4.631

Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S. T., Kwan, V. S. Y., Glick, P., Demoulin, S., Leyens, J.-P., Bond, M. H., Croizet, J.-C., Ellemers, N., Sleebos, E., Htun, T. T., Kim, H.-J., Maio, G., Perry, J., Petkova, K., Todorov, V., Rodríguez-Bailón, R., Morales, E., Moya, M., Palacios, M., Smith, V., Perez, R., Vala, J. and Ziegler, R. (2009) 'Stereotype content model across cultures: Towards universal similarities and some differences'. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 48, 1–33. DOI: 10.1348/014466608X314935

Cunningham, H. (2016) 'The multi-layered history of Western philanthropy' in *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy*. eds. by Jung, T., Phillips, S.D., and Harrow, J. Abingdon: Routledge, 42-55

Damgaard, J., and Elkjaer, T. (2017) 'The Global FDI Network: Searching for Ultimate Investors'. *IMF Working Paper* 17/258, Washington: International Monetary Fund

Damian, R.I., Su, R., Shanahan, M., Trautwein, U., and Roberts, B.W. (2014) 'Can Personality Traits and Intelligence Compensate for Background Disadvantage? Predicting Status Attainment in Adulthood'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 109 (3), 473-489. DOI: 10.1037/pspp0000024

Dashtipour, P. (2015) 'Social psychology: A commentary on organizational research'. in *Handbook of Critical Psychology*. ed. by Parker, I. Hove: Routledge, 79-87

Day, K. (2012) 'Social class, socioeconomic status and "health risk" behaviours: A critical analysis'. in *Advances in Health Psychology: Critical Approaches*. eds. by Horrocks, C., and Johnson, S. Hampshire: Palgrave, 61–73

Day, K., Rickett, B., and Woolhouse, M. (2014) 'Class Dismissed: Putting Social Class on the Critical Psychological Agenda'*. Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 8 (8), 397–407. DOI: 10.1111/spc3.12118

De Benedictis, S., Allen, K., and Jensen, T. (2017) 'Portraying Poverty: The Economics and Ethics of Factual Welfare Television'. *Cultural Sociology* 11 (3), 337–358. DOI: 10.1177%2F1749975517712132

De Vos, J. (2008) 'From panopticon to pan-psychologisation or, Why do so many women study psychology?' *International Journal of Žižek Studies* 2 (1), 1-20

De Vos, J. (2012) *Psychologisation in Times of Globalisation*. Hove: Routledge

Department for Communities and Local Government (2016) *Basement*

Developments and the Planning System: Call for Evidence [online] available from <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/564556/161031_Basements_Call_for_Evidence_Final.pdf> [5 July 2018]

Derrida, J. (1976) *Of Grammatology*. trans. by Spivak, G.C. London: John Hopkins University Press

Derrida, J. (1990) *Writing and Difference*. trans. by Bass, A. Chicago, IL: University

Di Tella, R., and MacCulloch, R. (2010) 'Happiness adaptation beyond basic needs'. in *International differences in well-being*. eds. by Diener, E., Kahneman, D., and Helliwell, J.F. New York: Oxford University Press, 217–246

Dixon, J., and Durrheim, K. (2000) 'Displacing place-identity: A discursive approach to locating self and other'. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 39 (1), 27-44. DOI: 10.1348/014466600164318

Dixon, J., and Durrheim, K. (2003) 'Contact and the ecology of racial division: Some varieties of informal segregation'. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 42 (1), 1-23. DOI: 10.1348/014466603763276090

Dorling, D. (2014) *Inequality and the 1%*. London: Verso Books

Doss, C.R., Deere, C.D., Oduro, A.D., and Swaminathan, H. (2014) 'The Gender Asset and Wealth Gaps'. *Development* 57 (3-4), 400–409

Draguns, J.G. (2001) 'Toward a Truly International Psychology: Beyond English Only'. *American Psychologist* 56 (11), 1019–1030

Dryburgh, H. (1999) 'Work Hard, Play Hard: Women and Professionalization in Engineering—Adapting to the Culture'. *Gender and Society* 13 (5), 664-682. DOI: 10.1177/089124399013005006

Dubois, D., Rucker, D.D., and Galinsky, A.D. (2015) 'Social class, power, and selfishness: When and why upper and lower class individuals behave unethically'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 108 (3), 436–449. DOI: 10.1037/pspi0000008

Duffy, D. (2013) ‘Constructing “masculine” identities: Consuming “feminine” practices’. in *The Routledge companion to identity and consumption*. eds. by Ruvio, A., and Belk, R.W. Abingdon: Routledge, 344-352

Duranti, A., and Goodwin, C. (1992) ‘Rethinking Context: an introduction’ in *Rethinking Context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. eds. by Duranti, A., and Goodwin, C. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-42

Easterlin, R.A. (1974) ‘Does Economic Growth Improve the Human Lot? Some Empirical Evidence’. *Nations and households in economic growth* 89, 89–125

Edley, N., (2001) ‘Conversation analysis, discursive psychology and the study of ideology: a response to Susan Speer’. *Feminism and Psychology* 11 (1), 136-140. DOI: 10.1177%2F0959353501011001007

Edley, N., and Wetherell, M. (1997) ‘Jockeying for position: The construction of masculine identities’. *Discourse and Society* 8 (2), 203-217. DOI: 10.1177%2F0957926597008002004

Edley, N., and Wetherell M. (2014) ‘Roles, roots, and rifts: A rejoinder to

Mahalik, Silverstein, and Hammond'. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 15 (4), 375-376. DOI: 10.1037/a0038008

Edwards, D. (1997) *Discourse and cognition*. London: Sage

Edwards, D. (1998) 'The relevant thing about her: Social identity categories in use'. in *Identities in Talk*. eds. by Antaki, C., and Widdicombe, S. London: SAGE, 15-33

Edwards, D. (1999) 'Emotion Discourse'. *Culture and Psychology* 5 (3), 271-291. DOI: 10.1177%2F1354067X9953001

Edwards, D. (2006) 'Facts, Norms and Dispositions: Practical Uses of the Modal Verb Would in Police Interrogations'. *Discourse Studies* 8 (4), 475–501. DOI: 10.1177%2F1461445606064830

Edwards, D. (2012) 'Discursive and scientific psychology'. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 51, 425–435. DOI: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.2012.02103.x

Edwards, D. (2014) 'Rhetoric, cognition and discursive psychology'. in *Rhetoric, Ideology and Social Psychology: Essays in honour of Michael Billig*. eds. by Antaki, C., and Condor, S. London: Routledge, 29-42

Edwards, D., and Potter, J. (1992) *Discursive Psychology*. London: SAGE

Evans, A. (2015) Diversity in gender and visual representation: a commentary. *Journal of Gender Studies* 24 (4), 473-479. DOI: 10.1080/09589236.2015.1047628

Evans, A., and Stasi, M. (2014) Desperately seeking methods: new directions in fan studies research. *Participations* 11 (2), 4-23.

Evans, W.N., and Fitzgerald, D. (2017) 'The Economic and Social Outcomes of

Refugees in the United States: Evidence from the ACS'. *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper* 23498 [online] available from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w23498> [30 June 2018]

Every, D., and Augoustinos, M. (2008) 'Taking advantage' or fleeing persecution? Opposing accounts of asylum seeking'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12, 648–667. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9841.2008.00386.x

Eysenck, H. J. (1975) *The Inequality of Man*. London: Pan.

Fernandez, R., Hofman, A., and Aalbers, M.B. (2016) 'London and New York as a safe deposit box for the transnational wealth elite'. *Environment and Planning A* 48 (12), 2443–2461. DOI: 10.1177/0308518X16659479

Firth, M., He, X., Rui, O.M., and Xiao, T. (2014) 'Paragon or Pariah? The Consequences of Being Conspicuously Rich in China's New Economy'. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 29, 430–448. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2014.09.004

Fiske, S.T., Cuddy, A.J.C., and Glick, P. (2007) 'Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth, then competence'*. Trends in Cognitive Science* 11, 77– 83. DOI: 10.1016/j.tics.2006.11.005

Fogarty, K., and Augoustinos, M. (2008) 'Feckless fathers and monopolizing mothers: Motive, identity, and fundamental truths in the Australian Public Inquiry into Child Custody'. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 47 (3), 535-556. DOI: 10.1348/014466607X238652

Forrester, M. (2011) 'The video-camera as a cultural object: The presence of

(an)Other'. in *Visual Methods in Psychology: Using and interpreting images in qualitative research*. eds. by Reavey, P. Hove: Psychology Press, 119-138

Fox, D., Prilleltensky, I., and Austin, S. (2009) 'Critical Psychology for Social Justice: Concerns and Dilemmas'. in *Critical Psychology: An Introduction*. eds. by Fox, D., Prilleltensky, I., and Austin, S. London: SAGE, 3-19

Foucault M. (1972) *The Archeology of Knowledge.* London: Tavistock

Foucault, M. (1975) *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Vintage Books

Frankfurt, H.G. (2015) *On Inequality*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

Freedman, D. (2014) 'Metrics, models and the meaning of media ownership'. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 20 (2), 170–185. DOI: 10.1080/10286632.2012.752821

Frie, R. (2008) 'Introduction: The Situated Nature of Psychological Agency'. in *Psychological Agency: Theory, Practice and Culture*. eds. by Frie, R. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1-31

Friedli, L., and Stearn, R. (2015) 'Positive affect as coercive strategy: conditionality, activation and the role of psychology in UK government workfare programmes'. *Medical Humanities* 41, 40-47. DOI: 10.1136/medhum-2014-010622

Furnham, A. (1987) 'Work related beliefs and human values'. *Personality and Individual Differences* 8, 627–637. DOI: 10.1016/0191-8869(87)90060-2

Furnham, A. (1990) *The Protestant Work Ethic: The Psychology of*

Work-related Beliefs and Behaviours. London: Routledge

Furnham, A., Masters, J., Bond, M., Payne, M., Heaven, P., Rajamanikam, R., Stacey, B., and van Daalen, H. (1993) 'A Comparison of Protestant Work Ethic Beliefs in Thirteen Nations'. *Journal of Social Psychology* 133 (2), 185-197. DOI: 10.1080/00224545.1993.9712136

Fusco, A. (2015) 'The relationship between income and housing deprivation: A longitudinal analysis'. *Economic Modelling* 49, 137-143. DOI: 10.1016/j.econmod.2015.04.002

Gadhoum, Y., Lang, L.H.P., and Young L. (2005) 'Who Controls US?' *European Financial Management* 11 (3), 339–363. DOI: 10.1111/j.1354 7798.2005.00287.x

Gaucher, D., and Jost, J. (2011) 'Difficulties awakening the sense of injustice and overcoming oppression: On the soporific effects of system justification'. in *Conflict, interdependence, and justice: The intellectual legacy of Morton Deutsch*. ed. by Coleman, P.T. New York: Springer, 227-246

Ghosh, C. (2013) *The Politics of the American Dream: Democratic Inclusion in Contemporary American Political Culture*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan

Gibson, S. (2009) 'The Effortful Citizen: Discursive Social Psychology and Welfare Reform'. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 19, 393–410. DOI: 10.1002/casp.1003

Gibson, S. (2011) 'Dilemmas of citizenship: young people's conceptions of

un/employment rights and responsibilities'. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 50 (3), 450-468. DOI: 10.1348/014466610X520113

Gibson, S., and Booth, R. (2017) 'An Australian-style points system': Individualizing immigration in radical right discourse in the 2015 UK General Election campaign'. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*. DOI: 10.1037/pac0000267

Gibson, S., Crossland, M., and Hamilton, J. (2018) 'Social citizenship and immigration: Employment, welfare and effortfulness in online discourse concerning migration to the UK'. *Qualitative Psychology* 5 (1), 99-116. DOI: 10.1037/qup0000078

Gilbert, G.N., and Mulkay, M. (1984) *Opening Pandora's Box: A sociological analysis of scientists' discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Glucksberg, L. (2016) 'A view from the top'. *City* 20 (2), 238-255. DOI: 10.1080/13604813.2016.1143686

Godfrey, E.B., and Wolf, S. (2016) 'Developing Critical Consciousness or Justifying the System? A Qualitative Analysis of Attributions for Poverty and Wealth Among Low-Income Racial/Ethnic Minority and Immigrant Women'. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 22 (1), 93–103. DOI: 10.1037/cdp0000048

Goffman, E. (1967) *Interaction Ritual. Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. London: Penguin

Goffman, E. (1974) *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organisation of Experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goffman, E. (1981) *Frames of Talk*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania

Press

Goldsmith, A. H., Veum, J. R. and Darity, W. (1997) 'The Impact of Psychological and Human Capital on Wages'. *Economic Inquiry* 35, 815–829. DOI: 10.1111/j.1465-7295.1997.tb01966.x

Goodman, S., and Burke, S. (2010) ‘’Oh you don’t want asylum seekers, oh you’re just racist’: A discursive analysis of discussions about whether it’s racist to oppose asylum seeking’. *Discourse and Society* 21 (3), 325-340. DOI: 10.1177/0957926509360743

Goodman, S., Burke, S., Liebling, H., and Zasada, D. (2015). “I can't go back because if I go back I would die”: How asylum seekers manage talk about returning home by highlighting the importance of safety. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 25, 327–339. DOI: 10.1002/casp.2217

Goodman, S., and Carr, P. (2017) 'Belief in a Just World as an argumentative resource in debates about unemployment benefits'. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 27(4), 312-323. DOI: 10.1002/casp.2314

Goodman, S., Sirriyeh, A., and McMahon, S. (2017) 'The evolving (re)categorisations of refugees throughout the ‘Refugee/Migrant crisis'. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 27 (2), 105-114. DOI: 10.1002/casp.2302

Goodman, S., and Speer, S. (2016) ‘Natural and contrived data’. in *Discursive*

Psychology: Classic and contemporary issues. eds. by Tileagă, C., and Stokoe, E. Abingdon: Routledge, 57-69

Gottfredson, L.S. (2016) ‘Hans Eysenck's theory of intelligence, and what it reveals about him’. *Personality and Individual Differences* 103, 116-127. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2016.04.036

Goudsblom, J. (1990) ‘Human History and Long-term Social Processes- Towards A Synthesis of Chronology and Phaseology’. *Netherlands Journal of Social Sciences* 26 (1), 67–81

Grisold, A., and Theine, H. (2017) 'How Come We Know? The Media Coverage of Economic Inequality'. *International Journal of Communication* 11, 4265-4284

Guthey, E., Clark, T., and Jackson, B. (2009) *Demystifying Business Celebrity*. London: Routledge.

Hall, S. (1980) ‘Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms’. *Media, Culture, Society* 2, 57-72

Hall, S. (2011) ‘The Neo-Liberal Revolution’. *Cultural Studies*, 25(6), 705-728. DOI: 10.1080/09502386.2011.619886

Halpin, D., and Guilfoyle, A. (2004) ‘Attributions of Responsibility: Rural Neoliberalism and Farmers’ Explanations of The Australian Rural Crisis’. *Rural Society* 14 (2), 93-111

Harrington, B. (2016) *Capital Without Borders: Wealth Managers and the One Percent*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Harris, J. (2006) *The Interactional Significance of Tears: A Conversation*

Analytic Study. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Brisbane: University of Queensland

Harvey, D. (2000) *Spaces of Hope*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Harvey, L., Allen, K., and Mendick, H. (2015) 'Extraordinary acts and ordinary pleasures: Rhetorics of inequality in young people's talk about celebrity'. *Discourse and Society* 26 (4), 428 – 444. DOI: 10.1177/0957926515576636

Hay, I., and Muller, S. (2012) "'That Tiny, Stratospheric Apex That Owns Most of the World'-Exploring Geographies of the Super-Rich'. *Geographical Research* 50 (1), 75–88

Hayes, T.J., and Dennis, C. (2014) 'State Adoption of Tax Policy New Data and New Insights'. *American Politics Research* 42 (6), 929–955. DOI: 10.1177/1532673X13517131

Hayter, D., and Hegarty, P. (2015) 'Insisting on the Unthinkable: A Reply to Wetherell and Potter'. *Theory and Psychology* 25 (3), 396–402. DOI: 10.1177/0959354315588635

Headey, B., and Wooden, M. (2004) 'The Effects of Wealth and Income on Subjective Well-Being and Ill-Being'. *The Economic Record* 80 (s1), S24–S33. DOI: 10.1111/j.1475-4932.2004.00181.x

Heath, A., Savage, M., and Senior, N. (2013) 'Social class: The role of class in shaping social attitudes'. in *British Social Attitudes: the 30th Report*. eds. by Park, A., Bryson, C., Clery, E., Curtice, J. and Phillips, M. London: NatCen Social Research [online] available from

<http://www.bsa.natcen.ac.uk/media/38723/bsa30_full_report_final.pdf> [3 July 2018]

Hecht, K. (2017) 'A Relational Analysis of Top Incomes and Wealth: Economic Evaluation, Relative (Dis)advantage and the Service to Capital'. *LSE Working Paper* 11 [online] available from <http://www.lse.ac.uk/International-Inequalities/Assets/Documents/Working-Papers/Katharina-Hecht-A-Relational-Analysis-of-Top-Incomes-and-Wealth.pdf> [5 July 2018]

Hegarty, P. (2007) 'Getting Dirty: Psychology's History of Power'. *History of Psychology* 10 (2), 75-91. DOI: 10.1037/1093-4510.10.2.75

Heider, F. (1958) *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley

Hepburn, A. (1999) 'Derrida and Psychology: Deconstruction and its Ab/uses in Critical and Discursive Psychologies'. *Theory and Psychology* 9 (5), 639-665. DOI: 10.1177/0959354399095004

Hepburn, A. (2003) *An Introduction to Critical Social Psychology*. London: SAGE

Hepburn, A., and Wiggins, S. (2007) *Discursive Research in Practice: New Approaches to Psychology and Everyday Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

HM Revenue and Customs (2017) *Statistics on Non-domiciled Taxpayers in the UK 2007-08 to 2014-15* [online] available from <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/640897/Statistical_commentary_on_non-domiciled_taxpayers.pdf> [4 July 2018]

Hester, H. (2014) 'Weaponizing Prurience'. in *Narrating Poverty and Precarity in Britain*. eds. by Korte, B., and Regard, F. Berlin: De Gruyter, 205-224

Hilton, M. (2004) 'The Legacy of Luxury Moralities of Consumption Since the 18th Century'. *Journal of Consumer Culture* 4 (1), 101-123. DOI: 10.1177/1469540504040906

Hilton, M., and Daunton, M. (2001) 'Material politics: An introduction'. in *The Politics of Consumption: Material Culture and Citizenship in Europe and America*. eds. by Matthew, H., and Martin, D. Oxford: Berg, 1–32

Ho, A. K., Sidanius, J., Kteily, N., Sheehy-Skeffington, J., Pratto, F., Henkel, K. E., and Stewart, A. L. (2015) 'The nature of social dominance orientation: Theorizing and measuring preferences for intergroup inequality using the new SDO scale'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 109 (6), 1003-1028. DOI: 10.1037/pspi0000033

Ho, A.H., Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Levin, S., Thomsen, L., Kteily, N., and Sheehy- Skeffington, J. (2012) 'Social Dominance Orientation: Revisiting the Structure and Function of a Variable Predicting Social and Political Attitudes'. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 38 (5), 583-606. DOI: 10.1177/0146167211432765

Hodson, G., MacInnis, C.C., and Busseri, M.A. (2017) 'Bowing and kicking: Rediscovering the fundamental link between generalized authoritarianism and generalized prejudice'. *Personality and Individual Differences* 104, 243-251. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2016.08.018

Hollway, W. (2011) 'Through discursive psychology to a psycho-social

approach'. in *Social psychology: The turn to discourse*. ed. by Bozatzis, N., and Dragonas, T. Athens: Metaixmio, 209–240

Holt, M., and Griffin, C. (2005) 'Students versus locals: Young adults' constructions of the working-class other'. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 44, 241–267. DOI: 10.1348/014466604X17614

Home Office (2017) *Tier 1 (Investor) of the Points Based System – Policy* [online] available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/606189/T1_Investor_Guidance_04_2017.pdf> [11 October 2017]

House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee (2017) *Sustainable Development Goals in the UK: Ninth Report of Session 2016–17* [online] available from <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201617/cmselect/cmenvaud/596/596.pdf> [2 July 2018]

Housley, W., and Fitzgerald, R. (2002) 'A Reconsidered model of Membership Categorisation Analysis'. *Qualitative Research* 2 (1), 59-84. DOI: 10.1177/146879410200200104

Hülsz, E. (2013) 'Heraclitus on Logos: Language, Rationality and the Real'. in *Doctrine and Doxography: Studies on Heraclitus and Pythagoras*. eds. by Sider, D., and Obbink, D. Berlin: De Gruyter, 281-301

Huma, B., Stokoe, E. and Sikveland, R.O. (2018) 'Persuasive conduct: Alignment and resistance in prospecting 'cold' calls'. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. DOI: 10.1177/0261927X18783474

Hunt, M.O. (2004) 'Race/Ethnicity and Beliefs about Wealth and Poverty'. *Social*

Science Quarterly 85 (3), 827-853. DOI: 10.1111/j.0038-4941.2004.00247.x

Hyde, M. (2016) ‘Julia Stakhiva: the Rich Kid of Instagram who isn’t quite what she seems’. *The Guardian* [online] 19 August. available from <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/lostinshowbiz/2016/aug/18/rich-kid-of-instagram-is-what-she-seems-julia-stakhiva> [17 August 2018]

Iatridis, T., and Fousiani, K. (2009) 'Effects of status and outcome on attributions and just-world beliefs: How the social distribution of success and failure may be rationalized'. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 45 (2), 415-420. DOI: 10.1016/j.jesp.2008.12.002

Ingleby, D. (1985) ‘Professionals as socializers: The ‘psy complex’’. *Research in Law Deviance and Social Control* 7, 79–109

Instagram (2017) *Instagram’s 2017 Year in Review* [online] available from <https://instagram-press.com/blog/2017/11/29/instagrams-2017-year-in-review> [22 January 2018]

Institute for Public Policy Research (2018) *Prosperity and Justice: A Plan for the New Economy: The Final Report of the IPPR Commission on Economic Justice*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Islam, G., and Zyphur, M. (2009) ‘Concepts and directions in critical industrial/organizational psychology’. in *Critical Psychology: An Introduction*. eds. by Fox, D., Prilleltensky, I., and Austin, S. London: SAGE, 110-125

Jackson, S., and Gee, S. (2005) ''Look Janet’, ‘No you look John’: constructions

of gender in early school reader illustrations across 50 years'. *Gender and Education* 17 (2), 115-128. DOI: 10.1080/0954025042000301410

Jefferson, G. (1990) ‘List construction as task and resource’. in *Interaction competence*. ed. by Psathas, G. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 63-92

Jefferson, G. (2004) ‘Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction’. in *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. ed. by Lerner, G.H. Amsterdam: John Benjamin, 13-31

Jetten J., Mols F., and Postmes, T. (2015) ‘Relative Deprivation and Relative Wealth Enhances Anti-Immigrant Sentiments: The V-Curve Re-Examined’. *PLOS ONE* 10 (10). DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0139156

Jetten, J., Wang, Z., Steffens, N.K., Mols, F., Peters, K., and Verkuyten, M. (2017) 'A social identity analysis of responses to economic inequality'. *Current Opinion in Psychology* 18, 1–5. DOI: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.05.011

Jo, Y.N. (2013) ‘Psycho-Social Dimensions of Poverty: When Poverty Becomes Shameful’. *Critical Social Policy* 33 (3), 514–531. DOI: 10.1177/0261018313479008

Joseph Rowntree Foundation (2016a) *Monitoring poverty and social exclusion 2016* [online] available from <https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/monitoring-poverty-and-social-exclusion-2016> [26 July 2018]

Joseph Rowntree Foundation (2016b) *A London without Poverty: The Joseph*

Rowntree Foundation's Manifesto Briefing for the London Mayoral Election 2016 [online] available from <https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/london-without-poverty> [1 February 2016]

Jost, J.T. (1995) 'Negative illusions: Conceptual clarification and psychological evidence concerning false consciousness'. *Political Psychology* 16, 397-424. DOI: 10.2307/3791837

Jost, J.T. (1996) *Ingroup and outgroup favoritism among groups differing in socio-economic success: Effects of perceived legitimacy and justification processes*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Connecticut: Yale University

Jowett, A. (2015) 'Questioning the Taken-for-Granted: The Role of Psychology and Qualitative Inquiry in Social Change'. *Qualitative Methods in Psychology Bulletin* 20 (3), 28–30

Kahneman, D., and Tversky, A. (1972) 'Subjective probability: A judgment of representativeness'. *Cognitive Psychology* 3, 430–454

Kaika, M. (2011) 'Autistic Architecture: The Fall of the Icon and the Rise of the Serial Object of Architecture'. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 29 (6), 968–992. DOI: 10.1068%2Fd16110

Kaika, M., and Thielen, K. (2006) 'Form follows power: A genealogy of urban shrines'. *City* 10 (1), 59-69. DOI: 10.1080/13604810600594647

Kapoor, I. (2016) 'Billionaire Philanthropy: 'decaf capitalism''. in *Handbook on Wealth and the Super-Rich*. eds. by Hay, I., and Beaverstock, J.V. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 113-130

Kendall, D. E. (2005) *Framing Class: Media Representations of Wealth and Poverty in America*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield

Keeley, B. (2015) ‘Income Inequality: The Gap between Rich and Poor’. *OECD Insights.* DOI: 10.1787/9789264246010-en

Kelley, H.H., and Michela, J.L. (1980) 'Attribution Theory and Research'. *Annual Review of Psychology* 31, 457-501

Kesisoglou, G., Figgou, E., and Dikaiou, M. (2016) ‘Constructing work and subjectivities in precarious conditions: Psycho-discursive practices in young people’s interviews in Greece’. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology* 4 (1), 24-43. DOI: 10.5964/jspp.v4i1.494

Kiatpongsan, S., and Norton, M.I. (2014) ‘How Much (More) Should CEOs Make? A Universal Desire for More Equal Pay’. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 9 (6), 587–593. DOI: 10.1177%2F1745691614549773

Kirchler, E. (2007) *The Economic Psychology of Tax Behaviour*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Kirkwood, S. (2012) ‘Negotiating the dilemmas of claiming asylum: A discursive analysis of interviews with refugees on life in Scotland’. *eSharp, Special Issue: The 1951 UN Refugee Convention - 60 Years On*, 87–112.

Kirkwood, S., McKinlay, A., and McVittie, C. (2013) 'The Mutually Constitutive Relationship between Place and Identity: The Role of Place-Identity in Discourse on Asylum Seekers and Refugees'. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 23 (6), 453-465. DOI: 10.1002/casp.2141

Kitis, E. (2009) ‘Emotions as discursive constructs: the case of the psych-verb 'fear''. in *Studies in Cognitive Corpus Linguistics*. eds. by Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. and Dziwirek, K. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 147-172

Klein, E. (2014) ‘Psychological Agency: Evidence from the Urban Fringe of Bamako’. *World Development* 64, 642-653

Koh, S.Y., Wissink, B., and Forrest, R. (2016) ‘Reconsidering the super-rich: variations, structural conditions and urban consequences’. in *Handbook on Wealth and the Super-Rich*. eds. by Hay, I., and Beaverstock, J.V. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 18-41

Kondo, S. (2000) *Empire of Rhetorics: A Discursive/Rhetorical Approach to the Study of Japanese Monarchism*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Loughborough: Loughborough University

Korpela, K. M. (1989) ‘Place-identity as a product of environmental self-regulation’. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 9, 241-256

Kraus, M.W., and Callaghan, B. (2016) 'Social class and prosocial behavior'. *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 7 (8), 769–777. DOI: 10.1177/1948550616659120

Kress, G. and Van Leeuwen, T. (1996) *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. London: Routledge

Kuhn, T.S. (1977) *The Essential Tension: Selected Studies in Scientific Tradition and Change*. London: University of Chicago Press

Küpper, B., and Zick, A. (2011) 'Inverse gender gap in Germany: Social dominance orientation among men and women'. *International Journal of Psychology* 46 (1), 33–45. DOI: 10.1080/00207594.2010.491121

LaMarre, A., and Sutherland, O. (2014) 'Expert Opinion? A Micro-Analysis of Eating Disorder Talk on Dr. Phil'. *The Qualitative Report* 19 (43), 1-20

Leahy, R. (1981) 'The Development of the Conception of Economic Inequality:

Descriptions and Comparisons of Rich and Poor People'. *Child Development* 52 (2), 523-532

Lerner, M.J. (1980) *The Belief in a Just World: A Fundamental Delusion*. London: Plenum Press

Leudar, I., and Antaki, C. (1996) 'Discourse Participation, Reported Speech and Research Practices in Social Psychology'. *Theory & Psychology* 6 (1), 5–29. DOI: 10.1177/0959354396061001

Lipset, S. M. (1990) 'The work ethic-then and now'. *The Public Interest* 98, 61-70

Littler, J. (2013) 'Meritocracy as plutocracy: the marketising of 'equality' within neoliberalism'. *New Formations: a journal of culture/theory/politics* 80-81, 52-72. DOI: 10.3898/NewF.80/81.03.2013

Littler, J. (2018) *Against Meritocracy: Culture, power and myths of mobility*. London: Routledge

Louis, W.R., Mavor, K.I., La Macchia, S.T., and Amiot, C.E. (2014) 'Social Justice and Psychology: What Is, and What Should Be'. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology* 34 (1), 14-27. DOI: 10.1037/a0033033

Lynn, N., and Lea, S. (2003) ''A phantom menace and the new apartheid': The social construction of asylum-seekers in the United Kingdom'. *Discourse and Society* 14 (4), 425–452. DOI: 10.1177/0957926503014004002

MacMillan, K., and Edwards, D. (1999) 'Who Killed the Princess? Description and Blame in the British Press'. *Discourse Studies* 1 (2), 151-174. DOI: 10.1177/1461445699001002002

Mankiw, N.G. (2013) ‘Defending the One Percent’. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 27 (3), 21–34

Mansfield, N. (2011) ‘Derrida, Democracy and Violence’. *Studies in Social Justice* 5 (2), 231-240. DOI: 10.26522/ssj.v5i2.989

Manstead, A.S.R. (2018) ‘The psychology of social class: How socioeconomic status impacts thought, feelings, and behaviour’. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 57 (2), 267-291. DOI: 10.1111/bjso.12251

Martin, C.R. (2003) ‘The 1997 United Parcel Service Strike: Framing the Story for Popular Consumption’. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 27 (2), 190-210. DOI: 10.1177/0196859902250867

Martin, G., Dymock, D., Billett, S., and Johnson, G. (2014) ‘In the name of meritocracy: managers' perceptions of policies and practices for training older workers’. *Ageing and Society* 34 (6), 992-1018. DOI: 10.1017/S0144686X12001432

Marwick, A. E. (2015) 'Instafame: Luxury Selfies in the Attention Economy'. *Public Culture* 27(1/75), 137-160. DOI: 10.1215/08992363-2798379

Marx, K., and Engels, F. ([1888] 2012) *The Communist Manifesto*. ed. by Isaac, J.C. Connecticut: Yale University Press

Mayblin, L. (2016) ‘Complexity reduction and policy consensus: Asylum seekers, the right to work, and the ‘pull factor’ thesis in the UK context’. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 18 (4), 812–828. DOI:10.1177/1369148116656986

McGoey, L. (2015) *No Such Thing as a Free Gift: The Gates Foundation and*

the Price of Philanthropy. London: Verso

McGrath, L., Walker, C. & Jones, C. (2016) 'Psychologists Against Austerity: mobilising psychology for social change'. *Critical and Radical Social Work* 4 (3), 409-413. DOI: 10.1332/204986016X14721364317537

McMahon, S. (2015) *Immigration and Citizenship in an Enlarged European Union: The Political Dynamics of Intra-EU Mobility.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

McMullen, L.M. (2005) Talk about receiving, giving, and taking in radio interviews: 'doing modesty' and 'making a virtue out of necessity'. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 44 (4), 557-570. DOI: 10.1348/014466604X18532

McNamee, S.J., and Miller, R.K. Jr. (2014) *The meritocracy myth*. 3rd edn. Plymouth: Rowman and Littlefield

Medeiros, M. and de Souza, P.H.F. (2015) 'The Rich, the Affluent and the Top Incomes'. *Current Sociology Review* 63 (6), 869–895. DOI: 10.1177%2F0011392114551651

Mentinis, M. (2010) 'Rebel Pathologies: From Politics to Psychologisation… and Back'. *Annual Review of Critical Psychology* 8, 217-236

Merton, R. (1968) 'The Matthew Effect in science'. *Science* 159 (3810), 56-63

Migration Advisory Committee (2014) *Tier 1 Investor Route: Investment thresholds and economic benefits* [online] available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/285220/Tier1investmentRoute.pdf> [11 October 2017]

Mols, F., and Jetten, J. (2017) *The wealth paradox: economic prosperity and*

the hardening of attitudes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Moore J.W. (2016) 'What Is the Sense of Agency and Why Does it Matter?'. *Frontiers in Psychology* 7, 1272. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01272

Moscatelli, S., Albarello, F., Prati, F., and Rubini, M. (2014) 'Badly off or better off than them? The impact of relative deprivation and relative gratification on intergroup discrimination'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 107, 248–262. DOI: 10.1037/a0036704

Mumford, G., and Wardell, S. (2015) 'Catch-up TV guide: Super-Rich Season, Togetherness and more'. *The Guardian* [online] 10 January. available from <https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2015/jan/10/catch-up-tv-guide> [20 July 2018]

Nehru, J. (1937) *Recent Essays and Writings*. Allahabad: Kitabistan

Ng, S.H., and Allen, M.W. (2005) 'Perception of Economic Distributive Justice: Exploring Leading Theories'. *Social Behavior and Personality* 33 (5), 435-454. DOI: 10.2224/sbp.2005.33.5.435

Norris, S. (2016) 'Concepts in multimodal discourse analysis with examples from video conferencing'. *Yearbook of the Poznań Linguistic Meeting* 2, 141–165. DOI: 10.1515/yplm-2016-0007

Norton, M.I. and Ariely, D. (2011) 'Building a Better America- One Wealth Quintile at a Time'. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 6 (1), 9–12. DOI: 10.1177/1745691610393524

Obermayer, B., and Obermaier, F. (2016) *The Panama papers: Breaking the story of how the rich & powerful hide their money*. London: Oneworld Publications

Office for Budget Responsibility (2013) *Fiscal Sustainability Report* [online] available from <http://obr.uk/docs/dlm_uploads/2013-FSR_OBR_web.pdf> [30 June 2018]

Office for National Statistics (2013) *Inheritance in Great Britain, 2008/10* [online] available from <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20160109111909/http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171776_333036.pdf > [27 October 2017]

Office for National Statistics (2015) *Trend in life expectancy at birth and at age 65 by socio-economic position based on the National Statistics Socio-economic Classification, England and Wales: 1982—1986 to 2007—2011* [online] available from <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/lifeexpectancies/bulletins/trendinlifeexpectancyatbirthandatage65bysocioeconomicpositionbasedonthenationalstatisticssocioeconomicclassificationenglandandwales/2015-10-21#main-findings> [3 July 2018]

Office for National Statistics (2018) *Wealth in Great Britain Wave 5: 2014 to 2016* [online] available from <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/personalandhouseholdfinances/incomeandwealth/bulletins/wealthingreatbritainwave5/2014to2016#property-wealth> [2 July 2018]

Office of Communications (2014) *Ofcom Broadcast Bulletin 257* [online] available from <https://www.ofcom.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0016/47302/obb257.pdf> [6 July 2018]

Office of Communications (2017a) *News consumption in the UK: 2016*. [online] available from <https://www.ofcom.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0016/103570/news-consumption-uk-2016.pdf> [23 February 2018]

Office of Communications (2017b) *The Communications Market: UK* [online] available from <https://www.ofcom.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0016/105442/uk-television-audio-visual.pdf> [23 February 2018]

Olick, J.K. (2016) 'The poverty of resilience: On memory, meaning, and well-being'. *Memory Studies* 9 (3), 315-324. DOI: 10.1177/1750698016645265

Oishi, S. and Kesebir, S. (2015) 'Income Inequality Explains Why Economic Growth Does Not Always Translate to an Increase in Happiness'. Psychological Science 26,1630-1638. DOI: 10.1177/0956797615596713

Oishi, S., Schimmack, U., and Diener, E. (2011) 'Progressive Taxation and the Subjective Well-Being of Nations'. *Psychological Science* 23, 86-92. DOI: 10.1177/0956797611420882

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2012) *Divided We Stand: Why Inequality Keeps Rising*. OECD Publishing. DOI: 10.1787/9789264119536-en

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2013) *International Migration Outlook 2013* [online] available from <https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/international-migration-outlook-2013_migr_outlook-2013-en#page1> [30 June 2018]

Östman, J. (1981) *You Know: A Discourse-Functional Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Ostrower, F. (1995) 'Philanthropy, prestige and status'. in *The Philanthropy Reader*. eds. by Moody, M., and Breeze, B. London: Routledge, 217-219

Oxfam (2018) *Reward Work, Not Wealth: Methodology Note* [online] available from <file:///C:/Users/carrp/Downloads/tb-reward-work-not-wealth-methodology-note-220118-en.pdf> [2 July 2018]

Oxford Dictionaries (2006) *Oxford English Dictionary*. 3rd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Poster, M. (1984) *Foucault, Marxism and History: Mode of Production Versus Mode of Information*. London: Polity Press

Parker, I. (1997) *Psychoanalytic culture: Psychoanalytic discourse in Western society*. London: SAGE

Parker, I. (2005) 'Discourse'. in *Qualitative Psychology: Introducing Radical Research*. ed. by Parker, I. Maidenhead: Open University Press, 88-104

Parker, I. (2007) *Revolution in Psychology: Alienation to Emancipation*. London: Pluto Press

Parker, I. (2007b) 'Critical Psychology: What It Is and What It Is Not'. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 1 (1), 1–15. DOI: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00008.x

Parker, I. (2015) *Critical discursive psychology*. 2nd edn. ed. by Parker, I. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Peterson, E.W.F. (2017) 'Is Economic Inequality Really a Problem? A Review

of the Arguments'. *Social Sciences* 6 (4), 147. DOI: 10.3390/socsci6040147

Pettit, M. (2015) 'Subject Matter: Human Behavior, Psychological Expertise, and Therapeutic Lives'. *Social studies of science* 45 (1), 146–158. DOI: 10.1177%2F0306312714546366

Pharoah, C. (2016) 'What motivates people to give their own private resources for the public good?' in *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy*. eds. by Jung, T., Phillips, S.D., and Harrow, J. Abingdon: Routledge, 71-87

Pickett, K.E., James, O.W., and Wilkinson, R.G. (2006) 'Income Inequality and the Prevalence of Mental Illness: A Preliminary International Analysis'. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 60 (7), 646–647. DOI: 10.1136/jech.2006.046631

Pickett, K.E. and Wilkinson, R.G. (2015) 'Income Inequality and Health: A Causal Review'. *Social Science and Medicine* 128 (C), 316–326. DOI: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.12.031

Piff, P.K. (2014) 'Wealth and the inflated self: Class, entitlement, and narcissism'. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 40 (1), 34–43. DOI: 10.1177/0146167213501699

Piff, P.K., Kraus, M.W., Côté, S., Cheng, B H., & Keltner, D. (2010) 'Having less, giving more: The influence of social class on prosocial behavior'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 99 (5), 771–784. DOI: 10.1037/a0020092

Piff, P.K., Kraus, M.W., and Keltner, D. (2017) 'Unpacking the Inequality

Paradox: The Psychological Roots of Inequality and Social Class'. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 57, 53-124

Piff, P.K., and Moskowitz, J.P. (2017) 'Wealth, Poverty, and Happiness: Social Class Is Differentially Associated With Positive Emotions'. *Emotion.* DOI: 10.1037/emo0000387

Piff, P., Stancato, D.M., Côté, S., Mendoza-Denton, R., and Keltner, D. (2012) 'Higher social class predicts increased unethical behavior'. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109 (11), 4086-4091. DOI: 10.1073%2Fpnas.1118373109

Piketty, T. (2015) 'Putting Distribution Back at the Center of Economics: Reflections on Capital in the Twenty-First Century'. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 29 (1), 67–88. DOI: 10.1257/jep.29.1.67

Piketty, T., and Zucman, G. (2015) 'Wealth and Inheritance in the Long Run'. *Handbook of Income Distribution* 2B, 1303-1368. DOI: 10.1016/B978-0-444-59429-7.00016-9

Plato ([5BC] 1998) *Cratylus*. trans. by Reeve, C.D.C. Cambridge: Hackett

Plato ([5BC] 2008) 'Gorgias'. trans. by Lamb, W.R.M. in *Readings in Classical Rhetoric*. eds. by Benson, T.W., and Prosser, M.H. London: Routledge, 3-21

Pomerantz, A. (1986) 'Extreme case formulations: A way of legitimizing claims'. *Human Studies* 9 (2–3), 219–229

Poole, G.A. (2000) "Wealth Porn' and Beyond'. *Columbia Journalism Review* 39 (4), 22

Potter, J. (1996a) *Representing reality: discourse, rhetoric and social*

construction. London: SAGE

Potter, J. (1996b) 'Discourse analysis and constructionist approaches: theoretical background'. in *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods for Psychology and the Social Sciences*. ed. by Richardson, J. Leicester: BPS Books, 125-140

Potter, J. (2002) 'Two kinds of natural', *Discourse Studies* 4, 539-542. DOI: 10.1177/14614456020040040901

Potter, J. (2012) 'Rereading Discourse and Social Psychology: Transforming social psychology?' *British Journal of Social Psychology* 51, 436-455. DOI: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02085.x

Potter, J., and Edwards, D. (1990) 'Nigel Lawson's tent: Discourse analysis: attribution theory and the social psychology of fact'. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 20 (5), 405-424. DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.2420200504

Potter, J., Edwards, D., and Ashmore, M. (1999) 'Regulating criticism: some comments on an argumentative complex'. *History of the Human Sciences* 12 (4), 79-88. DOI: 10.1177/09526959922120504

Potter, J., and Hepburn, A. (2005) 'Qualitative interviews in psychology: problems and possibilities'. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 2 (4), 281-307

Potter, J., and Mulkay, M. (1985) 'Scientists' interview talk: Interviews as a technique for revealing participants' interpretative practices'. in *The Research Interview: Uses and Approaches*. eds. by Brenner, M., Brown, J., and Canter, D. London: Academic Press, 247-71

Potter, J., and Wetherell, M. (1987) *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: SAGE

Potter, J., Wetherell, M., Gill, R., and Edwards, D. (1990) ‘Discourse: Noun, verb or social practice?’ *Philosophical Psychology* 3 (2-3), 205-217

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L.M., and Malle, B.F. (1994) 'Social dominance orientation: a personality variable predicting social and political attitudes'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 67, 741–763. DOI: 10.1037%2F0022-3514.67.4.741

Prilleltensky, I. (1997) ‘Values, Assumptions, and Practices: Assessing the Moral Implications of Psychological Discourse and Action’. *American Psychologist* 52 (5), 517. DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.52.5.517

Pyysiäinen, J., Halpin, D., and Guilfoyle, A. (2017) ‘Neoliberal governance and ‘responsibilization’ of agents: reassessing the mechanisms of responsibility-shift in neoliberal discursive environments’. *Distinktion: Journal of Social Theory* 18 (2), 215-235. DOI: 10.1080/1600910X.2017.1331858

Ramos, M.R., Correia, I., and Alves, H. (2014) ‘To Believe or Not to Believe in a Just World? The Psychological Costs of Threats to the Belief in a Just World and the Role of Attributions’. *Self and Identity* 13 (3), 257-273. DOI: 10.1080/15298868.2013.798890

Reavey, P. (2011) ‘The return to experience: Psychology and the visual’ in *Visual Methods in Psychology: Using and interpreting images in qualitative research*. eds. by Reavey, P. Hove: Psychology Press, 1-14

Reavey, P., and Johnson, K. (2008) ‘Visual Approaches using and interpreting Images’. in *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* eds. by W. Stainton Rogers, W., and Willig, C. London: SAGE, 296-315

Reicher, S. (2004) ‘The Context of Social Identity: Domination, Resistance, and Change’. *Political Psychology* 25 (6), 921-945

Reichle, B., Schneider, A., and Montada, L. (1998) ‘How do observers of victimization preserve their belief in a just world cognitively oractionally?’ in *Responses to victimization and belief in a just world*. eds. by Montada, L., and Lerner, M.J. New York: Plenum, 55-86

Reynolds, K.J., and Turner, J.C. (2001) 'Prejudice as a group process: The role of social identity'. in *Understanding prejudice, racism and social conflict*. eds. by Augoustinos, M., and Reynolds, K. London: Sage, 159-79

Rickett, B. (2016) ‘VI. Feminist psychology – poststructuralism, class and maternal subjectivities: Where are we and where should we go next?’ *Feminism and Psychology* 26 (3), 320-326. DOI: 10.1177/0959353516641140

Ringrose, J., and Walkerdine, V. (2008) ‘Regulating the abject: The TV make-over as a site of neo-liberal reinvention towards bourgeois femininity’. *Feminist Media Studies* 8, 227–246. DOI: 10.1080/14680770802217279

Rodriguez-Bailon, R., Bratanova, B., Willis, G. B., Lopez-Rodriguez, L., Sturrock, A. and Loughnan, S. (2017) ‘Social Class and Ideologies of Inequality: How They Uphold Unequal Societies’. *Journal of Social Issues* 73, 99–116. DOI: 10.1111/josi.12206

Rose, N. (1990) *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*. London: Routledge

Roth, W-M., and Hsu, P-L. (2008) ‘Interest and Motivation: A Cultural- Historical

and Discursive Psychological Approach'. in *Cognition and Learning, Individual Differences and Motivation*. ed. by Larson, J.E. New York: Nova Science Publishers

Ruel, E., and Hauser, R.M. (2013) 'Explaining the Gender Wealth Gap'. *Demography* 50 (4), 1155-1176. DOI:10.1007/s13524-012-0182-0.

Rugg, J. (2016) *Temporary Accommodation in London: Local Authorities under Pressure* [online] available from <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Temporary%20AccommAccommo%20in%20London%20report%20%20FINAL%20VERSION%20FOR%20PUBLICATION.pdf> [17 April 2018]

Sacks, H. (1972) 'An initial investigation into the usability of conversational data for doing sociology.' in *Studies in Social Interaction*. ed. by Sudnow, D. Free Press, New York: Free Press, 31–74

Sacks, H. (1992) *Lectures on Conversation. Volumes I and II.* Oxford: Blackwell

Savage, M., Devine, F., Cunningham, N., Taylor, M., Li, Y., Hjellbrekke, J., Le Roux, B., Friedman, S., and Miles, A. (2013) 'A new model of social class? Findings from the BBC's Great British class experiment'. *Sociology* 47, 219–250. DOI: 10.1177/0038038513481128

Scheepers, D. (2017) 'Intergroup status differences as challenge or threat: The role of legitimacy'. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* 20 (1), 75-90. DOI: 10.1177/1368430215595108

Schegloff, E.A. (1979) 'The Relevance of Repair to Syntax-for-Conversation'. in *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 12: Discourse and Syntax*. ed. by Givon, T. New York: Academic Press, 261-286.

Schegloff, E.A. (1997) ‘Whose Text? Whose Context?’ *Discourse and Society* 8, 165-187. DOI: 10.1177/0957926597008002002

Schegloff, E.A. (1999) ‘Naivete vs sophistication or discipline vs self-indulgence: A rejoinder to Billig’. *Discourse and Society* 10 (4), 577-582. DOI: 10.1177/0957926599010004008

Schegloff, E.A. (2007) ‘A tutorial on membership categorization’. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39, 462–482

Schegloff, E.A. (2015) ‘Conversational Interaction: The Embodiment of Human Sociality’. in *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis: Volume I*. eds. by Tannen, D., Hamilton, H.E., and Schiffrin, D. 2nd edn. London: John Wiley and Sons, 346-366

Schervish, P.G. (1994) ‘The Moral Biographies of the Wealthy and the Cultural Scripture of Wealth’. in *Western Thought: The Case for and Against Riches*. ed. by Schervish, P.G. Westport: Praeger, 167-208

Schervish, P.G. (1997) ‘Major Donors, Major Motives: The People and Purposes Behind Major Gifts’. in *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising: Developing Major Gifts*. eds. by Burlingame, D.F., and Hodge, J.F., 85–112

Schervish, P.G. and Havens, J.J. (1998) ‘Money and Magnanimity: New Finding on the Distribution of Income, Wealth and Philanthropy’. *Non-profit Management and Leadership* 8 (4), 421–434

Schervish, P.G. and Havens, J.J. (2001) ‘The Mind of the Millionaire: Findings

from a National Survey on Wealth with Responsibility'. *New Directions in Philanthropic Fundraising, Understanding Donor Dynamics: The Organizational Side of Charitable Giving* 32 (Summer), 75–107

Schlenker, B., Pontari, B., & Christopher, A. (2001) 'Excuses and character: Personal and social implications of excuses'. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 5, 15–32. DOI: 10.1207/S15327957PSPR0501_2

Schlosberg, J. (2017) *Media ownership and agenda control: The hidden limits of the information age*. London: Routledge

Shackman, A.J., Tromp, D. M.P., Stockbridge, M.D., Kaplan, C.M., Tillman, R.M., and Fox, A.S. (2016) 'Dispositional negativity: An integrative psychological and neurobiological perspective'. *Psychological Bulletin* 142 (12), 1275-1314. DOI: 10.1037/bul0000073

Short, J.R. (2013) 'Geographies of the Super-Rich'. in *Handbook on Wealth and the Super-Rich*. eds. by Hay, I., and Beaverstock, J.V. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 26–43

Sidanius, J., and Pratto, F. (1999) *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Siegrist, J. and Marmot, M. (2004) 'Health Inequalities and the Psychosocial Environment—Two Scientific Challenges'. *Social science and medicine* 58 (8), 1463–1473. DOI: 10.1016/S0277-9536(03)00349-6

Smith, A. (2010) 'Lifestyle television programmes and the construction of the expert host'. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 13 (2), 191–205. DOI: 10.1177/1367549409352279

Smith, J. F. and Skrbiš, Z. (2017) 'A social inequality of motivation? The relationship between beliefs about academic success and young people's educational attainment'. British Educational Research Journal 43, 441–465. DOI: 10.1002/berj.3272

Social Mobility and Child Poverty Commission (2014) *Elitist Britain?* [online] available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/347915/Elitist_Britain_-_ Final.pdf> [6 July 2018]

Social Mobility Commission (2016) *Socio-Economic Diversity in Life Sciences and Investment Banking* [online] available from <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/549994/Socio-economic_diversity_in_life_sciences_and_investment_banking.pdf> [4 July 2018]

Speer, S.A. (2002) ‘‘Natural' and ‘contrived' data: a sustainable distinction?’ *Discourse Studies* 4 (4), 511 – 525. DOI: 10.1177/1461445602004004 0601

Stenner, P. and Taylor, D. (2008) ‘Psychosocial Welfare: Reflections on an Emerging Field’. *Critical Social Policy* 28 (4), 415–437. DOI: 10.1177/0261018308095278

Stiglitz, J. (2012) *The Price of Inequality*. London: Penguin

Stockhammer, E. (2015) ‘Rising Inequality as a Cause of the Present Crisis’. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 39, 935–958. DOI: 10.1093/cje/bet052

Stokoe, E.H. (2003) 'Mothers, Single Women and Sluts: Gender, Morality and Membership Categorization in Neighbour Disputes'. *Feminism and Psychology* 13 (3), 317–344. DOI: 10.1177/0959353503013003006

Stokoe, E. (2010) ‘‘I’m not gonna hit a lady’: Conversation analysis, membership categorization and men’s denials of violence towards women’. Discourse and Society 21, 59–82. DOI: 10.1177/0957926509345072

Stokoe, E. (2012) ‘Moving forward with membership categorization analysis: Methods for systematic analysis’. *Discourse Studies* 14, 277-303. DOI: 10.1177/1461445612441534

Stokoe, E.H. and Edwards, D. (2012) ‘Mundane morality: Gender, categories and complaints in familial neighbour disputes’. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice* 9 (2), 165-192

Sue, S. (1999) ‘Science, Ethnicity, and Bias: Where Have We Gone Wrong?’ *American Psychologist* 54 (12), 1070–1077. DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.54.12.1070

Sugarman, J. (2015) ‘Neoliberalism and Psychological Ethics’. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology* 35 (2), 103–116. DOI: 10.1037/a0038960

Sutton, R.M., and Douglas, K.M. (2005) ‘Justice for all, or just for me? More evidence of the importance of the self-other distinction in just-world beliefs’. *Personality and Individual Differences* 39 (3), 637-645. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2005.02.010

Sutton Trust (2014) *Pathways to Banking: Improving access for students from*

non-privileged backgrounds [online] available from <https://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/pathwaystobankingreport-24-jan-2014.pdf> [4 July 2018]

Tajfel, H. (1981) *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H. (1984) 'Intergroup relations, social myths and social justice in social psychology'. in *The Social Dimension: European Developments in Social Psychology*. ed. by Tajfel, H. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 695-716

Tajfel, H., and Turner, J. C. (1986) 'The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour'. in *Psychology of intergroup relations*. 2nd ed. eds. by Worchel, S., and Austin, W.G. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 7-24

Taylor, P. (2010) *The Careless State: Wealth and Welfare in Britain Today*. London: Bloomsbury

Teo, T. (2015) 'Critical Psychology: A Geography of Intellectual Engagement and Resistance'. *American Psychologist* *70* (3), 243-254. DOI: 10.1037/a0038727

Terman, L.M. G. Lyman, G. Ordahl, L. E. Ordahl, N. Galbreath, and W. Talbert. (1917) The Stanford Revision and Extension of the Binet-Simon Scale for Measuring Intelligence. *Educational Psychology Monographs* 18

Thornton, J.R., Agnello, R.J., and Link, C.R. (1978) 'Poverty and Economic Growth: Trickle down Peters out'. *Economic Inquiry* 16 (3), 385–394

Tierney, K. (2015) 'Resilience and the Neoliberal Project: Discourses, Critiques,

Practices— And Katrina'. *American Behavioral Scientist* 59(10), 1327–1342. DOI: 10.1177/0002764215591187

Tileagă, C. (2005) 'Accounting for extreme prejudice and legitimating blame in talk about Romanies'. *Discourse and Society* 16, 603–624. DOI: 10.1177/0957926505054938

Tileagă, C. (2006a) 'Representing the 'other': a discursive analysis of prejudice and moral exclusion in talk about Romanies'. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 16, 19–41. DOI: 10.1002/casp.846

Tileagă, C. (2006b) 'Discourse, Dominance and Power Relations: Inequality as a Social and Interactional Object'. *Ethnicities* 6 (4), 476-497. DOI: 10.1177/1468796806070719

Tileagă, C. (2007) 'Ideologies of moral exclusion: A critical discursive reframing of depersonalization, delegitimization and dehumanization'. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 46, 717–737. DOI: 10.1348/014466607X186894

Tileagă, C. (2010a) 'Political accountability, public constitution of recent past and the collective memory of socio-political events: A discursive analysis'. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 20, 363–376

Tileagă, C. (2010b) 'Cautious morality: Public accountability, moral order and accounting for a conflict of interest'. *Discourse Studies* 12 (2), 223-239. DOI: 10.1177/1461445609356501

Tileagă, C. (2011) '(Re)writing biography: Memory, identity, and textually

mediated reality in coming to terms with the past'. *Culture and Psychology* 17 (2), 197-215. DOI: 10.1177/1354067X11398315

Tileagă, C. (2013) *Political Psychology: Critical Perspectives*. Cambridge University Press

Tileaga, C. (2014) 'Prejudice as collective definition: Ideology, discourse and moral exclusion'. in *Rhetoric, ideology and social psychology: Essays in honour of Michael Billig*. eds. by Antaki, C. and Condor, S. London: Routledge, 71-82

Tileagă, C., and Stokoe, E. (2016) 'Introduction: the evolution of discursive psychology'. in *Discursive Psychology: Classic and contemporary issues*. eds. by Tileagă, C., and Stokoe, E. Abingdon: Routledge, 1-11

Toulmin, S., and Leary, D.E. (1985) 'The Cult of Empiricism in Psychology, and Beyond'. in *A Century of Psychology as Science*. eds. by Koch, S., and Leary, D.E. New York: McGraw-Hill, 594-617

United Nations (2016) *UNDP Support to the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals* [online] available from <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/sustainable-development-goals/undp-support-to-the-implementation-of-the-2030-agenda/> [2 July 2018]

Urry, J. (2007) *Mobilities*. London: Polity

Urry, J. (2014) *Offshoring*. London: Polity

van Dijk, T. A. (1990) 'Social cognition and discourse', in *Handbook of Social Psychology and Language*. eds. by Giles, H., and Robinson, R.P. Chichester: Wiley, 163-83

van Dijk, T. A. (1995) ‘Power and the news media’. in *Political Communication and Action*. ed. by Paletz, D. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 9-36

van Dijk, T.A. (2000) 'On the Analysis of Parliamentary Debates on Immigration'. in *The Semiotics of Racism: Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis.* eds. by Reisigl, M., and Wodak, R. Vienna: Passagen Verlag, 85-103

van Hoorn, A., and Maseland, R. (2013) ‘Does a Protestant work ethic exist? Evidence from the well-being effect of unemployment’. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 91, 1-12. DOI: 10.1016/j.jebo.2013.03.038

Vargas-Silva, C. (2016) ‘The Fiscal Impact of Immigration in the UK’. *Migration Observatory briefing 4th revision* [online] <http://www.migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Briefing-Fiscal_Impacts.pdf> [30 June 2018]

von Stumm, S., and Plomin, R. (2015) Socioeconomic status and the growth of intelligence from infancy through adolescence. *Intelligence* 48, 30–36. DOI: 10.1016/j.intell.2014.10.002

Wai, J. (2014) ‘Investigating the world’s rich and powerful: Education, cognitive ability, and sex differences’. *Intelligence* 46, 54-72. DOI: 10.1016/j.intell.2014.05.002

Walberg, H.J., and Tsai, S-L. (1983) 'Matthew Effects in Education'. *American Educational Research Journal* 20 (3), 359-373

Walker, J. and Cooper, M. (2011) ‘Genealogies of resilience: From systems

ecology to the political economy of crisis adaptation'. *Security Dialogue* 42 (2), 143-160. DOI: 10.1177/0967010611399616

Walsh-Bowers, R. and Gokani, R. (2014) 'The Personal and Political Economy of Psychologists' Desires for Social Justice'. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology* 34, 41–55. DOI: 10.1037/a0033081

Watson, W. (2015) *The Inequality Trap: Fighting Capitalism Instead of Poverty*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press

Weber, M. ([1930] 2013). *Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.

Weltman, D. and Billig, M. (2001) 'The Political Psychology of Contemporary Anti-Politics: A Discursive Approach to the End-of-Ideology Era'. *Political Psychology* 22, 367–382. DOI: 10.1111/0162-895X.00245

Wetherell, M. (1998) 'Positioning and interpretative repertoires: conversational analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue'. *Discourse and Society* 9 (3), 387-412. DOI: 10.1177/0957926598009003005

Wetherell, M. (2007) 'A step too far: Discursive Psychology, linguistic ethnography and questions of identity'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11 (5), 661-681. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9841.2007.00345.x

Wetherell, M. (2008) 'Subjectivity or Psycho- Discursive Practices? Investigating Complex Intersectional Identities'. *Subjectivity* 22, 73-81

Wetherell, M. (2012) 'The prejudice problematic'. in *Beyond Prejudice:*

Extending the Social Psychology of Conflict, Inequality and Social Change. eds. by Dixon, J., and Levine, M. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 158-178

Wetherell, M. and Edley, N. (2009) 'Masculinity manoeuvres: critical discursive psychology and the analysis of identity strategies'. in *The new sociolinguistics reader*. eds. by Coupland, N., and Jaworski, A. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 201-214

Wetherell, M., and Potter, J. (1988) 'Discourse analysis and interpretative repertoires' in *Analysing Everyday Explanation: A Casebook of Methods*. eds. by Antaki, C. London: SAGE, 156-183

Wetherell, M., and Potter, J. (1992) *Mapping the Language of Racism: Discourse and the legitimisation of exploitation*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf

Widdicombe, S. (2016) 'Some relevant things about gender and other categories in discursive psychology'. in *Discursive Psychology: Classic and contemporary issues*. eds. by Tileagă, C., and Stokoe, E. Abingdon: Routledge, 194-209

Wiggins, S. (2014) 'On the Accountability of Changing Bodies: Using Discursive Psychology to Examine Embodied Identities in Different Research Settings'. *Qualitative Psychology* 1 (2), 144–162. DOI: 10.1037/qup0000012

Wiggins, S. (2017) *Discursive Psychology: Theory, Method and Applications*. Los Angeles: SAGE

Wilkinson, R., & Pickett, Kate. (2010) *The spirit level: Why equality is better for*

everyone. London: Penguin Books.

Wilkinson, R., & Pickett, Kate. (2018) *The Inner Level: How More Equal Societies Reduce Stress, Restore Sanity and Improve Everyone's Wellbeing*. London: Penguin Books

Willig, C. (2001) *Introducing qualitative research in psychology: Adventures in theory and method*. Buckingham: Open University Press

Wilson, M.S. (2003) 'Social Dominance and Ethical Ideology: The End Justifies the Means?' *The Journal of Social Psychology* 143 (5), 549-558. DOI: 10.1080/00224540309598462

Wilterdink, N. (1995) 'Increasing Income Inequality and Wealth Concentration in the Prosperous Societies of the West'. *Studies in comparative international development* 30 (3), 3–23. DOI: 10.1007/BF02717492

Windle, G. (2010) 'What is resilience? A review and concept analysis'. *Reviews in Clinical Gerontology* 21 (2), 152-169. DOI: 10.1017/S0959259810000420

Winters, J.A. and Page, B.I. (2009) 'Oligarchy in the United States?' *Perspectives on Politics* 7 (4), 731–751. DOI: 10.1017/S1537592709991770

Yousef, D.A. (2001) 'Islamic work ethic: A moderator between organizational commitment and job satisfaction in a cross-cultural context', *Personnel Review* 30 (2), 152-169. DOI: 10.1108/00483480110380325

Zhao, K., Ferguson, E. and Smillie, L. D. (2017) 'Individual Differences in

Good Manners Rather Than Compassion Predict Fair Allocations of Wealth in the Dictator Game'. *Journal of Personality* 85, 244–256. DOI: 10.1111/jopy.12237

Appendices

Appendix 1: Data Corpus

Programme title	Date broadcast	Episode no.	Broadcaster	Duration (mins)	Audience (million)	Position in broadcaster's weekly top 30 on BARB	Repeat prior to 2016	Date	Audience (million)	Position in broadcaster's weekly top 30 on BARB	Used in thesis
Million Pound Motors	02/01/2016	1 of 1	Channel 4	60	Not available	Below top 30	Y	27/12/2015	1.1	27	Y
The Millionaire's Gift Guide	03/01/2016	1 of 1	BBC2	60	1.59	22	N				Y
How the Rich Live Longer	04/01/2016	1 of 1	Channel 4	60	Not available	Below top 30	Y	22/12/2015	1.34	18	N
Fat, Fabulous and Filthy Rich	30/01/2016	1 of 1	Channel 5	60	Not available	Below top 30	Y	07/09/2015	Not available	Below top 30	N
Inside Jaguar: Making a Million Pound Car	20/03/2016	1 of 1	Channel 4	60	Not available	Below top 30	Y	28/05/2015	1.8	2	N
Millionaires Mansions	07/04/2016	1 of 3	Channel 4	60	1.43	13	N				N
Millionaires Mansions	14/04/2016	2 of 3	Channel 4	60	1.38	13	N				N

Millionaires Mansions	21/04/2016	3 of 3	Channel 4	60	1.15	11	N				N
Homes by The Med (series 1)	26/04/2016	2 of 6	Channel 4	60	Not available	Below top 30	N				N
Inside the Billionaire's Wardrobe	26/04/2016	1 of 1	BBC2	60	1.5	10	N				N
Britain's Biggest Superyachts: Chasing Perfection	16/04/2016	1 of 1	BBC2	60	1.41	16	N				Y
Britain's Billionaire Immigrants	04/05/2016	1 of 1	Channel 4	60	1.08	14	N				Y
The World's Most Expensive Food (series 1)	03/06/2016	1 of 1	Channel 4	60	Not available	Below top 30	Y	13/05/2015	2	6	Y
The World's Most Expensive Food (series 2)	05/06/2016	2 of 1	Channel 4	60	Not available	Below top 30	Y	26/11/2015	1.37	11	N
Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives (Series 1)	06/06/2016	3 of 6	Channel 5	60	Not available	Below top 30	Y	10/11/2015	1.38	6	Y
Lagos to London: Britain's New Super-Rich	07/06/2016	1 of 1	Channel 4	60	0.79	27	N				Y

The Millionaire's Holiday Club	10/06/2016	1 of 2	BBC2	60	1.68	13	N				Y
The World's Most Expensive Food (series 1)	10/06/2016	1 of 2	Channel 4	60	Not available	Below top 30	Y	20/05/2015	1.66	7	N
The New Gypsy Kings	16/06/2016	1 of 1	BBC2	60	0.93	28	N				N
The Millionaire's Holiday Club	17/06/2016	2 of 2	BBC2	60	2.03	6	N				N
The Extraordinary Collector	17/06/2016	6 of 6	BBC2	30	1.19	21	N				N
The World's Most Expensive Food (series 2)	23/06/2016	2 of 2	Channel 4	60	Not available	Below top 30	Y	28/12/2015	1.64	10	N
The Millionaire Matchmaker	24/06/2016	Unknown	ITV Be	60	Not available	Below top 30	Unknown				N
Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives (Series 1)	30/06/2016	1 of 6	Channel 5	60	Not available	Below top 30	Y	27/10/2015	1.77	1	Y
The Rich Kids of Instagram	04/07/2016	1 of 6	E4	60	Not available	Below top 30	N				N

Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives (Series 1)	07/07/2016	2 of 6	Channel 5	60	Not available	Below top 30	Y	03/11/2015	1.51	3	Y
The Rich Kids of Instagram	11/07/2016	2 of 6	E4	60	Not available	Below top 30	N				Y
The Job Interview	26/07/2016	3 of 5	Channel 4	60	1.22	14	N				N
The Job Interview	02/08/2016	4 of 5	Channel 4	60	1.26	12	N				N
Flying to the Ends of the Earth (series 2)	07/08/2016	2 of 3	Channel 4	60	0.97	18	N				N
This Morning	09/08/2016		ITV	120	Not available	Below top 30	N				N
Multi Million Pound Mega Yachts	29/08/2016	1 of 1	More4	60	Not available	Below top 30	Y	15/11/2015	1.75	12	N
Too Posh to Parent	05/09/2016	1 of 1	Channel 4	60	1.28	12	N				N
Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives (Series 2)	13/09/2016	1 of 6	Channel 5	60	1.22	5	N				Y
Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives (Series 2)	20/09/2016	2 of 6	Channel 5	60	1.22	5	N				Y

Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives (Series 2)	27/09/2016	3 of 6	Channel 5	60	1.17	6	N				N
Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives (Series 2)	04/10/2016	4 of 6	Channel 5	60	1.37	4	N				Y
Eamonn and Ruth: How the Other Half Lives (Series 2)	11/10/2016	5 of 6	Channel 5	60	0.99	14	N				N
Eamonn and Ruth: Blowing a Fortune	18/11/2016	6 of 6	Channel 5	60	Not available	Below top 30	N				Y
The World's Most Expensive Christmas	14/12/2016	1 of 1	Channel 4	60	1.23	12	N				N
Sold! Inside the World's Biggest Auction House	26/11/2016	2 of 2	BBC2	60	Not available	Below top 30	N				Y

Appendix 2: Transcription Guide

(.)	Micro pause
(.2)	A longer pause measured in tenths of a second
(h)	Laughter
(unknown)	Audio indecipherable or unclear
((context))	Contextual information such as speaker actions, footage on screen or use of camera angles
[interrupt]	Speakers talk overlaps
italics	Voiceover or narration where speaker is not present on screen*

Taken from Jefferson (2004) except for notation*

Appendix 3: Ethics Certificate

Certificate of Ethical Approval

Applicant:

Philippa Carr

Project Title:

Utilising Discursive Psychology to explore the construction of 'super-rich' identities

This is to certify that the above named applicant has completed the Coventry University Ethical Approval process and their project has been confirmed and approved as Low Risk

Date of approval:

27 May 2016

Project Reference Number:

P43950