

Tomi-Ann Roberts · Nicola Curtin
Lauren E. Duncan · Lilia M. Cortina
Editors

Feminist Perspectives on Building a Better Psychological Science of Gender

 Springer

Feminist Perspectives on Building a Better Psychological Science of Gender

Tomi-Ann Roberts • Nicola Curtin
Lauren E. Duncan • Lilia M. Cortina
Editors

Feminist Perspectives on Building a Better Psychological Science of Gender

 Springer

Editors

Tomi-Ann Roberts
Psychology
Colorado College
Colorado Springs, CO, USA

Nicola Curtin
Psychology
Clark University
Worcester, MA, USA

Lauren E. Duncan
Psychology
Smith College
Northampton, MA, USA

Lilia M. Cortina
Psychology and Women's Studies
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI, USA

ISBN 978-3-319-32139-4

ISBN 978-3-319-32141-7 (eBook)

DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-32141-7

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016944490

© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2016

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG Switzerland

Feminist Psychological Science and the Future of Gender Research

Foreword by Stephanie A. Shields

A look at the diverse contributions to this exciting volume suggests that this book will set the agenda for feminist psychological science for the next decade and beyond. We are on the verge of rethinking the entire psychology of gender and, simply put, this book provides a valuable roadmap to do so.

We are in a transformative moment in the study of the psychology of gender, and therefore the timing of this volume is perfect. New theories, questions, and methods are challenging old conventions in the psychology of gender. The time is ripe to shift the discussion of gender from an often non-theoretically driven exploration of whether differences exist to issues that cut closer to the bone. These include, for example, intersectionality theory (Grzanka, 2014; Warner, Settles, & Shields, in press), trans* problematizing of gender binaries, and new neuroscientific findings (e.g., Richardson, 2013) that shatter psychological conventions built on a model of gender that assumes two fixed and non-overlapping gender categories.

Up to the present time, gender research in psychology, reflecting popular culture visions of gender, has largely been stuck in a search for gender differences, despite numerous strong and sophisticated critiques of that approach from the 1970s to the present (e.g., Eagly & Diekmann, 2006; Magnusson & Marecek, 2012 to mention only two from this decade). The focus on difference promotes a binary notion of gender, and, further, a notion of gender as somehow separable from other aspects of social identity, such as race, and social class. One result is that a universalized version of adult women and men (presumed to be race-less, class-less, etc.) represents Gender. In addition, comparatively little attention has been given to how gender operates across cultures and historical time. Social psychologists who study adults rarely pay attention to what developmental psychologists have discovered. For their part, developmental psychologists, with few exceptions (e.g., Bigler & Wright, 2014; Fivush, 2015), do not consider how the process of learning gender categories relates to the maintenance of inequities supported by the gender binary. There is, however, a growing awareness that an account of adult gender requires attention to developmental precursors, both biological and social, as well as the lifelong bidirectional effects of social and biological factors.

What Feminist Psychologists Bring to the Table

Feminist psychologists have developed a body of knowledge, practices, and theories that merit a wider audience in the field of psychology, across research, practice, and teaching. No one will come asking for it, however, so the burden of making this work broadly available is up to those of us who identify as feminist psychologists. That said, what makes psychological science “feminist psychological science”? Feminist psychology can be thought of as “endeavors that bring feminist values, theories, and practices directly to bear on psychological inquiry” (Rutherford & Pettit, 2015, p. 224). As researchers, feminist scientists are concerned not only with creating new knowledge but also with the social applications and implications of our work. We ask ourselves: What is the intended purpose of this work? Who benefits? How does this work contribute to a better world? These questions hover over every project, from start to finish. For many of us, this social accountability—above and beyond our scientific accountability—is the lodestar of our research programs.

The first generation of feminist psychologists, such as Helen Thompson Woolley (e.g., 1910), Leta Stetter Hollingworth (e.g., 1914), and others, were the first psychologists to argue that social factors and environment must be included in any explanation of gender difference in behavior. In fact, to the best of my knowledge, they were the first modern psychologists to systematically consider the power of the social environment in creating and maintaining gender inequity. Their work occurred, and unfortunately much of feminist psychological science today still occurs, within a broad scientific context that too often falls back on unanalyzed essentialism as if it were a satisfactory explanation for gendered behavior.

One legacy of early feminist psychologists is the reminder that we who follow them have an obligation to ensure that our feminist research is widely available to psychologists, the public, and other scientists and scholars. We have a rich and generative body of feminist research that has grown in sophistication and social usefulness over the past 40 years. We need to give away our research to other psychologists, to scholars in other disciplines, and to the general public in an easily read, easy to access form.

Getting the Word Out

The project that inspired this book began with the goal of doing just that: giving away the best feminist psychological science. This volume, as the editors propose, is both a culmination of recent feminist psychological science and an invitation, along with suggestions for “best practices,” to participate and move the science forward. The project originated during my 2011–2012 term as president of The Society for the Psychology of Women (APA Division 35), when I asked Tomi-Ann

Roberts and Lilia Cortina to chair a Task Force on “Educating through Feminist Research.” I did not have a specific project in mind, nor a specific goal beyond publicizing innovative and useful feminist psychological research to other psychologists, to the general public, and/or to colleagues in women’s, gender, and sexuality studies. Lilia and Tomi-Ann took that simple idea and transformed it into so much more! Bringing volunteers Nicola Curtin and Lauren Duncan onto the Task Force (TF), Tomi-Ann and Lilia conceived the idea of a symposium on “Gender Beyond Difference” for the annual convention of the Association for Psychological Science (APS). The symposium was intended to highlight feminist psychology’s contributions to the study of gender, bringing the conversation to APS and encouraging other researchers to engage in innovative, theoretically driven work on gender.

APS was the perfect forum to explore the future of feminist psychological science of gender, women, men, and sexuality. APS is open to scientific psychological studies across areas of specialization within the field. APS does not have a caucus or division system that sorts researchers into interest groups, as does the American Psychological Association, so its annual convention offered a new forum for inviting conversation about the future of gender research across subfields and offered a way to encourage networking among psychologists with interests in gender research.

The Task Force submitted a proposal for the Washington, DC, APS meeting in 2013. Because there was so much ground to cover, the TF ambitiously proposed two back-to-back sessions. The chance of getting two hours of valuable conference time was slim to none, but they were persuasive and the two-hour proposal was accepted. The two-part symposium and discussion were successful beyond our ambitions. Both sessions were standing room only in a room with designated capacity of 150. The second year APS encouraged us to apply for the San Francisco meeting, and now we received “Invited Symposium” billing. It was another resounding success, again with the room bursting at the seams with eager attendees. That same year, the Task Force sponsored a Teaching Roundtable on incorporating feminist psychological science across the psychology curriculum at the American Psychological Association (APA) Convention in Honolulu. It was here where the idea for this edited volume first began to take form. And in year 3, given the success of the first 2 years, APS convention organizers promoted us even further, to a “Featured Program” for the meeting in New York. It, too, had a capacity crowd and high level of engagement with the issues.

It was clear to the organizing committees and all symposium participants across the 3 years that there is an interest in scientific psychology for an informed and forward-looking consideration of the study of gender. The success of these symposia obviously called for the project to continue in an even more tangible way. Hence this game-changing edited volume.

The TF has since merged with another I had appointed and become an SPW committee: The Committee on Academic Feminist Psychology. The second TF had also been successful beyond our expectations. Chaired by Isis Settles and Kate Richmond, it organized the first Institute for Academic Feminist Psychologists, held in San Antonio, Texas, in January 2012, in which over 40 early career

academic feminist psychologists participated. That TF then organized a second Institute in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in March 2016, which hosted nearly 45 early career academic feminist psychologists. Today the merged Committee on Academic Feminist Psychology provides ongoing community for feminist psychological scholars to mentor and share their work with one another and to continue to “infiltrate” the field (and beyond) with exciting feminist psychological science, theory, and pedagogy.

The Changing Landscape of Psychological Research

The timing of this book is fortuitous, not only in relation to the state of gender research, but in relation to psychology as a field of study. New methods are coming into wider use to collect physiological, behavioral, and self-report data. Big Data, biomarkers, ecological momentary assessment, and geospatial data, to name just a few of the new tools, are being used in innovative ways to investigate complex questions about human thought, behavior, and emotion. Gender is complex and, as this volume shows, we will be ready to use these new tools to move the study of gender beyond reductionist, essentialist, descriptive accounts that all too often prevail.

Furthermore, if the 2015 Inaugural International Convention of Psychological Science is any indication, there is a realization that an integrative, interdisciplinary approach to research is ultimately the most productive and useful. As one of the co-organizers observed, “More so than at any previous time in our field’s history, today’s studies of people—whole intact persons who develop within cultures, societies, and communities—produce critical scientific findings” that are the basis for deeper study in cognitive and affective science, and then genetics and brain sciences, resulting in “multilayered, multifaceted, integrative programs of research” (Cervone, quoted in “Intertwined Sciences,” 2015, p. 16). Feminist psychologists are well positioned to be leaders in the move toward interdisciplinary approaches, concern with useful and socially conscious application of psychological science, collaborative involvement of research participants, and a scientific stance that acknowledges the complex cultural, economic, and environmental contexts in which humans operate.

State College, PA, USA

Stephanie A. Shields

References

- Bigler, R. S., & Wright, Y. F. (2014). Reading, writing, arithmetic, and racism? Risks and benefits to teaching children about intergroup biases. *Child Development Perspectives*, 8, 18–23.
- Eagly, A. H., & Diekmann, A. B. (2006). Examining gender gaps in sociopolitical attitudes: It’s not Mars and Venus. *Feminism & Psychology*, 16, 26–34. doi:10.1177/0959-353506060817.

- Fivush, R., & Zaman, W. (2015). Gendered narrative voices: Sociocultural and feminist approaches to emerging identity in childhood and adolescence. In K. C. McLean & M. Syed (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of identity development* (pp. 33–52). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Grzanka, P. R. (2014). (Ed.) *Intersectionality*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Hollingworth, L. S. (1914). Variability as related to sex differences in achievement: A critique. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 19, 510–530.
- Intertwined Sciences: Coverage of the Inaugural International Convention of Psychological Science. (2015). *APS Observer*, 28 (No. 5 May/June), 16.
- Magnusson, E., & Marecek, J. (2012). *Gender and culture in psychology*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Richardson, S. S. (2013). *Sex itself: The search for male and female in the human genome*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Rutherford, A., & Pettit, M. (2015). Feminism and/in/as psychology: The public sciences of sex and gender. *History of Psychology*, 18, 223–237.
- Warner, L. R., Settles, I. H., & Shields, S. A. (in press). Intersectionality theory in the psychology of women. In C. Travis & J. W. White (Eds.), *American Psychological Association Handbook on the Psychology of Women*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Woolley, H. T. (1910). A review of the recent literature on the psychology of sex. *Psychological Bulletin*, 7, 335–342.

Contents

Feminist Psychological Science and the Future of Gender Research	v
Building a Better Psychological Science of Gender: Reflections on Theory, Research, and Action	1
Lauren E. Duncan, Tomi-Ann Roberts, Lilia M. Cortina, and Nicola Curtin	
Part I Theory and Research Taking Gender Beyond Difference	
Scientific Weightism: A View of Mainstream Weight Stigma Research Through a Feminist Lens	9
Rachel M. Calogero, Tracy L. Tylka, and Janell L. Mensinger	
Death and the Real Girl: The Impact of Mortality Salience on Men’s Attraction to Women as Objects	29
Jamie L. Goldenberg and Kasey Lynn Morris	
Embodiment and Well-Being: The Embodied Journeys of Girls and Women	43
Niva Piran	
Feminist Perspectives on Gender Development: Contributions to Theory and Practice	61
Christia Spears Brown and Rebecca S. Bigler	
Feminism and the Study of Masculinity: Unlikely Bedfellows?	79
Jennifer K. Bosson	
Gendered Autobiographical Memory: Feminist Approaches to Theory and Method	99
Robyn Fivush and Azriel Grysman	

The Development of Other-Gender Interactions: Behavioral, Biological, Cognitive, and Contextual Influences 121
 Ryan D. Field and Carol Lynn Martin

Part II Feminist Psychologists Reflect on Research in Their Subdisciplines

Digging Deeper: Research Practices and Recommendations for Exploring Intersectionality and Social and Cultural Influences on Personality, Identity, and Well-Being 143
 Natalie J. Sabik

Adventures in Feminist Health Psychology: Teaching about and Conducting Feminist Psychological Science 161
 Joan C. Chrisler and Jennifer A. Gorman

Intersectionality: Infusing I-O Psychology with Feminist Thought 179
 Verónica Caridad Rabelo and Lilia M. Cortina

Voicing Academia: Developmental Psychology and the Loss of Voice 199
 Patricia L. Waters

New Perspectives on Gender and Emotion 213
 Kaitlin T. McCormick, Heather J. MacArthur, Stephanie A. Shields, and Elaine C. Diccio

Beyond Difference: Gender as a Quality of Social Settings 231
 Meg A. Bond and Christopher T. Allen

Part III From Theory and Research to Action: Best Practices in Feminist Psychological Science

Replacing Sexy and Skinny with Strong and Powerful: How Feminist Research on Media Depictions of Women Can Effect Change 257
 Elizabeth A. Daniels

Mind the Thigh Gap? Bringing Feminist Psychological Science to the Masses 275
 Tomi-Ann Roberts

Transnational Feminism in Psychology: Moving Beyond Difference to Investigate Processes of Power at the Intersection of the Global and Local 295
 Shelly Grabe

Feminist Psychologists and Institutional Change in Universities 319
 Abigail J. Stewart

Walking the Walk: Conducting Feminist Community-Based Research 333
Britney G. Brinkman

The Benefits and Risks of Feminist Practice as Early Career Scholars in Social Psychology 353
Nicola Curtin, Laura R. Ramsey, and Julia Tran

Journeys Through Feminist Psychological Science: Lessons Learned and a Look to What Lies Ahead 381
Nicola Curtin, Lilia M. Cortina, Tomi-Ann Roberts, and Lauren E. Duncan

Index 389

Building a Better Psychological Science of Gender: Reflections on Theory, Research, and Action

Lauren E. Duncan, Tomi-Ann Roberts, Lilia M. Cortina, and Nicola Curtin

Over the course of 2 years, the 4 of us brought together 11 prominent researchers from 10 different subdisciplines of psychology to think about how gender has been represented in their subfields and what changes have occurred in recent years. We organized three very well-attended symposia at the annual conferences of the Association for Psychological Science in 2013, 2014, and 2015 and a teaching roundtable at the annual conference of the American Psychological Association in 2013. Our sessions were standing room only, and they sparked discussions that continued for hours after the session. These symposia grew out of a Task Force named by Stephanie Shields, who was the president of the American Psychological Association's Division 35 Society for the Psychology of Women (SPW). The Task Force was charged with raising the visibility, understanding, and impact of innovative feminist psychological science on women, sex, and gender.

During conversations spilling into the hallways after these symposia and later continuing on email and Twitter, it became clear that though we often feel alone, there are actually large numbers of feminist psychological scientists working in the major subfields of psychology. These scientists shared the experience of frequently finding their work underappreciated, misunderstood, or marginalized by the field. At the same time, many of these feminist researchers in psychology also find their work deemed reductionist or too narrowly focused to be fully accepted in the

L.E. Duncan (✉)
Psychology, Smith College, Northampton, MA, USA
e-mail: lduncan@smith.edu

T.-A. Roberts
Psychology, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, CO, USA

L.M. Cortina
Psychology and Women's Studies, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

N. Curtin
Psychology, Clark University, Worcester, MA, USA

interdisciplinary areas of Women's and Gender Studies. In other words, many of our colleagues doing this work feel caught between a rock and a hard place.

Despite being recognized as an important topic in psychology for almost 50 years, the study of sex and gender has only recently moved beyond simple and straightforward documentation of gender differences. And, as some of the chapters in this book attest to, psychologists continue to face challenges finding ways to ensure that this research is published in mainstream journals, appears in popular college psychology textbooks, and is not sidelined as "special interest." Furthermore, new and exciting (explicitly feminist) approaches to gender and sexuality that have the potential to significantly alter the ways the psychology curriculum is taught or fundamentally move research in new directions rarely make its way beyond the few conferences and journals where such scholarship is welcomed.

The Task Force on Educating Through Feminist Research was charged to most effectively "give away" the best of our feminist psychological research to colleagues in all areas of psychology. When we put out our call for members, we welcomed young scholars as well as those more advanced to join us in bringing to light the best of feminist psychological science. Beyond "infiltrating" the conferences, journals, and textbooks of the many subareas of psychology, in a time of tremendous challenge on the national scene to the basic rights of women, girls, and other marginalized communities, we wished our voices might also make an important impact upon the general public.

The purpose of this book is to raise the visibility, understanding, and impact of innovative feminist psychological science. The authors of these chapters share their expertise in addressing central questions about sex and gender in psychology, based on the APS and APA conference symposia and teaching roundtable. We solicited three different types of contributions from authors: (1) empirical and theoretical accounts that demonstrate cutting edge feminist psychological thinking, (2) overviews of subdisciplines and where they are in their treatment of sex and gender, and (3) reflections on dilemmas encountered while doing the work of feminist psychological science. For each of these types of contributions, authors were asked to do the "reflexivity" work, so characteristic of feminist methodologies and explicitly *reflect* either on how their work helps us think about expanding our traditional treatment of sex and gender to consider findings not emphasizing difference and/or to make recommendations for best practices for other researchers wanting to conduct feminist psychological science. Several subdisciplines are represented in this volume: social, developmental, emotions, health, cognitive, personality, community, and organizational. The volume begins with Stephanie Shields' reflection on the overall state of gender in psychology. In her foreword, she considers the history of gender research in psychology, documenting how far we've come while recognizing how far we still have to go.

In the first part, *Theory and Research Taking Gender Beyond Difference*, authors contributed chapters exemplifying feminist psychological science in their subdiscipline and reflected on what made their approaches feminist. Rachel Calogero, Tracy Tylka, and Janell Mensinger discuss the state of research on fat as a feminist issue, shine a light on the ways the scientific study of weight stigma

serves as an agent of weight stigma itself, and offer recommendations for advancing the social justice applications of their work. Jamie Goldenberg and Kasey Morris illustrate the importance of using women's experiences to generate research questions and theory. In their empirical study, they use longstanding work about terror management theory to try to understand a perennial problem faced by women—the objectification of their bodies. Niva Piran uses a case study from her own qualitative research on embodiment and well-being to demonstrate innovative theory generation and research strategies in feminist psychology. Christia Spears Brown and Rebecca Bigler review five cutting edge areas of study in developmental psychology (gendered language, gender atypicality, gender discrimination and harassment, sexualization of girls, and single-sex schooling) that highlight feminist-grounded research and approaches and discuss implications for theory and practice. Jennifer Bosson reflects on some of the challenges she has faced as a feminist psychological researcher. Bosson studies what she calls “precarious manhood,” arguing that hierarchical systems of oppression cannot be challenged if privilege is not well understood. Robyn Fivush and Azriel Grysman consider how theory and research practices in the subfield of autobiographical memory are affected by gender in local, developmental, and cultural contexts. They consider the impact of gender on findings about relative stability and change in autobiography and narrative identity over time. Ryan Field and Carol Martin review the state of research on same- and other-gender adolescent-peer interactions, considering the influence of behavioral, biological, social cognitions, and contextual factors.

In the second part, *Feminist Psychologists Reflect on Research in Their Subdisciplines*, authors presented overviews that addressed broad questions relating to how psychology in their subfield is doing in the research and teaching of the psychology of gender and sex and in what ways they have moved psychology beyond a “gender-as-difference” paradigm, to incorporate more nuanced understandings of women and men, gender and sex, or gender as it intersects with other social categories (e.g., race, ethnicity, class). Natalie Sabik integrates theoretical and empirical feminist work in order to assist personality researchers in exploring the psychosocial processes that shape personality, identity, and experience, specifically taking an intersectional perspective. She argues that researchers must look for variation within social groups, examine the ways in which social forces impact psychology, and draw on theory and research from outside their own subdiscipline. Joan Chrisler and Jennifer Gorman reflect on the history of the integration (or lack thereof) of feminist psychology and health psychology. They discuss difficulties they have encountered in conducting feminist research in health psychology and in teaching health psychology from an explicitly feminist perspective, offering suggestions for best practices. Verónica Caridad Rabelo and Lilia Cortina tackle the application of intersectional approaches to industrial-organizational psychology. They provide an overview of intersectionality research, describe the importance and relevance of intersectional research to industrial-organizational psychology, and outline guidelines and challenges for psychologists in the field interested in engaging in a consideration of how power and privilege play out in organizational settings. Tricia Waters discusses research on girls' loss of voice in adolescence and

the contributions of qualitative and quantitative studies and intersectional perspectives on this research. In their chapter, Kaitlin McCormick, Heather MacArthur, Stephanie Shields, and Elaine Dicicco organize the conventional field of emotion research by highlighting two neglected aspects central to feminist thinking—intersectionality of social identities and hierarchies of power and status. They use these feminist-grounded constructs to offer suggestions for future research strategies and methods in their mainstream subdiscipline. Meg Bond and Christopher Allen describe how the fact that gender is situated in its social context affects research, paying special attention to how it plays out in formally organized settings like schools and workplaces. They use the example of sexual assault on college campuses to illustrate the transactional nature of gender in these settings.

In the third part, *From Theory and Research to Action: Best Practices in Feminist Psychological Science*, authors reflected on the kinds of dilemmas, challenges, and decisions they have made when conducting feminist psychological science in their subdiscipline, focusing on lessons learned as they bring their research to bear on real world solutions to difficult problems. Elizabeth Daniels reports on the state of research on how girls and women are portrayed in popular media, offering suggestions for how feminist psychological scientists can affect social change. Tomi-Ann Roberts reflects on some of the challenges and rewards of translating her scholarly work in the realms of objectification, self-objectification, and sexualization of girls and women into the public arena as an advocate. She offers best practices suggestions for feminist psychological scientists interested in becoming active advocates. Shelley Grabe contemplates transnational feminism and activism and offers recommendations for advancing the social justice applications of her work. Abigail Stewart considers some of the ways that feminist and gender psychology research have been utilized in institutional change efforts in higher education, particularly in the transformation of science and engineering to include more students and faculty from underrepresented groups (women and people of color). She provides an overview of mainstream and feminist psychological research that has been invaluable in these efforts and describes the unexpected pleasures derived from newfound institutional appreciation of feminist research. Britney Brinkman reflects on the rewards and challenges of conducting feminist community-based research. She emphasizes the importance of working collaboratively with community members, often giving voice to disenfranchised groups and paying attention to power dynamics in the process. Nicola Curtin, Laura Ramsey, and Julia Tran discuss the rewards and challenges of negotiating academia as feminist psychological scientists, especially those faced at the junior level.

Across these varied and valuable contributions, several themes emerge that should inform best practices in feminist psychological science. First, contemporary feminist research on gender goes beyond the simple documentation of gender differences. Feminist psychological researchers understand that gender serves as a marker for a constellation of experiences intimately tied to power structures in society. One way in which feminist psychological science researchers have resisted the compulsion to simply compare women to men is to begin with research questions rooted in women's unique experiences (Field & Martin; Fivush &

Gryzman; Goldenberg & Morris; Piran; Waters). For example, objectification theory (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997) originated from a desire to understand the process and impacts of the uniquely and universal female experience of having one's body constantly scrutinized by others. Feminist psychological researchers understand gender is a hierarchical power system (McCormick et al.) and that these uniquely female experiences serve to socialize boys and girls into the behaviors that maintain the status quo. At the same time that we consider experiences unique to women, it is essential to consider the complementary role privileged identities play in the maintenance of power hierarchies (Bond & Allen; Bosson; Brown & Bigler; Calogero et al.). Intersectionality is implicated here, as men's and women's experiences are strongly affected by their unique constellations of privileged and powerless group memberships (Rabelo & Cortina; Sabik). A consideration of power and intersectionality is clearly evident in the reflection pieces about conducting feminist research and teaching on the ground (Brinkman; Chrisler & Gorman; Curtin, et al.). Finally, feminist psychological science has the opportunity to transform the status quo by illuminating processes underlying sexist experiences and by directly challenging sexist social and organizational structures (Daniels; Goldenberg & Morris; Grabe; Roberts; Stewart).

We believe that this collection of empirical, state-of-the-subdiscipline, and reflection pieces offer readers many things to think about as well as concrete suggestions for conducting research, teaching, and advocacy. The most important aspect of this book, and what makes it unique, is its contribution to a growing dialogue not only about what we *know* about gender research in psychological science, but how we think critically about *doing* gender research in psychological science, and what that looks like "on the ground." The book should be useful for both trainees in psychological science, as well as more veteran scholars, by including "how to" elements, as well as sophisticated reflections on important big-picture questions in our field. Finally, we bring together diverse scholars, across a range of areas in the field, institutions, as well as points in their careers to focus on the *future* of feminist research in the psychological sciences.

Reference

- Fredrickson, B. L., & Roberts, T. (1997). Objectification theory: Toward understanding women's lived experiences and mental health risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *21*(2), 173–206. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00108.x.

Part I
Theory and Research Taking Gender
Beyond Difference

Scientific Weightism: A View of Mainstream Weight Stigma Research Through a Feminist Lens

Rachel M. Calogero, Tracy L. Tylka, and Janell L. Mensinger

In all the ways it matters, fat *is* a feminist issue. Yet, this perspective is absent within the mainstream weight stigma literature. In light of the rampant weight bias in Western culture, and the well-established relationship between stigma and health (Hatzenbuehler, Phelan, & Link, 2013; Link & Phelan, 2006), this feminist perspective has never been more important to revisit and reclaim. Although we acknowledge an extensive literature exists on the nature, assessment, and consequences of weight stigma, with a number of valuable insights and impacts produced from this research (Brownell, Puhl, Schwartz, & Rudd, 2005; Forhan & Salas, 2013; Puhl & Heuer, 2009; Sikorski et al., 2011; Tomiyama, 2014; Tylka et al., 2014), mainstream weight stigma research is saturated with anti-fat bias and stigmatizing discourses; and it is void of theoretical perspectives on the intersecting social identities that contribute to the lived experiences of fat people, which is not (and this may come as a surprise to many) perpetually negative. The purpose of this chapter is to apply a feminist lens to mainstream weight stigma research, bringing into view the assumptions, mixed messages, and gaps embedded in this literature, which sustain the very stigma this research seeks to elucidate and eradicate.

For a number of reasons, a feminist perspective is uniquely suited for recognizing and confronting scientific weightism. At the broadest level, a feminist lens can help to reveal both visible and invisible forms of oppression, which are fueled by latent dynamics of power and privilege. Thus, this lens helps illuminate built-in fat bias and innuendos of thin privilege within any discourse, including the weight

R.M. Calogero (✉)
University of Kent, Canterbury, UK
e-mail: R.Calogero@kent.ac.uk

T.L. Tylka
Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA

J.L. Mensinger
Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA, USA

stigma literature. Applying a feminist perspective also permits an appreciation of the inherent diversity among individuals across an array of social identities, and how these identities intersect and interlock to provide a unique experience for each individual; therefore, a fat identity cannot be extracted and understood apart from an individual's other identities. Moreover, this perspective recognizes that degrees of privilege are interwoven with these identities; hence, the experiences of fat individuals are appreciated (rather than ignored or disrespected) and understood in the context of diminished societal power. Importantly, a feminist perspective encourages the unconditional promotion of well-being for all individuals, ensuring that the interventions delivered to improve wellness are empirically supported rather than based on empirically void recommendations (e.g., dieting), researcher bias (e.g., funded by weight-loss industry), or societal prejudice (e.g., anti-fat attitudes). Ultimately, a feminist perspective recognizes that the personal is political; in other words, the experiences of fat people and how they are studied within the weight stigma literature reflect back to us a wider ideological system that serves to moralize weight and pathologize people who are fat by portraying them as unhealthy and unhappy. Our feminist analysis in this chapter is meant to reveal some of these (often) invisible patterns within the weight stigma literature and appeal to weight stigma scholars for consideration of these issues within their own work.

This chapter is not intended to be an exhaustive review of the weight stigma literature. Instead, we have selected several of the more cited and popular articles (often review papers) as illustrative examples of some of the most pressing challenges and concerns within this literature. This chapter is also not intended to be a critique of any one particular research group or article, and we do not assume any malicious intentions or motivations on the part of weight stigma scholars, as we are all part of deeply entrenched social structures and systems that perpetuate weight stigma (and a host of other oppressions) of which we need to be more conscious and critical. Our purpose here is to highlight some problems within the mainstream weight stigma literature, based on our engagement with it over a period of many years as weight stigma and body image scholars, with the overarching aim of this chapter to encourage a more critical and inclusive psychological science of weight stigmatization.

We begin by providing a brief overview of weight stigma, as defined and described in the mainstream weight stigma literature. Consideration of the weightist assumptions and messages embedded within the weight stigma literature follows, and scientific evidence refuting these claims is summarized. Next, we identify critical gaps in the coverage of who is targeted by weight stigmatization and how they are targeted. In particular, we call attention to the absence of theorizing about the impact of weight stigma at the intersection of fat identities and other social identities, especially other stigmatized identities. Then, reaffirming that weight stigma *is* a social justice issue, we consider the unjust treatment of fat bodies and fat people in the weight stigma literature as inconsistent with the goals of this literature. In so doing, we invite weight stigma scholars to take a careful (and more accurate) look at the Health at Every Size (HAES[®]) paradigm. We conclude with

several recommendations for best feminist practices that could be applied to expand and advance the impact of mainstream weight stigma research.

Weight Stigma: A Brief Introduction on a Long-Standing Oppression

Stigma is an attribute or condition that at once differentiates and devalues the beholder of said attribute and results in widespread social disapproval—creating a “spoiled social identity” (Dovidio, Major, & Crocker, 2000; Goffman, 1963). Although stigma and prejudice go hand in hand, stigma refers more specifically to conditions that are viewed as deviant from the norm in order to enforce the dominant social norms and avoid ‘contamination’ (Bos, Pryor, Reeder, & Stutterheim, 2013). Based on this definition, our use of the term weight stigma already communicates a particular view of people who are fat—they are diseased deviants and polluting our communities. Some researchers have gone so far as to blame “obese people” for contributing to the world food crisis and climate change (Edwards & Roberts, 2008). Such perceptions will hardly capture the hearts and minds of society and proffer good will toward people at the higher end of the weight spectrum. Stigma serves an oppressive function by consigning the stigmatized group to a subordinate (devalued) position in society, which strips them of their much needed social power and agency to combat the stigma, and unduly and unfairly burdens them with personal, social, political, and economic penalties (Link & Phelan, 2014). Stigmatization, then, functions to sustain group inequalities (Hebl & Dovidio, 2005; Phelan, Link, & Dovidio, 2008), and in the case of weight stigma, it sustains a body size hierarchy whereby the fattest bodies are relegated to the lowest ranks.

Specifically, weight stigma¹ refers to the social devaluation, denigration, and marginalization of people who are fat² (see Puhl & King, 2013, for review). Weight stigmatization is enacted through a number of overt and subtle forms, although always recognizable by its discriminatory nature, such as weight-related teasing, bullying, harassment, violence, hostility, ostracism, and weight-related microaggressions (e.g., asking someone if she/he plans to diet, assuming that

¹ We use the term ‘weight stigma’ in this chapter to encompass obesity stigma, anti-fat attitudes, fat prejudice, fat phobia, and weight bias, which are terms also used in the mainstream weight stigma literature.

² We use the word ‘fat’ as an adjective and not pejoratively, consistent with size acceptance movements and the preferred language use in the critical weight studies literature. Fat also does not connote a medical condition or suggest an ideal weight, against which the fat person would be ‘overweight.’ We also use the term ‘person/people of size’ interchangeably with fat, in recognition of the fact that not all people subscribe to the usage of ‘fat’ or are comfortable with it, and also to reduce the monotonous use of ‘fat’ within our own writing. We recognize, however, that all people have size and therefore this term is also less than optimal.

he/she has negative body image, mentioning a diet that she/he could try). Such stigmatizing experiences have been documented across multiple domains of people's social universe, including educational settings, the workplace, the media (including social media), public health initiatives, health care settings, industry, and all sorts of interpersonal and social interactions (Puhl & King, 2013). Indeed, the pervasiveness of this stigma is so widespread that an individual merely seen in close proximity to a person of size may be vulnerable to stigmatization, known as stigma by association (Hebl & Mannix, 2003; Pryor, Reeder, & Monroe, 2012). Compared to other forms of prejudice (e.g., racism, sexism), the prejudice and discrimination directed toward people who are fat is more likely to be publicly sanctioned even when openly hostile, which is why weight stigma is often referred to as the last socially acceptable prejudice (Latner, O'Brien, Durso, Brinkman, & MacDonald, 2008).

Some fundamental negative perceptions and beliefs underlie weight stigma, including such stereotypes as people who are fat must be lazy, lacking willpower, lacking self-control, impulsive, incompetent, unhealthy, and unattractive (Puhl & Heuer, 2009; Rothblum, Miller, & Garbutt, 1988; Schwartz, Vartanian, Nosek, & Brownell, 2006); and these beliefs are learned early in life (Cramer & Steinwert, 1998; Harriger, Calogero, Witherington, & Smith, 2010). Ultimately, these negative perceptions translate into severe weight penalties being exacted on stigmatized individuals in critical areas of their lives, especially girls and women. For example, some obstetricians and gynecologists in southern Florida have refused to perform medical services for women over 200 lb, thus denying them basic healthcare. Fatter women have markedly lower household incomes and lower net worth at retirement than women of average or lower weight, whereas the same economic penalties have not been observed for fatter men (Fikkan & Rothblum, 2012). Adolescents who are fat are subjected to abuse and humiliation at school in the form of verbal, relational, virtual, and physical victimization (Puhl, Peterson, & Luedicke, 2013). For example, these youth report being physically assaulted, being trapped somewhere by others, having mean comments or pictures posted about them online, others spreading rumors about them, and being laughed at and insulted by others in the classroom, hallways, cafeteria, PE class, waiting areas, locker rooms, bathrooms, outdoor areas, on the bus, on the computer, and on the phone. Virtually no legislation exists to protect people who are fat from this prejudice and discrimination (Friedman & Puhl, 2012).

Regular encounters with publicly enacted weight stigma can result in the internalization of weight stigma, a form of self-stigma that refers to the degree to which individuals have personally adopted and endorse negative weight-related stereotypes (Carels et al., 2013; Durso & Latner, 2008; Lillis, Luoma, Levin, & Hayes, 2010; Schafer & Ferraro, 2011; Tylka et al., 2014). This self-stigma contributes to body blame and body shame among those people who self-identify as fat or "obese" because they attribute these stereotypes to the self and come to view themselves through the same anti-fat lens as the general public does—needless to say, this set of responses is not conducive to self-care and health promotion (for review, see Durso et al., 2012; Tylka et al., 2014). Internalized weight stigma has been linked to

a host of negative psychological and physical outcomes for people, such as eating disorder symptomatology, depression, avoidance of exercise, and low self-esteem (Durso et al., 2012; Puhl, Moss-Racusin, & Schwartz, 2007; Vartanian & Novak, 2011). This self-stigma also plays a critical role in the allostatic load stress model, whereby weight stigma and internalized weight stigma beget future weight gain and poor health outcomes through neuroendocrine modulators, immune system activation, and inflammatory responses, creating a destructive feedback loop (Beckie, 2012; Dickerson, Gruenewald, & Kemeny, 2004; Puhl & Heuer, 2010; Tomiyama, 2014).

Structural Stigma: Weight Bias in the Scientific Literature on Weight Stigma

Structural stigma is defined as the “legitimization and perpetuation of a stigmatized status by society’s institutions and ideological systems” (Pryor & Reeder, 2011, p. 793), taking the form of cultural ideologies and norms (Hatzenbuehler et al., 2014), laws and social policies (Herek, 2011), and even newspapers (Corrigan et al., 2005). On this basis, we consider the scientific literature on weight stigma to constitute another structural form of stigma. We have encountered a number of assumptions and mixed messages in the mainstream weight stigma literature that are fundamentally problematic and harmful because they promulgate stigmatizing messages about weight, fatness, and “obesity.”³ The most common assumptions can be pieced together to form a recognizable weight narrative: *fat is bad, obesity is a disease, we are in the midst of an “obesity epidemic,” obesity causes increased morbidity and mortality, obesity costs us money, weight loss improves health, weight loss is within personal control, weight loss is an effective solution to obesity, and thinner equals happier*. It is not simply that these claims are debatable or a matter of opinion—there is considerable scientific evidence to refute them (see Bacon & Aphramor, 2011; Costanzo et al., 2015; Flegal, Kit, Orpana, & Graubard, 2013; Wildman et al., 2008). Yet, rarely has attention been given to the veracity of these claims and their potential to stigmatize. This “obesity” discourse implies the need to wage “war on obesity,” but to do so without simultaneously waging war on obese *people* is simply nonsensical, as well as impossible. This is the first and most fundamental way in which the weight stigma literature stigmatizes fat individuals. “Obesity” is embodied—it denotes the fat body—and it is the inhabitants of the fat body that “obesity” warriors seek to annihilate. In this section, we point to the fallaciousness of these assumptions and how they reinforce weight stigmatization.

³ We use the word ‘obesity’ sparingly, and place it in quotes when we do use it to reflect the contentious nature of the word, as it designates a medical condition, pathologizes the fat body, and fuels weight stigma and prejudice.

Many scholars begin their articles on weight stigma by describing the harm of “obesity,” the fear over the “obesity epidemic,” and/or the challenges to “obesity” treatment and prevention. We admit that this approach is one of our biggest pet peeves. It is difficult to understand how scholars and advocates can vilify weight stigma, yet in the same breath describe the people who belong to this stigmatized group as *diseased* and their bodies as the *problem*. We have encountered empirical articles (some submitted to us in our roles as associate journal editors) wherein researchers have actually *warned against* promoting positive body image, for example in populations of African American women, because these researchers hold the misguided belief that feeling good about their bodies is somehow causing African American women to have a higher BMI which places them in the “overweight” or “obese” category—implying they should be dieting to reduce their body size and not celebrating and caring for the bodies they inhabit. In addition to being uninformed about the lack of empirical evidence for the proposition that body shame will motivate weight loss, withholding effective approaches for promoting physical and mental well-being (in this case, positive body image) is unethical and violates the tenet to first, do no harm. Moreover, the fact that African American women are more vulnerable to such mistreatment on account of their racial identity underscores the tensions and overlap between sexist, racist, and weightist ideologies in the stigmatization of minority groups (we give specific attention to this issue later in the chapter).

We urge weight stigma scholars to be cognizant and steer clear of the exaggerated warnings of the “obesity epidemic” (Basham & Luik, 2008; Flegal, 2006; Gard & Wright, 2005; Lyons, 2009), instead of regurgitating them. Despite the fact that “obesity” is not a communicable disease or an inherent medical condition (Boero, 2012; Campos, 2004, 2011; Murray, 2008), it has been touted as a contagious social condition (Christakis & Fowler, 2007). Even worse, it has been compared to terrorism, and as a threat to our very survival (Pace, 2006). By the logic of a disease epidemic, people should be doing everything they can to eradicate and prevent the spread of fat people—how could people who are fat *not* be publically stigmatized under these conditions of their “epidemic” proportions?

There is another troubling issue with these claims—an absence of basic knowledge on causal inference. Not only do many weight stigma scholars refer to “obesity” as a disease, but they also discuss the negative health “consequences” of “obesity,” as if correlational data can confirm a causal relationship: Correlation does not equal causation. It behooves weight stigma researchers to acknowledge that, despite the widely held belief within the medical community and general population that a higher BMI causes poor health, the empirical data on which these beliefs rest do not (and cannot) support this link (Campos, Saguy, Ernsberger, Oliver, & Gaesser, 2006; de Gonzalez, Hartge, Cerhan et al., 2010; Flegal et al., 2013; Orpana et al., 2010), as causality can only be inferred via experimental designs. To take the data on BMI as a key example, the risk for mortality is highest for people with BMIs < 18.5 (underweight) and BMIs > 35 (obese II), but lowest for people with BMIs 25 to <30 (overweight), and the risk of those with BMIs 18.5 to <25 (average weight) and BMIs 30–35 (obese I) is comparable to and falls

between the other groups. Indeed, BMI is a corollary of certain conditions such as osteoarthritis, sleep apnea, hypertension, and coronary heart disease, but this means that other variables either partially or fully explain the links between BMI and health outcomes (e.g., exercise, nutrition, insulin resistance, weight prejudice). The claim that “obesity” and/or high BMIs *cause* increased morbidity and mortality simply cannot be true.

Relatedly, public health messages to “maintain a healthy weight” are both uninformed and unfair as they imply that body weight is malleable through sheer will or voluntary action. Indeed, weight controllability beliefs have been acknowledged as contributing factors to weight stigma within the mainstream literature; and scholars have called for interventions to target these misguided beliefs. On the one hand, weight stigma scholars claim that changing internal attributions about weight as a matter of personal control and responsibility is necessary to reduce weight stigma (Black, Sokol, & Vartanian, 2014), but on the other hand many scholars simultaneously advocate for weight loss programs that place personal responsibility for weight on individuals. It is encouraging that the mainstream literature has started to acknowledge the evidence demonstrating poor long-term results of conventional weight-loss programs, but we remain troubled by the continued search for predictors of success for behavioral weight loss programs. In light of the growing body of evidence that indicates weight loss programs are both ineffective and harmful, it is beyond our comprehension why weight stigma scholars in particular would be encouraging the pursuit of weight loss, which sets most people on track for failure, weight cycling, and the detriments to health associated with these pursuits (Loth et al., 2014; Mann et al., 2007; Montani, Schutz, & Dulloo, 2015; Montani, Viccelli, Prévot, & Dulloo, 2006; Tomiyama, 2014; Tomiyama, Ahlstrom, & Mann, 2013).

Importantly, in a cross-cultural study by Puhl et al. (2015), the authors noted that over half of the adult population in each of the countries was classified as overweight or obese according to BMI measures. We think this astounding statistic requires pause. According to Mari Ruti (2015), “When a scientific theory says something is wrong with so many people, perhaps the theory is wrong and not the people” (2015, p. 27). Perhaps there is nothing wrong with fat people. Perhaps there is nothing wrong with the bodies of fat people. Perhaps there is something wrong with the biased scientists, unfounded theories, and misleading reports dedicated to convincing us there is something wrong with fat people and their bodies. Is it truly a *paradox* that metabolically healthy obese people exist, or has the science simply been exaggerated and inaccurate in its adamant claims that “obesity” is a killer? The focus of the mainstream weight stigma literature is on the stigmatized targets, rendering the stigmatizing agents (including the institutionalized weight stigma that problematizes and pathologizes being fat) invisible and therefore unaccountable.

One key (and invisible) stigmatizing agent is anti-fat ideology, which we believe underlies the perpetual communication of these false assumptions about weight. The “obesity” myth has taken on the status of an uncontested fact despite *the fact* that it rests on correlational and selected data (Tylka et al., 2014). Weight stigma research articles could emphasize the correlational nature of the data or the

contradictory evidence on the issue, but we find that most do not. What passes for knowledge is very much a product of the concerns of those who produce that knowledge. By making these claims without question, weight stigma scholars explicitly and implicitly communicate their agreement with them, thus legitimizing and leaving intact the most fundamental basis of weight prejudice and discrimination. In this way, weight stigma research often reinforces stigmatizing social ideologies that link weight, disease, and health, whether intentional or not. As long as the myth continues—*fat is bad, thin is good, obesity is a disease, fat is unhealthy, thin is healthy*—efforts to prevent weight stigma will be stymied and undermined.

In sum, as an influential form of scientific discourse, the weight stigma literature perpetuates the very bias and stereotyping that are ironically under investigation in articles on weight stigma and anti-fat attitudes. Society accepts and perpetuates prejudice against people of size because of the stigma and myths that surround fatness and “obesity.” Publishing these misleading claims in research articles about weight stigma only serves to legitimize these myths and misrepresent the empirical evidence. In so doing, mainstream weight stigma research is more likely to contribute to the tolerance of weight stigma than the eradication of it. In light of the evidence refuting these claims, we find the reiteration of this narrative to be unconscionable, unscientific, and unethical. Obviously, this popular narrative is embedded in many other scientific literatures and disciplines, but its occurrence in the weight stigma literature is both paradoxical and hypocritical. Moreover, the applied nature and scope of weight stigma research demands greater accountability for the science it communicates and promotes.

Interlocking Identities and Hyper(in)visibility: Mining the Gaps at the Intersection of Fat and Nowhere

Weight stigma research has most often described the impact of the stigma in general terms, controlling for the diversity of identities and experiences of stigmatized individuals. Certain identities may impact people in particular ways, on account of the degree of power and privilege afforded to them by their social positioning. We need to understand how relative power and privilege, access to resources, and social status relate to the development and consequences of weight stigma. When particular social identities are examined, they are often treated as nuisance variables instead of explanatory constructs in their own right. Rarely do we find group comparisons analyzed in a theory-driven way; rather these comparisons are descriptive and atheoretical. According to Williams and Fredrick (2015), “... psychological scientists should *want* to conduct and not avoid inclusive and intersectional work for the very reason of challenging long-held or cherished general theories and processes. Such a test, although difficult, will determine if psychological theories in general, and stigma theories in particular, hold for

everyone” (p. 2). In general, however, inadequate attention has been given to theorizing about gender, race, social class, sexual identity, age, or disability in the context of weight stigmatization, both from the perspective of the target and perpetrator of this stigma.

Gender is one of the most striking social identities overlooked in the mainstream weight stigma literature, despite the considerable evidence for the gendered nature of weight stigma. In their extensive review of gender differences in weight bias, Fikkan and Rothblum (2012) convincingly demonstrate that weight stigma disproportionately disadvantages fat women in employment, education, leadership, romantic relationships, and the media, compared to men and thin women. Situating the lived experiences of fat women at the center of their narrative, Fikkan and Rothblum draw our attention to how fat intersects with other social identities and locations and renders women more vulnerable to other forms of social disadvantage and discrimination. Women are more vulnerable to being stigmatized based on their weight for a number of reasons, including the pervasive objectification of women and the rigid cultural prescriptions for demonstrating femininity and self-discipline (Chrisler, 2012; Fikkan & Rothblum, 2012). Whereas too much body fat defeminizes women, it appears to emasculate (and hyperfeminize) men (Bell & McNaughton, 2007; Monaghan, 2008), leveling weight bias at both of them and demonstrating the fully gendered nature of weight stigma for women and men. Yet, the treatment of gender in the mainstream weight stigma literature does not reflect these fundamental associations between being the target of weight stigma and being female, being feminine, and/or being insufficiently masculine. By and large, the literature appears to ignore it. In one of the most popular volumes on the topic of weight bias, “gender considerations” (as indexed) are mentioned on 13 of the 308 pages, comprising a mere 4% of the entire text (Brownell et al., 2005).

Also noted by Fikkan and Rothblum (2012), we know virtually nothing about weight stigma among other social identities, either singularly or at the intersection of multiple identities, including race, ethnicity, social class, age, sexual identity, religion, and disability. (The category of disability is especially intriguing in light of the fact that “obesity” itself is defined as a disability in many social and medical circles). Certainly, one size does not fit all when it comes to how weight stigma is experienced among multiply constituted social identities. For example, some research has shown that Black women, and to a lesser extent Black men, report more weight discrimination than their White counterparts (Puhl, Andreyeva, & Brownell, 2008). However, fat Black women are also viewed more positively than thin Black women in some circles, especially within the African American community (Fikkan & Rothblum, 2012). This finding suggests that being fat is experienced differently for Black women depending on the context, although thinness is still highly valued among Black women from higher socioeconomic strata. As Saguy (2012) cogently notes, “. . . White women’s racial privilege is significantly muted when they are fat, whereas neither fat nor thin Black women enjoy racial privilege in the first place” (p. 604). The mainstream weight stigma literature renders the experiences of people with these intersecting identities invisible, thereby rendering the impact of intersecting oppressions (racism, sexism,

heterosexim, poverty, and weightism) on wellness and well-being invisible. Studies of weight stigma among isolated individuals or more homogenous groups simplify and sanitize the more complicated reality of weight stigma.

One promising shift in the direction of recognizing diversity in the experience of weight stigma includes recent research on weight bias across four different countries. Puhl et al. (2015) examined anti-fat attitudes among individuals in Canada, the United States, Iceland, and Australia and assessed several sociodemographic variables in addition to the cultural context, including gender, age, race/ethnicity, and educational attainment. The key patterns indicated stronger weight bias among men, people who endorsed beliefs about the controllability of and personal responsibility for weight, and people who did not have friends or family who have experienced weight bias. Although paying attention to these social and individual difference variables is a shift in the right direction, the focus on these sociodemographic comparisons remains descriptive and post hoc. For example, although gender differences were examined, predictions were not made a priori for these differences. Despite the fact that gender demonstrated the largest effect size in most of the models, and the general pattern of findings revealed significantly less weight bias among women compared to men across all four cultural contexts, the role of gender in the experience of weight stigma is given virtually no attention. The authors acknowledged that the intense appearance scrutiny endured by women in these cultures might be one reason that this difference emerged, but this idea was never fully developed. That is, women's experiences were not situated within a broader sexist and weightist cultural milieu wherein female-bodied individuals are more vulnerable to weight stigmatization, and thus more likely to be conscious of the negative impact of weight stigma.

Gailey (2014) articulates more precisely the way in which women are especially vulnerable to weight stigma: "as visible as they appear and feel, they also experience invisibility in numerous social contexts, to the extent that they become hyper (in)visible. They often notice disapproving stares and experience an intense "onstage" feeling as if judged and ridiculed with every move" (p. 10). On the one hand, Gailey observed that fatness makes people hypervisible because fat bodies are readily identified and categorized in everyday social contexts. On the other hand, she recognized that fatness simultaneously renders people who are fat socially invisible, marginalized by the dominant thinness standards for appearance, leaving their needs, desires, and lives unnoticed. This hyper(in)visible status positions people of size (particularly women) as the "Other." This act of Othering signifies social disapproval and permits the revocation of social privileges otherwise bestowed on the thin or average-sized body. In countless ways, people suffer by virtue of being visibly (and invisibly) fat—which constitutes a situation of social oppression.

Can we do better than this post hoc theorizing and analysis? We think so. There are elegant and timely theoretical and empirical frameworks that scholars might call upon to investigate the social construction of a stigmatized fat body in order to understand more fully the perpetuation and consequences of weight stigma. On the whole, the mainstream weight stigma literature does not grapple with the fat body

itself, what it means to be fat from the standpoint of a fat person, or the existence of fat oppression. Indeed, the fat body is both invisible and visibly marginalized within the mainstream weight stigma literature, an irony that is not lost on us. Whereas the mainstream weight stigma literature seeks to *recognize* the frequent and varied contexts (or *where*) people with fat bodies are stigmatized, and *how* they are stigmatized, it does not similarly seek to *explain why* fat bodies are stigmatized or *why* people are unable (and unwilling) to embrace size diversity.

Weight Stigma is a Social Justice Issue: That’s Why We Need Size Acceptance

Some scholars have labeled weight stigma as a social justice issue (e.g., Friedman & Puhl, 2012; Puhl & Heuer, 2010). To refer to it by this definition assumes an awareness of fat oppression, an oppression that is driven by a rejection of fat bodies, and an oppression that warrants a call for size acceptance and respect for body size diversity as potential correctives to anti-fat ideology. We fail to see this acknowledgment of fat oppression in our reading of the mainstream literature. Instead, what we tend to see is a lot of hand-wringing about stigma as a barrier to weight loss. The message is that we should reduce weight stigma, otherwise it will impair efforts to reduce the fat body to a more socially acceptable body size and shape. Typical writings about weight stigma often assume that if left to their own devices, in a shame-free environment, people who are fat would be able to “stick to” their diets, lose excess weight, and no longer be categorized as fat/overweight/obese—it’s a win-win if one looks at it through an anti-fat lens.

Upon closer inspection, what the mainstream literature appears to be saying is that what is unfair about the stigmatization is not the stigma per se, but the possibility that it serves as an obstacle to moving out of the stigmatized group. Labeling weight stigma as a social justice issue with these stipulations for the stigmatized group undermines any efforts toward justice on behalf of people of size because it implies that fat people are not valued for their own sake. Social justice for people who are fat and stigmatized on the basis of their weight cannot be fully realized when their advocates on the scientific front lines believe they should (and can) be thin. It is absolutely essential that scholars campaign for formal legislation to protect against weight stigma and discrimination, but these same scholars are undermining their own efforts if the science they are relying on assumes fat is bad and “obesity” needs to be cured, and if they endorse these assumptions themselves. If fat is bad, then so are fat people, and these perceptions will reinforce and sustain the weight stigmatization and weight cycling that we know are associated with increased morbidity and mortality (Sutin, Stephan, & Terraccinao, 2015). This takes the political out of the personal and hence is not social justice.

Weight stigma is a social justice issue because our society does not value the natural diversity of body size and weight and does not dignify the bodies of people

across the entire weight spectrum. Weight stigma is a social justice issue because people who are fat are denied basic civil rights in every aspect of their lives, and this includes *their right to be fat* and live free of unfair treatment. We have yet to see these social justice issues tackled in the mainstream weight stigma literature. In addition, we encourage weight stigma scholars to engage more directly and openly with nonstigmatizing models for health and well-being, instead of promoting a stigmatizing treatment (weight loss) for an already stigmatized group (people who are fat). There are empirically supported models and approaches for health promotion that do not rely on weight loss and weight control as markers of success or misalign weight loss with health. Weight neutral approaches have emerged in recent years as a response to weight-normative (or weight-centered) approaches to health and recognize the debilitating stigma associated with being fat and the failure to procure weight loss.

Perhaps the most well-known incarnation of these approaches is the Health at Every Size[®] (HAES) paradigm, for which there is a rapidly growing body of supportive scientific evidence (Bacon, 2010; Bacon et al., 2002; Bacon & Aphramor, 2011; Bacon, Stern, Van Loan, & Keim, 2005; Burgard, 2009; Mensinger, Calogero, & Stranges, 2016; Mensinger, Calogero, & Tylka, 2016; O'Hara & Gregg, 2014; Tylka et al., 2014). HAES[®] is defined as:

A model to support the health of people across the weight spectrum that challenges the current cultural oppression of higher-weight people. Specifically, the model seeks to end (1) the stigmatizing of health problems (healthism) and (2) weight-based discrimination, bias, and iatrogenic practices within healthcare and other health-related industries, as well as other areas of life. The model acknowledges that weight is not a behavior or personal choice and that normal human bodies come in a wide range of weights and seeks alternatives to the overwhelmingly futile and harmful practice of pursuing weight loss. (Tylka et al., 2014, p. 7).

Contrary to erroneous claims made by those who do not support this more humane approach to health promotion (e.g., Sainsbury & Hay, 2014), HAES[®] does not contend that people are automatically healthy at every size or that everyone *can* achieve good health. HAES[®] advocates that every person has the *potential* for health at every size, and can adopt self-care practices to improve health and well-being, independent of weight status or whether these practices produce changes in weight. Weight does not define a person's health status and we cannot determine whether people are 'healthy' or not simply by looking at them. To correct another erroneous claim, HAES[®] is not against weight loss—it is against the *pursuit* of weight loss, because the evidence does not demonstrate that losing weight is a feasible, safe, and effective strategy for people to improve health over the short and long term (Mann et al., 2007; Neumark-Sztainer et al., 2006). We agree with the HAES[®] perspective that it is hypocritical to prescribe weight loss practices to people who are fat that we would diagnose as eating disordered (and thus discourage) in people who are thin or average-sized (Burgard, 2009).

It is important to highlight that Western culture speciously portrays weight loss in the opposite light—as feasible, safe, and effective when individual motivation to lose weight is strong—and uses the promise of happiness, as a “transparent