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Abstract

The field of Fat Studies has undergone tremendous growth in recent years, with colleges now offering courses in this area. Our investigation sought to identify and describe courses centered on this topic. Our solicitation of syllabi detected four Fat Studies courses currently being offered, along with two courses focused on Health at Every Size. Our inquiry also revealed six courses, four from the health sciences, which contain significant Fat Studies content.

This paper seeks to illustrate the content and pedagogical practices associated with these courses, discussing directions for future research in the teaching of Fat Studies.
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Teaching Fat Studies: From Conception to Reception

The emergent, interdisciplinary field of Fat Studies (FS) has at its core the identification and elimination of bias based on body weight, shape, and size. Akin to Women’s Studies (WS), Queer Studies, and scholarly fields of inquiry based on race and ethnicity, FS evolved from grassroots activism and a strengthening political movement to resist discrimination and promote body acceptance as well as health for people of all sizes (Farrell, 2011; Wann, 2009). FS challenges the long-standing denigration of fat in the U.S. and other cultures (e.g., Tomrley & Naylor, 2009) as well as contemporary medical models that pathologize fat and prescribe weight-loss as a means of attaining health. Solovay and Rothblum (2009) identify intersectionality as a key component of FS, noting that weightism has a synergistic effect with oppression based on other areas of difference such as gender, race, social class, and sexual identity. They also note that FS classes have begun to appear in various university settings. Wann suggests that the advent of The Fat Studies Reader (Rothblum & Solovay, 2009) might spur further course offerings in this growing discipline. In her chapter therein, Koppelman (2009) asks what is being taught about fat and fat people in college courses. After reviewing syllabi from classes incorporating fat literature, she expressed dismay that these seemed to be taught from a perspective that reinforced derogatory fat stereotypes rather than a fat liberation perspective. Koppelman also critiqued the absence of fat people’s voices in the curricula she reviewed. This omission is problematic as Farrell (2011, p. 22) cites listening to “the works and words of fat people themselves” as a defining aspect of FS.

In the last decade, numerous courses across disciplines have begun to incorporate a single text or unit that reflects a FS perspective such as the following introductory WS assignment:

Explore the website, Health at Every Size: http://www.haescommunity.org/. Discuss how two pieces of information from the website connect to the reading. How can reclaiming the word "fat" revolutionize our ideas about health and shift the discussion to include how size is a system of oppression?

We are interested in exploring courses that focus primarily on FS concepts in order to gauge the state of the field when full-fledged classes are just beginning to appear. We solicited syllabi for FS courses from fatstudies@yahoogroups.com, fatstudiesuk@yahoogroups.com, showmethedata@yahoogroups.com, the FS interest group within the National Women’s Studies Association, academicians conducting FS research, and individuals
named as instructors of FS courses in popular press articles. Following, we describe our findings and share our own experiences teaching FS, tracing our journeys from the conception of our classes to their reception among students and colleagues. We then examine our experiences along with the material supplied by our fellow instructors in relation to scholarship on pedagogical practices.

We garnered syllabi for 12 courses across a range of academic disciplines and institutions. Most were undergraduate courses except for one graduate course and two courses that combined levels. Two courses were taught in Australia. All others were taught in U.S. Three courses contained FS in the title, and another contained the word “Fat.” Two contained the phrase, Health at Every Size (HAES), which reflects a FS approach to physical and psychosocial well-being. Because we wish to feature courses specifically centered on FS concepts, we discuss these six courses separately from the others. Table 1 depicts where these courses are taught and by whom, along with the required readings. While the first two FS courses have been taught previously, the next two are being taught for the first time as of this writing. The latter HAES course has been taught previously while the former is slated to be taught in fall 2012.

Most courses were interdisciplinary, with syllabi articulating this approach, “This inter-disciplinary course will explore the connections between weight and culture, examining fatness not just as a public health issue, but as a socially, historically, morally, and politically constructed category tied up with cultural understandings of gender, race, class, and geographical location.” Reflected by this statement, all syllabi contained information highlighting intersectionality. For instance, one syllabus contained an objective that states, as a function of the course, students will be able to “Describe how body weight is an area of human difference subject to privilege and discrimination that intersects with other systems of oppression in the U.S. based on gender, race, class, age, sexual orientation, and ability.” This course, in fact, meets its university’s U.S. Diversity requirement. Another syllabus stated that “The class has a focus on the examination of multicultural issues such as race, class, gender, culture, ability, and sexual orientation as they relate to body size issues.” A third stated that the class would facilitate “the development of critical and analytical skills that will enable students to evaluate the ethical, political and social implications of ‘fatphobia’ and the ways in which discourses about body size intersect with gender, race, class, sexuality and health.”

All courses emphasized cultural contexts and fatness as a social construction, “This class will address body size and weight issues from a social constructionist perspective. Body ideals and people’s experiences of their own
bodies have been culturally constructed in very much the same way as race, and sexuality. We will use feminist and constructionist theory to deconstruct the dominant discourse on body size and weight.” All courses critiqued mainstream views, with objectives such as, “Critically evaluate the credibility of weight-related claims…” Another syllabus noted that students would develop “An understanding of the role of [fatphobic] discourses in normalising and shaping our evaluation of ‘proper’ and ‘improper’ bodies.”

Most courses highlighted fatness in the U.S., using readings by American authors. Only one syllabus explicitly stated that international perspectives would be explored. The Australian FS course contains content critiquing U.S.-centrism in FS research. Activism varied as to its inclusion in these courses. Three FS syllabi stated that students would learn about activism and one HAES syllabus mentioned covering the “fat liberation movement.” Only one course required students to engage in activism themselves. Only one syllabus included a statement suggesting that the course endeavored to modify students’ own psychosocial functioning, “Describe strategies to improve current body and self-image.” Rather than target self-improvement, the graduate HAES course aims to train doctoral-level psychotherapists to enact HAES tenets among clients presenting with “weight issues.” While most syllabi included general information about classroom conduct, only one addressed behavioral expectations related to the course topic. The syllabus for Food, Fat, and Culture declared the classroom a “Body Disparagement Free Zone,” explaining “In this class, we don’t talk smack about our bodies or the bodies of others.”

The remaining syllabi illustrate ways in which FS concepts might be incorporated into classes on the body, courses with the traditional heading of “obesity,” and introductory health science courses. Karen Flood, lecturer at Harvard University provided syllabi for American Bodies, American Beauty and Body Sculpting in Modern America, the latter identified as a FS course in The Harvard Crimson (Hill, 2006). Both courses address physical alterations including skin modifications and transsexual surgery. However, both contain sections on controlling body size, using some of the same readings as the FS classes. The latter course has a section entitled, “Fat Activism and the Movement for Fat Acceptance” which requires reading Such a Pretty Face: Being Fat in America (Millman, 1980).

The two “obesity” courses included Paul Ernsberger’s Nutrition course, Obesity: From Cells to Society, and Margaret Duncan’s Human Movement Sciences course, The Social Construction of Obesity. Both critique mainstream models and include material from outside the health sciences. In Ernsberger’s course, topics include the obesity paradox, controversies surrounding programs targeting childhood obesity, and “Eating disorders, feminist critiques and the health at every size movement.” Duncan’s class, identified as incorporating FS material in a New
York Times article (Ellin, 2006), explicitly recognizes weight as a social construction, “the underlying assumption in this course is that obesity, fat, and overweight are socially constructed just as gender, race, ethnicity, ability/disability, sexuality, age, and other social factors are.” Many readings address intersectionality, some reflecting an international perspective. Sections of the course include “Obesity, bias, and discrimination” and “Fat memoirs and fat activism,” the latter featuring fat activists as guest speakers. Assignments include a weight-loss field experience paper in which students attend and critique a program sponsored by a weight-loss center or one given by a fitness organization with an explicit weight loss goal.

The final two courses were introductory health science classes, Health Promotion Principles co-taught by Jane Gregg and Lily O’Hara, instructors in Public Health, and Introduction to Nutrition taught by Linda Bacon, Biology Department faculty member. The syllabus for the former states that it “explores the meaning of health and well-being from the perspective of different health paradigms.” Specifically, it contrasts the principles associated with traditional health promotion to those associated with “holistic, ecological, salutogenic health promotion,” consistent with the HAES paradigm. Bacon’s class emphasizes HAES concepts, incorporating her text by this name (Bacon, 2008).

Fat Studies at Dickinson College

In fall 2009 and spring 2011 I taught “Fat Studies,” cross-listed at the 200-level between American Studies and Women’s and Gender Studies. I will be teaching it again in spring 2012. Dickinson colleagues were enthusiastic about the field since I began working on Fat Shame, a decade ago. Indeed, for years prior to teaching the course faculty from other departments had asked me to guest speak in their classes, and I had written an essay, “Fat Studies,” for the Health Studies reader used on campus.

What I hadn’t expected when I announced I was teaching FS, however, was the level of student interest. Each time I have taught the course, over 100 students signed up for the class that had a 25-student limit. In retrospect, I shouldn’t have been surprised. Students love to discuss bodies; indeed, it was students’ intense interest in Brumberg’s (1988) Fasting Girls that had propelled my own research on fat and dieting. Anger and anxiety over a culture of body size surveillance coupled with the wider cultural concern over an “obesity epidemic” had created a ready audience for this class. Prior to registering, students had access to the course description:

This course will provide an introduction to an emerging academic field, Fat Studies. By drawing from historical, cultural and social texts, Fat Studies explores the meaning of fatness within the
U.S. and also from comparative global perspectives. In this class you will examine the
development of fat stigma and the ways it intersects with gendered, racial, ethnic and class
constructions. Not a biomedical study of the “obesity epidemic,” this course instead will
interrogate the very vocabulary used to describe our current “crisis.” Finally, you will become
familiar with the wide range of activists whose work has challenged fat stigma and developed
alternative models of health and beauty.

Nevertheless, students generally arrived confused as to the purpose of the course. On the first day, I asked them
to list on the board everything they associated with fatness: lazy, gluttonous, ugly, stupid, low-class. Predictably,
a list of health dangers also emerged: heart disease, high blood pressure, diabetes, death. I use this exercise to
point out how well-versed they are in what our culture thinks about fat. I then explain that this class will
interrogate that knowledge, exploring the meanings of fatness and learning about the HAES perspective that
challenges the dominant medical paradigm.

The class is divided into three units. In the first, I introduce the idea that the meaning of fatness is
culturally relative. I assign Kulick and Meneley’s (2005), *Fat: The Anthropology of an Obsession*, which
provides short, global comparisons of fat valorization and degradation. I also introduce current challenges to the
dominant medical paradigm regarding fat with readings by Campos (2004) (who came as a guest speaker during
one class), Bacon (2008), and Burgard (2009). If I don’t introduce some complicating material on health and fat
and the HAES paradigm early in the semester, students are so stuck in “it’s unhealthy” and “if people wanted to
change they could” that they can’t do close textual readings and historical analysis.

In the second unit we move to a deeper exploration of fat stigma, drawing on Goffman (1963) to provide an
understanding of how stigma works as a discrediting attribute. We read the first chapters of *Fat Shame* to study the
roots of fat stigma and how the idea of the “civilized” thin body intersects with gender, race, and class
discrimination. Essays in *The Fat Studies Reader* on fat children and discrimination, the “spatial” problems fat
people face in airplanes and school desks, and the connections between gender and sexuality and fat discrimination
provide students with detailed examples of living with fat stigma. Finally we read Moore’s (2005) memoir, *Fat Girl*,
a disturbing portrait of a woman consumed by fat hatred. We also see a number of films—*Precious* (2009);
*Hairspray* (1988); *Super Size Me* (2004) –to explore, respectively, how fat stigma intersects with other forms of
oppression and how contemporary food activism relies on fat stigma. For this unit, students write a paper focusing on an example of historical or contemporary fat stigma chosen by themselves.

In our final unit, we move to fat activism beginning with my chapter on its history in *Fat Shame*, then moving to the range of examples in *Bodies Out of Bounds* (Braziel & Lebesco, 2001), *The Fat Studies Reader*, and *Fat?So!* (Wann, 1998). We were lucky to have Marilyn Wann visit our class the first time I taught it. We discuss what I call “implicit” versus “explicit” fat activism; we explore the limits to many forms of commercial “fat liberation” (e.g., the Dove ads); we think through the ways that some forms of fat activism might also challenge, or reinforce, other hierarchies of race, gender, class, sexuality. In groups, students present a form of fat activism—either historical or contemporary—they have researched themselves; topics ranged from fat beauty pageants to the photographs by Leonard Nimoy to the National Association to Advance Fat Acceptance. Even the weakest students return to Goffman to discuss the ways these forms of activism challenge the idea that fat is a discrediting attribute; the more advanced groups explore the theoretical and practical problems that various groups face and the ways that fat activism links to queer and anti-racist activism.

Student response in the evaluations has been overwhelmingly positive. They liked the “intense conversation” and learning to “look at fat in a different light.” One student—perhaps the one whose father was a bariatric surgeon?—wanted to learn more regarding the “strongly held medical beliefs” about fat. My decision not to do this was based on the fact that students already knew these beliefs, as indicated by their responses on day one.

One of the greatest disappointments for me was that there were no fat students in the class. “It’s as if you have to pass a BMI test to get into this class,” I overheard one student say sarcastically. Perhaps fat students shied away from it, thinking it would be yet another arena in which they would be lectured and “observed.” Perhaps it was the wooden, rickety desks in our old building, disciplining to fat bodies as Hetrick and Attig (2009) wrote in their essay on classroom desks. (I’ve since located and claimed a room with larger, armless chairs.) Perhaps it was my own body size (medically “overweight” but generally recognized as “thin enough”). While my body size creates a veneer of “neutrality” both within the classroom and when appearing on mainstream media outlets like the *Colbert Report*, I understand that had I been recognizably fat, I may have had better luck attracting fat students to my class. Or, perhaps, as Marilyn Wann said in her visit to campus, it was just too dangerous for fat students to “out” themselves by taking the class, especially within the context of our small, liberal arts school. If Wann is correct, our non-FS courses that incorporate FS materials may be as important as our explicitly FS courses.
Fat Studies at Oregon State University

I initially taught FS, cross-listed between Psychology and WS, last spring. FS is actually a spin-off of *Women, Weight, and Body Image* (WWB) which I have taught for the past decade. While WWB reflects FS principles (Watkins, Hugmeyer, & Belle, 2010), it begins with body image disorders and discusses weight bias reflected in media representations, interpersonal interactions, and institutional policies as a contributing factor. FS, on the other hand, begins with weight bias, with the development of body image disorders as just one of its many deleterious consequences. While WWB relies primarily on psychological literature, FS is decidedly interdisciplinary. Students read *The Fat Studies Reader* in its entirety which includes writings from scholars representing a panoply of academic disciplines as well as those from activists working outside of academia. Because of my health psychology background, and because I anticipated that FS would draw health-science majors, I also assigned articles from the HAES journal as well as readings by various behavioral health scientists.

I had ample support for developing FS from WS colleagues who were eager to add a course focusing on weightism to existing offerings focusing on other forms of oppression. The Psychology Department was similarly supportive although, historically, it has not offered diversity-oriented classes, but now seems poised to do so. In the process of having the course approved by the university, I learned that questions arose concerning its validity which were countered by a member of our diversity faculty during the deliberations.

The course filled to capacity with 28 undergraduate and 2 graduate students. All but three enrolled through Psychology where the pre-requisite of a lower-division WS course was unintentionally omitted, leading most students to enter the course without a basic grounding in social justice or systems of oppression based on other areas of difference. As such, I encountered considerable resistance not only to the concept of weightism, but to the notions of sexism and racism as well. I had students question the purpose of reading about fat, black lesbians because “these people are nothing like me” and question the credibility of authors, many of whom identified themselves as fat and usually women and/or a member of another oppressed category. By Week 3, I found myself needing to process these objections with the students, relating the course content to the university’s mission statement on diversity and relating their own reactions to the literature on bias which they had encountered in introductory psychology. While difficult to confront these issues, this was a productive discussion. Unlike WS students, Psychology students are typically not urged to relate course material to their own lives or to process their reactions to course content although they grew accustomed to this pedagogical approach over time.
Many students certainly arrived in the class with resistance to the idea of weightism and the HAES paradigm which one health science student called an “attack on my profession.” Some students were overt in their fat hatred especially in written assignments. One disclosed, “I find fat people to be disgusting—I’m only taking this class because I need upper division credits.” Another commented that he did not feel sorry for people who died from bariatric surgery if they were stupid enough to undergo it in the first place. As painstaking and time-consuming as it was to address such comments, I considered these to be teachable moments that I did not want to let pass. Thus, I simply prompted this student to reconsider the aggressive, misleading advertising for such surgery, the authority that we confer to physicians who recommend it, and the desperation experienced from a lifetime of weight-biased treatment. One student complimented me on my patience and ability to calmly address these types of statements when verbalized in class. In that regard, however, I did not feel alone as the hard-core resisters were in the minority so other students’ voices added to my own in discussing the existence of weight bias and the magnitude of harm it incurred. The activism assignments further diffused resistance as the onus was now on students to understand and communicate the tenets of the field. Projects included a Stop-Fat-Hatred Facebook page, a radio show that discussed FS concepts and played fat positive songs, self-designed stop-weight-bias t-shirts, a newspaper opinion piece, and a scale-smashing event that included distributing handouts decrying weight-based health models. Other strategies designed to address students’ resistance and preconceived ideas of fat people included the use of images and films (e.g., Weightless) of competent, active fat people. I also assigned personal narratives and shared contemporary news items such as stories on teen suicides resulting from weight-based bullying.

My class included students ranging widely in body shape and size. I believe the fatter students felt validated and supported by the material while students at the other end of the weight continuum found the class to be “a real eye opener.” Some experienced challenges to their thin privilege, such as a gymnast who remarked that she, herself, saw no problem with public weigh-ins as depicted in a video of a weight-loss group. A respectful discussion ensued about how stepping on the scale, especially publically, may differ for someone like herself who clearly meets societal weight ideals and those women whose weight far exceeds these ideals. Regarding instructor body size, I have a BMI of 30----or so I have been told by a physician who recommended weight loss despite my overall health, fitness, and physically active lifestyle. I have not weighed myself since the ‘80s and I communicate this and other FS concepts to the class as they relate to my own life. In doing so, I attempt to be a coping model who has achieved a relatively high level of body acceptance and who has overcome the dieting and disordered eating behaviors to
which many students currently subscribe. Despite the growing pains experienced by all—myself included—the class received favorable evaluations and will be offered again next year.

Summary and Future Directions

Our quest to identify what is being taught in way of FS uncovered four courses centered on this topic as well as two courses centered on HAES that have been or are scheduled to be offered in the near future. We also came across courses in other disciplines, particularly the health sciences, which drew upon FS tenets. The importance of such courses is underscored by findings that students with health-related majors have significantly stronger weight-biased beliefs (Greenleaf, Martin, & Rhea, 2008). Our hope in documenting the content of the courses we reviewed is that others will be inspired to develop similar courses, particularly those with FS as the primary focus. By providing excerpts from syllabi and describing our own experiences, we hope to provide practical ideas for implementing such curricula and for anticipating and managing possible resistance. Barlow and Becker-Blease (2011) offer strategies for responding to students’ resistance as well as possible psychological distress evoked by difficult material. In the case of FS, this might involve recurrence of trauma related to weight-bias experiences or exacerbation of eating disordered behaviors prompted by weight-related discussions. Guthman (2009), in fact, reports qualitative accounts of students’ increased body image distress attributed to taking her Politics of Obesity course.

Learning to teach fat feminism can be a challenge as Boling (2011) describes in her account of integrating this material into WS courses. One issue warranting further attention is the role of instructor body size. Boling expresses concern that fat students may consider her suspect given her relatively thin physique. However, like Bacon (2009), this concern prompted an examination of her own thin privilege which she sees as a pedagogical tool, concluding that she can use this power to challenge mainstream discourses surrounding fat. Questions have also arisen about fat instructors who have become thin. Wilson (2006) discusses the impact of Kathleen LeBesco’s weight loss as potentially damaging to her integrity as a FS professor. In this article, however, LeBesco is quoted as espousing a HAES-consistent lifestyle rather than one characterized by internalized weight bias. Conversely, Tirosh (2006) describes accepting student compliments on her weight loss even though it was precipitated, not by an improvement in health behaviors, but by stress-induced loss of appetite. Cliff and Wright (2010) examined such conflicting messages evidenced in college courses, discussing how instructor behavior can undermine the alternative discourses on weight that classes attempt to convey. Escalera (2009) addresses the potential for stigmatization of fat
professors’ bodies, suggesting that instructors can view this as a challenge rather than a threat. While Guthman reports refraining from providing autobiographical information in the classroom, Bacon (2009) suggests that fat instructors have the potential to be powerful role models for their students. Fisanick (2007) describes the positive impact of using her own fat body and discussions about her weight-biased experiences as a pedagogical practice that disrupts normative discourses and invites students to do the same with respect to their bodies.

The extent to which FS classes invite or require students to apply concepts to themselves, thus examining and talking about their own bodies, is another pedagogical practice deserving further attention. This approach is consistent with feminist pedagogy (e.g., Stake, 2006) that seeks to have transformative effects on students, helping to eradicate or at least explain, in this case, internalized fat shame. It is also one for which the authors are somewhat divided. While Amy does not explicitly assign students to examine their own bodily circumstances, Patti’s assignments encourage students to apply course concepts to their own lives. Her research shows that this approach can improve students’ weight-biased attitudes toward themselves and others (Watkins et al., 2010). However, Tirosh reports establishing an explicit rule that students’ own bodies were not to be discussed in the classroom, deeming such discussions would be unproductive and simply reinforce traditional discourses. She did allow such discussion in written assignments and in private conversations though she recognized that the latter might result in disclosures of distress that she, without a professional therapeutic background, was ill-equipped to handle. Guthman also reports discouraging student disclosure of personal experiences in the classroom, with qualitative reports indicating that at least one student felt violated by such discussions.

The use of personal disclosure may be one reason that popular press critiques of FS view these courses as lacking academic integrity, with a New York Times article (Ellin, 2006) containing a commentary that passion and venting do not constitute a scholarly pursuit. In documenting the extensive scholarship on which FS courses are based and the large amount of reading and writing students are required to accomplish in these courses, we hope to dispel this appraisal. Another criticism involves the idea that FS promotes the institutionalization of victimhood, disrupting the ideals of traditional higher education. Such claims permeate Ellin’s (2006) article with assertions that most FS scholars are not only women, but lesbians as well, and that FS courses are problematic in the same way as are other identity studies courses. Boling notes that such criticisms are often leveled at courses associated with particular political positions. Fisanick acknowledges that such liberatory pedagogy is, as is all teaching, value-laden. The values espoused in FS classes are, however, often in line with contemporary college mission statements and
core objectives regarding diversity and social justice as Hill (2006) implies in The Harvard Crimson. FS instructors might endeavor to make these connections explicit in their syllabi, reinforcing them throughout the course, especially as students voice objections similar to those in these lay commentaries.

These popular press opinion pieces also intimate that FS lies on the fringe, far from entering the mainstream. However, our exploration suggests that, as scholarship in this field expands, so do course offerings that disseminate this information. To address critiques and assess the ability of FS classes to produce positive changes among students, we recommend empirical evaluation of FS teaching. For instance, Escalera (2009) documented significant improvements in weight bias over the course of a health psychology class that integrated FS pedagogy. Both qualitative and quantitative studies could provide evidence of the effectiveness of these courses—or reveal unintended side-effects, such as increased body dissatisfaction, that need to be remedied. Research might also help identify best pedagogical practices and answer questions surrounding faculty and student discussions about personal body weight, shape, and size. Finally, we strongly recommend that FS instructors actively endeavor to incorporate a broader range of international perspectives. Our review of courses, though not necessarily comprehensive, reveals that FS teaching is largely an American endeavor with the need for greater attention to the work of scholars worldwide. Not only do we hope to see courses offered through U.S. institutions heighten their consideration of international issues, we also hope to see continued development of FS courses abroad in places such as Iceland and New Zealand following on the heels of FS conferences and scholarship taking place in these locales.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Level/Instructor</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Fat Studies</td>
<td><em>Fat shame: Stigma and the fat body in American culture</em> (Farrell, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Farrell, Ph.D.</td>
<td><em>The fat studies reader</em> (Rothblum &amp; Solovay, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Studies/Women’s &amp; Gender Studies</td>
<td><em>Fat girl: A true story</em> (Moore, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson College</td>
<td><em>Fat: The anthropology of an obsession</em> (Kulick &amp; Meneley, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fat Studies</td>
<td><em>The fat studies reader</em> (Rothblum &amp; Solovay, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patti Lou Watkins, Ph.D.</td>
<td><em>Health at Every Size journal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology/Women Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Murray, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary journal articles/book chapters on fatness and body size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fat Studies: Panic, Politics, &amp; Embodiment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical &amp; Cultural Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Brown, M.T.S.</td>
<td><em>Fat shame: Stigma and the fat body in American culture</em> (Farrell, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Studies</td>
<td><em>Bodies out of bounds: Fatness and transgression</em> (Braziel &amp; Lebesco, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest College</td>
<td><em>She’s come undone</em> (Lamb, 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health at Every Size: A Non-Diet Approach to Wellness</td>
<td><em>Push</em> (Sapphire, 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The diet survivor’s handbook</em> (Matz &amp; Frankel)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Dawn Clifford, Ph.D., R.D. | *Fat shame: Stigma and the fat body in American culture* (Farrell, 2011)  
Nutrition & Food Science              | *Fat politics* (Oliver, 2006)  
Chico State University                | *The obesity myth* (Campos, 2004) |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Professional Skills Workshop: | *The fat studies reader* (Rothblum & Solovay, 2009)  
Body Image: Health at Every Size | *FAT!SO?: Because you don’t have to apologize for your size* (Wann, 1998)  
Michael Lowery, Ph.D. & Nathaniel Pyle, M.A.  
Psychology                         | California School of Professional Psychology at Alliant International University |