

Discovering Fat Studies Literature: A Bibliometric Analysis

Emily Gilbert and Paula R. Dempsey*

This study engages with information literacy with respect to the marginalizing experience of fat oppression. The aim is to illuminate assumptions underlying research and scholarship into the lives of people living in larger bodies and to investigate how researchers can discover studies founded on either a medicalization or fat studies paradigm. A bibliometric analysis reveals where fat studies literature is published and indexed, as well as how keywords differ among authors and indexes. The study is important not only for courses in fat studies, but also as a valuable exemplar for critical thinking in information literacy instruction across disciplines.

Introduction

In recent years, more scholarly and popular discourse has begun to address the treatment of people in larger bodies. Instead of linking body size to moral values (e.g., self-control, vigor, industriousness, health consciousness), this discourse makes space for diversity of body sizes with an understanding that fat people deserve respect and dignity, and that their societal treatment is due to systematic oppression and exclusion. Among other social dynamics, this work shows that medical concerns about body weight are often accepted as neutral scientific discourse, which is not always justified. As Chastain notes, “There are people of the same weight who have vastly different health statuses, and there are people of vastly different weights who have the same health statuses” (2021). Recognizing studies founded on anti-fat bias and distinguishing them from weight-neutral studies can serve as an important exercise, whether students are researching fat lives or building critical thinking skills in general.

This study provides evidence to support academic librarians who seek to provide information literacy (IL) instruction and inform collections decisions in weight-neutral ways. *Fat Studies* is the only academic journal that declares its commitment to academic inquiry concerning the lived experiences of fat people and the obstacles society constructs to marginalize and exclude them (*Fat Studies*, n.d.). In addition to the lack of specialized periodicals, inconsistent terminology and limited indexing make it difficult for researchers to identify this work. As Brunskill (2021) shows, this set of challenges is shared by other interdisciplinary and

*Emily Gilbert is Assistant Professor and Information Services and Liaison Librarian at the University of Illinois Chicago, email: emilygil@uic.edu, ORCID: 0000-0001-9928-2105; Paula R. Dempsey is Associate Professor and Research Services and Resources Librarian at the University of Illinois Chicago, email: dempsey@uic.edu, ORCID: 0000-0003-3148-4450. ©2026 Emily Gilbert and Paula R. Dempsey, Attribution-NonCommercial (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) CC BY-NC.

cross-disciplinary fields such as disability studies. However, no study has yet investigated fruitful search strategies to discover fat studies research or developed IL approaches with respect to the marginalizing experience of fat oppression.

This study uses a bibliometric analysis method to fill a gap in the IL literature for fat studies. The findings will illuminate the strategies for discovering and evaluating information sources that depart from the dominant discourse around fatness and anti-fatness.

Note on Language

Like many other scholars of fat studies, we use the term *fat* as a neutral adjective to describe bodies (Wann, 2009). When we discuss other terms from the medical community, such as *ob*sity* and *overw*ight*, we mark them to highlight their inherent bias. What is more, we acknowledge that these terms are implicated in anti-Black racism and white supremacy (Strings, 2019; Harrison, 2021), and we find them inappropriate in a scholarly conversation about a marginalized population. When these words fall in titles of works or direct quotations, they will not be altered.

Literature Review

This study is situated in two scholarly conversations, one centered on the interdisciplinary field of fat studies and its criticism of the dominant medical discourse around fatness and health, and the other centered on how information literacy pedagogy can invite students to recognize and interrogate the underlying assumptions of information sources in their relationship to social power.

Paradigms in the Literature

Fatness and fat people appear in academic literature largely under one of two paradigms. The dominant paradigm is *medicalization*, which frames fat people as diseased, unhealthy, or otherwise a problem to be solved. Alternatively, the *fat studies* paradigm assumes that fatness is part of normal body diversity, and that fat people are systemically oppressed and excluded across many facets of society (Cooper, 2010).

The medicalization paradigm appears in the bulk of biomedical literature, especially *ob*sity* research (Bacon & Aphramor, 2011). The so-called *ob*sity epidemic* was defined in a report by the World Health Organization (2000), which warned of global health implications leading to overly strained health systems and a subsequent financial burden. Works under this paradigm study how *ob*sity* can be treated and prevented, often leaving fat people out of the conversation entirely (Cooper, 2010). This view of fat people and fatness originated in the nineteenth century (Levy Navarro, 2010). In *The Birth of the Clinic*, first published in 1963, Foucault noted that the goal of medicine shifted during that time from health to normality, and subsequently organized itself around the binary of “healthy” versus “morbid” (Foucault, 1994).

Stoll and Egner (2021) demonstrate that the medicalization of fatness is strongly tied to the medicalization of disability, as some (but not all) fat people are disabled, and some (but not all) people with disabilities are fat. This synchronous medicalization dates to medieval Europe where body differences were viewed as divine punishment for one’s sins. Fat people were also perceived as lazy and out of control; therefore, fat people and disabled people were similarly maligned. As society became more industrial and capitalist, a person’s perceived worth

became tied to their productivity, which upheld moral ideas tied to strength and health (Stoll & Egner, 2021). Disability studies scholars have argued for a more holistic view that considers the built environment and social barriers, framing disability as a social construct (Herndon, 2002). Goldberg (2014) argues that “the problem is not so much with impaired bodies but with social structures (or lack thereof) that disable persons with diverse functionings and body types” (p. 118). In the case of fatness, this can also falsely imply that people are fat because they choose to be, or because they lack the discipline to make their bodies smaller. Discourse on disciplinary medicine is pervasive in Western society, promoting the idea that it is one’s responsibility to cultivate oneself and one’s body (Murray, 2008). This adds to societal views that fat people are lazy or weak-willed for visibly existing outside this ideal.

The fat studies paradigm approaches the subject of fatness through a sociological lens, seeing fatness as a neutral fact of body diversity. However, societal treatment and exclusion of fat bodies is rooted in the medicalization paradigm, and much of the fat studies literature seeks to highlight the stigma and discrimination therein. As noted by one of the first people to use the term *fat studies*, Wann (2009), “fat studies is defined in part by what it is not” (p. ix). Cooper (2010) also notes that *fat studies* as a term is “an inherent critique of the medicalised concept obesity” (p. 1021). Furthermore, people in larger bodies dislike being called *ob*se*, even if they are less aware of fat studies or anti-fatness as areas of study (Robbins et al., 2025).

In opposition to the medicalization paradigm, fat studies takes a neutral stance on the diversity of human bodies and examines why fat people are excluded and oppressed by society (Rothblum, 2012). Works concerning fat embodiment tend to be produced by those who have experienced it firsthand (Cooper, 2010).

It is important for information seekers to understand that all research has a perspective and a point of view. No research is neutral; however, medical science is particularly able to frame itself as neutral when in fact it has many specific perspectives. One such perspective is that fat people should not exist, and medical researchers may have financial interest in perpetuating this harmful paradigm (Stoll, 2019).

Critical Information Literacy and Fat Pedagogy

Teaching students how to think about information in light of social power and privilege is known as critical information literacy (CIL) (Crilly, 2024; Tewell, 2015). CIL is part of a larger pedagogical approach that favors inquiry-driven, learner-centered activities that interrogate how systems of oppression constrain the production and dissemination of information outside the dominant discourse (Cuevas-Cerveró et al., 2023). Research and scholarship on CIL tend to address dominant discourse around race, gender, and class.

There are a few studies in CIL that incorporate the social dynamics of anti-fatness, and there is a rich literature in fat pedagogy outside of CIL. A seminal study by Angell and Price (2012) addresses information bias around fatness not only in scholarly, peer reviewed literature itself, but also in how the counter-paradigm fat studies research is classified in academic libraries. They find that Library of Congress classification has no subject heading for *fat studies* and tends to class work in the field of medicine, “a decidedly problematic move, as this specific act of classification essentially medicalizes a social and political movement, as well as cements the common stigma of inferiority associated with all things fat” (Angell & Price, 2012, p. 159). A more recent presentation by Chenevey suggests liberatory ways to address this

problem in the IL classroom (2022). A study of library research guides that share information about anti-fat bias found 36 relevant guides, primarily in the context of social justice rather than health and medicine. Resources presented on the guides tended to be popular articles, books, podcasts, and blogs rather than academic (Silkotch et al., 2025).

The fat pedagogy movement in education also signals the importance of critical thinking. Cameron and Russell suggest that “Fat pedagogy helps educators and learners build skills and competencies needed to recognize dominant obesity discourse and to develop and maintain alternative discourses” (2021). Regardless of students’ ultimate conclusions about fatness, they will benefit from recognizing anti-fat assumptions in research and considering counter-paradigms. As Bhagat and Teegarden state, “Educators do not need to tell students what to think, but rather offer guidance so that they can learn *how* to think and develop their own understandings regarding weight and health” (2020, p. 12).

This current study fills a gap in both these streams of research by investigating how and where fat studies research may be identified. The findings will be useful not only in fat studies curricula, but also in the context of health literacy and health communications in service of social justice around anti-fatness.

Methods

With the aim of learning where fat studies literature is to be found and what discovery strategies are effective, we started with techniques drawn from bibliometrics, namely tracing citations. However, this study is unlike most bibliometric studies, which evaluate the impact of articles, journals or researchers (Bornmann, 2020). Rather, we developed our approach to identify which journals, databases, and keywords are most likely to lead to discovery of literature in the fat studies paradigm. To ensure that we were not missing relevant information literacy approaches, we also analyzed research guides compiled by other librarians on fat studies resources.

It was appropriate to start our investigation with *Fat Studies*, because it is the first and only academic journal with the stated goal of publishing literature in this paradigm. We reasoned that work in the fat studies paradigm published in other journals is likely to cite this key journal. Thus, we set about locating any article that had cited *Fat Studies*. We used the Scopus database, which has broad coverage across subject domains, to harvest citing articles. Scholars in the arts and humanities frequently publish in monographs or edited volumes rather than in journals. Since 2014, Scopus has added 292,000 book titles, of which 55% cover the arts, humanities, and social sciences (Elsevier, 2023).

We searched for articles in the Scopus database that cited *Fat Studies* from 2009 through May 2024 and downloaded a report listing 6,878 articles. From the list of citing sources, we identified eight journals that had cited *Fat Studies* more than 10 times (see Appendix A).

To identify relevant databases, we used the UlrichsWeb Periodicals Directory. UlrichsWeb shows which bibliographic databases index each journal in the directory. We looked up each journal in which at least 10 citations referred to *Fat Studies* to learn where researchers can find the referring articles. Each author searched UlrichsWeb for half the list of 84 journals. This analysis resulted in a list of 414 databases, from which we omitted three groups of databases: 328 databases that indexed fewer than 10 of the journals that cited *Fat Studies* more than 10 times; 21 agricultural and veterinary databases that indexed 13–25 of the citing journals; and six databases designated only for alumni use (see Appendix B).

To identify relevant keywords, we downloaded reports of the author keywords and Scopus subject headings for each of the 6,878 articles citing *Fat Studies* from January 2009 to May 2024. The aggregate of keywords and subject terms were then compared and analyzed. We compiled a table of terms that included fat studies and medical terms together and the number of instances we found in both keywords and subject headings. Related terms like *body positive/body positivity* and terms with spelling variations like *fat phobia/fatphobia* were combined in the table.

To identify library research guides, we searched Google in July 2024, using the keyword *library* and one of the following terms: *fat studies; fat liberation; fatmisia; sizeism; weight stigma; or weight bias*. The search was also limited to the .edu domain as research guides are usually linked to university or college websites.

Findings

Appendix A lists the 84 sources that cited *Fat Studies* more than 10 times from 2009 to May 2024. Note that one title on this list is actually an edited volume: *Thickening Fat: Fat Bodies, Intersectionality, and Social Justice* (Friedman et al., 2019). Journals with more than 50 citations in that period were *Body Image* (210 citations), *Fat Studies* (114), *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* (87), *Social Science and Medicine* (74), *Frontiers in Psychology* (57), *Appetite* (55), and *Nutrients* (54).

Appendix B lists the 59 databases that index at least 10 of these journals. Only three databases indexed more than 50 of them: Web of Science (74), Scopus (73), and PubMed (51).

Appendix C lists 18 library research guides covering fat studies. None of them addresses information literacy around the fat studies and medicalization paradigms in depth; in addition, research strategies for identifying resources in the fat studies paradigm were limited. All but three guides listed books and videos in the library collections that affirm and celebrate the fat-identifying community and/or call out anti-fat bias. The remaining three research guides provided access to relevant primary resources. Three named databases for research in fat studies, and three listed the key journals—*Fat Studies* and *Body Image*—and provided relevant subject headings. However, none of the guides explains how to distinguish articles from the fat studies perspective and the medical (ob*sity) perspective; at least one resource listed on the guides adopted the medicalization perspective suggesting that in an ideally healthy world, fat people would not exist.

Table 1 presents the results of our analysis of metadata for 6,878 articles that cite at least one article in *Fat Studies*, comparing keywords provided by the authors to index terms provided by Scopus.

TABLE 1 Incidence of Terms as Author Keywords and/or Scopus Index Terms		
Term	Author Keywords	Scopus Index Terms
Fat Studies Paradigm		
Fat	442	225
Fatness	44	0
Fatphobia	26	5
Anti-fat	22	0
Fat stigma	16	1
Fat acceptance	14	1
Medicalization Paradigm		
Ob*se	17	70
Ob*sity	1066	2475
Overw*ight	129	256
Adipose tissue	8	28
Adiposity	3	11
Both Paradigms		
Weight bias	176	199
Weight stigma	269	192

There were 2,475 total author keywords and 5,695 total Scopus keywords assigned to these 6,878 articles. *Ob*sity* and *overw*ight* are present in articles on both sides, though more so in the Scopus index terms. *Weight bias* and *weight stigma* are highly represented in both types of articles. However, terms such as *fat*, *fatness*, *body positive/positivity*, *anti-fat*, and *fat stigma* were much more (and sometimes exclusively) present in author keywords.

Discussion

Given that *Body Image* cites *Fat Studies* more than *Fat Studies* cites its own literature, it should be considered a key journal in the field of fat studies. *Body Image* does not focus specifically on fat studies literature, but it does “have a weight-inclusive focus rather than a weight-normative or weight-centric focus” (*Body Image*, n.d.).

We were surprised by the finding that so few databases index literature central to fat studies as a discipline. Findings from our analysis of research guides show that this fact may be unknown to other reference librarians, as the research guides generally listed databases that one would reasonably assume would cover fat studies research (e.g., Anthropology Plus, APA PsycINFO, GenderWatch, Sociology Source Ultimate). However, the databases suggested in the fat studies research guides do not cover *Fat Studies*, and some do not cover *Body Image*. Institutions without access to Web of Science and/or Scopus will be less able to provide discovery options for fat studies literature. Google Scholar, used skillfully, may be able to serve researchers at institutions without one of these expensive databases, and PubMed is freely available.

Language is one of the main methods of determining which paradigm an article belongs to; therefore, we suspected that there would be a large disparity between the author keywords and Scopus index terms. Discrepancies between keywords and subject headings mean that researchers will have to use stigmatizing language in their searches if they want a thorough representation of fat studies literature. While some authors did use *ob*sity* as a keyword, many more articles were indexed with *ob*sity* by Scopus. This means that articles which do not belong in the medicalization paradigm are being indexed as though they do, and fat studies researchers (who often identify as fat themselves) cannot avoid stigmatizing and potentially triggering terms as they conduct their research.

Downey (2016) argues that critical information literacy theory shows us the importance of highlighting the power structures inherent in information systems. In the case of fat studies literature, the power structure is apparent by its absence when compared to other population characteristics such as race, religion, sexual orientation, and gender. If the politics of body size were considered a true concern, there would be more literature and more than two journals focusing on the fat studies paradigm.

Building Inclusive Critical Information Literacy

Learning to recognize the governing paradigm of an academic study is an important critical thinking skill. This can serve as a central lesson in a fat studies course, as well as a useful example in a general CIL session or course. One model of such a lesson would start with a mini-lecture to introduce the idea that scientific discourse may rest on biased assumptions, such as the idea that thinness is equivalent to overall health.

Students would then participate in an active learning exercise with a set of article abstracts provided by the instructor about fatness or fat people. Students would have time individually

to compare the abstracts and then discuss one-on-one or in small groups. After a discussion of what students noticed about the articles, the instructor can summarize features common to the medicalization paradigm:

- Stigmatizing language such as “ob*se” and “overw*ight”
- Uncritical reliance on Body Mass Index (BMI) as a measure of health
- Implied goal of a world without any fat people

In contrast, articles in the fat studies paradigm tend to:

- Acknowledge body diversity
- Acknowledge systemic and structural harms against fat people
- Treat body differences neutrally

Next, students can be challenged to find articles on their own that fit into each paradigm.

In guiding this experience, it is important to acknowledge that researchers will need to use stigmatizing terms to retrieve all relevant materials, regardless of the paradigm.

In preparing for the session, instructors should check whether the institution subscribes to *Fat Studies* or *Body Image*, as well as Scopus or Web of Science databases, which give the most access to these two core journals and to the journals that frequently cite them. For institutions without access to Scopus or Web of Science, PubMed or Google Scholar can be useful free options. PubMed indexes *Body Image*, but not *Fat Studies*, so Google Scholar is preferred. However, students will need instruction on advanced Google Scholar strategies, such as the following to get beyond the algorithm’s reliance on citations as a measure of relevance:

- Use quotation marks to stipulate that terms are included in the search (e.g., “body positive,” “anti-fatness,” “fat stigma”)
- To indicate a Boolean OR, use the | operator (also known as a vertical bar or pipe, located above the Enter key) (e.g., “anti-fatness” | “fat stigma” “weight neutral” | “weight inclusive” | “body positive”)
- Use the Advanced search from the menu to the left of the Google Scholar logo to limit to specific journals (e.g., “Return articles published in” *Fat Studies*)

Another important learning outcome for Google Scholar is the concept of citation chaining as a means of following scholarly conversations back in time through references and forward in time through citing articles. Demonstrate the concept using the “cited by” feature in Google Scholar. It is possible to further search keywords within the citing articles to narrow the search to relevant concepts.

Finally, instructors may consider creating a research guide to support fat studies. The analysis by Silkotch et al. (2025) had similar findings to our study: most existing guides lean toward popular sources on social justice, rather than academic resources or information literacy guidelines. A comprehensive guide should (1) spell out the medicalization and fat studies paradigms, with clues on how to recognize each one, (2) provide keyword suggestions (both stigmatizing and inclusive), (3) identify *Fat Studies* and *Body Image* as key journals in fat studies, (4) point out that Scopus and Web of Science are the only subscription databases that index both of them, and (5) provide tips on Google Scholar as a free alternative. In our review, the guides from The Chicago School, Simmons University, and Widener University provided both keywords and identified core journals and thus represent good starting points (see Appendix C).

Limitations and Future Research

While this study focused on citations of *Fat Studies* as a marker of fat studies articles, that choice limited our scope of analyzed literature. It is possible that there are articles related to fat studies that do not cite the titular journal; in that case, we would not have captured them in this study.

There is a critical need for more literature examining anti-fat bias in libraries and library and information science, including critical information literacy and reference. Due to the countercultural aspects of fat studies as a discipline, it would be illuminating to see how many librarians are aware of this problem and know how they are empowered to work against the pervasiveness of these oppressive structures. It is also important that additional research is conducted on critical information literacy and fatness/anti-fatness. Only when fatness is seen as much in library literature as other population characteristics will it be regarded as a valid concern for patron and employee treatment.

Conclusion

Fat people continue to move through a society in which they routinely face anti-fat bias and stigma. This oppression will take time to dismantle; however, one way to start is to make the next generation aware of how a large subset of the population is mistreated and excluded through use of disparaging terminology and medicalization of their identity. The findings of this study will be useful not only in fat studies curricula, but also in the context of health literacy or health communications more generally, as well as in service to social justice around anti-fatness. This study contributes to critical information literacy by identifying pathways to discovering literature in the fat studies paradigm. Similarly to other hegemonic discourse, the medical model of ob*sity is difficult to dismantle because the link between fatness and moral shortcomings is pervasive and internalized. Unpacking the underlying assumptions of anti-fatness is relevant to any social justice issue, as all forms of oppression are connected. Providing a guide to discovering alternative paradigms is a way of inviting students to think critically about power, privilege and prejudice embedded in scholarly research on any topic, which contributes to the creation of the better world we all deserve.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Carl Lehn for his early review of this manuscript.

References

- Angell, K., & Price, C. (2012). Fat bodies in thin books: Information bias and body image in academic libraries. *Fat Studies*, 1(2), 153–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21604851.2012.641895>
- Bacon, L., & Aphramor, L. (2011). Weight science: Evaluating the evidence for a paradigm shift. *Nutrition Journal*, 10(1), 9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2891-10-9>
- Bhagat, K., & Teegarden, M. (2020). Health discourses in formal education: Why a counter-paradigm is essential in the quest for social justice. *Thresholds in Education*, 43(1), 8–18.
- Body Image. (n.d.). Aims and scope. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/body-image/about/aims-and-scope>
- Bornmann, L. (2020). Bibliometric indicators. SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526421036825851>
- Brunskill, A. (2021). Disability studies research literature: It's (mostly) not where we think. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 21(1), 81–97. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2021.0006>
- Cameron, E., & Russell, C. (2021). Fattening education: An invitation to the nascent field of fat pedagogy. In C. Pause, & S. R. Taylor (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of fat studies* (pp. 120–131). Taylor and Francis.

- Chastain, R. (2021, October 27). Is being fat really a chronic, lifelong health condition? [Substack newsletter]. Weight and Healthcare. <https://weightandhealthcare.substack.com/p/is-being-fat-really-a-chronic-lifelong>
- Chenevey, L. (2022, November). Exploring fat liberation in instruction [Slide deck]. Critical Librarianship and Pedagogy Symposium, University of Arizona. The University of Arizona. <https://repository.arizona.edu/handle/10150/667039>
- Cooper, C. (2010). Fat studies: Mapping the field. *Sociology Compass*, 4(12), 1020–1034. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2010.00336.x>
- Crilly, J. (2024). Diversifying, decentering and decolonising academic libraries: A literature review. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 30(2–3), 112–152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13614533.2023.2287450>
- Cuevas-Cerveró, A., Colmenero-Ruiz, M.-J., & Martínez-Ávila, D. (2023). Critical information literacy as a form of information activism. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 49(6), 102786. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2023.102786>
- Downey, A. (2016). *Critical information literacy: Foundations, inspiration, and ideas*. Library Juice Press.
- Elsevier. (2023). Scopus Content Coverage Guide. https://assets.ctfassets.net/o78emly1w4i4/EX1iy8VxBeOK-f8aN2XzOp/c36f79db25484cb38a5972ad9a5472ec/Scopus_ContentCoverage_Guide_WEB.pdf
- Fat studies. (n.d.). Aims and scope. <https://www.tandfonline.com/journals/ufts20>
- Foucault, M. (1994). *The birth of the clinic: An archaeology of medical perception*. Vintage Books.
- Friedman, M., Rinaldi, J., & Rice, C. (2019). *Thickening fat: Fat bodies, intersectionality, and social justice* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Goldberg, D. S. (2014). Fatness, medicalization, and stigma: On the need to do better. *Narrative Inquiry in Bioethics*, 4(2), 117–123. <https://doi.org/10.1155/nib.2014.0053>
- Harrison, D. (2021). *Belly of the beast: The politics of anti-fatness as anti-Blackness*. North Atlantic Books.
- Herndon, A. (2002). Disparate but disabled: Fat embodiment and disability studies. *NWSA Journal*, 14(3), 120–137. <https://www.tortor.org/stable/4316927>
- Levy-Navarro, E. (2010). *Historicizing fat in Anglo-American culture*. The Ohio State University Press.
- Murray, S. (2008). Pathologizing “fatness”: Medical authority and popular culture. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 25(1), 7–21. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.25.1.7>
- Robbins, M., Rinaldi, K., Brochu, P. M., & Mensinger, J. L. (2025). Words are heavy: Weight-related terminology preferences are associated with larger-bodied people’s health behaviors and beliefs. *Body Image*, 53, 101860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2025.101860>
- Rothblum, E. D. (2012). Why a journal on fat studies? *Fat Studies*, 1(1), 3–5. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21604851.2012.633469>
- Silkotch, C., Haines, L., & Dolan, A. (2025). An analysis of anti-fat bias libguides: Are libraries in the thick of it? *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 20(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.18438/ebliip30616>
- Stoll, L. C. (2019). Fat is a social justice issue, too. *Humanity & Society*, 43(4), 421–441. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0160597619832051>
- Stoll, L. C., & Egner, J. (2021). We must do better: Ableism and fatphobia in sociology. *Sociology Compass*, 15(4), e12869. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12869>
- Strings, S. (2019). *Fearing the Black body: The racial origins of fat phobia*. University Press.
- Tewell, E. (2015). A decade of critical information literacy: A review of the literature. *Comminfolit*, 9(1), 24. <https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2015.9.1.174>
- Wann, M. (2009). Fat studies: An invitation to revolution. In *The fat studies reader* (p. ix). New York University Press.

Appendix A

Journals Citing *Fat Studies* More Than 10 Times (2009–May 2024)

Source Title	Citations to <i>Fat Studies</i> 2009–May 2024
<i>Body Image</i>	210
<i>Fat Studies</i>	114
<i>International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health</i>	87
<i>Social Science and Medicine</i>	74
<i>Frontiers in Psychology</i>	57
<i>Appetite</i>	55
<i>Nutrients</i>	54
<i>BMC Public Health</i>	50
<i>New Media and Society</i>	47
<i>PLoS ONE</i>	47
<i>Qualitative Health Research</i>	40
<i>International Journal of Eating Disorders</i>	37
<i>Journal of Eating Disorders</i>	37
<i>Sociology of Health and Illness</i>	35
<i>Obesity Reviews</i>	35
<i>Eating Behaviors</i>	34
<i>Eating and Weight Disorders</i>	33
<i>Health Communication</i>	33
<i>Critical Public Health</i>	32
<i>Social Media and Society</i>	31
<i>Feminist Media Studies</i>	31
<i>Journal of Health Psychology</i>	28
<i>Sport, Education and Society</i>	27
<i>Archives of Sexual Behavior</i>	27
<i>Obesity Science and Practice</i>	27
<i>Feminism and Psychology</i>	26
<i>Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems—Proceedings</i>	25
<i>Health Promotion International</i>	25
<i>Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction</i>	25
<i>BMJ Open</i>	24
<i>Journal of Medical Internet Research</i>	24
<i>Stigma and Health</i>	23
<i>Clinical Obesity</i>	22
<i>Eating Disorders</i>	22
<i>Computers in Human Behavior</i>	20
<i>Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health</i>	20

Source Title	Citations to <i>Fat Studies</i> 2009–May 2024
<i>Frontiers in Public Health</i>	19
<i>Journal of Sex Research</i>	19
<i>Current Psychology</i>	18
<i>Obesity</i>	18
<i>International Journal of Obesity</i>	18
<i>Food, Culture and Society</i>	17
<i>Health (United Kingdom)</i>	17
<i>Gender and Education</i>	16
<i>Social Sciences</i>	15
<i>The Routledge International Handbook of Fat Studies</i>	15
<i>Frontiers in Psychiatry</i>	15
<i>Childhood Obesity</i>	15
<i>Frontiers in Nutrition</i>	14
<i>American Journal of Human Biology</i>	14
<i>Social Theory and Health</i>	14
<i>BMC Health Services Research</i>	14
<i>Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)</i>	14
<i>Psychology and Health</i>	14
<i>Geoforum</i>	14
<i>Social and Cultural Geography</i>	14
<i>Gender, Place and Culture</i>	13
<i>First Monday</i>	13
<i>The Contemporary Reader of Gender and Fat Studies</i>	13
<i>Canadian Journal of Public Health</i>	13
<i>SSM—Qualitative Research in Health</i>	13
<i>Disability and Society</i>	13
<i>Nutrition and Dietetics</i>	13
<i>Psychology of Sport and Exercise</i>	12
<i>Applied Mathematics and Nonlinear Sciences</i>	12
<i>Medical Anthropology Quarterly</i>	12
<i>Thickening Fat: Fat Bodies, Intersectionality, and Social Justice</i>	12
<i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology</i>	12
<i>Sexualities</i>	12
<i>Journal of Social Issues</i>	12
<i>ACM International Conference Proceeding Series</i>	12
<i>Obesity Surgery</i>	12
<i>Women's Studies International Forum</i>	12
<i>Patient Education and Counseling</i>	12
<i>Midwifery</i>	12

Source Title	Citations to <i>Fat Studies</i> 2009–May 2024
<i>Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior</i>	12
<i>Healthcare (Switzerland)</i>	12
<i>Sustainability (Switzerland)</i>	11
<i>Current Obesity Reports</i>	11
<i>Media, Culture and Society</i>	11
<i>Psychology and Sexuality</i>	11
<i>Journal of Lesbian Studies</i>	11
<i>Health Promotion Journal of Australia</i>	11
<i>Digital Health</i>	11

Appendix B

Databases Indexing More Than 10 Journals Citing *Fat Studies*

Database	Total Citing Journals Indexed
Web of Science	74
Scopus	73
PubMed	51
Essential Science Indicators	44
Current Contents	38
TOC Premier	34
Academic Search Complete	32
Current Abstracts (EBSCO)	32
APA PsycINFO	31
EMBASE	28
ProQuest Central	28
Academic Search Elite / Academic Search Premier	27
MEDLINE	26
Gale Academic OneFile	25
Global Health	24
ArticleFirst (OCLC)	23
Ovid MEDLINE	23
CINAHL Complete / CINAHL Plus with Full Text	22
Leisure Tourism	22
Nutrition and Food Science Database	22
PsycFIRST (OCLC)	22
Rural Development Abstracts	22

Database	Total Citing Journals Indexed
InfoTrac Custom	21
Nutrition Abstracts and Reviews, Series A: Human and Experimental	21
ProQuest Health Research Premium Collection	21
Abstracts on Hygiene and Communicable Diseases	20
Environmental Impact	20
ProQuest Hospital Premium Collection	20
Reactions Weekly	20
SocINDEX	20
ProQuest Health & Medical Collection	19
Social Science Premium Collection	19
Academic Search Ultimate	18
Electronic Collections Online (OCLC)	18
Sociological Abstracts	18
Tropical Diseases Bulletin	18
Environmental Sciences and Pollution Management	17
Professional ProQuest Central	17
SocINDEX with full text	17
STM Source	17
Biotechnology Source	16
Food Science and Technology (FSTA) Abstracts	16
Biomedical Reference Collection, Corporate Edition	15
E-psyche	14
Biological Sciences	13
Food Science Source	13
Health Reference Center Academic	13
ProQuest 5000 International	13
Public Affairs Index	13
Research Library (ProQuest)	13
Europe PubMed Central	12
Health and Safety Science Abstracts	12
Risk Abstracts	12
SciTech Premium Collection	12
Sociology Collection	12
GALE Literature: Book Review Index	11
ProQuest 5000	11
Social Services Abstracts	11
Studies on Women and Gender Abstracts	11

Appendix C

Library Research Guides Relevant to Fat Studies

- Boise State University: <https://guides.boisestate.edu/c.php?g=939889&p=6807549>
- Carroll Community College: <https://library.carrollcc.edu/explorebodyliberation/history>
- Chicago School (includes relevant journals and subject headings): <https://library.thechicagoschool.edu/c.php?g=1244933&p=9109000>
- Cornell University (undergraduate course guide suggesting databases): <https://guides.library.cornell.edu/english2880mo/background>
- DeVry University: <https://libguides.devry.edu/c.php?g=1337823>
- Duke University (primary resources): https://archives.lib.duke.edu/catalog/allisondorothy_aspace_ref197_avn
- Florida Atlantic University (suggests one healthcare database, includes video from medicalization paradigm): <https://libguides.fau.edu/Healthcare-for-All-Weight/>
- Harvard Kennedy School: <https://guides.library.harvard.edu/hks/book-displays/equality-at-every-size>
- Harvard University (primary resources): https://hollisarchives.lib.harvard.edu/repositories/8/archival_objects/3386079
- Indiana University Bloomington: <https://guides.libraries.indiana.edu/c.php?g=1041095&p=9723430#s-lg-box-32185432>
- Northern Virginia Community College: <https://libguides.nvcc.edu/confidenceandjoy/antifatbias>
- Pratt University: <https://libguides.pratt.edu/fatstudies>
- Simmons University (includes relevant journals and subject headings): <https://simmons.libguides.com/anti-oppression/anti-fatmisia>
- University of Connecticut (primary resources): <https://archivesearch.lib.uconn.edu/repositories/2/resources/522>
- University of Nebraska Omaha: <https://libguides.unomaha.edu/c.php?g=1049744&p=7986294>
- University of Washington: <https://guides.lib.uw.edu/FatActivism>
- Valdosta State University (suggests three databases): <https://libguides.valdosta.edu/anti-oppression/sizeism>
- Widener University (includes relevant journals and subject headings): <https://widener.libguides.com/sizeism>