JOURNAL OF CULTURAL ANALYSIS AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change,
2026, 11(1), 1997-2010
ISSN: 2589-1316

Fat Masculinity and the Quiet Governance of Bodies at Work

María-Alejandra Energici[1*], Fernanda Manríquez[2], Nicolás Schöngut-Grollmus[3]

[1] *Universidad Andrés Bello*
[2] *Universidad Diego Portales*
[3] *Universidad de las Américas*

***Corresponding Author:** maria.energici@unab.cl

Citation: Energici, M. A., Manríquez, F. & Schöngut-Grollmus, N. (2026). Fat Masculinity and the Quiet Governance of Bodies at Work, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 11(1), 1997-2010. https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v11i1.4220

Published: January 13, 2026

ABSTRACT

This article examines how weight-based exclusion operates in contemporary workplaces by analyzing fat masculinity in a context where body weight rarely circulates as an explicit category of discrimination. Drawing on three focus groups with self-identified fat men conducted in different urban settings, the study conceptualizes weight stigma as a cultural and organizational regime that links body size to moral worth, professionalism, and employability. Rather than relying on overt rules or explicit sanctions, workplaces govern fat bodies through aesthetic expectations, health rationales, informal surveillance, and anticipatory self-regulation. Men describe adjusting clothing, eating practices, visibility, and social comportment in response to environments where weight remains highly legible but essentially unspeakable. Inclusion discourse further reorganizes this governance by rendering explicit commentary on bodies reputationally risky while allowing embodied sorting to persist in deniable forms. Focusing on masculinity reveals how weight stigma operates through idioms compatible with male respectability—discipline, productivity, health, and competence—while discouraging claims of discrimination that might threaten masculine legitimacy. By examining weight stigma in a depoliticized setting, the article shifts attention from individual prejudice to the conditions that make exclusion appear ordinary, reasonable, and institutionally defensible. The findings contribute to scholarship on aesthetic labor, stigma, and masculinity by showing how power operates most effectively when it remains normalized, individualized, and difficult to name.

Keywords: Fat Masculinity, Quiet Governance, Bodies at Work

INTRODUCTION

Organizations increasingly adopt discourses of inclusion, well-being, and diversity (Combs et al., 2019). However, employers continue to evaluate and sort workers through embodied norms that many actors treat as "common sense." Weight functions as a highly legible bodily marker in contemporary culture, and evaluators routinely use it to infer competence, self-control, and professionalism (Anderson-Fye & Brewis, 2017; Murray, 2007). In many sectors, organizations do not codify a preferred body type as a formal requirement; instead, they translate expectations about image, presentation, and fit into background criteria that shape who they perceive as employable, credible, and promotable (Mayernik, 2025). This article conceptualizes weight stigma not simply as negative attitudes toward fat people, but as a cultural regime that links body size to moral worth and workplace value.

Scholars have documented labor-market penalties for fat people and have shown how employers justify these penalties through narratives of health, discipline, and fit (Puhl & Heuer, 2009; Roehling et al., 2013). However, researchers have built much of this evidence in Anglo-American settings where Fat Studies, body-positivity activism, and frameworks such as Health at Every Size (HAES) circulate critical vocabularies for naming and

contesting weight-based oppression(Cooper, 2021; Steele, 2025). These vocabularies matter analytically: they shape what participants can articulate, how organizations defend their practices, and which harms become publicly recognizable. When researchers build theory primarily from politicized settings, they risk treating this discursive infrastructure as ubiquitous.

This article examines weight-based exclusion in Chile, where institutions and everyday practices often moralize and individualize body size rather than politicize it (M. A. Energici, Acosta, Huaiquimilla, Borquez, et al., 2016). We focus on fat masculinity in Chilean workplaces to analyze how organizations reproduce weight-based exclusion while rarely naming it as discrimination. We argue that the Chilean case clarifies how workplaces stabilize weight norms by shaping how actors interpret weight through respectability, self-management, and marketized professionalism.

Research demonstrates that weight stigma structures labor markets and organizational cultures beyond interpersonal interaction. Employers often perceive fat employees as less competent, less disciplined, and less suitable for customer-facing roles, while they treat thinness as evidence of self-management and professionalism (Agerström & Rooth, 2011; Fikkan & Rothblum, 2012). Researchers also show how weight stigma intersects with gender, race, class, and disability, producing uneven consequences across occupations and sectors (Himmelstein et al., 2017). Aesthetic labour clarifies one mechanism through which organizations embed these evaluations in everyday practice. Warhurst & Nickson (2007) define aesthetic labor as the organizational production and management of workers' appearances for service delivery, brand performance, and corporate image. Organizations, therefore, reward embodied styles alongside skills, and they frequently treat weight as a visible indicator of self-governance and fit.

Cultural studies scholars caution against treating Anglo-American accounts as universal templates (Campbell & Kean, 2016; Skinner, 2022). They show how actors produce social meanings within specific histories, moral orders, and institutional arrangements. When researchers conceptualize weight stigma as a cultural and institutional regime, they shift the analytical question from individual bias to the conditions that render weight-based exclusion visible, contestable, or ordinary and deniable (M. A. Energici et al., 2020). In politicized contexts, actors can name weight stigma as discrimination and mobilize counter-discourses, even when institutions continue to reproduce exclusion. In depoliticized contexts, actors may interpret weight stigma as personal failure or as a reasonable consequence of health and image. Depoliticization does not eliminate politics; it renders norms non-political, individualized, and inevitable, and it positions self-management as the appropriate response (De Nardis & Antonazzo, 2017).

Chile offers a strategically important site for analyzing this dynamic because three conditions converge. First, Chilean public culture organizes everyday life around respectability, self-control, and the persistent demand for *buena presencia*, an idiom through which actors link appearance to credibility and moral worth (M. A. Energici et al., 2026). Second, Chile has not consolidated Fat Studies as an institutional field, nor has it developed a large-scale body politics movement that routinely frames fatness as structural injustice; public discourse therefore often positions weight as an individual matter of health, self-esteem, or humor (M. A. Energici, 2024). Third, Chile's deep neoliberal rationalities of self-management encourage actors to treat the body as a personal project that requires continuous optimization (De La Fabián et al., 2025; M.-A. Energici, 2016). Together, these conditions help organizations present weight-based exclusion as rational and non-discriminatory.

We focus on men because scholars and practitioners often presume that weight matters less for men than for women. Dominant constructions of masculinity may detach male embodiment from conventional beauty standards, yet workplaces and peer cultures attach moral expectations to discipline, performance, authority, and competence (Cinta et al., 2025; Monaghan, 2008). Employers can therefore stigmatize fat men through idioms of productivity and self-control while avoiding explicitly aesthetic language. By analyzing fat masculinity in a depoliticized context, we extend scholarship on weight stigma and aesthetic labor beyond the Anglo-American settings that dominate the field.

Empirically, we draw on focus groups with fat men conducted in three Chilean urban contexts. We analyze participants' accounts of work, professionalism, health, and image as cultural practices through which actors reproduce, negotiate, and at times contest bodily norms. We argue that the Chilean case allows researchers to examine weight-based exclusion not as a contested injustice, but as a normalized feature of everyday institutional life—one that persists precisely because institutions and workers rarely name it as discrimination. The remainder of the article situates this argument within scholarship on aesthetic labor and moral regimes of the body, outlines our methodological approach, and presents thematic findings that trace how workplaces govern fat masculinity through norms of employability and self-management.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This article conceptualizes weight stigma as a cultural and organizational regime that links body size to moral worth and workplace value (Brown et al., 2022; M. A. Energici et al., 2017; Rubino et al., 2020). Workplaces can reproduce weight-based exclusion without explicit rules by translating embodied expectations into seemingly neutral criteria—image, presentation, professionalism, and fit—that shape hiring, visibility, and promotion (Johnson et al., 2024; Täuber et al., 2018). The analytical focus, therefore, shifts from individual prejudice to the conditions that make weight-based sorting ordinary, deniable, and institutionally durable (M. A. Energici & Acosta, 2020; Rubino et al., 2020; Zacher & von Hippel, 2022).

Across diverse settings, weight operates as a highly legible marker through which observers infer moral character. Research consistently shows that fatness is interpreted as evidence of weak self-discipline, poor self-management, and diminished responsibility, whereas thinness signals control, effort, and moral worth (Puhl & Heuer, 2009; Timbs & Maranges, 2025). These inferences do not arise solely from individual prejudice but are socially organized through shared cultural schemas that classify bodies, moralize difference, and treat physical appearance as informative of competence, seriousness, and reliability (M. A. Energici, 2018). In organizational contexts, such moralized readings of weight translate into evaluations of professionalism, motivation, and attitude, enabling weight-based sorting without explicit reference to discrimination (Zacher & von Hippel, 2022). Once weight becomes tied to moral character, exclusion appears reasonable and deniable, framed as an assessment of merit rather than as a stigmatizing practice grounded in bodily norms (Bannuru et al., 2025; M. A. Energici et al., 2017).

Aesthetic Labor, Organizational Representation, and *Good Presence*.

Organizational scholarships on embodiments demonstrate how workplaces actively translate culturally valued bodily traits into organizational value. Research on aesthetic labor shows that employers do not merely tolerate workers' appearances but actively select, cultivate, and regulate them as part of service delivery and institutional representation (Wan, 2023). In customer-facing and status-sensitive contexts, workers' bodies function as semiotic resources through which clients, supervisors, and colleagues infer credibility, trustworthiness, and professionalism, thereby transforming appearance into organizational capital (Zacher & von Hippel, 2022).

This framework also explains how body weight shapes organizational outcomes without being formally acknowledged. Rather than naming weight explicitly, organizations embed embodied standards within seemingly neutral categories such as presentation, image, or client readiness, allowing body size to influence task allocation, visibility, and career advancement while remaining institutionally invisible (Dolado et al., 2023; Johnson et al., 2024; Täuber et al., 2018). Empirical research demonstrates that organizations impose heavier weight-based penalties in roles that involve frequent interaction with clients or external stakeholders, treating appearance as implicitly relevant to organizational performance and reputation (Campos-Vazquez & Gonzalez, 2020; Dolado et al., 2023).

In Chile, a culturally entrenched norm of *buena presencia* (good presence) reinforces these dynamics by framing bodily presentation as evidence of respectability, self-discipline, and moral credibility. Qualitative studies show that evaluators moralize body size—especially women's body size—and read it as an indicator of personal responsibility and social worth, thereby legitimizing weight as a basis for evaluation even when actors frame it as concern for professionalism or institutional image (M. A. Energici, 2016; M. A. Energici et al., 2017) Because *buena presencia* circulates as common sense rather than as an explicit evaluative rule, it provides a ready-made cultural vocabulary through which organizations can justify embodied sorting as a reasonable matter of representation, image, or fit, rather than as stigma or discrimination (Campos-Vazquez & Gonzalez, 2020; Täuber et al., 2018).

Surveillance, Discipline, and Self-Regulation

If aesthetic labor explains why bodies matter at work, theories of surveillance and discipline explain how workplaces govern bodies. Workplaces operate as arenas of continuous social reading in which coworkers, supervisors, and clients actively interpret bodies, and these interpretations shape access to opportunity, visibility, and status (Russell-Mayhew et al., 2024; Zacher & von Hippel, 2022). Because culture moralizes body weight as a sign of self-control and responsibility, workers anticipate being read as undisciplined and regulate themselves accordingly. Discipline, therefore, rarely requires explicit instruction. Instead, it operates through the constant legibility of the body, prompting workers to monitor and adjust clothing, posture, and everyday comportment in response to an environment that renders appearance continuously interpretable (Sollerhed & Bringsén, 2023).

This perspective foregrounds what Foucault (1990) described as *technologies of the self*: practical repertoires through which individuals actively manage their bodies and their public visibility in accordance with dominant norms. In contemporary workplaces, such technologies extend beyond formal performance metrics into everyday conduct. Ordinary activities become evaluative performances precisely because bodies function as signs of moral and professional character. Eating at work, for instance, is not merely consumption but a public scene in which

appetite becomes readable as restraint or excess. Empirical research on impression management shows that individuals systematically regulate food choices, portion sizes, and eating pace in social settings to project self-control and avoid negative judgments (Vartanian, 2015).

When stigma attaches to visible appetite, workers regulate not only what they eat but how that eating appears. Studies show that people deliberately select smaller portions, slower pacing, and visibly "moderate" foods when they anticipate evaluation, particularly in professional or mixed-status environments (Vartanian, 2015). In workplaces where organizations implicitly link weight to competence and professionalism, workers use these micro-practices of bodily regulation as defensive strategies against anticipated devaluation (Bannuru et al., 2025; Zacher & von Hippel, 2022). Such practices do not reflect idiosyncratic anxieties or private insecurities. Instead, they constitute patterned and socially intelligible responses to environments in which bodies are continuously evaluated as evidence of a disciplined, responsible, and professionally credible self (Russell-Mayhew et al., 2024; Timbs & Maranges, 2025)

Medicalization, Healthism, and Health as an Alibi

Weight governance in workplaces stabilizes itself through medicalization, which converts moral judgments about body size into technical claims about health, risk, and productivity. Organizations frequently justify weight-based penalties by invoking health narratives that frame exclusion as a matter of safety, efficiency, or objective necessity rather than stigma or bias (Johnson et al., 2024; Kokubun, 2025). Standardized biomedical metrics—such as body mass index (BMI), routine medical examinations, and eligibility thresholds—allow employers to formalize weight as a criterion for access to jobs, training opportunities, or specific tasks, while presenting these decisions as neutral and evidence-based forms of risk management (Valdez & Mejía, 2021).

Medicalization gains force through healthism, an ideological framework that defines health as a moral obligation and locates responsibility primarily in individual behavior. Within a healthism logic, organizations frame pressure to lose weight as care ("for your own good"), responsibility ('for safety'), or prevention, thereby narrowing the space for critique and rendering resistance difficult (Albet, 2022; Täuber et al., 2018). Empirical research shows that workplace health promotion programs emphasizing individual responsibility intensify weight stigma and increase discriminatory outcomes, even when implemented under the banner of employee wellbeing (Täuber et al., 2018). In this context, health functions less as a descriptive category than as a culturally legitimate vocabulary through which organizations naturalize thresholds and recode exclusion as responsible governance rather than discrimination.

Importantly, this argument does not deny that safety and health requirements may matter in specific occupations. Instead, it highlights how the language of health provides a powerful alibi that allows organizations to stabilize embodied hierarchies while displacing moral judgment onto ostensibly technical standards. By framing exclusion as compliance with medical norms or risk reduction, workplaces obscure the social and moral assumptions embedded in these criteria and render weight-based exclusion both ordinary and institutionally defensible (Johnson et al., 2024; Kokubun, 2025).

Depoliticization, Silence, and the Gendered Governance of Body Weight at Work

The politics of weight stigma depend on the discursive resources available to name and contest it. Much existing scholarship has developed in Anglo-American contexts where Fat Studies, body-positivity activism, and frameworks such as Health at Every Size (HAES) provide established vocabularies for identifying weight-based harm as a form of structural injustice (Gordon, 2020; Nutter et al., 2016). These vocabularies matter because they delimit what individuals can articulate as harm and what organizations can be held accountable for defending or justifying. Where such frameworks circulate, actors frame weight-based exclusion as discrimination rather than as a private or moral failing.

Chile offers a contrasting context in which public discourse more often moralizes and individualizes body weight rather than politicizes it as a form of inequality. Research shows that weight stigma remains widespread yet weakly institutionalized as a recognizable form of discrimination, lacking both legal protection and shared public language (Brown et al., 2022; M. A. Energici et al., 2017). Depoliticization does not eliminate power; instead, it renders weight norms non-political, inevitable, and privately managed. In this context, individuals are positioned as responsible for self-correction, while weight-based exclusion becomes difficult to name and contest. Organizations and peers reinterpret critiques as personal fragility or lack of resilience rather than as a claim about unjust organizational structures (Timbs & Maranges, 2025).

Discourses of inclusion, diversity, and wellbeing introduce a further transformation rather than a rupture. As organizations publicly perform inclusion, explicit commentary on bodies becomes reputationally risky, yet embodied sorting persists by migrating into deniable forms. Research shows that weight stigma increasingly operates through silence, humor, "friendly" advice, and backstage steering of who appears visible, client-ready, or suitable for high-status roles (Johnson et al., 2024; Täuber et al., 2018). In such settings, silence does not signal the

absence of regulation. Instead, it functions as a regulatory technology that reorganizes control into forms that remain socially acceptable and institutionally defensible. Weight norms remain powerful precisely because organizations treat them as unsayable and manage them through informal practices rather than explicit statements (Brown et al., 2022).

Masculinity also intersects with classed professional cultures. Although dominant gender ideologies often detach men from conventional beauty standards, workplaces strongly link masculinity to discipline, competence, productivity, and authority (Montgomery Sklar, 2017). Consequently, organizations stigmatize fatness in men not through overt aesthetic language but through idioms of self-control and professional credibility. Empirical research shows that observers routinely infer men's moral and vocational qualities from body size, penalizing bodies that deviate from cultural norms of disciplined physicality (Krems & Bock, 2023). In high-status, client-facing environments, bodies signal belonging and polish, and thinness often indicates respectability and professional legitimacy, intensifying surveillance and self-regulation among men whose bodies fall outside those ideals.

Taken together, this framework conceptualizes weight stigma not as an interpersonal bias but as a culturally organized regime that links moral worth, bodily discipline, and workplace value through aesthetic norms, health rationales, and surveillance practices. In contexts where weight lacks a consolidated political vocabulary, these mechanisms operate with force, as exclusion becomes routinized, deniable, and framed as self-management rather than discrimination. This article, therefore, asks: **how do Chilean workplaces govern fat masculinity through aesthetic, medicalized, and moralized norms while sustaining inclusion discourses that render weight-based exclusion ordinary, legitimate, and difficult to contest?** By addressing this question, the study shifts attention from explicit acts of discrimination to the conditions that make weight-based regulation appear reasonable, inevitable, and institutionally defensible in everyday organizational life.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Participants

We conducted three focus groups with adult men in Chile who self-identified as fat. We held one group in each of three urban settings - La Serena (north), Santiago (central), and Concepción (south) - to capture regional variation in how men narrate body size, respectability, and employability. We recruited participants through snowball sampling and community contacts in each location. We used self-identification as the main inclusion criterion because our analytic interest lay in fatness as a lived and socially meaningful category rather than a biomedical threshold (Woodward, 2007). We convened men-only groups to support candid discussion about the body and workplace experiences, in line with evidence that men often participate less actively in mixed-gender conversations about embodiment (M. A. Energici, Acosta, Huaiquimilla, & Borquez, 2016). We focused on masculine identifications and did not recruit non-binary or gender-fluid participants in this phase; we treat this as a limitation rather than an assumption about who counts as masculine. We followed a qualitative logic of cultural density rather than statistical representativeness. We aimed to surface the interpretive repertoires through which participants make workplace exclusion appear reasonable, inevitable, or contestable.

Table 1 summarizes the composition of the three focus groups, detailing their regional distribution, participant numbers, and age characteristics. Together, the groups include 20 participants spanning a wide age range, providing diversity in both geographic location and life stage.

Table 1. Characterization of participants

Focus Group	Code	Number of participants	Age range	Age average
Chilean Central Zone	FGCE	8	26-50	40
Chilean Southern Zone	FGSO	9	23-55	44
Chilean Northern Zone	FGNT	3	23-40	42
Total		20	23-55	43

Source: authors' analysis.

Table 2 presents the occupational profile of the participants. Most participants are dependent or self-employed workers, while a smaller proportion are students, indicating that the sample primarily reflects experiences rooted in active labor participation.

Table 2. Participants occupation

Occupation	Participants
Dependent worker	11
Self-employed	7
Student	2
Total	20

Source: authors' analysis

Focus Groups as Meaning-Making Sites

We approached each focus group as an interactive cultural scene rather than a container of individual opinions. We used the group setting to observe how participants collectively produce common sense about fat masculinity at work through agreement, disagreement, joking, and repair (Kitzinger, 1994). We used open-ended prompts to elicit discussion about hiring and career mobility, workplace interactions, professionalism and buena presencia, client-facing expectations, health narratives, and everyday strategies for managing visibility and judgment. We treated interactional features - humor, teasing, silences, hesitations, and shifts in tone - as analytically meaningful. These moves clarified what participants could say openly about weight-based exclusion and what they rendered deniable, individualized, or just a joke. We conducted the sessions in Spanish and translated excerpts into English for publication, prioritizing meaning and local idioms over literal equivalence. We removed identifying details from transcripts and quotations.

3.3. Analytical Strategy

We analyzed the transcripts using Reflective Thematic Analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). We moved iteratively between the whole dataset and emerging codes, building themes that captured patterned meanings rather than counting mentions. We coded both explicit content (e.g., accounts of hiring, promotion, or medical examinations) and tacit dynamics (e.g., naturalized assumptions about professional appearance and moments of silence following stigmatizing comments). We also treated contradictions and ambivalence as data, reading them as tensions between compliance and critique. We used ATLAS.ti to manage the transcripts, coding, and linked audiovisual material from the sessions. Throughout the analysis, we practiced reflexivity by interrogating how our theoretical commitments to embodiment, masculinity, and cultural studies shaped our interpretations.

Ethical Considerations

This study received ethics approval from the Institutional Ethics Committee of Universidad Alberto Hurtado. All participants provided informed consent before taking part. We explained the study aims, the focus group format, potential risks, and the voluntary nature of participation, including the right to withdraw at any point without consequence. We anonymized all data and stored it securely. When reporting results, we remove identifying details to protect participants' confidentiality.

RESULTS

Weight, Surveillance, and Discipline

Participants repeatedly treated body size as a workplace-relevant cue that others could readily read and use to form judgments about competence, credibility, and self-control. Fatness and thinness did not appear as private bodily states; weight functioned instead as a regime of monitoring and normalization that disciplines men through everyday evaluations. This regime becomes especially salient in work contexts because employment ties bodily presentation to institutional representation, customer trust, and organizational hierarchy. The recurrence of this logic across topics establishes it as the foundational pattern in the data.

Accounts of workplace surveillance highlighted how organizations actively curate which bodies appear "in front." In the Concepción focus group, participant 1 introduced this selection as routine managerial practice in public employment:

Participant 1: *I work as a public employee, and this happens a lot—especially within public-sector ranks, where weight is very noticeable, or they want to put someone out front to project a different image of the employees* (Participant in FGSO).

Bernardo's description shows how institutional representation turns weight into an object of scrutiny without requiring an explicit policy. Supervisors select who can appear "out front," using that selection to project a different image of the workforce to the public. This practice treats thinness as a visual asset and marks fatness as a liability that institutions must manage. In doing so, the workplace converts body size into an evaluative criterion that shapes task allocation and visibility. By framing the issue as the projection of "a different image" rather than as prejudice, the practice normalizes the judgment, presenting bodily selection as a reasonable—and even strategic—decision about how an institution should appear.

Discipline also emerged as a form of anticipatory self-regulation: men adjust their bodies and modes of presentation before any explicit comment, on the assumption that others are already monitoring them. In La Serena, one participant explained how he anchors these adjustments in the workday and uses clothing to control how his body appears:

Interviewer: *Do you think strategically about your clothing? Do you tend to wear certain garments more because they conceal particular parts of your body, or do you choose clothes simply because you like their color? How do you decide what to wear?*

Participant 3: *Well, in my case… during the workday I don't wear shirts. I cover myself more when I go out with my wife, say, to a party or to go dancing. In those situations, I wear a long, loose shirt. I don't tuck it into wide pants; I just leave it loose, so that the shirt falls loosely on my body. But during the workday, yes—you know—just a T-shirt* (Participant in FGNT).

This extract shows how self-surveillance operates as an ordinary requirement of work participation. Rather than citing a formal dress code or a supervisor's instruction, the account describes a practical repertoire for managing how others interpret the body at work. The account describes avoiding tight clothing, favoring loose-fitting garments, and varying wardrobe choices across settings, anticipating scrutiny. The phrase "during the workday" is analytically significant because it marks the workplace as a context in which visibility and judgment carry heightened consequences.

Clothing operates here as a technology of discipline, reshaping the body's social legibility and reducing the risk that others will interpret its size as out of place.

In Santiago, accounts emphasized how client-facing and classed workplaces intensify this regime by linking body size to professional legitimacy. One participant working in insurance described how he reads the norms of affluent clients and aligns his body with what he calls "modern."

Participant 2: *Well, in my case—because I work with the public, really—my client segment is ABC1 and the issue is that, unfortunately, you have to maintain a certain image. If I'm an executive at an insurance company, a well-established company, you have to look quite—what's the word? How would I put it?—"modern," so to speak* (Participant in FGCE).

Interviewer: *What would "modern" mean, if you had to describe it?*

Participant 2: *"Modern"? It would mean being more polished—not fat. You have to be on top of your weight, more slender. More slender, more precise, yes. Yes, I think so. That's it. And in fact, you also have to eat very little so that you don't end up gaining weight* (Participant in FGCE).

This description links body size to a culturally specific ideal of professional authority. Rather than simply expressing a preference for thinness, it translates this expectation into an image of social positioning—"more polished, not fat"—and treats thinness as an embodied signal of belonging in a high-income market. Eating less appears as a practical obligation required to sustain that signal. Together, these elements show how workplace surveillance operates through classed imaginaries and moral judgments: clients read the body as evidence of self-governance, prompting adjustments in appetite and appearance.

Across the groups, these expectations appear as pervasive and self-reinforcing. Accounts repeatedly refer to workplace contexts in which colleagues, supervisors, or clients treat weight as an index of seriousness and discipline, generating an ongoing imperative to "work on the body" through food restriction, exercise, and other bodily projects. Rather than framing these demands as isolated or temporary, the accounts depict them as a continuous background condition of employability. This theme thus establishes weight surveillance and discipline as the baseline through which actors interpret workplace value, everyday comportment, and the terms of occupational respectability.

Explicit Governance in the Name of Health

Weight regulation did not operate solely through image management. It also took shape through practices that explicitly invoke health and safety to justify control, exclusion, and compulsory weight loss. Within this framing, institutions recast bodily size as a risk category, present intervention as responsible control, and deflect the language of discrimination. Employers and training settings rely on medical checkups and standardized metrics to formalize weight as a condition of eligibility.

In Concepción, one participant described annual medical examinations as routine occupational surveillance that can remove workers from positions when weight exceeds an acceptable range:

Participant 4: *There is also a form of control in relation to jobs. That's why we work in industrial assembly. Every year we have to undergo checks—complete medical checkups: blood pressure, weight. I mean, our weight has to fall within an acceptable range. Otherwise, in that sense, I don't know how one would call it discrimination. But if we are overweight, they won't assign us the job. They discriminate against us. I don't know if it can really be called discrimination, but they sideline us. "You can't—you're overweight"* (Participant in FGSO).

The participant frames this process as a form of "control" and situates it within a predictable schedule—once a year. The complete medical checkup produces weight as an objective occupational parameter and authorizes explicit action: the employer can sideline a worker and state, "You can't—you're overweight." He also underscores the interpretive ambiguity generated by clinical governance. He hesitates to label the outcome as discrimination—

"I don't know whether it can be called discrimination"—because medical language renders exclusion legitimate. By presenting the requirement as necessary for organizational functioning, this framing shows how medical rationales operate as both moral and technical alibis, enabling employers to regulate access while presenting exclusion as responsibility rather than stigma.

In La Serena, explicit health governance took a straightforward form in mining and high-altitude work, where institutions use standardized metrics to regulate access. One participant described this requirement in non-negotiable terms:

Participant 1: *Yes. In my case, I had to go north to complete my internship, and I weighed—I don't know—around 96 kilos. So you go in for the medical exams, and they told me that my body mass index was very high, and because I was going to be working at height, they told me, "You absolutely have to lose weight"* (Participant in FGNT).

This extract shows how health governance produces compulsion through measurement. The participant anchors the requirement in body mass index, a standardized metric that carries institutional authority and conveys inevitability—"you absolutely have to." Another participant reinforces the same boundary by stating, "they won't let you go up," clarifying that institutions treat body size as a determinant of access. The safety rationale renders this exclusion reasonable and objective. Nevertheless, the effect remains exclusionary: institutions tie employability and training to a quantifiable bodily threshold and transform weight loss into a compulsory prerequisite for participation.

In Santiago, health rationales also authorize everyday scrutiny, extending governance beyond formal medical assessments. One participant described how observers medicalize changes in body weight and deploy the language of care to justify their commentary:

Participant 2: *And then people say, "Okay, you're thin—you're sick." You know what I mean? I mean, people are really harsh about it. Seriously—really. Someone loses 20 kilos and immediately it's, "Oh, he's sick. He must have cancer or AIDS or something." They jump straight to that. And then, if you're fat, it's, "You're really fat—terribly fat. You let yourself go." You know what I mean? It's true; it's extremely unforgiving. And I've seen people who have lost a lot of weight, but for health reasons, for their own health. But still… You have to take care of yourself. That's true* (Participant in FGCE).

This example illustrates how health talk legitimizes surveillance in ordinary interaction. Observers treat thinness as a potential sign of illness—"He must have cancer or AIDS"—and treat fatness as a trigger for immediate judgment. By closing with the injunction "you have to take care of yourself," the participant articulates a moral directive that normalizes intervention in others' bodies. Health discourse thus does more than describe risk: it supplies a culturally acceptable rationale for monitoring bodies, evaluating behavior, and commenting on weight in ways that can appear caring rather than stigmatizing.

Taken together, these materials show that appeals to bodily well-being operate as an explicit device for legitimizing the governance of bodies, work capacity, and access. Medical assessments and BMI thresholds render weight a measurable criterion that institutions invoke as a neutral necessity, even when such measures exclude individuals or redirect their career trajectories. This framing encourages individuals to understand weight regulation as a matter of self-management rather than as stigmatization. The theme thus clarifies how appeals to "health" stabilize weight regulation by recoding it as defensible risk control and moral responsibility.

Implicit and Silent Forms of Regulation

Weight regulation also emerged in forms that operate without explicit commands or formal rules. In these moments, regulation works through social presence, affective atmospheres, and internalized expectations: men adjust appetite, visibility, and self-presentation in anticipation of how others will read them. These descriptions also point to a discursive environment that discourages explicit talk of weight-based discrimination, as humor, comparison, and unsolicited "advice" render regulation socially acceptable while constraining open contestation.

In Concepción, everyday humor emerged as a mechanism that regulates body size by keeping it constantly available for comment. One participant described weight-related teasing as routine within his social and work circles:

Participant 7: *In general, within our work group, there are some of us who are overweight. And the teasing is always there. But it doesn't really bother anyone, because everyone has already come to accept it. I don't think discrimination is a major issue—at least not in the world I move in. Appearance doesn't matter that much; what matters more is size than actual ability. Still, I think it shows up more clearly in sales jobs. I worked in executive sales at an AFP and in banking, and in those settings, they pay much closer attention to how you are expected to present yourself* (Participant in FGSO).

The participant describes teasing as ever-present and largely non-problematic because it has become taken for granted within the group. This normalization does not eliminate regulation; it stabilizes it. Humor enables co-workers to comment on body size without overt hostility, thereby lowering the social cost of monitoring. It also shapes which responses appear legitimate: when joking registers as ordinary, complaints can appear excessive. The participant's reference to sales work links this informal climate to occupational differentiation, indicating that even when men downplay discrimination, they still recognize that specific workplaces impose expectations about bodily

presentation. Teasing thus contributes to regulation by keeping body size salient as a category of evaluation, even as actors resist framing these dynamics in the language of discrimination.

Implicit regulation also appeared as embodied anticipatory restraint—self-imposed limits that manage exposure before any external intervention occurs. In La Serena, one participant explained how he controls the camera's gaze by restricting what others can see:

Participant 3: *As for me, I don't post photos. No, the one who posts photos is my wife. I don't post stories, I don't post photos on Facebook either. None at all. She's the one who does all of that, and I'm fine with it—I like that she does it. But I do set limits. I don't allow photos where I look bad. Not my face or being messy—that's not the issue. It's that sometimes photos come out where I look bad, you know? It really shows I am fat. And when that happens, I tell her, "Don't send those photos." Because she's sent some before—look at them, the photos you sent, look at them* (Participant in FGNT).

This practice governs visibility through self-surveillance and delegated control. The participant reports that he does not post photos or stories himself; instead, his wife manages that public-facing activity, which he describes as acceptable and even preferable. At the same time, he sets explicit limits on what she can share, instructing her not to send images in which he thinks he looks bad and emphasizing that "it really shows I am fat." He does not describe an external demand; instead, he describes a pre-emptive form of filtering that regulates the circulation of his image. In doing so, he manages not only how others might see him, but also which representations of him enter social exchange at all.

In Santiago, another micro-technology of restraint operates through the social presence of co-workers: the regulation of eating in shared settings. One participant summarized the adjustments he makes when sharing meals with colleagues:

Participant 7: *And something else I wanted to mention is that at work, people tend to modify their attitudes and everyday habits. For example, when you have lunch with co-workers, you practically have to eat very slowly, you have to leave food on your plate, and you can't go back for seconds because it obviously looks bad* (Participant in FGCE).

The extract reveals regulation precisely because it remains unspoken within the interaction itself. No manager issues an explicit rule; instead, the participant describes an internalized obligation—"you have to"—that arises when eating with co-workers. He translates this normative pressure into practical routines: eating slowly, leaving food on the plate, and avoiding a second serving. These practices regulate not only consumption but also the social meaning of appetite. Anticipating that others will read visible eating practices as inappropriate, the participant turns lunch into a performance of restraint.

Softer forms of workplace steering also emerged, relying on suggestion rather than command. Men described employers and colleagues who promote "healthy habits" through wellness talks, gym partnerships, and comments framed as concern. These gestures function as indirect instruction, signaling how organizations expect workers to manage their bodies. Some accounts describe an escalation of bodily work in response—shifting from routine dieting and exercise to more invasive forms of body modification—precisely because the workplace renders these expectations both present and deniable. Although such initiatives present themselves as benefits, they operate as forms of soft governance by implying that workers owe the organization a disciplined body.

Implicit regulation also operates through the boundaries of what actors recognize and contest as discrimination. Some formulations minimize weight-based discrimination by relocating "real" discrimination to other domains, thereby narrowing the space for contestation. In Concepción, one participant cast doubt on weight discrimination by explicitly contrasting it with racialized exclusion:

Participant 2: *I think discrimination based on weight is more of a myth. In the end, the really serious discrimination operates elsewhere, above all, racial discrimination. That is something I have seen and experienced myself. I lived abroad, in Brazil, and there you really understand what racial discrimination looks like: there were places where Black people could not live, and neither could people identified as brown; in the schools I attended, there were no Black students—there were mixed-race students, but not Black ones. You see the same thing in the news in the United States, or in how Latinos are treated in Europe. I think discrimination works much more along those lines. By contrast, discrimination based on weight—except in extreme cases, when a person is obese—I do not see as comparable* (Participant in FGSO).

This comparison performs a silencing function. By characterizing weight discrimination as a "myth" and foregrounding racial discrimination as the paradigmatic form of injustice, the participant positions weight-based treatment as less legitimate than a discrimination claim. This move supports the broader regulatory regime by shifting attention away from structural dynamics and toward individual responsibility. If weight-related harm does not qualify as discrimination, men interpret it as a personal condition to manage rather than as a social relation to contest. The comparison thus helps explain how participants can acknowledge surveillance and exclusion while remaining hesitant to politicize those experiences.

In La Serena, a related logic condensed around sociability, framed as a pathway into groups without naming the stigma that renders such compensation necessary:

Interviewer: *Right, we've come across that quite often—people who sometimes don't feel comfortable with their appearance and end up compensating for it by…*

Participant 2: *By being pleasant, so they can gain entry into other people's social circles* (Participant in FGNT).

This statement locates adjustment in the self rather than in the environment. It suggests that men can secure a sense of belonging by demonstrating friendliness and agreeableness, which turns social inclusion into an individual project. Rather than confronting weight norms, the strategy works around them by shifting attention to personality. In doing so, it reproduces the premise that fat men must offer something extra to enter social spaces comfortably.

Finally, participants described silence as an explicit boundary that inclusion talk imposes on workplaces, even while weight norms continue to operate informally. In Santiago, one participant explained how organizations and supervisors avoid explicit statements but still evaluate bodies "detrás del escenario":

Participant 6: *Yes. Yes, it still happens. Yes. I mean, it isn't said—you don't openly say that someone's body or weight is a problem. It's frowned upon to say it. Because we're talking about a company that has to align itself with this whole discourse of inclusion, so they can't explicitly talk about weight or appearance, but it's common knowledge. You see it backstage. The supervisors, the chain managers, the crew members—the higher the position, the more they criticize you or comment on it. And in the end, what happens is that you just become one more. Because eventually there comes a point when someone overweight shows up, and I've said it myself—like, "Hey, let's ease up on the bread," you know? I mean… of course* (Participant in FGCE).

This extract clarifies how deniability sustains regulation. The participant explains that weight and bodily appearance are "not openly talked about" because doing so is "frowned upon," explicitly linking this silence to the organization's commitment to inclusion. At the same time, he insists that the expectation remains widely known—"it's common knowledge"—and locates evaluation in backstage spaces, including supervisory hierarchies and peer interactions. He further describes casual peer correction—"let's ease up on the bread"—as the form regulation takes when organizations avoid explicit directives. Silence, therefore, does not weaken regulation; it reorganizes it into informal practices that preserve organizational respectability while continuing to discipline bodies.

Taken together, these materials show that implicit regulation sustains the weight regime by rendering monitoring routine and by making contestation socially and discursively costly. Anticipating judgment in contexts where others rarely need to speak directly, individuals regulate what they eat, how they present themselves, how visible their bodies become, and how they name harm. Operating through humor, self-censorship, social presence, and deniable "advice," implicit regulation keeps weight-based evaluation culturally ordinary, interactionally manageable, and institutionally adaptable.

DISCUSSION

This study set out to examine how weight-based exclusion operates in Chilean workplaces by focusing on fat masculinity in a context where weight rarely circulates as an explicit category of discrimination. Rather than treating Chile as a deviation from Anglo-American cases, this study positions it as an analytically generative setting that clarifies how weight stigma operates when political vocabularies remain weak, conflict-avoidant structures interact, and individuals take on bodily self-regulation as personal responsibility. The discussion advances this contribution along three axes: it examines the absence of fat politics, analyzes the coexistence of inclusion discourse and material exclusion, and shows why studying stigma before complete politicization matters analytically.

Fat Stigma without Fat Politics

One of the most striking features of the data is participants' persistent reluctance to describe their experiences as discrimination, even when they recount clear practices of exclusion, surveillance, and bodily regulation. Men repeatedly acknowledge that weight shapes job assignments, visibility, credibility, and access to opportunities, yet they hesitate to name these dynamics as unjust. This hesitation signals neither false consciousness nor denial. Instead, this hesitation reflects the absence of a shared political language that would allow actors to articulate weight-based harm as a structural problem rather than as a personal condition.

In the Chilean context, weight circulates primarily through moral and medical idioms. Participants overwhelmingly accept the idea that weight predicts health, safety, and work capacity, treating these links as self-evident rather than as culturally produced assumptions. As a result, exclusion appears reasonable and even necessary. When institutions invoke health, participants rarely contest the requirement's legitimacy; instead, they debate whether the situation counts as discrimination at all. This ambiguity is not accidental. It is precisely what allows weight-based governance to persist while remaining deniable.

Significantly, men's reluctance to claim discrimination also intersects with gendered norms. The position of the discriminated subject remains culturally feminized (fikkan). To claim injury based on appearance risks occupying a subject position associated with fragility, vulnerability, or victimhood—traits that contradict dominant ideals of masculinity centered on resilience, self-control, and autonomy. In this sense, denying discrimination does

not signal the absence of harm but rather an active effort to preserve masculine legitimacy. Men manage stigma not by politicizing it, but by reframing it as self-improvement, adaptation, or personal responsibility.

The data show that weight deeply regulates men, but this regulation operates through idioms compatible with masculinity: discipline, productivity, health, and competence. The effect is not a weaker stigma, but a stigma that is harder to name.

Inclusion without Transformation

A second contribution concerns the relationship between contemporary inclusion discourse and the persistence of aesthetic exclusion. Chilean workplaces increasingly adopt the language of diversity, wellbeing, and respect. Explicit commentary on bodies becomes reputationally risky, and supervisors rarely articulate weight norms directly. However, this silence does not weaken regulation. On the contrary, it reorganizes it.

Participants describe workplaces where "it is not said" that weight matters, yet everyone knows that it does. Supervisors avoid explicit directives, but manage bodies through task allocation, visibility, informal advice, humor, and backstage evaluations. Peers participate in this governance through jokes, comments framed as concern, and shared expectations about appropriate eating and appearance. In this context, silence functions as a regulatory technology: it preserves organizational respectability while shifting the regulatory burden onto individuals.

This finding challenges celebratory accounts of inclusion that focus on discourse rather than practice. Inclusion here does not transform evaluative criteria; it merely renders them unspeakable. Weight-based norms persist precisely because organizations expect workers to self-monitor and self-correct without generating conflict. The Chilean emphasis on avoiding interpersonal confrontation reinforces this dynamic.

The result is a form of governance that is both pervasive and difficult to contest. Because exclusion rarely takes the form of explicit prohibition, it appears as a diffuse atmosphere rather than as a decision. Men regulate their eating, clothing, visibility, and even social media presence in anticipation of evaluation, often without being able to locate a clear source of constraint. This anticipatory self-regulation aligns with broader neoliberal rationalities of self-management, where individuals internalize responsibility for meeting standards they did not define (referencia energici 2016).

Masculinity, Self-Regulation, and the Refusal of Victimhood

The data also illuminate how masculinity reshapes the experience and interpretation of weight stigma. Participants rarely describe themselves as victims. Instead, they frame adaptation as competence: knowing how to dress, how to eat in public, how to compensate socially, and how to remain employable. These strategies do not indicate comfort; they indicate labor. Fat masculinity requires continuous bodily and affective work to remain legitimate within professional spaces.

This requirement for continuous bodily and affective work helps explain why men may insist that they are not discriminated against while simultaneously describing extensive regimes of surveillance and exclusion. To acknowledge discrimination would require recognizing dependence on others' judgments and structural constraints—positions that clash with masculine ideals of autonomy and control. Denial, therefore, operates less as ignorance than as a gendered strategy of self-positioning.

By foregrounding masculinity, the study extends research that has treated weight stigma primarily as a feminized issue. The analysis shows that men are not exempt from aesthetic governance; instead, gendered moral economies shape both its form and the ways men can articulate it. Weight stigma does not disappear; it changes idiom.

Chile as a Generative Analytical Condition

Finally, the Chilean case contributes to cultural studies by highlighting the value of examining norms before they become fully politicized. Much of the existing literature on weight stigma emerges from contexts where fat politics already circulate, making discrimination legible and contestable. Chile allows us to observe how weight-based exclusion operates when such vocabularies are weak or absent.

This analytical condition does not make Chile a "lagging" case. Instead, this case reveals mechanisms that may operate elsewhere but become harder to see once actors publicly contest norms. By studying weight stigma in a depoliticized setting, the analysis shifts attention from explicit acts of discrimination to the conditions that render exclusion ordinary, reasonable, and morally defensible.

CONCLUSION

This article argues that scholars should not treat Chile as an illustrative example of weight stigma but as an analytical condition that clarifies how bodily governance operates under depoliticization, conflict avoidance, and

neoliberal self-management. By focusing on fat masculinity, the study shows that men are intensely regulated through appearance, even as they resist occupying the position of the discriminated subject.

The findings show that weight-based exclusion in Chilean workplaces does not rely primarily on explicit rules or overt hostility. Instead, it operates through health rationales, aesthetic expectations, informal supervision, and anticipatory self-regulation. Inclusion discourse does not dismantle these mechanisms; it reorganizes them into deniable forms that intensify individual responsibility while preserving institutional legitimacy.

More broadly, the study contributes to scholarship on aesthetic labor, stigma, and masculinity by showing how power operates when it remains unsaid. It invites future comparative work not to measure how "advanced" different contexts are in recognizing discrimination, but to examine how norms operate before they become objects of critique. In doing so, it reframes Chile not as a peripheral case, but as a site that makes visible the ordinary, durable, and gendered workings of weight-based governance.

Funding

This article forms part of the research project *"Cuerpo, gordura y diseño: entramados materiales-discursivos de la discriminación del cuerpo gordo"*, funded by **Fondo Nacional de Desarrollo Científico y Tecnológico (FONDECYT)**, Grant No. **1221642**, administered by **Agencia Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo (ANID)**, Chile.

REFERENCES

Agerström, J., & Rooth, D.-O. (2011). The role of automatic obesity stereotypes in real hiring discrimination. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*(4), 790–805. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021594

Albet, L. (2022). La epidemia de obesidad como discurso biopolítico. Control corporal y ética de la biociudadanía. *Astrolabio. Revista Internacional de Filosofía*, *26*, 145–158.

Anderson-Fye, E. P., & Brewis, A. (2017). *Fat planet: Obesity, culture, and symbolic body capital*. University of New Mexico Press.

Bannuru, R. R., ElSayed, N. A., Aroda, V. R., Aronne, L. J., Balapattabi, K., Bennett, A. K., Kanaka, S. C. S., Early, K. B., Fitch, A., Fitzpatrick, S. L., Garvey, W. T., Gudzune, K. A., Kahan, S., Khunti, K., Kushner, R. F., Nadglowski, J., Pearl, R. L., Pekas, E. J., Perreault, L., … Bannuru, R. R. (2025). Weight stigma and bias: standards of care in overweight and obesity-2025. In *BMJ Open Diabetes Research and Care* (Vol. 13, Issue 3). BMJ Publishing Group. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjdrc-2025-004962

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using Thematic analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(1), 77–101.

Brown, A., Flint, S. W., & Batterham, R. L. (2022). Pervasiveness, impact and implications of weight stigma. *The Lancet*, *47*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j

Campbell, N., & Kean, A. (2016). *American cultural studies: An introduction to American culture* (4th Editio). Routldge.

Campos-Vazquez, R. M., & Gonzalez, E. (2020). Obesity and hiring discrimination. *Economics and Human Biology*, *37*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ehb.2020.100850

Cinta, C., Putri, A., & Tenriani, A. (2025). Reimagining Masculinity through Shifts in Male Identity in Contemporary Popular Culture. *Journal Social Humanity Perspective*, *3*(3), 139–153. https://doi.org/ttps://doi.org/10.71435/661336

Combs, G. M., Milosevic, I., & Bilimoria, D. (2019). Introduction to the Special Topic Forum: Critical Discourse: Envisioning the Place and Future of Diversity and Inclusion in Organizations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *26*(3), 277–286. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051819857739

Cooper, C. (2021). *Fat activism: A radical social movement. Intellect*. Intellect. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1386/9781910849309

De La Fabián, R., Jiménez-Molina, A., Pizarro Obaid, F., & Carrasco Madariaga, J. (2025). Healthism and Digital Self-Tracking: Reinventing the Individualistic Ethos in Chile. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, *47*(8). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2313456/v1

De Nardis, F., & Antonazzo, L. (2017). No Title. *Società Mutamento Politica*, *8*(15), 103–128. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.13128/SMP-20852

Dolado, J. J., Minale, L., & Guerra, A. (2023). Uncovering the roots of obesity-based wage discrimination: The role of job characteristics. *Labour Economics*, *85*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2023.102425

Energici, M. A. (2016). Propuesta metodológica para un estudio de gubernamentalidad : Los procesos de subjetivación y los mecanismos de regulación poblacional como ejes de análisis para su abordaje empírico. *Psicoperspectivas*, *15*(2), 29–39. https://doi.org/10.5027/PSICOPERSPECTIVAS-VOL15-ISSUE2-FULLTEXT-604

Energici, M. A. (2018). Afectividad y subjetividad femenina: análisis de la gordura como código moral. *Límite. Revista Interdisciplinaria de Filosofía y Psicología*, *13*(43), 17–28.

Energici, M. A. (2024). *Hablemos de Chile: Obesidad y Salud* [Broadcast]. Canal 13C. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xhb9WRzDghE&list=PLw-3dHPXyhYQZ3ztb5BxcQbu63xInXCo2&index=5

Energici, M. A., & Acosta, E. (2020). El estudio de la obesidad y la gordura desde la sociologúa y la psicología social. *Athenea Digital*, *20*(2), 1–19.

Energici, M. A., Acosta, E., Bórquez, F., & Huaiquimilla, M. (2017). Gordura, Discriminación y Clasismo: un Estudio en Jóvenes de Santiago de Chile. *Psicologia & Sociedade*, *29*, 1–10.

Energici, M. A., Acosta, E., Huaiquimilla, M., & Borquez, F. (2016). Feminización de la gordura: estudio cualitativo en Santiago de Chile. *Revista de Psicología*, *25*(2), 1–17. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.5354/0719-0581.2016.44771

Energici, M. A., Acosta, E., Huaiquimilla, M., Borquez, F., & Bórquez, F. (2016). Feminización de la gordura y sus efectos sobre la función de los cuidados. *9o Congreso Chileno de Sociología*.

Energici, M. A., Manríquez-Castillo, F., Schongut-Grollmus, N., Chavez, J., & Arévalo, C. (2026). The Weight of Appearance: Aesthetic, Moral, and Social Norms of "Looking Good." *Clothing Cultures Journal*.

Energici, M. A., Schöngut-Grollmus, N., & Soto-Lagos, R. (2020). Aesthetic/affective norms of femininity: An obstacle to women's performance of exercise. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/1012690220969352

Energici, M.-A. (2016). El self emprendedor. Sociología de una forma de subjetivación. *Persona y Sociedad*, *29*(3), 131–136.

Fikkan, J. L., & Rothblum, E. D. (2012). Is Fat a Feminist Issue? Exploring the Gendered Nature of Weight Bias. *Sex Roles*, *66*, 575–592. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-0022-5

Foucault, M. (1990). *Las tecnologías del yo y otros textos afines*. Ediciones Paidós Ibérica.

Gordon, A. (2020). *What we don't talk about when we talk about fat*. Beacon Press .

Himmelstein, M. S., Puhl, R. M., & Quinn, D. M. (2017). Intersectionality: An Understudied Framework for Addressing Weight Stigma. In *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2017.04.003

Johnson, B. N., Hunger, J. M., Sawhney, G., & Kunstman, J. W. (2024). Weight in the Workplace: Weight Discrimination Impacts Professional Outcomes as a Function of Social Pain Minimization. *Occupational Health Science*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41542-024-00208-9

Kitzinger, J. (1994). The methodology of Focus Groups: the importance of interaction between research participants. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, *16*(1), 103–121. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.ep11347023

Kokubun, K. (2025). Obesity and Discrimination in the Workplace: A Narrative Review and New Perspectives for Breaking out of the Negative Spiral. In *Obesities* (Vol. 5, Issue 1). Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI). https://doi.org/10.3390/obesities5010008

Krems, J. A., & Bock, J. E. (2023). *The Role of Women's and Men's Body Shapes in Explicit and Implicit Fat Stigma*. https://doi.org/10.3390/obesities

Mayernik, M. S. (2025). Technical standards within socio-technical systems: An Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (ARIST) paper. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.25017

Monaghan, L. F. (2008). *Men and the War on Obesity: A Sociological Study* (1st Editio). Routldge. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203929575

Montgomery Sklar, E. (2017). Body Image, Weight, and Self-Concept in Men. *American Journal of Lifestyle Medicine*, *11*(3), 252–258. https://doi.org/10.1177/1559827615594351

Murray, S. (2007). Corporeal Knowledges and Deviant Bodies: Perceiving the Fat Body. *Social Semiotics*, *17*(2), 361–373. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330701448694

Nutter, S., Russell-Mayhew, S., Alberga, A. S., Arthur, N., Kassan, A., Lund, D. E., Sesma-Vazquez, M., & Williams, E. (2016). Positioning of Weight Bias: Moving towards Social Justice. In *Journal of Obesity* (Vol. 2016). Hindawi Limited. https://doi.org/10.1155/2016/3753650

Puhl, R. M., & Heuer, C. A. (2009). The stigma of obesity: A review and update. In *Obesity* (Vol. 17, Issue 5, pp. 941–964). https://doi.org/10.1038/oby.2008.636

Roehling, M., Roehling, P., & Wagstaff, M. (2013). Sex Differences in Perceived Weight-Based Employment Discrimination When Weight Discrimination is Illegal. *Employee Responsibilities & Rights Journal*, *25*(3), 159–176. http://10.0.3.239/s10672-013-9217-y

Rubino, F., Puhl, R. M., Cummings, D. E., Eckel, R. H., Ryan, D. H., Mechanick, J. I., Nadglowski, J., Ramos Salas, X., Schauer, P. R., Twenefour, D., Apovian, C. M., Aronne, L. J., Batterham, R. L., Berthoud, H. R., Boza, C., Busetto, L., Dicker, D., De Groot, M., Eisenberg, D., … Dixon, J. B. (2020). Joint international

consensus statement for ending stigma of obesity. *Nature Medicine*, *26*(4), 485–497. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0803-x

Russell-Mayhew, S., Estefan, A., Moules, N. J., Lefebvre, D., Morhun, J. M., Saunders, J. F., Wong, K., & Myre, M. (2024). The optics of weight: expert perspectives from the panopticon and synopticon. *Psychology and Health*, *39*(6), 823–837. https://doi.org/10.1080/08870446.2022.2117810

Skinner, J. (2022). *Anglo-American cultural studies*. UTB.

Sollerhed, A. C., & Bringsén, Å. (2023). Appearance between professionalism and work-related stress among marketing employees. *Work*, *75*(4), 1231–1242. https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-220307

Steele, J. (2025). The Weight of Whiteness: Fatphobia and the Psychosocial Disavowal of the Ancestral Body. *Studies in Gender and Sexuality*, *26*(2), 103–110. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/15240657.2025.2503588

Täuber, S., Mulder, L. B., & Flint, S. W. (2018). The impact of workplace health promotion programs emphasizing individual responsibility on weight stigma and discrimination. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*(NOV). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02206

Timbs, C. L., & Maranges, H. M. (2025). Does Control-Related Information Attenuate Biased Self-Control and Moral Perceptions Based on Weight? *Behavioral Sciences*, *15*(7). https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15070970

Valdez, Y., & Mejía, C. (2021). Obesidad como causa de no aptitud laboral en empresas constructoras, Lima 2011 - 2017. *Nutrición Clínica y Dietética Hospitalaria*, *41*(2).

Vartanian, L. R. (2015). Impression management and food intake. Current directions in research. *Appetite*, *86*, 74–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2014.08.021

Wan, R. (2023). Aesthetic Labor in Service Work: The Breakthroughs, Debates and Future. *Anthropology and Ethnology Open Access Journal*, *6*(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.23880/aeoaj-16000195

Warhurst, C., & Nickson, D. (2007). Employee experience of aesthetic labour in retail and hospitality. *Work, Employment and Society*, *21*(1), 103–120. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017007073622

Woodward, S. (2007). *Why Women Wear What They Wear*. Berg.

Zacher, H., & von Hippel, C. (2022). Weight-based stereotype threat in the workplace: consequences for employees with overweight or obesity. *International Journal of Obesity*, *46*(4), 767–773. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41366-021-01052-5

