Published in final edited form as:

Obes Res Clin Pract. 2014 ; 8(6): e599–e607. doi:10.1016/j.orcp.2013.11.003.

The Influence of Plaintiff's Body Weight on Judgments of Responsibility: The Role of Weight Bias

Darrell E. White II¹, Carissa B. Wott¹, and Robert A. Carels^{1,2}

¹Department of Psychology, Bowling Green State University

Abstract

Problem—The current study investigated the influence of a plaintiff's weight and the location of an accident on a simulated jury's perceptions of plaintiff's personal responsibility for an accident.

Methods—Participants were 185 lean and overweight male and female adults (mean self-reported body mass index: 24.87 ± 5.45) who read one of three vignettes describing an accident that occurred while leaving one of three different establishments (fast food burger restaurant; fitness gym; department store) while viewing one of two silhouettes of the alleged plaintiff (a lean female; an obese female).

Results—Participants were significantly more likely to report the plaintiff's weight entered into their perceptions of personal responsibility when they viewed the overweight plaintiff compared to the thin plaintiff. As respondent's self-reported weight bias increased, participants were more likely to hold the plaintiff responsible and more likely to blame plaintiff characteristics for the accident.

Conclusion—The weight of a plaintiff may affect juror perceptions of personal responsibility particularly if the juror possesses self-reported weight bias.

Keywords

weight bias; anti-fat attitudes; courtroom discrimination; perceptions of responsibility; juror discrimination in the courtroom

Weight stigma is widespread and is related to unfair and harmful treatment towards overweight and obese individuals in nearly all domains of life (1-5). Obese people experience stigma in interpersonal relationships as well as employment, medical, health care, and educational settings (4). Similarly, qualitative research suggests that individuals with obesity often report subtle forms of stigma (e.g., scrutinizing gazes of their shopping cart; having to request a seatbelt extender on an airline) that have powerful impacts on their

health and well-being (6). Additionally, obese individuals often blame themselves for being obese, rarely challenge the stigma, and often avoid potentially stigmatizing situations (6).

Despite instructions to be objective and unbiased, research indicates that juries are easily influenced by plaintiff characteristics (7,8). The sex of the defendant is a factor that alters jury decision making. For example, female defendants receive less severe punishments compared to male defendants. (9). Physical attractiveness also alters juror decision making. Physically attractive defendants are less likely to be convicted and receive less severe punishment relative to less attractive defendants (9). In fact, juries tend to exact more severe punishment on people whom they consider different than themselves. This has been labeled an “in group” versus “out group” bias. Juries are more punitive toward people who are in their “out group” on categories, such as race, gender, religion, etc. (10,11). These findings on jury bias are consistent with a large body of evidence showing that when people assign an individual to a certain class or group (e.g., race, obese), they unconsciously and automatically assign stereotypical characteristics of the group to the individual (12). This automatic and unconscious assignment of personality attributes can bias their judgments in legal proceedings or otherwise. Whether weight bias is something that can alter juror decision making is currently an area that is under-researched (4).

The current investigation examined the role of weight bias in legal cases. To our knowledge, there has been one study to date examining how weight bias impacts jury perception (13). In a criminal law jury simulation study, Schvey, Puhl, Levandoski and Brownell (13) found that for male respondents making judgments about female defendants, the weight of the defendant increased their perceived level of guilt. The current investigation extends research on weight bias into the realm of civil law. The study was designed to examine whether the weight of the plaintiff influenced how “responsible” the jury believes that person is for their injuries in a setting where comparative or contributory negligence is raised. The primary research question to be answered is: Does the weight of a plaintiff in a civil lawsuit influence the jury’s view of responsibility on the part of the plaintiff when comparative or contributory negligence is raised, if the facts of the lawsuit remain constant, but the weight of the plaintiff varies between subjects? It was hypothesized that an overweight plaintiff would be judged as more “responsible” for an accident than a non-overweight plaintiff in the same situation.

Additionally, beyond the plaintiff’s weight, this investigation was designed to examine whether “context” (i.e., location) influenced judgments of plaintiff responsibility. For example, some of the most common stereotypes about obese individuals include the belief that they are lazy, sedentary, and that they overeat and do not exercise (4). Therefore, we wanted to examine whether judgments of responsibility were influenced by whether an alleged accident occurred in a stereotype consistent, neutral, or inconsistent setting. The settings for an alleged accident to occur were a: 1) fast-food, burger restaurant (stereotype consistent setting), 2) fitness center (stereotype inconsistent setting), and 3) department store (neutral setting). We wanted to examine whether an overweight individual being injured while leaving a presumably unhealthy, fast food restaurant was more likely to be judged harshly than an obese individual leaving a department store or fitness setting. While it is possible that an obese person might be viewed favorably for being at a fitness center, we

were equally open to the possibility that the obese person might be criticized for “being there in the first place.” Therefore, it was hypothesized that when the subjects were provided with a vignette containing an overweight plaintiff, and the case played upon stereotypes commonly associated with obese people (e.g., an overweight individual leaving an unhealthy, fast food restaurant), that the responsibility for the accident assessed to the plaintiff would be significantly higher than the responsibility for the accident assessed to an overweight plaintiff in a neutral or stereotype inconsistent situation. Finally, while weight bias is widespread, differing levels of bias among individuals may influence perceptions of responsibility for those viewing the overweight silhouette in the vignette. Therefore, it was hypothesized that greater self-reported weight bias would be associated with greater attributions of customer responsibility among respondents to the overweight silhouette.

Previous research has suggested that women are judged more harshly for their weight and an overweight or obese female may experience more bias and discrimination than her male counterpart (4). Additionally, a recent study on jury perception in a criminal case discovered that defendant’s weight influenced jury perceptions of guilt for females, but not for males (13). Thus, in the current investigation, only female plaintiffs were described.

Methods

Materials and Methods

Participants were 185 undergraduate men and women at a Midwestern University. The study was conducted via an online survey made available to participants. Participants were compensated with class credit. Data were collected between March and May, 2013. All participants were at least 18 years of age and participation was voluntary. The mean age of the sample was 19.4 (SD = 1.9) years (range = 18-33). The mean body mass index was 24.9 (SD = 5.5) kg/m^2 (range = 16.6-53.8). The sample was predominantly female (75.7%) and identified their marital status as “single” (93.4%). The majority of the sample identified their racial/ethnic background as Caucasian (78.9%) while 11.9% identified as Black, 2.7% identified as Asian or Pacific Islander, and 3.2% of the sample identified as “other” (most commonly reporting bi-racial).

Procedures

All self-report questionnaires were completed by all participants online. Access to the questionnaires required the participants to provide informed consent and indicate willingness to participate. Personal identifying information was collected for the purpose of assigning class credit described above.

Case Vignette

The study was described to potential participants as an investigation to examine how juries make decisions. It was indicated that jury decision making is important because many legal cases are determined by how the jury reviews the evidence. Participants were informed that they would be asked to respond to questions regarding a short legal scenario. Following consent, participants were randomly assigned to view one of six variations of the same case. In each case participants viewed a silhouette of the plaintiff and a brief description of the

case. Participants were informed that the silhouette was of the plaintiff in the case vignette. The silhouette was placed directly to the left of the vignette and was viewable throughout all of the follow up questions except for the measures of weight bias. In all cases a customer was injured after slipping on ice while rushing to leave an establishment. All facts remained the same except three variations had an overweight silhouette and three variations had a thin silhouette depicting the customer. To reduce the possibility of introducing additional unintended biases, no demographic information was provided about the plaintiff. Also, in each vignette, the setting was either described as a department store, a fast-food, burger restaurant, or a fitness center. Thus, the six variations were: 1) obese customer - fast-food, burger restaurant ($N = 31$), 2) obese customer - fitness gym ($N = 30$), 3) obese customer - department store ($N = 30$), 4) normal weight customer - fast-food, burger restaurant ($N = 32$), 5) normal weight customer - fitness gym ($N = 31$), and 6) normal weight customer - department store ($N = 31$).

The vignette explained a layman's understanding of contributory/comparative negligence, namely, that the degree of responsibility that should be assigned to the customer or the establishment for the injuries sustained by the person who fell must be determined in court. We used the layman's definition of contributory/comparative negligence and the intuitive definition of responsibility to measure someone's *prima facie* attitudes toward the plaintiff before being introduced to any legal jargon. Our purpose was not to educate on the legal distinctions between contributory and comparative negligence, but rather our purpose was to see how weight bias influenced juror perceptions and decisions.

Vignette follow-up questions

Participants indicated their perception of how responsible the plaintiff was for her injuries on a scale from 0-100%. Next, participants were asked, based upon the facts of the case, which of 10 factors played a role in their decision regarding responsibility (customer's weight; customer was clumsy; customer rushing; customer not wearing boots; customer not prepared for bad weather; establishment not prepared for bad weather; type of establishment; establishment unsafe; establishment didn't check for ice; establishment did not put down salt), on a five point scale from "Not at all" to "Very much." Next, participants were asked if they had to assign full responsibility to one party, would it be the "customer" or the "business?" Also, it was indicated that the female was asking for \$100,000 to pay for damages and respondents were asked to provide an open-ended response for how much compensation they believed she should receive.

Measures

Participants provided demographic information and completed several self-report measures. The measures were administered in the order presented below.

Demographic measure

Participants were asked questions regarding their gender, age, race, relationship status, education, current self-reported weight and height, and whether they considered themselves to be overweight. Participants' BMI was calculated from their self-reported height and weight.

Weight bias measures

After completing the case vignette follow up questions, the participants filled out two weight bias indicator measures. Those measures included the following:

The Beliefs About Obese Persons Scale—The Beliefs About Obese Persons Scale (BAOP; 14) is an 8-item, 6-point Likert –response scale that measures beliefs about how much an obese individual is in control of his/her weight, and whether obesity is caused by factors within or outside of an individual’s control. For example, one of the items is: “Obesity is really caused by a lack of willpower.” Higher scores reflect a stronger belief that obesity is caused by factors *outside* of an individual’s control. The BAOP has been shown to have adequate psychometric properties in adult populations. Coefficient alphas range from 0.65 to 0.82 (14). In the current investigation, Cronbach’s alpha was 0.58.

Anti-fat Attitudes Scale—Crandall’s Anti-fat Attitudes Scale (AFA; 2) was used to assess explicit anti-fat attitudes. This scale has three subscales. The Dislike subscale measured participants’ level of dislike for overweight individuals. The Fear of Fat subscale assessed participants’ own anxiety related to gaining weight and negative associations towards personally becoming fat. The Willpower subscale measured the participants’ belief that obese individuals are in control of and are responsible for their weight. Participants answered on a ten point Likert scale ranging from 0 (“very strongly disagree”) to 9 (“very strongly agree”). Higher scores indicate greater dislike of overweight individuals, greater personal fear of becoming fat, and greater belief in the controllability of weight, respectively. Cronbach’s alphas for the Dislike, Fear of Fat and Willpower subscales were all acceptable ($\alpha = .85$; $\alpha = .87$; $\alpha = .75$, respectively).

Statistical Analysis

One way analysis of variance and chi-square tests were used to assess baseline differences between the six conditions, between those who viewed the obese silhouette versus the thin silhouette, and male and female participants. Multivariate and univariate ANOVA’s were used to test the hypothesis that participants would assign more responsibility to the obese individual as compared to the thin individual, and to determine the effects of establishment location on perceptions of responsibility. Finally, Pearson correlations were used to assess the relationship between baseline weight bias and perceptions of customer responsibility. All statistical tests were conducted using two-tailed probability tests.

Results

Baseline differences

Upon examination for normality, two variables, AFA-Dislike and AFA-Fear of fat, had non-normal distributions. Log10 transformations were performed and the transformed variables were used in subsequent analyses. One way ANOVA and Chi square analyses were used to test baseline differences between the six groups on demographic variables. No significant differences were discovered between groups on participant age, gender, marital status, BMI, and racial/ethnic background (See Table 1).

Baseline differences were also assessed for differences between male and female participants. No significant differences were found for the demographic variables or weight bias measures with the exception of the AFA-Fear of Fat scale. Females' scores on this measure ($M = 18.46$, $SD = 7.58$) were significantly higher than males ($M = 11.83$, $SD = 6.75$; $F(2,182) = 8.53$, $p < .01$) indicating that the female participants had a greater fear of gaining weight than male participants. The relationships between participant BMI and weight bias measures were examined using Pearson correlations. Participant BMI was positively associated with BAOP scores ($r = .21$, $p < .01$) and negatively associated with Willpower scores ($r = -.20$, $p < .01$). Thus, higher BMI was associated with greater perceptions that weight is outside of one's control.

Silhouette weight and accident location on perceptions of responsibility

Multivariate and univariate ANOVAs were used to examine customer responsibility based on weight status (thin; overweight) and location (fast food burger restaurant; fitness gym; department store; See Table 2). No covariates were used in the subsequent models. The first model included percentage customer responsibility and beliefs about who should be assigned full responsibility if forced to make the choice (customer or establishment) as the dependent variables and silhouette weight (thin; overweight) and location (fast food burger restaurant; fitness gym; department store) as the predictor variables. Neither silhouette weight nor location significantly predicted the percentage of responsibility assigned to the customer, or to whom participants assigned full responsibility for the accident (customer or establishment).

The amount of compensation participants believed the customer was entitled to receive was included as a dependent variable in a separate model because 40 participants provided qualitative rather than quantitative responses (e.g., "the customer deserves the cost of medical bills + 10%") and could not be included in the analysis. Neither silhouette weight, nor location predicted the amount of compensation awarded to the customer. In addition, multivariate ANOVA was used to examine the factors that were associated with perceptions of responsibility. The five customer variables and five establishment variables (see vignette follow up questions above) were included as dependent variables and weight status (thin; overweight) and location (fast food burger restaurant; fitness gym; department store) were included as predictor variables. Silhouette weight predicted customer weight, $F(1,169) = 7.21$, $p = .00$, $\eta^2 = .06$. Thus, participants were more likely to say that the customer's weight influenced their decision on responsibility when they were presented with an obese silhouette as compared to a thin silhouette. Silhouette weight did not predict any other customer or establishment variables. Location only predicted one establishment variable, namely perceptions that the establishment was unsafe, $F(2, 169) = 3.1$, $p = .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$. Post hoc tests indicate that perceptions that the establishment was unsafe were rated as more important for the burger restaurant ($M = 3.4$, $SD = 1.6$) than for the fitness gym ($M = 2.7$, $SD = 1.4$), $p = .01$. The interaction of silhouette weight and location did not predict any customer or establishment variables.

Weight bias and customer responsibility for the obese silhouette

It was hypothesized that greater weight bias might influence attributions of customer responsibility among participants responding to the overweight silhouette. Therefore, partial correlations, controlling for participant BMI (collapsed across locations) were conducted to determine if any of the bias measures were associated with ratings of responsibility and the factors that may have influenced their decisions on customer and establishment responsibility (See Table 3). As seen in Table 3, BAOP scores were negatively correlated with three out of the five customer variables (customer was rushing, customer was not wearing boots, and customer was not prepared), as well as the belief that the establishment was unsafe, indicating that a stronger belief that one is in control of his or her own weight (lower BAOP score) was associated with attributing more importance to customer variables, and decreased importance to perceptions of establishment safety as deciding factors for determining responsibility. Moreover, AFA - Dislike scores were significantly correlated with the percentage of responsibility assigned to the customer, as well as customer weight as factors that influenced decisions on responsibility. Specifically, a higher level of dislike for obese individuals was associated with higher importance placed on customer weight as a determining factor in perceptions of customer responsibility. Finally, AFA - Willpower scores were significantly correlated with percentage responsibility, perceptions that the customer was rushing and perceptions the customer was not prepared for the weather. Thus, a stronger belief that one can control their weight through willpower was associated with stronger belief in customer responsibility. Thus, it appears that baseline weight bias was associated with a sense of customer responsibility in general, as stronger weight bias scores were associated with stronger beliefs in customer responsibility.¹

Discussion

Despite widespread evidence of weight prejudice in nearly all domains of life (employment, medical, health care, and educational settings; (4), very little research has examined whether weight bias is related to perceptions of a defendant's guilt or a plaintiff's responsibility in legal proceedings. Nevertheless, research indicates that, despite instructions to be objective and unbiased, juries are easily influenced by plaintiff characteristics, such as gender, race, attractiveness, etc. (7). In one of the few studies examining weight and jury perceptions, Schvey, Puhl, Levandoski, and Brownell (13) found that for a female defendant accused of check fraud, the weight of the defendant increased her perceived level of guilt among male respondents. To our knowledge, the current study is the first to examine the impact of a plaintiff's weight on perceptions of responsibility in a civil law negligence setting. In addition, this investigation examined whether the "setting" that the alleged accident

¹It was not expected that weight bias would have a substantial impact on perceptions of responsibility for the thin silhouette, however, for comparison, post hoc partial correlations (controlling for participant BMI) were also examined for the thin silhouette to demonstrate that bias measures were not associated with factors that influenced ratings of customer responsibility. Willpower scores were negatively associated with assignment of full responsibility ($r = -.23$, $p = .04$) such that the more one believed in personal responsibility for weight, the more likely they were to assign the customer as responsible. None of the weight bias measures were associated with the percentage responsibility assigned to the customer. Only two correlations between bias measures and customer variables was significant (Willpower and customer clumsy, $r = .25$, $p = .03$; Willpower and customer rushing, $r = .22$, $p = .05$). Similarly only one correlation between bias measures and establishment variables was significant (Willpower and type of establishment; $r = .26$, $p = .02$). Thus, as expected, while weight bias was associated with many factors that influenced perceptions of responsibility for those who viewed the obese silhouette, these relationships were not observed in the thin silhouette condition.

occurred (i.e., fast food burger restaurant, fitness gym, department store) influenced perceptions of customer responsibility. In other words, we were interested in determining whether an accident occurring in a setting consistent with prevailing stereotypes (e.g., an overweight person being injured leaving a fast-food burger restaurant) would adversely influence perceptions of the plaintiff's responsibility.

Respondents were statistically more likely to report that the customer's weight influenced their perception of the customer's responsibility for the accident in the heavier compared to the thin condition. Nevertheless, despite this relationship, there was only modest evidence of an across the board effect of plaintiff weight on perceived percentage responsibility for the accident (50% overweight versus 45% thin) and the difference was not statistically significant. The lack of statistical difference between conditions was likely attributable, at least in part, to the significant variability observed in the reported perceived percentage responsibility for the accident ($SD = 22-24\%$; range 0-100% regardless of silhouette weight). Several factors may account for this variability. First, the vignette was written to be purposefully ambiguous as to whether the plaintiff or defendant was responsible for the accident, leaving considerable room for varying interpretations. Second, a number of other important individual difference factors (e.g., Just World Beliefs) not accounted for in this investigation may have influenced the respondents rating of responsibility. Research indicates that strong Just World Beliefs are associated with higher levels of perceived responsibility (15). Beyond the observed variability, a similar investigation by Schvey et al. (13) found an effect only among males. Given that only 23.8% of the respondents in this investigation were males, the observed associations may have been attenuated.

Additionally, it was hypothesized that when the subjects were provided with a case containing an overweight plaintiff and the vignette played upon stereotypes commonly associated with obese people (e.g., an overweight individual leaving an unhealthy, fast food restaurant), that the responsibility for the accident assessed to the overweight plaintiff would be significantly higher than the responsibility for the accident assessed to an overweight plaintiff in a neutral or stereotype inconsistent situation. We found no evidence for weight by location effects. Therefore, while overweight plaintiffs were generally seen as more responsible and their weight was more often cited as a contributing factor to their responsibility for the accident, the setting of the accident appeared to have little bearing on judgments of responsibility. Perhaps, other stereotypes about obese individuals, such as they are unathletic and clumsy, overshadowed the effect of accident location. Also, individuals may have attended more closely to aspects of the case (e.g., customer rushing; no salt on cement) other than location. Finally, it is possible that while obese individuals are commonly believed to overeat high fat foods this stereotype may have little bearing on the respondents' perceptions of personal responsibility for an accident.

The strongest evidence for weight bias influencing perceptions of customer responsibility in this investigation came when examining the associations between levels of self-reported weight bias and perceived customer responsibility among people responding to the overweight silhouettes. In analyses examining the association between levels of weight bias, percent customer responsibility and factors that influenced perceptions of responsibility, respondents with greater weight bias were much more likely to blame the customer than the

establishment. First, people possessing a greater dislike of obese persons, were not only more likely to assign greater percent responsibility to the overweight customer, but also indicated that the customer was clumsy, not prepared, and that their weight influenced their judgments of responsibility. Second, people possessing a greater belief that weight is controllable were not only more likely to assign greater percentage responsibility to the overweight customer, but also indicated that the customer was rushing, not prepared, and not wearing boots as factors influencing decisions of responsibility. In fact, 10 out of 18 potential correlations associating greater dislike for obese individuals and greater belief that weight is controllable to increased attributions of customer responsibility were significant. These findings suggest that jury bias towards overweight and obese individuals may be most prevalent among those who have negative pre-existing attitudes toward obese individuals.

Despite some interesting findings, the study is not without notable limitation. First, this sample of undergraduate university students is unlikely to be representative of most juries in civil trials which represent a relatively random selection of people from a particular community primarily compiled from voter registrations and driver license/state ID renewals. Replication with a more representative cross-section of community adults will be important. Second, it is limited by its reliance on online questionnaire assessments of responsibility which may not reflect actual behavior or reasoning in legal proceedings. Third, the silhouettes lacked ecological validity and a manipulation check was not performed on the images. However, the silhouettes used in this investigation were selected for their noticeably different body types. Further, given that validated measures of weight bias correlated primarily with the obese silhouette, this provides further evidence that the participants accurately differentiated the images as obese and non-obese. Fourth, the internal consistency of the BAOP measure was low ($\alpha = 0.58$). This finding is consistent with previous research utilizing the BAOP (e.g., $\alpha = .65$; 14). Nevertheless, the BAOP was reliably and significantly correlated with a number of obese plaintiff personal responsibility variables. Fifth, given that research reveals that people with other physical handicaps/conditions are also subject to stigma (16), future research should examine whether the existence of any physical condition, not just weight, increases perceptions of plaintiff responsibility. Sixth, the idiosyncratic nature of the legal situation suggests that replication with a larger sample is warranted. Finally, a similar investigation by Schvey et al. (13) found an effect only among males. However, given the limited number of male participants (44 in total) split across multiple conditions, this study lacked the power to detect meaningful and reliable gender differences.

Results of the current study are consistent with a growing body of research which suggests that juries are influenced by plaintiff characteristics. The findings from this investigation indicate that under identical conditions, participants were significantly more likely to report the customer's weight entered into their perceptions of personal responsibility when they viewed the overweight plaintiff compared to the thin plaintiff. In addition, as self-reported weight bias increased, respondents were more likely to hold the customer responsible and more likely to blame customer characteristics for the fall. Despite instructions to be objective and unbiased, it might be beneficial to caution jurors that common stereotypes about weight, gender, race, etc. can sometimes bias objectivity and influence jury verdicts. While some judges spend time giving juries instructions to resist bias, it is unclear if this is a

common practice (17). Given that a stronger belief that weight is controllable was positively correlated with plaintiff blame, it may be beneficial to remind jurors about the complex etiology/biological causes of obesity and to caution them about making unfavorable attributions about character based on an individual's weight. These findings suggest that legal settings are not immune from weight bias and that juries may struggle to be objective in criminal and civil proceedings where the plaintiff/defendant is overweight, particularly if a jurist possesses preexisting weight bias. Future research might benefit from examining whether attributions of guilt and responsibility are lessened when juries are made aware of the potential for weight bias to influence judgments.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Darcelle D. White, J.D., for her careful reading and helpful suggestions on this manuscript.

References

- (1). Cramer P, Steinwert T. This is good, fat is bad: How early does it begin? *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*. 1998; 19(3):606–11.
- (2). Crandall CS. Prejudice against fat people: Ideology and self-interest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1994; 66(5):882–94. [PubMed: 8014833]
- (3). Klesges RC, Klem ML, Hansoon CL, Eck LH, Ernst J, et al. The effects of applicant's health status and qualifications on simulated hiring decisions. *International Journal of Obesity*. 1990; 14(6):527–35. [PubMed: 2401589]
- (4). Puhl RM, Heuer CA. The stigma of obesity: A review and update. *Obesity*. 2009; 17(5):1–24.
- (5). Teachman BA, Brownell KD. Implicit anti-fat bias among health professionals: Is anyone immune? *International Journal of Obesity*. 2001; 25:1525–31. [PubMed: 11673776]
- (6). Lewis S, Thomas SL, Warwick Blood R, Castle DJ, Hyde J, Komesaroff PA. How do obese individuals perceive and respond to the different types of obesity stigma that they encounter in their daily lives? A qualitative study. *Social Science in Medicine*. 2011; 73:1349–56.
- (7). Parker W. Juries, race, and gender: A story of today's inequality. *Wake Forest Law Review*. 2011; 46:209–40.
- (8). Kerr NL, Hymes RW, Anderson AB, Weathers JE. Defendant-juror similarity and mock juror judgments. *Law and Human Behavior*. 1995; 19:545–67.
- (9). Efran MG. The effect of physical appearance on the judgment of guilt, interpersonal attraction, and severity of recommended punishment in a stimulated jury task. *Journal of Research and Personality*. 1974; 8:45–54.
- (10). Bodenhausen GV. Stereotypic biases in social decision making and memory: Testing process models of stereotype use. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1988; 55:726–37. [PubMed: 3210142]
- (11). Sommers SR, Ellsworth PC. Race in the courtroom: Perceptions of guilt and dispositional attributions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2000; 26:1367–79.
- (12). Stangor C, Lynch L, Duan C, Glass B. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1992; 62(2):207–18.
- (13). Schvey NA, Puhl RM, Levandoski KA, Brownell KD. The influence of a defendant's body weight on perceptions of guilt. *International Journal of Obesity*. 2013 In press.
- (14). Allison DB, Basile VC, Yuker HE. The measurement of attitudes toward and beliefs about obese persons. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*. 1991; 10(5):599–607.
- (15). Hafer CL, Begue L. Experimental research on Just-World Theory: Problems, developments, and future challenges. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2005; 131(1):128–67. [PubMed: 15631556]
- (16). Susman J. Disability, stigma, and deviance. *Social Science in Medicine*. 1994; 38:15–22.

- (17). Kang J, Bennett M, Carbado D, Casey PDN, Faigman D, Godsil R, et al. Implicit bias in the courtroom. *UCLA Law Review*. 2012; 59:1124–86.

Table 1

Participant Demographics by Condition

	Thin Silhouette			Obese Silhouette			
	Burger Restaurant n = 32	Fitness Gym n = 31	Department Store n = 31	Burger Restaurant n = 31	Fitness Gym n = 30	Department Store n = 30	Total
Mean age	19.4 (1.3)	19.6 (2.6)	19.6 (1.2)	19.5 (2.9)	18.9 (0.8)	19.5 (1.5)	19.4 (1.9)
Mean BMI	25.1 (5.8)	25.9 (5.1)	23.4 (4.2)	26.1 (7.6)	24.8 (4.2)	24.0 (4.8)	24.9 (5.4)
% female	71.8	74.2	77.4	77.4	67.7	86.7	75.7
% Caucasian	84.4	83.9	74.2	83.9	63.3	83.3	78.9

* = p .05;

** = p .01

Table 2
Means and SD of Customer Responsibility Factors for Silhouette Weight and Type of Establishment

Responsibility Factor	Thin Silhouette				Obese Silhouette				Sil Weight		Location	
	Burger Restaurant M (SD) N	Fitness Gym M (SD) N	Department Store M (SD) N	Total M (SD) N	Burger Restaurant M (SD) N	Fitness Gym M (SD) N	Department Store M (SD) N	Total M (SD) N	F – value p	F – value p	F – value p	F – value p
Percent Responsibility – customer	45.8 (24.1) 32	42.5 (21.3) 30	49.4 (27.1) 31	45.9 (24.2) 93	49.8 (22.9) 30	50.2 (23.7) 30	48.8 (20.8) 30	49.6 (22.2) 90	F(1,168) = .1 p = .97	F(1,168) = .7 p = .41	F(2,168) = .1 p = .97	F(2,168) = .1 p = .97
Full responsibility	1.7 (.5) 32	1.6 (.5) 30	1.7 (.5) 31	1.68 (.47) 93	1.7 (.5) 30	1.7 (.5) 30	1.7 (.5) 30	1.68 (0.47) 90	F(1,168) = .5 p = .58	F(1,168) = .0 p = .7	F(2,168) = .5 p = .58	F(2,168) = .5 p = .58
Compensation	39498.7 (35022.9) 25	26153.8 (28527.1) 26	28652.2 (33791.6) 23	31438.8 (32568.9) 74	30478.3 (25880.6) 23	30229.2 (31469.1) 24	31545.5 (26648.9) 22	30731.9 (27772.3) 69	F(1,137) = .6 p = .53	F(1,137) = .0 p = .89	F(2,137) = .6 p = .53	F(2,137) = .6 p = .53
Deciding factor: Customer weight	1.3 (.8) 31	1.1 (.4) 31	1.1 (.3) 31	1.2 (.5) 93	1.6 (1.1) 31	1.6 (1.0) 29	1.6 (1.0) 28	1.6* (1.0) 88	F(1,168) = .3 p = .74	F(1,168) = 11.2 p < .01	F(2,168) = .3 p = .74	F(2,168) = .3 p = .74
Deciding factor: Customer clumsy	2.1 (1.1) 31	2.4 (1.3) 31	2.4 (1.5) 31	2.3 (1.3) 93	2.5 (1.3) 31	2.6 (1.4) 29	2.4 (1.3) 28	2.5 (1.3) 88	F(1,168) = .9 p = .34	F(1,168) = .9 p = .34	F(2,168) = .9 p = .71	F(2,168) = .9 p = .71
Deciding factor: Customer rushing	4.0 (1.2) 31	3.9 (1.3) 31	4.2 (1.2) 31	4.0 (1.2) 93	4.0 (1.2) 31	4.03 (.98) 29	4.0 (1.2) 28	4.0 (1.1) 88	F(1,168) = .1 p = .74	F(1,168) = .1 p = .74	F(2,168) = .1 p = .97	F(2,168) = .1 p = .97
Deciding factor: Customer not wearing boots	3.4 (1.5) 31	3.3 (1.4) 31	3.3 (1.5) 31	3.3 (1.5) 93	3.5 (1.5) 31	3.5 (1.3) 29	3.3 (1.4) 28	3.3 (1.4) 88	F(1,168) = .0 p = .99	F(1,168) = .0 p = .91	F(2,168) = .0 p = .99	F(2,168) = .0 p = .99
Deciding factor: Customer not prepared for weather	3.5 (1.5) 31	3.2 (1.4) 31	3.5 (1.4) 31	3.4 (1.4) 93	3.4 (1.5) 31	3.4 (1.2) 29	3.2 (1.5) 28	3.3 (1.4) 88	F(1,168) = .4 p = .52	F(1,168) = .4 p = .52	F(2,168) = .4 p = .52	F(2,168) = .4 p = .52

* = p .05;

** = p .01

Table 3
Post hoc Partial Correlations for Obese Silhouette Controlling for Participant BMI

Bias Measure	Customer % responsibility	Full responsibility	Customer weight	Customer clumsy	Customer rushing	Customer no boots	Customer not prepared	Type of estab	Estab unsafe	Estab did not check	Estab did not salt
BACOP	-.33**	.27*	-.10	-.11	-.43**	-.32**	-.37**	.00	.25*	.15	.08
AFA-dislike	.26*	-.10	.32**	.21	.12	.13	.20	.19	-.09	-.18	-.16
AFA-fear of fat	-.01	.12	-.19	-.07	.04	-.04	.04	.05	-.06	.05	.11
AFA-willpower	.26*	-.22	.11	.17	.38**	.21	.34**	.16	-.15	-.05	-.05

* = p .05;

** = p .01