Teaching Sociology
39(1) 16–26

DOI: 10.1177/0092055X10390655
http://ts.sagepub.com

Judging Books by Their Covers: Teaching about Physical Attractiveness Biases

Samantha Kwan[1] and Mary Nell Trautner[2]

Abstract

Sociologists have developed a wide range of pedagogical strategies to facilitate student learning about racial/ethnic, class, and gender inequalities. Despite the growing subdiscipline of the sociology of the body and evidence pointing to the prevalence of inequalities based on physical attractiveness, the pedagogical literature has yet to develop strategies for teaching students about biases based on physical attractiveness. In this article, the authors report on a pedagogical module that involves student evaluations of photographs (depicting individuals ranging in levels of physical attractiveness) using semantic differential scales, and discuss the results of this evaluation. The authors test for student learning outcomes through (1) a one-group pretest-posttest design and (2) an assessment survey with both qualitative and quantitative components. Because this photograph evaluation typically illustrates students' beauty biases, a discussion of these results, paired with relevant readings, provides a powerful tool for the exchange of ideas about physical attractiveness biases.

Keywords

beauty, bias, body, gender, physical attractiveness

The sociology of the body is a newly established subfield of sociology that examines a wide range of embodied dynamics including human and nonhuman bodies, human reproduction, body fluids, biotechnology, and genetics, along with theories of embodiment, changing bodies, life course and the body, and unequal bodies (American Sociological Association Section on the Sociology of the Body and Embodiment 2010). In the past few decades, sociology has begun to recognize the importance of the body as a subject of scholarly inquiry. In 1995 Sage Publications launched the journal *Body & Society,* and in 2009 the American Sociological Association (ASA) Sociology of the Body and Embodiment section was formed. Corresponding to these developments have also been changes in the classroom. Sociology of the body and related courses have now emerged in college classrooms throughout the nation. In addition, an ASA sociology of the body syllabi set (Anderson and Ferguson 2007) is available to instructors. Indeed, this climate encourages both scholarly engagement with and pedagogical instruction about the social body.

Despite these developments, a search of *Teaching Sociology* reveals only two articles that draw on the body—one that considers insights from sociologies of the body (Crowdes 2000) and one that turns to body knowledge to illustrate forms of

[1]University of Houston, Houston, TX, USA
[2]University at Buffalo, SUNY, Buffalo, NY, USA

Corresponding Author:
Samantha Kwan, Department of Sociology, University of Houston, 482 Philip G. Hoffman Hall, Houston, TX 77204, USA
Email: sskwan@uh.edu

social inequality (MacNevin 2004). Notably, the teaching and learning literature is silent about body inequalities per se and more specifically physical attractiveness or beauty bias. This is in stark contrast to the wide range of pedagogical strategies sociologists have developed to facilitate student learning about racial/ethnic, class, or gender inequalities (e.g., Harlow 2009; Kleinman, Copp, and Sandstrom 2006; Nichols, Berry, and Kalogrides 2004; Tiemann, Davis, and Eide 2006).

This silence is especially notable given long-standing evidence that individuals hold biases based on physical attractiveness or beauty. Scholars have documented how beauty is an important signifier that shapes interactions and life outcomes (see, e.g., Umberson and Hughes 1987; Webster and Driskell 1983). Similar to other diffuse status characteristics such as race or gender, beauty affects not only how individuals think about others but also how they interact with them (Berger et al. 1977; Webster and Driskell 1983). For example, people often hold biases that favor physically attractive individuals (for an overview of the literature, see Hatfield and Sprecher 1986; Kwan and Trautner 2009); meta-analyses generally confirm the existence of this beauty bias, although its documented magnitude varies by methodology (e.g., Eagly et al. 1991; Feingold 1992).

Beyond perceptions are the real effects of beauty on life outcomes. "Lookism" has meant that physically attractive people are in fact treated better in many arenas of social life. For example, researchers have examined how physical attractiveness can translate into employment rewards, including hiring, performance evaluation, and promotion (e.g., Hosoda, Stone-Romero, and Coats 2003). Researchers have even documented a correlation between appearance and earnings (Frieze, Olson, and Russell 1991; Hammermesh and Biddle 1994; Umberson and Hughes 1987). As a whole, physical attractiveness impacts a broad array of outcomes, including personal and family income, educational attainment, occupational prestige, and psychological well-being (e.g., Umberson and Hughes 1987).

Conversely, there is also ample evidence that individuals who do not conform to conventional beauty ideals experience stigma, negative treatment, and discrimination. This is particularly evident when individuals, but particularly women, do not conform to the thin ideal (e.g., McKinley 1999; Puhl and Brownell 2001; Sobal 2004). Several studies have also found that women who do not shave their legs and underarms are deemed unattractive as well as less intelligent, happy, and sociable than women who do remove body hair (e.g., Basow and Braman 1998; Tiggemann and Lewis 2004). Research on makeup illustrates a similar process of negative treatment and social sanctioning when women fail to conform to hegemonic beauty norms (e.g., Dellinger and Williams 1997).

In contrast to this large body of research on inequalities and physical attractiveness, to date there are no published pedagogical reports about physical attractiveness biases. To address this gap, we present a teaching module designed to expose students to this form of inequality. Moreover, we report, with critical reflection, the results of a one-group pretest-posttest design that formally tests the effectiveness of this module in facilitating student learning. We also report on student evaluations of this module, which we measured through a survey that included both closed- and open-ended assessments.

A LEARNING MODULE: PHOTOGRAPH EVALUATION USING SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALES

Our pedagogical module teaches students about physical attractiveness biases. The learning outcomes of this module are twofold. At the very least, we endeavor to (1) introduce students to physical attractiveness as an important status characteristic that shapes perceptions and life outcomes and (2) encourage students to reflect on any physical attractiveness biases they might personally hold. These learning outcomes provide the foundation for further exploration of related ideas. For example, with the first outcome, while our aim is to teach students about beauty as an important status characteristic, subsidiary objectives include teaching students about intersectionality and how the body intersects with other characteristics to influence social outcomes (e.g., Collins 2000; West and Fenstermaker 1995), the gendered nature of beauty ideals and its differential impact on women and men (e.g., Bordo 2003; Wolf 1991), the beauty work that individuals perform to conform to physical appearance ideals (Gimlin 2002; Kwan and Trautner 2009), and related issues of agency and cultural structure (e.g., Davis 1991; Gagné and McGaughey 2002). With the second learning

outcome, while our primary objective is to expose students to their own biases, a secondary objective is to foster a *critical* self-reflection of these biases. Potentially, this second learning outcome would lead to a reduction in individual student bias.

Our pedagogical module consisted of a photograph evaluation exercise followed by a discussion. For the class exercise, we selected 14 photographs of women.[1] We obtained photos from Web image searches[2] and categorized each woman as either conventionally physically attractive or conventionally physically unattractive. This process involved a degree of subjectivity. However, we relied on a conception of female physical attractiveness well established in the beauty literature and defined beauty primarily in terms of a Eurocentric, youthful, and thin ideal (e.g., Bordo 2003; Wolf 1991). We conferred about these photographs and solicited reactions from colleagues and students before selecting the final 14 photos. Because we had run this exercise in prior classes, we were also fortunate to have some pretested photos that students had previously categorized. We found many of the conventionally attractive photographs on beauty pageant and modeling sites. The women in these photos tended to have professionally styled hair and symmetrical features and were wearing light makeup. In contrast, the women in the conventionally unattractive photographs appeared to be wearing no makeup and had visible blemishes, naturally styled hair, and asymmetrical or somewhat exaggerated features, for example, large teeth or a big nose. Several of these photos were "before" shots for beauty makeovers.

To maintain uniformity in the overall feel of the photographs, all photos depicted, or we cropped photos to depict, women facing the camera from the shoulders up. All the women were smiling gently and none wore glasses. To ensure variation, especially in light of our diverse student populations, we included four overweight women and eight women of color—two East Asian women and six black women (two dark-skinned and four light-skinned); overweight women and women of color appeared in both the attractive and unattractive categories. In our conclusion, we discuss further the possibility of varying the characteristics of the individual depicted in the photograph. All the photos we showed were high resolution and similar in quality.

We presented the photos to students in a PowerPoint slide presentation. We used auto-timing and showed each photograph for 10 seconds followed by a black screen. Before the exercise started, we provided students with a survey and walked them through the survey instructions (see the appendix for template). The surveys asked students to evaluate each photograph using 7-point semantic differential scales. Semantic differential scales employ adjectives that are polar opposites to gauge attitudes toward a person or object (see Snider and Osgood 1969). Students were asked to provide their "immediate response" to the photograph and to not "overthink" their response. Using findings from the attractiveness bias studies described earlier as our guide, we provided students with 16 word pairs to evaluate each woman's photograph: fake-genuine, follower-leader, unhealthy-healthy, lazy-hardworking, unintelligent-intelligent, physically unattractive-physically attractive, selfish-selfless, unfriendly-friendly, wallflower-social butterfly, not dateable-dateable, untrustworthy-trustworthy, emotionally unstable-stable, unsuccessful-successful, uncaring-caring, rude-polite, and unsexy-sexy.[3] On the survey, we also collected students' demographic information.

Using the mean physical attractiveness rating score for each photograph, we discerned whether students generally rated each woman as physically attractive or unattractive—an observation that has typically confirmed our initial categorization. We grouped the three most unattractive women (as rated by the students) together and the three most attractive women (as rated by the students) together and reported group means on each semantic differential pairing. While the effectiveness of the pedagogical exercise rests in large part on whether students in fact rate attractive women more positively than physically unattractive women on certain traits (and less positively on others), our experience indicates that this is usually the case. However, if there is little difference in means (for the attractive women versus the unattractive women), this too we think is a point for interesting and critical discussion. Table 1 presents the scores from select semantic differential pairs from Trautner's Spring 2010, 300-level Sociology of Gender class ($n = 48$).[4]

While we report significant levels based on a difference of means *t*-test comparing the three most attractive women and the three least attractive women, we encourage instructors not to overprivilege these significance levels per se. Instead, we encourage instructors to approach these results as a teaching tool. In this vein, in the second component of the pedagogical module, we presented these

Table 1. Comparing (3) Least Attractive Women and (3) Most Attractive Women

	Unattractive		Attractive		Difference between the means significance level
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	
Fake-genuine	5.00	1.30	3.43	1.83	$p < .05$
Follower-leader	4.01	1.64	4.79	1.60	$p < .05$
Unhealthy-healthy	4.34	1.37	5.51	1.19	$p < .05$
Lazy-hardworking	4.61	1.23	4.45	1.26	Not significant
Unintelligent-intelligent	4.79	1.18	3.99	1.42	$p < .05$
Selfish-selfless	4.70	1.19	3.43	1.49	$p < .05$
Unfriendly-friendly	4.95	1.23	5.00	1.45	Not significant
Wallflower-social butterfly	3.65	1.66	6.15	0.94	$p < .05$
Not dateable-dateable	4.07	1.34	5.89	1.15	$p < .05$
Untrustworthy-trustworthy	4.75	1.17	3.81	1.33	$p < .05$
Emotionally unstable-stable	4.33	1.54	4.54	1.38	Not significant
Unsuccessful-successful	4.52	1.29	5.30	1.16	$p < .05$
Uncaring-caring	5.03	1.12	4.20	1.39	$p < .05$
Rude-polite	4.93	1.34	4.19	1.44	$p < .05$
Unsexy-sexy	2.94	1.27	5.93	1.17	$p < .05$

results to students for discussion and highlighted differences by attractiveness level, all of which were generally in the expected direction. For example, as Table 1 illustrates, students indicated on the 7-point semantic differential scale (where 1 = *unsuccessful* and 7 = *successful*), a mean of 4.52 for the unattractive women and a mean of 5.30 for the attractive women (suggesting that students think of attractive individuals as more successful). In the classroom discussion, we probed: Why do you think attractive people are more successful? More likely to be leaders than are unattractive people? More emotionally stable? Less genuine? More selfish?

We embedded this discussion of the results with a discussion of an assigned reading, the authors' "Beauty Work: Individual and Institutional Rewards, the Reproduction of Gender, and Questions of Agency" (Kwan and Trautner 2009). This article examines how physically attractive individuals are often perceived more positively and treated more favorably in many arenas of social life, including education, dating, and the workplace. The article also examines beauty work practices as well as the gendered nature of these practices and questions of agency. We chose to use our own work because it is a recent review of the literature that covers many of the issues that we wanted to cover in class, but we believe that any comparable reading would effectively serve the same function and elicit similar learning outcomes. Instructors could select excerpts from Rhode's (2010) book on the legal aspects of appearance discrimination or turn to several oft-cited pieces on beauty as an influential status characteristic (e.g., Umberson and Hughes 1987; Webster and Driskell 1983). Articles by Dellinger and Williams (1997) or Weitz (2001) that focus on inequalities and perceptions surrounding specific aspects of appearance, namely, makeup and hair, respectively, could also be effectively paired with this exercise.

EFFECTIVENESS OF MODULE AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

One-group Pretest-posttest Design

To evaluate the effectiveness of this learning module, we implemented an Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved one-group pretest-posttest study. This study was designed to evaluate, through pre- and posttest measures, whether students actually increased their learning about physical attractiveness biases due to the pedagogical module (defined formally as participation in the photograph evaluation and discussion of subsequent results). While this type of pre-experimental design is not without problems (see Campbell and Stanley 1963), we turned to it because of feasibility issues.[5] As methodologists observe, it is a design commonly used in organizational, clinical, and educational research (Singleton and Straits 2010). We also

gauged student learning through a follow-up evaluation survey that included both open- and closed-ended questions.

The sample reported here comes from Trautner's Spring 2010 Sociology of Gender course that consists of 60 students—56 women (93.3 percent) and 4 men (6.7 percent). The course introduces students to the social construction of sex and gender, key theories of gender acquisition, feminism and inequality, and how gender shapes various dimensions of social life, including work, body, language, sexuality, sports, and violence. The course requires students to engage a wide range of both classic and contemporary sociological and feminist scholarship (e.g., Fausto-Sterling 2000; Johnson 2005; Messner 1990; Padavic and Reskin 2002; West and Zimmerman 1987; Williams 1992). Students complete three written assignments throughout the semester on gender in advertising, gender and sports, and hegemonic masculinity.

Students ranged from 20 to 30 years of age, with a mean age of 21.7. The majority of students (42) self-identified as white (70.0 percent). For the remainder, 5 (8.3 percent) self-identified as black, 2 (3.3 percent) as Hispanic, 9 (15.0 percent) as Asian, and 2 (3.3 percent) as mixed raced. The majority also self-identified as heterosexual (57 or 95.0 percent) while a small minority identified as LGBT (3 or 5.0 percent). All but one of the students in this 300-level course were juniors or seniors. The students came from a variety of majors, mostly from sociology (23 percent), health and human services (29 percent), or other social sciences (30 percent). In addition, 42 percent had previously taken three or more sociology courses, whereas this was the first sociology course for 16 percent of students. Being that the institution is a large, public university, many students (62 percent) held part- or full-time jobs.

We measured students' understanding of physical appearance bias before and after the pedagogical module using the same instrument. We administered the pretest survey near the start of the semester, about 3 weeks before the photo evaluation. We administered the posttest survey a week after the photo evaluation. To ensure anonymity yet retain the ability to match pre- and posttest measures, we asked students to note the last four digits of their cell phone number on all surveys.[6] This 10-minute survey consisted of several basic demographic questions, followed by a series of 5-point Likert-scale statements about physical appearance biases. For example, students were asked to rate their level of agreement (where 1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *neutral*, 4 = *agree*, and 5 = *strongly agree*) with the following statements (variable name indicated in parenthesis): "Physically unattractive individuals are less likely to get a promotion or a raise than physically attractive individuals" (*promotion*); "Physically unattractive individuals are more likely to receive poor customer service than physically attractive individuals" (*customer service*); "Physically attractive individuals are more likely to succeed in school than physically unattractive individuals" (*school success*); "In general, society treats physically attractive individuals better than physically unattractive individuals" (*better treatment*); "In general, society treats physically unattractive individuals worse than physically attractive individuals" (*worse treatment*); and "Physically unattractive individuals are discriminated against in our society" (*discrimination*).

Table 2 represents the results of a paired sample *t*-test, a statistical technique commonly used to compare two population means. Specifically, in Table 2, we present the pre- and posttest means for these six Likert-scale items. As higher levels of agreement across all five variables would indicate students recognize differential treatment in favor of physically attractive individuals (1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*), we would expect a negative mean difference if students increased their understanding of (or were more willing to acknowledge) physical appearance–based discrimination. For example, with the promotion variable, recall that students were asked to rate if physically unattractive individuals are less likely to get a promotion or a raise than physically attractive individuals. As indicated in Table 2, the pretest mean was 3.11 and the posttest mean was 3.47, with a difference of .362. With the exception of the worse treatment variable, in all posttest measures students generally increased their level of agreement. We attribute the positive mean difference for this one exception to the small range in responses and the relatively high levels of agreement to begin with (i.e., the *worse treatment* pretest mean was 4.15 and the posttest mean was 4.11). Similar to better treatment (which was essentially an internal reliability check on the worse treatment variable), these means were in the 4 range. This is unlike all the other variables reported here that were in either the 3 range or even lower; for example, the pretest

Table 2. Paired Samples Difference in Means *t*-Test

	Pre- and posttest mean difference	*SD*	*t*-value	*df*	*p* value
Promotion	–.362	.942	–2.631	46	$p < .05$
Customer service	–.435	.935	–3.155	45	$p < .05$
School success	–.234	.840	–1.911	46	$p < .10$
Better treatment	–.234	.865	–1.855	46	$p < .10$
Discrimination	–.128	.850	–1.030	46	Not significant
Worse treatment	.043	.721	0.405	46	Not significant

mean of *school success* was 2.09 and the posttest mean was 2.32.

We also partly attribute the lack of significance seen with the two variables to sample size. Our sample size dropped to about 46 for most variables as some students did not participate in both the photograph evaluation and subsequent discussion of the results. These are two essential components of the learning module and what we defined as the stimulus. While we contemplated including the assigned reading as an essential component of the stimulus, because we have little control over whether students in fact completed the reading, we ensured instead that the key points of the reading were covered in the follow-up discussion. Thus, even if students participated in the pretest and posttest surveys, they were dropped from the comparison of means analysis if they did not participate in the stimulus. While we asked students to report the same four-digit ID number on all study documents, we also did a check on participation in our follow-up survey that asked students to indicate specifically in which components of the quasi-experiment they participated.

Student Feedback

We also solicited direct student feedback. Upon completion of the quasi-experiment and in a separate class period, we administered a survey consisting of several closed-ended and open-ended questions. The first survey question asked if the entire exercise (defined for them as evaluating photos and discussing the results of this evaluation along with the assigned reading) increased their general understanding of physical appearance–based biases.[7] Out of 48 students, 45 (93.8 percent) reported yes.[8] A second question asked if the entire exercise helped them to understand any physical appearance–based biases that they might personally hold: 41 (85.4 percent) reported yes.

We then asked students who answered affirmatively to either of one of these questions to explain how they thought the exercise increased their understanding. As a whole, this qualitative feedback was very positive. Students were even thankful for the learning opportunity that was described by one student as "fun." We were also encouraged to repeat the exercise in future semesters. Many students admitted that they "never even thought of," "don't normally think about," or "never realized how different people are treated based on looks." These students wrote about how the exercise made them "aware it [beauty bias] existed" and "opened [their] eyes" to this issue. Several students said that they were previously aware of these biases, but the exercise was nevertheless helpful in making them even "more" aware or knowledgeable. For example, one student said the exercise made him or her "more aware of the situation and that it occurs in many institutions, networks, and other relations throughout society." Another admitted that while he or she saw how "attractive people are treated . . . I didn't acknowledge the stigma the physically unattractive people face." This qualitative feedback illustrates that, to some extent, the large majority of students reached either a new or better understanding of physical appearance–based biases.

Many of the students also wrote that the module helped them not only to see this general bias, but their own personal biases as well. So while students said the exercise helped them "realize how biased *people* are in society" (emphasis added), 18 students commented that the exercise helped them to see their own personal biases. The following quotes are exemplary: "This exercise made me realize that many including myself, do hold biases regarding the better treatment of attractive individuals over unattractive individuals" and "By doing the photo evaluation myself, it helped me see

my own bias, because it was photo after photo, and not just one instance." We observed that student comments often referenced the photograph evaluation and differential semantic scales, indicating that biases were illuminated, as one student put it, "especially during the photo evaluation survey."

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Together, student feedback coupled with the results of the one-group pretest-posttest study suggests that the pedagogical module is a rather effective teaching tool for understanding social inequalities based on physical appearance. However, we recognize several drawbacks of this exercise as a teaching tool. The first is that this exercise does require a good deal of planning. While we do not believe that preparing this exercise requires an inordinate amount of time, the initial stage preceding classroom learning does involve photo selection, the construction and administration of a short survey instrument, and the coding and analysis of survey data. By providing part of the survey instrument as a template (see appendix), we hope to reduce instructor preparation time. In addition, the presentation of results along with the discussion of these results requires little beyond what would be ordinarily expected to prepare a class discussion. The coding of survey data is also not as time consuming as one might initially think; it took approximately an hour for a class of 60. Another way of addressing the overall workload is to use fewer photographs. In fact, in future renditions, we would use only 10 photos. In our follow-up survey, one student recommended using fewer photographs: "It was fun, educational; though put less images for it gets repetitive and loses relevance."

The analysis does require some basic statistical knowhow. Our analysis involved mostly descriptive statistics, statistical correlations, and comparison of means tests, with which we believe most instructors are familiar. However, should an instructor not feel comfortable with statistical analysis or not want to conduct such a formal photograph evaluation, we encourage adopting a qualitative version of this exercise. After selecting photos, with or without the use of a formal survey instrument, an instructor could ask students to discuss how they think about each person in terms of a list of characteristics: Why do you think the attractive person is more competent? Why do you think they are healthier? And so forth.

The process of photo selection also elicits the question of who should be depicted in the photos. We selected only women for this exercise largely to reflect our student population and because of the well-documented gendered nature of beauty ideals and physical appearance inequalities (cf. note 1). However, by excluding men, we perhaps reinforced the misguided belief that beauty and body issues are only women's issues. As one student pointed out: "It would have been nice to have a few pictures of men to evaluate, too." We thus encourage instructors to vary photographs by sex, along with other relevant characteristics such as race/ethnicity, age, and body size, something we plan to do ourselves in future iterations of the exercise. While an instructor may not want to introduce too much variation for a formal statistical analysis, such variation may be especially appropriate if he or she is adopting a qualitative version of our exercise. A qualitative adaptation with variation on multiple status characteristics might prove to be an excellent starting point for discussing the body and intersectionality.

This classroom exercise is also somewhat sensitive to time order. Our course syllabus instructed students to read the article on physical appearance bias after the photograph evaluation survey. If this did not occur, the results of the survey evaluation may have been insincere and, in many ways, reflected a social desirability effect. One student brought this to our attention in the follow-up survey: "I like the order in which we were presented the article. If we had read the article, then looked at the photos, I think the results would have been skewed." In fact, another student admitted to being biased because he or she had read the article before taking the survey: "I have to admit though that I believe some of my answers, especially on the 'semantic dirrerential [*sic*] portrait evaluation and survey' were influenced by my newly gained knowledge of the concepts in the article." While it is beyond our control when students read ahead (and we will always remain pleased when they do), the photograph evaluation is based on the premise that students have not been recently exposed to an in-depth understanding of these issues (as would be the case if they read the article in advance).

In sum, we present a classroom technique that we think is an effective teaching tool for providing students with a foundational understanding of beauty bias or "lookism." This exercise can be employed in a wide range of courses, including small- to medium-sized Introduction to Sociology,

Sociology of Gender, and Sociology of the Body classes or in discussion sections of larger-sized classes. We encourage instructors to adapt this exercise as it provides a foundation for discussing physical appearance inequalities, and we also encourage further in-depth examination of related issues such as beauty work, gendered beauty ideals, and Western beauty culture. Furthermore, we encourage instructors to explore how students react to individual photographs and the sources of these biases. We even encourage instructors, without compromising student identity, to present any interesting comparisons to students by, say, race or sex and to discuss the social significance of such results. This exercise, we think, is an important learning tool that will help students understand, and thus potentially combat, physical appearance biases.

APPENDIX

Class Exercise—Photo Evaluation

You will be shown X number of photographs. You will be given 10 seconds to examine each photo. Please evaluate each of the photos using the scales provided. Please mark off the box ☒ that you think best characterizes the individual in the photograph. Please indicate your **immediate** response. Do not "overthink" your response. A neutral/midway point has been marked for your convenience. For example, if you feel that the woman in the photograph would be characterized as quite sad, you might indicate:

		☒
Sad	□ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □	Happy
Fake	□ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □	Genuine
Follower	□ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □	Leader
Unhealthy	□ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □	Healthy
Lazy	□ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □	Hardworking
Unintelligent	□ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □	Intelligent
Physically unattractive	□ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □	Physically attractive
Selfish	□ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □	Selfless
Unfriendly	□ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □	Friendly
Wallflower	□ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □	Social butterfly
Not dateable	□ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □	Dateable
Untrustworthy	□ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □	Trustworthy
Emotionally unstable	□ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □	Emotionally stable
Unsuccessful	□ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □	Successful
Uncaring	□ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □	Caring
Rude	□ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □	Polite
Unsexy	□ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □ - - - □	Sexy

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are thankful to Scott V. Savage for his assistance during various stages of project design and analysis, University of Houston Sociology Librarian Christina Gola for her help in finding relevant literature, and Paul Durlak for his assistance with data collection and data entry. We would also like to thank the editor and reviewers for their thoughtful and helpful feedback throughout the review process.

NOTES

Reviewers for this article were, in alphabetical order: Donna King and Betsy Lucal.

1. We chose to use photographs of women because while attractiveness matters for both men and women, research shows that men are given more social latitude than women when they deviate from conventional beauty ideals (see, e.g., Conley and Glauber 2006; Deutsch, Zalenski, and Clark 1986). Thus,

physical attractiveness biases may be more likely to manifest themselves with regard to women than men. In our discussion, we encourage instructors to include photographs of men.

2. Because these photos were freely available on the Web, we do not believe that we violated any ethical or copyright standards in using them in the classroom. Also, the Institutional Review Boards at both the University of Houston and the University at Buffalo did not take issue with the use of the publicly available photos for teaching purposes.
3. We selected these pairs because a wide range of pairs would allow for a broad discussion of beauty bias. We also selected these pairs because previous research shows that some of these characteristics vary by perceived level of physical attractiveness. For example, research suggests that health care workers exhibit an anti-fat bias and endorse implicit stereotypes of obese individuals as lazy, stupid, and worthless (Schwartz et al. 2003); mental health practitioners are more likely to assign negative psychological symptoms to obese individuals (Young and Powell 1985); physically attractive individuals experience a social vitality or extraversion stereotype (Bassili 1981); and despite positive traits associated with beauty, individuals also stereotype beautiful people as self-centered (Cash and Janda 1984).
4. The results of this class are typical of the results we have seen in previous semesters. We report this specific set of results simply because it was the first semester following Institutional Review Board approval of our study. The sample size of 48 represents the number of students who attended class on the day Trautner administered the photograph evaluation.
5. Randomization is difficult to obtain in a study of this sort, and while some students did not participate in both components of the pedagogical module, thereby providing the opportunity for the possibility of a post facto control group, this potential control group was (a) small in comparison to the experimental group and (b) likely not comparable to the group that did participate in the full pedagogical module. Because of these missing components, we opted for the one-group pretest-posttest design.
6. This method was approved by both universities' Institutional Review Boards as students' cell phone numbers are not part of their permanent record. Thus, instructors do not have access to these data. Every student in the class owned a cell phone.
7. We understand that some students may have felt uncomfortable expressing criticism of this component because it included the professor's own written work. However, all feedback surveys were completely anonymous and did not ask students to comment at length upon the article. We also stressed to students that we wanted their honest opinion of the module and to not be afraid to say anything negative.
8. This includes one student who did not take seriously the entire exercise. When administering the photograph evaluation survey, Trautner asked students to indicate in writing on the evaluation if they had not taken seriously the exercise. Only one student indicated that he or she had not, and this individual also indicated no to both closed-ended survey questions. This individual was dropped from the analysis.

REFERENCES

American Sociological Association Section on Sociology of the Body and Embodiment. 2010. "Mission Statement." Retrieved May 1, 2010 (http://www.asanet.org/sections/body-embodiment.cfm).

Anderson, Erin K. and Susan J. Ferguson, eds. 2007. *Teaching the Sociology of the Body: A Collection of Syllabi, Assignments, and Other Resources*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

Bassili, John N. 1981. "The Attractiveness Stereotype: Goodness or Glamour?" *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 2(4):235-52.

Basow, Susan A. and Amie C. Braman. 1998. "Women and Body Hair: Social Perceptions and Attitudes." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 22(4):637-45.

Berger, Joseph, H. Famit Fisek, Robert Z. Norman, and Morris Zelditch, Jr. 1977. *Status Characteristics and Social Interaction: An Expectation-states Approach*. New York: Elsevier Scientific Publishing.

Bordo, Susan. 2003. *Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture, and the Body*. 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley. 1963. *Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Research*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Cash, Thomas F. and Louis H. Janda. 1984. "The Eye of the Beholder." *Psychology Today* 18(12):46-52.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

Conley, Dalton and Rebecca Glauber. 2006. "Gender, Body Mass and Socioeconomic Status: New Evidence from the PSID." *Advances in Health Economics and Health Services Research* 17:253-75.

Crowdes, Margret S. 2000. "Embodying Sociological Imagination: Pedagogical Support for Linking Bodies to Minds." *Teaching Sociology* 28(1):24-40.

Davis, Kathy. 1991. "Remaking the She-devil: A Critical Look at Feminist Approaches to Beauty." *Hypatia* 6(2):21-43.

Dellinger, Kirsten and Christine L. Williams. 1997. "Makeup at Work: Negotiating Appearance Rules in the Workplace." *Gender & Society* 11(2):151-77.

Deutsch, Francine M., Carla M. Zalenski, and Mary E. Clark. 1986. "Is There a Double Standard of Aging?" *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 16(9):771-85.

Eagly, Alice H., Richard D. Ashmore, Mona G. Makhijani, and Laura C. Longo. 1991. "What Is Beautiful Is Good, But . . . : A Meta-analytic Review of Research on the Physical Attractiveness Stereotype." *Psychological Bulletin* 110(1):109-28.

Fausto-Sterling, Anne. 2000. *Sexing the Body: Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality*. New York: Basic Books.

Feingold, Alan. 1992. "Good-looking People Are Not What We Think." *Psychological Bulletin* 111(2): 304-41.

Frieze, Irene Hanson, Josephine E. Olson, and June Russell. 1991. "Attractiveness and Income for Men and Women in Management." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 21(13):1039-1057.

Gagné, Patricia and Deanna McGaughey. 2002. "Designing Women: Cultural Hegemony and the Exercise of Power among Women Who Have Undergone Elective Mammoplasty." *Gender & Society* 16(6):814-38.

Gimlin, Debra. 2002. *Body Work: Beauty and Self-image in American Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hammermesh, Daniel S. and Jeff E. Biddle. 1994. "Beauty and the Labor Market." *American Economic Review* 84(5):1174-94.

Harlow, Roxanna. 2009. "Innovations in Teaching Race and Class Inequality: 'Bittersweet Candy' and the 'Vanishing Dollar.'" *Teaching Sociology* 37(2):194-204.

Hatfield, Elaine and Susan Sprecher. 1986. *Mirror, Mirror: The Importance of Looks in Everyday Life*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hosoda, Megumi, Eugene F. Stone-Romero, and Gwen Coats. 2003. "The Effects of Physical Attractiveness on Job-related Outcomes: A Meta-analysis of Experimental Studies." *Personnel Psychology* 56(2):431-62.

Johnson, Allan G. 2005. *The Gender Knot: Unraveling Our Patriarchal Legacy*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Kleinman, Sherryl, Martha Copp, and Kent Sandstrom. 2006. "Making Sexism Visible: Birdcages, Martians, and Pregnant Men." *Teaching Sociology* 34(2):126-42.

Kwan, Samantha and Mary Nell Trautner. 2009. "Beauty Work: Individual and Institutional Rewards, the Reproduction of Gender, and Questions of Agency." *Sociology Compass* 3(1):49-71.

MacNevin, Audrey L. 2004. "Embodying Sociological Mindfulness: Learning about Social Inequality through the Body." *Teaching Sociology* 32(3): 314-21.

McKinley, Nita Mary. 1999. "Ideal Weight/Ideal Women: Society Constructs the Female." Pp. 97-115 in *Weighty Issues: Fatness and Thinness as Social Problems*, edited by J. Sobal and D. Maurer. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Messner, Michael. 1990. "Boyhood, Organized Sports, and the Construction of Masculinities." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 18(4):416-44.

Nichols, Laura, Joshua Berry, and Demetra Kalogrides. 2004. "Hop on the Bus: Driving Stratification Concepts Home." *Teaching Sociology* 32(2):213-21.

Padavic, Irene and Barbara Reskin. 2002. *Women and Men at Work*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Puhl, Rebecca and Kelly D. Brownell. 2001. "Bias, Discrimination, and Obesity." *Obesity Research* 9(12):788-805.

Rhode, Deborah L. 2010. *The Beauty Bias: The Injustice of Appearance in Life and Law*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schwartz, Marlene B., Heather O'Neal Chambliss, Kelly D. Brownell, Steven N. Blair, and Charles Billington. 2003. "Weight Bias among Health Professionals Specializing in Obesity." *Obesity Research* 11(9):1033-39.

Singleton, Royce A. and Bruce C. Straits. 2010. *Approaches to Social Research*. 5th ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Snider, James G. and Charles E. Osgood, eds. 1969. *Semantic Differential Technique: A Sourcebook.* Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Sobal, Jeffery. 2004. "Sociological Analysis of the Stigmatisation of Obesity." Pp. 187-204 in *A Sociology of Food and Nutrition: The Social Appetite*, edited by J. Germov and L. Williams. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Tiemann, Kathleen A., Karen Davis, and Terri L. Eide. 2006. "What Kind of Car Am I? An Exercise to Sensitize Students to Social Class Inequality." *Teaching Sociology* 34(4):398-403.

Tiggemann, Marika and Christine Lewis. 2004. "Attitudes toward Women's Body Hair: Relationship with Disgust Sensitivity." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 28(4):381-87.

Umberson, Debra and Michael Hughes. 1987. "The Impact of Physical Attractiveness on Achievement and Psychological Well-being." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50(3):227-36.

Webster, Murray, Jr. and James E. Driskell. 1983. "Beauty as Status." *American Journal of Sociology* 89(1):140-65.

Weitz, Rose. 2001. "Women and Their Hair: Seeking Power through Resistance and Accommodation." *Gender & Society* 15(5):667-86.

West, Candace and Sarah Fenstermaker. 1995. "Doing Difference." *Gender & Society* 9(1):8-37.

West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender & Society* 1(2):125-51.

Williams, Christine L. 1992. "The Glass Escalator: Hidden Advantages for Men in the 'Female' Professions." *Social Problems* 39(3):253-67.

Wolf, Naomi. 1991. *The Beauty Myth*. New York: Harper Collins.

Young, Laura M. and Brian Powell. 1985. "The Effects of Obesity on the Clinical Judgments of Mental Health Professionals." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 26(3):233-246.

BIOS

Samantha Kwan is an assistant professor of sociology and a women's studies faculty affiliate at the University of Houston where she teaches research methods, sociology of the body, and sociology of gender. She is coeditor, with Chris Bobel, of *Embodied Resistance: Challenging the Norms, Breaking the Rules* (forthcoming, Vanderbilt University Press). Her recent articles appear in *Feminist Formations*, *Qualitative Health Research*, and *Sociological Inquiry*.

Mary Nell Trautner is an assistant professor at the University at Buffalo, SUNY, where she teaches sociology of gender, sociology of law, and criminology. Her areas of research interest include sociology of law; gender, sexuality, and the body; and labor and organizations. Her most recent articles appear in *American Sociological Review*, *Symbolic Interaction*, and *Research in the Sociology of Work*.