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Fat Commentary and Fat Humor Presented in Visual Media: A Content Analysis

Susan Himes

ABSTRACT

In order to examine the phenomenon of fat messages presented through visual media, a content analysis was used to quantify and categorize fat-specific commentary. Fat commentary vignettes were identified using a targeted sampling procedure, and 135 scenes were excised from movies and TV shows. The material was coded by trained raters. Reliability indices were uniformly high for the seven categories (% agreement ranged from .90-.98; kappas ranged from .66-.94). Results indicated that fat commentary and fat humor is often verbal, directed toward another person, and is often presented directly in the presence of the overweight target. Results also indicated that male characters are three times more likely to engage in fat commentary or fat humor than female characters. These findings provide the first information regarding the specific gender, age, and types of fat commentary that occur frequently in movies and TV shows. The stimuli should prove useful in future research examining the role of individual difference factors (e.g., BMI) in the reaction to viewing such vignettes.
Introduction

**Fat Stigmatization**

The glorification of the thin ideal and denigration of its opposite, an overweight or obese status, has been labeled “fat stigmatization” (Neumark-Stzainer & Haines, 2004). While racism and sexism, or the endorsement of stereotypes related to these issues, appears to have decreased over the last 80 years (Bobo, 2001; Fiske, 2003), there is little evidence that “fat disparagement” is on the wane (Crandall, 1994; Robinson, Bacon, O'Reilly, 1993; Thompson, Heinberg, Altabe, & Tantleff-Dunn, 1999). Negative weight-related commentary emanating from sources such as peers, parents and romantic partners has received substantial research attention and many researchers view the media as providing the impetus and model for individuals who engage in “fat humor” (Thompson et al., 1999).

Fat stereotyping in the media begins with a culture that promotes fat stigmatization. The psychosocial consequences of obesity are numerous and emerge from cultural values emphasizing the importance of thinness (World Health Organization [WHO], 1998). Negative attitudes about body fat contribute to weight-related stigmatization (Crandall, 1994; Neumark-Sztainer & Haines, 2004). Previous research indicates that overweight individuals are often negatively stereotyped, treated differently, and face discrimination (Crandall,
Fat Stigmatization in Media

Fat stigmatization is often presented in the form of commentary and humor through entertainment media. In a series of content analyses, Fouts and colleagues (1999, 2000, 2002) examined positive and negative verbal commentary received by characters in prime-time television situation comedies. Fouts and Burggraf (1999) found that female overweight characters are underrepresented on television and that below average weight female characters receive more positive comments from male characters than overweight female characters. In a follow-up study, Fouts and Burggraf (2000) found, conversely, that the higher the weight of the female character, the more negative comments she received from male characters. In addition, Fouts and Vaughan (2002) found that although there was a higher prevalence of overweight among male characters than female characters, only 9% of males received negative comments from females regarding their weight. Importantly, Fouts and Burggraf (2000) found that audience laughter was significantly associated with men making negative comments about women’s appearance, whereas Fouts and Vaughan (2002) found no association between women’s comments on men’s appearance and audience laughter. Fouts and Vaughn (2002) argued that popular prime-time programs reinforce discriminatory behavior against women.
based on weight and size, whereas heavy males receive little punishment or rejection, indicating a thin-ideal double standard in popular media programs.

Fat stigmatization in media may influence children as well as adults. In a content analysis of children’s popular movies, Herbozo, Tantleff-Dunn, Gokee-Larose, and Thompson (2004) found that obesity was equated with negative traits (evil, unattractive, unfriendly, cruel) in 64% of the most popular children’s videos. In 72% of the videos, characters with thin bodies had desirable traits, such as kindness or happiness.

Critique of Media Literature

Although the issue of fat stigmatization is associated with negative psychosocial consequences (Neumark-Stzainer & Haines, 2004), with the exception of the few empirical analyses noted above, little quantitative work has focused on a specific content analysis of instances of such fat disparagement in the media. The work of Fouts and colleagues, although intriguing, was limited in terms of scope (narrow stimulus sampling) to an examination of 28 (Fouts & Burggraf, 1999), 36 (Fouts & Burggraf, 2000), and 27 (Fouts & Vaughn, 2002) situation comedy episodes. In a similar vein, Herbozo et al. (2004) evaluated only the top 25 children’s movies and top 20 books.

To date, a broad content analysis of movies and television designed to pinpoint fat humor vignettes has not been undertaken. Such a survey could provide information regarding the gender and age of those perpetuating and receiving negative weight-based comments, as well as yielding specifics
regarding the verbal and nonverbal nature of such instances. Additionally, a content analysis of fat humor, resulting in a reliable set of stimuli, could potentially be used in work designed to explore individual difference factors in the experience of such humor. For instance, it is possible that overweight or obese individuals may be more negatively affected by the viewing of fat humor than persons who are not overweight. Additionally, such a set of stimuli would allow for independent ratings of the humorousness of such material, revealing just which particular vignettes are rated as funny (and by whom) and what material is seen as demeaning and unacceptable.

Hypotheses

Accordingly, the present study was designed to examine and quantify forms of fat-specific commentary found in television and movie media. The purposes of the study were threefold. First, a content analysis was performed to collect fat-specific commentary and facilitate the development of a categorization scheme. Second, inter-rater reliability was calculated to examine support for assignment of commentary to specific categories. Third, chi-square tests were conducted, when indicated, to test for differential categorical effects (e.g., gender).
Method

Sampling Approach

A targeted sampling approach was utilized to obtain fat-specific commentary and humor. Material was selected using four methods: 1) a power search was conducted using an internet movie database (IMDb) to select for American movie and television plots from 1984-2004 containing the keywords “obese”, “fat”, and “overweight,” 2) T.V. sitcom guides were reviewed for weight-related plots, 3) shelves at movie rental stores were combed for possible plots and themes containing fat disparagement and, 4) films and T.V. shows were recommended by an eight member research group specializing in body image. Although content analyses are often used to investigate prevalence rates of a phenomenon, the targeted sampling approach employed in this study was not designed to index prevalence, given that the universe of TV shows and movies is of such magnitude to make such an analysis impossible. Instead, the sampling approach used in the current study was designed to locate as many fat commentary vignettes as possible, with a goal of analyzing the particularities of the social interactions (e.g., gender, age, verbal/nonverbal nature of the incident). This sampling procedure yielded 25 movies and 10 television series (see List-A and List-B).
List-A

Movies Used for Content Analysis (1984-2004)

Hannah and Her Sisters (1986)
She-Devil (1989)
Hook (1991)
Heavyweights (1995)
Major Payne (1995)
The Nutty Professor (1996)
Thinner (1996)
South Park: Bigger, Longer, and Uncut (1999)
Erin Brockovich (2000)
I’m the One that I Want with Margaret Cho (2000)
The Tao of Steve (2000)
Bridget Jones’s Diary (2001)
Harry Potter and the Sorcerer’s Stone (2001)
Monster’s Ball (2001)
On Edge (2001)
Shallow Hal (2001)
Shrek (2001)
Summer Catch (2001)
My Big Fat Greek Wedding (2002)
Raising Victor Vargas (2002)
Camp (2003)
Mean Girls (2004)

List-B

Television Programs Used for Content Analysis (1984-2004)

Growing Pains (1985-1992)
Martin (1992-1997)
King of Queens (1998-current)
Will and Grace (1998-current)
Family Guy (1999-current)
Saturday Night Live: The Best of Chris Rock (1999)
The Parkers (1999-2004)
The Tonight Show with Jay Leno (2004)
Coding Procedure

Each vignette was coded and categorized according to the following: a) gender of the commentator, b) gender of the target, c) age of the commentator (children, adolescents, adults), d) age of the target (children, adolescents, adults), e) target source (self, external individual, no specific target), f) type of comment (direct or indirect), and g) form of comment (verbal or nonverbal). Each item was entered in a media editing database (Avid Xpress Pro Version 4.3) and was pruned of any response cues following a fat comment (e.g., negative facial expressions, retorts). (Responses to commentary (e.g., upset expression) were deleted in anticipation of using the set of stimuli for participant ratings in future research, given that target responses to commentary may provide cues for the viewer to sympathize or to laugh, thus manipulating the interpretation of the commentary.) Approximately 98 hours were devoted to viewing and coding material, and roughly 72 hours were spent editing material in AVID.

Selection of Items

A total of 180 fat-specific commentary items were selected from the media sources. Two pilot sessions were conducted in which material was rated for humor. Following humor rating sessions and discussion of items, some items were deemed inappropriate for future analyses. Items were removed from further analyses for the following reasons: skinny person as the target of fat disparagement (10 items), no clear category (10 items), layering (making ethnic
or sexual orientation or age references in addition to the fat commentary) (15 items), fat empowerment commentary (3 items), bad quality of media (3 items), and item not weight-related (4 items). Following the exclusion of these items, a total of 135 vignettes were used for the content analysis.

Random Assignment of Media Stimuli

All vignettes were initially assigned to categories by the first author. Material was then coded by independent raters. Items were first assigned a number and a computer based randomizer was employed to generate random numbers whereupon vignettes were placed in random order in accordance with the numbers generated. At this point, the material was encoded on videotape in the random order. This insured that fat-commentary presented to the raters would be less likely to receive an assignment to a category based on assumptions regarding the similarities of items presented together.

Inter-Rater Reliability Procedures

Body image research lab members (four graduate students, two undergraduate students) were trained to serve as raters. Before evaluating the items, they were given descriptions for each category. The six raters completed examples with items not used in the analysis. Discrepancies were resolved and coding criteria were refined. Following the training, the raters independently coded the material without further discussion.

Inter-rater reliability was calculated for each category. Raw proportion of agreement was obtained by calculating the percentages of agreement for each of
the seven categories. In order to obtain a more conservative estimate of agreement, kappa was calculated to correct for agreement due to chance. The raw agreement percentages ranged from 90% to 98% across all categories; this indicates an excellent level of inter-rater agreement (see Table 1).

Table 1

*Inter-rater Reliability for Each Category*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Raw Proportion of Agreement</th>
<th>Kappa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Commentator</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Target</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Commentator</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Target</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Source (Self, Other, No specific target)</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type (Direct or Indirect)</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form (Verbal or Nonverbal)</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimates for kappa ranged from 66% to 94%; these estimates suggest that for the majority of categories, there was a very high level of agreement among raters (Landis & Koch, 1977). The somewhat lower kappa estimate for the category form (.66), which would be considered a substantial or good level of agreement, must be examined in conjunction with base rate information. Base rates of a phenomenon are incorporated in the kappa statistic, and the form category had a high base rate of verbal commentary (88%) vs. nonverbal commentary (7%). Therefore, rates of agreement due to chance were extremely
high (80%), which lowered kappa. Thus, the lower kappa for the category form primarily reflects lopsided base rates rather than rater disagreement.
Results

Chi-square Goodness-of-Fit tests were used to analyze data. There was a significant difference in frequency of fat commentary among commentators ($x^2 (2, N=135) = 112.93, p < .001$). Males (74%) were three times more likely to make fat comments than women (25%). There was not a significant difference in frequency of fat commentary among targets ($x^2 (1, N=135) = .197, p < .65$). Males (49%) and females (45%) were almost equally likely to become targets of fat disparagement.

There was a significant difference in frequency of fat commentary among the age groups of the commentators ($x^2 (2, N=135) = 85.18, p < .001$). Adults (70%) were most likely to make fat comments, followed by children (16%) and adolescents (13%). There was also a significant difference in frequency of fat commentary among the age groups of the targets ($x^2 (2, N=135) = 61.62, p < .001$). Adults (62%) were most likely to become the targets of fat commentary, followed by adolescents (17%) and children (15%).

Additionally, there was a significant difference in frequency of fat commentary among target sources ($x^2 (2, N=135) = 128.13, p < .001$). Targets were overwhelmingly other persons (79%), with a significantly lower number of fat comments made about oneself (10%) or about no specific target (a group of individuals) (10%). There was also a significant difference for commentary types
Direct commentary (64%), or commentary occurring in the presence of the target, was more common than indirect commentary (35%), which was commentary occurring when the target is absent.

Finally, there was a significant effect for commentary form \( (x^2 (2, N=135) = 182.71, p <.001) \). Fat commentary was overwhelmingly verbal (88%), though some types of expression were nonverbal (7%). Some individuals used a combination of both verbal and nonverbal commentary (4%).

Additional categories were created in order to further explore the implications of the analyses. Percentages of items falling into each category are reported in Table 2.
Table 2

**Frequencies of Fat Commentary Within Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Commentator</th>
<th>Gender of Target</th>
<th>Type of Comment</th>
<th>Percentage of Items in Each Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Verbal, Nonverbal</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Verbal, Nonverbal</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male children</td>
<td>Verbal, Nonverbal</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Self (male)</td>
<td>Verbal, Nonverbal</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Verbal, Nonverbal</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Verbal, Nonverbal</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male children</td>
<td>Verbal, Nonverbal</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Self (female)</td>
<td>Verbal, Nonverbal</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>Verbal, Nonverbal</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Verbal, Nonverbal</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and Female</td>
<td>No specific target</td>
<td>Verbal, Nonverbal</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Men engaged in fat commentary toward both men (37%) and women (33%) in approximately similar amounts and women also engaged in fat commentary toward both men (12%) and women (12%) in similar amounts. However, men had much higher frequencies of expressing fat commentary (74%).
Discussion

The findings from this content analysis indicate that characters often confront one another directly with fat commentary. The data also suggest that the overwhelming majority of fat-specific material is verbal as opposed to non-verbal. Another interesting finding from the content analysis is that the target source is almost always another person. Fat comments made about the self are much less common. The findings also indicate that male characters are three times more likely to engage in fat commentary or fat humor; in contrast, female characters rarely engage in fat commentary directed toward male characters. These data support previous findings of a double standard in weight-related media commentary directed toward women (Fouts & Vaughn, 2002). However, the findings of higher levels of fat commentary expressed by men than women may be due partially to higher base rates of male characters on television. Nevertheless, these findings may accurately reflect genuine differences in the gender of commentators expressing fat-specific comments in the media.

One particularly useful framework for interpreting results is Bandura’s social learning model (1965, 1977). Fouts suggested the application of social learning to understand the powerful nature of media weight-related messages that employ vicarious positive reinforcement and punishment toward television characters. The combination of (a) popular characters modeling thinness and
receiving positive reinforcement and (b) simultaneously viewing overweight characters receiving punishment in the form of negative fat commentary could (c) increase internalization of the thin ideal (Fouts & Burggraf, 1999). The combination of differential modeling and reinforcement is a very powerful means to shape behavior (Bandura, 1965, 1977). This is consistent with the sociocultural model, which maintains that the development of body image and eating problems among women is partially due to unrealistic societal standards of beauty and the role of the mass media in transmitting those messages (Fallon, 1990; Raphael & Lacey, 1992; Rodin, Silberstein, & Striegel-Morore, 1985; Thompson et al. 1999; Tiggemann & Pickering, 1996.)

One limitation of the study is the sampling procedure used to collect material. Since it is impossible to select material from the entire universe of fat commentary items in movies and television, a targeted sampling approach was employed. While this approach allowed for the collection of over 180 pieces of fat commentary, it does not allow for an examination of the actual prevalence rate of fat commentary, with respect to other interactions among TV and movie participants. Randomly recorded samplings of movies and television programs would provide such information; however, this strategy would likely be incredibly time intensive and shed little light on the specifics of fat commentary.

This content analysis has laid the foundation for other studies by identifying reliable categories of fat specific commentary. With this set of stimuli, it may now be possible in future work to have participants rate their responses to the viewing of such vignettes. By varying participants on characteristics such as
body weight, gender, ethnicity, and age, it will be possible to determine which individual difference variables moderate ratings of the humorousness of the particular categories (or even specific vignettes within category). The following questions, among others, might be addressed: Are overweight and obese persons experiencing negative affect after viewing some types of fat-specific material? Do fat-specific content messages reinforce thin ideal internalization? Do fat-specific messages contribute to problem eating behaviors?

One of the most intriguing avenues for future work is the issue of the heightened exposure to negative fat commentary for individuals for whom the experience might be the most damaging. For instance, studies indicate that a dose-response relationship exists between hours of television viewing and obesity (Dietz & Gortmaker, 1985); therefore, it is likely that overweight and obese individuals may be exposed to more negative fat commentary than non-overweight individuals, with potentially negative effects on self-esteem and body image disturbance.
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Appendix A: Measures

A-1 Coding Criteria for Fat Commentary and Fat Humor Stimuli:

Gender of commentator:  Male Female
Gender of target:  Male Female
Age of commentator:  Children (ages 0-12)
                     Adolescents (ages 13-18)
                     Adults (ages 19-65)
Age of target:  Children (ages 0-12)
                Adolescents (ages 13-18)
                Adults (ages 19-65)
Commentator source:  Comment made about self
                     Comment made to or about another person
                     Comment made about no specific person (made about a group)
Type of commentary:  direct  (comment made in the presence of the target)
                     Indirect (comment made about the target-target not present)
Form of commentary:  verbal (expressing in words)
                     nonverbal (expressing in body language)
A-2 Sample Rating Form: Fat Commentary and Fat Humor Stimuli

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Gender of commentator</th>
<th>Gender of target</th>
<th>Age of commentator</th>
<th>Age of target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example 1</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 2</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 3</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## A-2 Sample Rating Form: Fat Commentary and Fat Humor Stimuli

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Person No specific target</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Verbal Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>