Review Article

PsychOpen GOLD

Social Psychological Bulletin

An Interdisciplinary Investigation Into the Behaviors That Build (and Express) Interpersonal Trust

R. Matthew Montoya [1], Brandon Porter [2]

[1] *Department of Psychology, University of Dayton, Dayton, OH, USA.* **[2]** *Department of Psychology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, USA.*

Social Psychological Bulletin, 2025, Vol. 20, Article e12663, https://doi.org/10.32872/spb.12663

Received: 2023-08-22 • **Accepted:** 2024-11-01 • **Published (VoR):** 2025-04-24

Check for updates

Handling Editor: Piotr Winkielman, University of California San Diego, San Deigo, USA

Corresponding Author: R. Matthew Montoya, School of Psychology, Murdoch University, 90 South St., Murdoch WA 6150, Western Australia, Australia. E-mail: matt.montoya@murdoch.edu.au

Supplementary Materials: Materials [see Index of Supplementary Materials]

Abstract

The expression of specific nonverbal behaviors has been proposed to play an important role in the development of interpersonal trust. In this review, we examined the andragogical descriptions presented by 8 different disciplines for which behaviors are used to build trust. Despite drawing from largely separate source material, cross-discipline analyses revealed consistency regarding the recommended behaviors that should be used to communicate trust, including eye contact, smiling, mimicry, and maintaining physical proximity. A comparison of these behaviors with those seen in the attraction literature and parenting context further suggests that the function of such behaviors is not confined to the professional context. A model in which affiliative behaviors are used in the expression of trust and interpersonal attraction is discussed.

Keywords

trust, interpersonal relationships, andragogical methods

Highlights

- Disciplines across academia agree on the recommendations of specific behaviors—called affiliative behaviors—to develop interpersonal trust.
- Recommended affiliative behaviors align with those behaviors investigated by the psychological literature as facilitating trust.
- The affiliative behaviors identified as indicators of trust are also the behaviors linked to the behavioral expression of interpersonal attraction and seen in parent-infant interactions.

In his famous book, Dale Carnegie (1936/2009) recommended engaging in a number of behaviors to build interpersonal trust, including smiling, using an open posture, and listening genuinely. More recently, popular culture has produced its own list, which commonly includes maintaining eye contact, mirroring, open palms, genuine smiles, "steeple hands," nodding, and a firm handshake, among other behaviors (e.g., Baker, 2018; Canales, 2019; Ellsberg, 2010; Ferrazzi, 2008; Gallo, 2014). The variability in the recommendations illustrates the seeming lack of consensus on which behaviors are relevant to building interpersonal trust.

The need to build trust is critical to all types of relationships, from one-off interactions to the enduring. Such is the importance of interpersonal trust that training and education programs for many professional occupations explicitly outline methods to build it. Given the central and critical role that trust plays, a well-defined taxonomy of the behaviors that build trust is necessary. The goal of this paper was to both outline a theoretical approach to trust development and to examine andragogical descriptions with the goal to present a multidisciplinary understanding of what trust is and how behaviorally to build it. We begin by outlining a theoretical foundation for when and why trust is communicated, then present an investigation into how educational materials for various professions describe how to develop it.

The Communication of Trust

In many interpersonal interactions, there is the possibility that one person will be asked to engage in a social exchange, which may include a request to depend on the other person, provide a good or service, or to engage in a particular behavior. Critically, these exchanges can involve the immediate or delayed exchange of goods or services, in which there may be a sequential distribution of resources. For such exchanges to be successful, both people must have the expectation that the other person will do as they say (Cosmides & Tooby, 1992; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). In other words, trust, "beliefs about the likelihood that another's future actions will be beneficial" (Robinson, 1996, p. 576), provides the foundation for a successful social interaction. In all different

types of interactions, people must determine the other person's intentions and they may communicate their own intentions. Communicating one's own intentions can dictate the likelihood of a successful interaction, whether it is approaching the teller at the bank, asking someone out on a date, agreeing to buy a used car, meeting a colleague after work, or greeting one's loved one at the end of the day.

One method to communicate trust is through nonverbal channels. Behaviors that communicate trust—called affiliative behaviors—express one's cooperative and benevolent intentions (Boone & Buck, 2003; Montoya et al., 2018), and often take the form of smiling, eye contact, and laughing. A smile with eye contact, for instance, is a cue in Western countries to communicate one's willingness to cooperate (Ray & Floyd, 2006).

Although the oft assumed goal of developing trust is persuasion (e.g., changing a person's attitude; Simons, 1976), the goal is more aptly characterized as compliance (e.g., changing a person's behavior). For instance, whereas attorneys may hope to change a juror's mind with their smiles, eye contact, and verbal presentations, the more relevant impact is on the juror's behavior, such that attorneys work to ensure that the juror will comply with the request to cast a vote in a particular way. Similarly, a doctor may hope to change a patient's attitude toward, say, healthy eating and regular exercise, but the critical impact is on the actual frequency of exercise and the quality of their diet. Requests to comply are more successful when paired with expressions of affiliative behavior (e.g., Cialdini, 2001; Goei et al., 2003; Mehrabian & Ksionzky, 1970). In the language of social exchanges, affiliative behaviors proximally augment the other person's level of trust, but ultimately function to ensure the other person complies with the request.

The expression of affiliative behavior can also be conceptualized using models of emotion. Specifically, functionalistic models of emotion (e.g., Ekman, 1992; Tooby & Cosmides, 1990) propose that emotions are associated with a cascade of neurological, physiological, and behavioral responses. Behavioral responses are hypothesized to have a specific interpersonal communicative function. For a subset of emotions called "social emotions" (Van Kleef et al., 2010), which includes anger, sadness, among other emotions, the interpersonal function is the regulation of the dynamics of a social exchange (Hareli & Parkinson, 2008). The expression of the emotion of interpersonal attraction, specifically, is proposed to maintain, deepen, or repair an interdependent relationship (Montoya & Horton, 2020; Montoya et al., 2018). From this perspective, attraction is associated with affiliative behaviors to instrumentally develop interpersonal trust. If one were attracted to another person, for instance, one may laugh and smile to communicate their benevolent intentions, with the desired effect of increasing the other person's chances of complying to a future request (e.g., a request for a date). This logic extends to the professional context, in which the expression of affiliative behavior shares the same function to increase compliance. The expression of affiliative behavior toward superiors, for instance, is colloquially called brownnosing or apple-kissing, and involves the same

behavior seen in the dating context—commonly, laughing at their jokes, trying to spend time with them, and the like (Higgins et al., 2003).

Developing Trust in Professional Contexts

Professionals (e.g., teachers, doctors, lawyers) may face distinct issues when working to develop trust in a professional setting. Specifically, the nature of requests made and the level of pre-existing familiarity may differ from those made in the personal context. Although models of trust development do not necessarily predict differences between professional and personal settings, such factors may affect whether trust is developed.

Rapid Development of Trust

Whereas some professionals may have months to years to develop and maintain a trusting relationship (e.g., teachers, coaches, clinicians), in some professional settings, only a few minutes are oftentimes available to develop trust. For instance, in the United States, the average medical doctor's visit lasts approximately 17 minutes (Tai-Seale et al., 2007), and salespeople, who may ask the client to make a large monetary investment, may have less than that (Soorjoo, 2012). In such cases, the tactics employed to generate trust must be communicated quickly and effectively. A question is whether the behaviors recommended to build trust differ between those professions in which trust must be built quickly versus those in which longer periods of time are available.

Magnitude of the Request

A critical element of compliance is the magnitude of the initial request (e.g., Brown & Levinson, 1978). Request can vary in magnitude from the trivial (e.g., "Have a seat.") to the large (e.g., "Set my client free."). Requests made in a hospital or a courtroom may involve a large request (e.g., "Undergo this painful procedure," "Sentence the defendant to death") that may require the development of trust to a point that such a request could be made with a reasonable expectation that it will be followed. Compared to the everyday compliance requests from friends and family (e.g., "Join us for a drink after work," "Put the kids to bed?", "Give me a ride to the airport?"), requests from professionals are often made without the benefit of strong existing trust and are thus more prone to fears of exploitation. Without trust, a doctor's referral for an invasive surgery may be seen unnecessary or as a "money grab," or a salesperson's recommendation for an expensive purchase as a shameless pursuit of commission.

There is an inverse relation between the magnitude of a request and compliance, such that compliance rates fall as the size of the initial request grows (e.g., Schwarzwald et al., 1979). However, the presence of trust can increase the size of the initial request that will be fulfilled (Kurzban, 2001; Wexley et al., 1975). Thus, an ancillary issue is whether those professions that more commonly make large requests recommend different

behaviors than those professions that make smaller requests (e.g., teachers, professional colleagues).

Relative Status

Status may also affect the strategies people use to build interpersonal trust. People who hold a higher status position (i.e., employers, coaches, managers), versus those in a lower status position (i.e., employees, players), might display different nonverbal behaviors to build trust. For example, head nodding is used more by students toward their instructors than toward their peers (Helweg-Larsen et al., 2004). But the question here is, does the set of behaviors recommended for developing trust change depending on the sender's status relative to the recipient?

Purpose of This Review

This research investigated the behaviors andragogical textbooks have proposed that develop interpersonal trust, and the degree to which the various behaviors were consistently presented across various disciplines, from the professional to the personal. To examine this question, we turned to the educational descriptions of what nonverbally generates trust. Because this question is broader than a single discipline, and many disciplines have investigated this question, we explored how future professionals from a range of disciplines—medical professionals, lawyers, professors, clinicians, among others—have been instructed to generate trust in the people with whom they interact. Whereas teachers are instructed to "develop a lasting bond" with their students (Henley, 2006, p. 56), which behaviors are they taught to use? Lawyers are recommended to "get the jury and judge on their side" (Read, 2007, p. 95). Medical professionals (doctors, nurses) are asked to "get the patient to trust you" (Cole & Bird, 2014, p. 13), but how were they taught to act?

Moreover, we examined the degree to which the various disciplines recommended behaviors that aligned with the large empirical literature on the development of trust. The affiliative behaviors that have received considerable research support—labeled "core" behaviors—were compared with other behaviors recommended by various textbooks.

We also investigated taxonomies from two "personal" domains, namely, (a) how people act when they like someone (romantically or otherwise) and (b) how people interact with their infant children (parent-infant interactions), because it may be that any cross-discipline consistency with the professional domains is no coincidence. These two domains differ from the professional domains in that they describe what people *actually* do, rather than recommendations for what people *should* do. Identifying cross-discipline consistency, in which even disparate disciplines posit similar sets of behaviors, would provide convergent evidence on the meaning and expression of trust-producing behavior. Specifically, if attraction is an emotion that expresses cues to build interpersonal trust, then the list of behaviors between parents-infants and when people like another person

should be identical to the taxonomy of behaviors used to build interpersonal trust in the professional context.

Moreover, this approach provided the opportunity to address three ancillary questions. First, it may be that in disciplines that require a relatively rapid development of trust (e.g., sales, medical professionals), recommended behaviors differ from those in disciplines that allow for a slower and prolonged development of trust (e.g., education, clinical). Second, we investigated whether the professions that may have to make large requests (e.g., medical professionals, lawyers) are taught to use different behaviors than those who commonly make smaller requests (business, education). A third question was whether the behaviors used to develop trust with people of equal status differed from behaviors used to develop trust with people of higher or lower status.

Method

To investigate what future professionals are taught, we identified academic disciplines that specifically trained students to develop interpersonal trust. Future professionals for whom there is the need to develop trust with nonhumans (e.g., veterinarian) or for whom interpersonal trust is not the central focus of the profession (e.g., architects, computer programmers, engineers) were not considered. Based on this criterion, we identified eight disciplines for inclusion.

To identify the content that future professionals are taught, we collected textbooks used in the classes that discussed communication specific to that discipline (e.g., business communication, health communication) and courses that featured discipline-specific communication as a topic or subtopic (e.g., introduction to coaching, marketing, counseling). We searched for relevant syllabi and course listings to find textbooks assigned to university undergraduate- and/or graduate-level courses. In addition to discipline-specific classes offered through specific departments (business, medicine, law), courses offered through communication departments (e.g., medical communication, business communication) and related departments (e.g., "clinical" could be found in the medical field, but also in psychology departments) were also reviewed. In situations in which different volumes of the same texts were used, the most recent edition was selected. Using this strategy, we identified 149 textbooks, of which 86 (58%) made mention of behavioral displays to develop interpersonal trust. A "mention" was considered present when a specific behavior was explicitly mentioned as an action that would build trust. A mention could vary in length from brief (just a few words) to expansive (several pages).

Textbooks were categorized into a specific discipline based on a combination of the following factors. They were sorted according to how the course was listed (i.e., business communication, marketing, classroom management), how the course was titled (e.g., BUS ###, EDUC ###, COMM ###), and by the department from which the course was offered. Beyond course titles and listings, the framing of the specific syllabi and

textbooks was also considered (i.e., whether it stressed communication in the classroom, communication with athletes).

Table 1 presents the eight disciplines and the number of textbooks included in the analysis. "Coaching" refers to instructions for coaches when they communicate with athletes and was drawn from textbooks taught in such classes as sport psychology, sport communication, or courses offered by kinesiology and athletic departments. "Medical" refers to physician-patient communication within a hospital or healthcare-related setting. "Clinical" refers to therapist-client communication within a clinical/mental health setting. "Business" pertains to communication within an office setting and includes the wide array of activities that could occur during a typical business day (e.g., interviews, meetings, presentations). "Leadership" refers to interactions that include communications from persons in a position of power to those people lower in standing (e.g., business leader speaking with employees). This leadership domain was derived from courses ranging from communication, professional studies, and management. "Education" refers to communication within a school setting (k-12) between a teacher and students. "Law" pertains to attorney-to-jury communication within a courtroom. Finally, "sales" refers to communication between a salesperson and a potential buyer.

Table 1

Definition of Communication for Each Discipline

Domain	Scope	Sample textbook title	# of texts reviewed	# with behavior recommendations	% unique citations	Mean citations
Medical	Physicians providing medical care/services to their patients	*Talking with patients: Keys to good communication* (Myerscough & Ford, 1996)	21	15	89.0%	4.87
Law	Attorneys speaking to juries in a courtroom	*The art and science of trial advocacy* (Perrin et al., 2011)	18	11	75.0%	1.45
Sales	Salespeople communicating with their potential buyer	*Relationship selling* (Johnston & Marshall, 2010)	12	11	92.9%	3.81
Clinicians	Clinicians speaking with their clients during a therapy session	*Clinical interviewing* (Sommers-Flanagan & Sommers-Flanagan, 2015)	12	8	93.3%	5.63

Domain	Scope	Sample textbook title	# of texts reviewed	# with behavior recommendations	% unique citations	Mean citations
Coaching	Coaches communicating with athletes	*Successful coaching* (Martens, 2012)	18	7	0.00%	0.43
Business	Employees speaking with coworkers and employers	*Business communication today* (Bovée & Thill, 2008)	19	12	81.8%	1.83
Education	Instructors communicating with their students in the classroom	*Classroom management: A proactive approach* (Henley, 2006)	38	13	77.5%	5.46
Leadership	People speaking from power positions (e.g., employers speaking with employees) across various settings (one-on-one, large audiences)	*Leadership: A communication perspective* (Hackman & Johnson, 2009)	11	9	91.7%	2.67

Note. Unique citations column refers to the percentage of citations that were used by textbooks in that discipline but were not used by any other textbooks reviewed across any other disciplines. Mean citations refers to the average number of citations used by textbooks in a given discipline.

In total, the search included textbooks (Publication Year$_{Median}$ = 2009, SD_{year} = 9.30) taught in approximately 213 different departments across 149 colleges and universities within the United States.

Redundancy Analysis

A critical question is whether these disciplines can be considered distinct. A conclusion based on identifying differences among disciplines would be moot if the textbooks each cited and built discussions based on the same small number of seminal sources.

Evidence indicates that the various disciplines drew primarily from their own discipline. The average number of references describing the use of or definition of behavioral displays per textbook was 3.35 (SD = 5.31, min = 0, max = 30), with clinical textbooks citing the most (M = 5.63, SD = 4.84) and coaching texts citing the fewest (M = 0.43, SD = 0.53). The proportion of citations from disciplines outside their own discipline varied across fields. Across all disciplines, 44% of citations were derived from their own discipline. For instance, in medical textbooks, 49 of the 73 references (67%) cited sources published in medical journals (e.g., *Journal of General Internal Medicine, Medical Care, Journal of the American Medical Association*). Alternatively, for education, 23 of

71 references (32%) came from education-based sources (e.g., *Communication Education, Educational Leadership*). Leadership texts featured the lowest proportion of citations from its own domain with 2 out of 24 (8%), and coaching textbooks provided the fewest total citations (3 total citations across 7 textbooks) and only one of these citations came from sport-related literature (*Successful Coaching*).

However, and importantly, across disciplines, a large portion of the sources were not cited by any other textbooks examined (85%), suggesting a low degree of overlap. When considering whether the impact of common citations, two authors from psychology and communications, namely, Albert Mehrabian (e.g., Mehrabian, 1972; Mehrabian & Ferris, 1967) and Edward Hall (e.g., Hall, 1963, 1966) were cited across several disciplines (e.g., education, law, and leadership). However, if the influence of those specific authors were removed from analyses, it would have little effect on the specific behaviors mentioned. Rather, these citations were used to define nonverbal communication and underscore the ubiquitous nature of nonverbal communication displays. Taken together, the data suggest that although textbooks did cite other fields, those citations did not meaningfully contribute to their list of recommended behaviors.

Data Analysis

To assess the frequency with which specific behaviors were mentioned within the textbooks, a "yes" or "no" score was given for each textbook for each behavior. Frequency counts were tabulated for each discipline across each behavior. To examine more closely the relevant research questions, chi-square tests were used. Specifically, when different disciplines were compared, chi-square tests of independence were used. Alternatively, chi-square tests for equal proportion were used to test whether the behavior was mentioned more or less than chance (i.e., 50%). Fisher *p*-values were reported when no a priori predictions were made.

Results

A summary of the specific behaviors organized by discipline is presented in Table 2. Textbooks mentioned 26 different behaviors. A complete listing for each behavior from each textbook is presented in the online supplement (see Porter, 2023). Behaviors for which over 50% of the textbooks from a particular discipline mentioned a behavior are shaded. However, eight behaviors—those categorized as "core" behaviors in the table, plus mimicry—accounted for 56.7% of the mentions. A chi-square analysis examined whether core behaviors were mentioned at a different rate than the other behaviors. Across all disciplines, they were mentioned more frequently, $\chi^2(1) = 8.14$, $p < .01$. This pattern was consistent when this test was conducted for education, medicine, and coaching, χ^2's$(1) \geq 4.17$, $p \leq .04$, but not for business, clinical, law, leadership, and sales, χ^2's$(1) \leq 2.38$, $p \geq .12$.

Table 2

Number of Times a Behavior Was Cited by Textbooks Featuring Nonverbal Recommendations

Behavior	Medical 15 texts	Law 11 texts	Sales 11 texts	Clinicians 8 texts	Coaching 7 texts	Business 12 texts	Education 13 texts	Leadership 9 texts	Parenting	Attraction
Core behaviors										
Eye contact	13	9	10	6	5	12	9	8	X	X
Physical distance	9	4	9	5	3	6	2	3	X	X
Smile	3		7	4	1	4	9	4	X	X
Head nod	8		7	5	2	4	6	2		X
Laughter	2			1			3	1	X	X
Physical touch	10		2	3	2	3	5		X	X
Body orientation	4	3		2	4	2		1		X
Vocal characteristics										
Regulate speaking rate		2	3	2		3		3	X	
Regulate vocal tone			1		1	1		1		
Use vocal variety (rate, pitch, volume)	1	4	6	1		5	3	3	X	
Silence	5	5	4	4	1	5	3	2		
Mimicry										
Match facial expression with person	2			4			1	2	X	X
Mirroring body/posture	3		3	3		1	1	1	X	X
Match vocal qualities with person	4		2	4				1	X	X
Match voice and/or facial expression with presentation/ feelings		3	1	4	2	5	1	1	X	
Gestures synchronized with message	1	4	3	4		2		2		
Body lean										
Body lean (forward)	11	1	7	6	2	8	3	3		X
Body lean (back)						1				

Social Psychological Bulletin | 2569-653X
https://doi.org/10.32872/spb.12663

Behavior	Medical 15 texts	Law 11 texts	Sales 11 texts	Clinicians 8 texts	Coaching 7 texts	Business 12 texts	Education 13 texts	Leadership 9 texts	Parenting	Attraction
Open posture										
Uncrossed arms and/or legs	1	3	3	4	1	2	1	1		X
Palms exposed/open hands	1	2	3			2	1	2		
Legs crossed			1							
Sitting/standing behavior										
Sit upright/stand straight		1	2			4		2		
Sit with hands in one's lap	2						1			
Sit at eye level	6					2				
Stand, feet close together						1	1	1		
Symmetrical arm placement	2	1								

Note. X = Behavior was mentioned. The table presents the number of textbooks that mentioned a specific behavior. Shaded cells indicate that the behavior was mentioned by 50% or more of textbooks.

Social Psychological Bulletin | 2569-653X
https://doi.org/10.32872/spb.12663

In the sections that follow, we present each discipline's theoretical model for expressing various behaviors and which specific behaviors they advocate.

Medical Professionals

Fifteen of the 21 medical textbooks mentioned specific behaviors in which medical professionals should engage during meetings with clients. On average, they mentioned 5.87 behaviors (SD = 2.40). As noted in Table 2, the medical textbooks largely agreed on the importance of consistent eye contact with the patient (13 of 15 textbooks), a pattern different from chance $\chi^2(1) = 8.07$, $p < .01$. Textbooks also noted that professionals should lean toward their patients (11 of 15 textbooks), nod their head when listening (8 of 15), and make physical contact with the patient (10 of 15). Leaning forward, head nodding, and physical contact were not mentioned at a rate different from chance, $\chi^2(1) = 3.27$, $p = .07$, $\chi^2(1) = 0.07$, $p = .80$, and $\chi^2(1) = 1.67$, $p = .19$, respectively.

Medical textbooks provided several interrelated reasons as to why medical professionals should engage in trust-producing behaviors with patients. Specifically, they should build trust to understand their complaints completely (e.g., Fortin & Smith, 2012) and to ensure that the patient complies with the professional's treatment recommendations (Hart, 2010; Kim et al., 2004). Furthermore, textbooks stressed that active listening—which is a process through which the listener better understands the speaker's perspective and indirectly communicates this understanding back to the speaker (Rogers et al., 1957)—was fundamental to (a) an effective therapeutic relationship (e.g.,Bickley et al., 2007; Hart, 2010; Myerscough & Ford, 1996), (b) the establishment and development of trust (e.g., Fortin & Smith, 2012; Hojat, 2006), and (c) the ability to be empathetic to the needs of the client (e.g., Hojat, 2006; Polack & Avtgis, 2011; Roter & Hall, 2006).

Medical textbooks specifically spoke to the importance of head nodding. The textbooks' description of head nodding aligns with the larger literature on the topic. Specifically, head nods serve an important function to help regulate social interactions (McClave, 2000; Osugi & Kawahara, 2018) by demonstrating (a) agreement with the listener and (b) that the person is listening and understands their concerns (J. R. Anderson, 1985; Mehrabian, 1972). Head nodding was mentioned by at least 22% of the textbooks for each discipline, except for law, which did not mention it at all. This variability of head nodding across disciplines was unlikely to occur by chance, $\chi^2(7) = 14.72$, Fisher $p = .02$. On the one hand, the literature was clear that head nodding is associated with active listening and better provider-client relationships (Malisz et al., 2016). On the other hand, some research views head nodding as a form of submission (e.g., Eibl-Eibesfeldt, 1972; Morris, 1977), akin to a miniature bow, which may have reduced its recommended use in domains that stress the importance of expertise or high status.

Smiling was mentioned less frequently by medical textbooks than other disciplines. Smiling was mentioned by 20% of medical textbooks but was mentioned by 69% of

education texts and 64% of sales texts. The recommendation of smiling is a pattern unlikely to emerge through chance, $\chi^2(7) = 19.83$, Fisher $p < .01$.

Law

Eleven of 18 law textbooks (61%) provided guidelines for which behaviors should be communicated in the courtroom. Each textbook mentioned an average of 3.82 behaviors (*SD* = 1.33). The textbooks largely agreed on the importance of several behaviors, including maintaining an appropriate level of eye contact, creating verbal pauses during arguments (e.g., silence), and maintaining an appropriate physical distance from the judge and jury box.

Textbooks emphasized that the attorney's goal is to be viewed as trustworthy (C. H. Rose, 2011), honest (Rieke & Stutman, 1990), sincere (Findley & Sales, 2012), and that they should engage in various behaviors to demonstrate that they have "nothing to hide" (Berger et al., 2015). To facilitate this goal, eye contact (mentioned by 9 of 11 textbooks) was referenced more than chance, $\chi^2(1) = 4.45$, $p = .03$. Eye contact was mentioned more often than all of the other core behaviors, X^2's$(1) \geq 6.60$, Fisher p's $\leq .03$, except for physical distance which was not mentioned at a different frequency, χ^2's$(1) = 4.70$, Fisher $p = .08$. For textbook authors, eye contact was critical because it conveyed "belief, sincerity, and commitment" (Findley & Sales, 2012) and creates a "personal connection" with the jury (Read, 2007, p. 93). Five textbooks mentioned using an open posture (uncrossed arms and legs, open hands/palm exposed) as a cue to develop trust, a frequency unlikely to occur by chance, $\chi^2(1) = 6.55$, $p = .01$. These textbooks were specific regarding how such nonverbal behaviors could be used in conjunction: C. H. Rose (2011), for instance, proposed that attorneys should speak with an open posture, which when paired with silence while dropping one's arms and exposing one's body, gives "power" to the speaker by capturing the jury's attention.

Two behaviors advocated by other disciplines, mimicry and physical touch, were not mentioned for attorneys. Indeed, the pattern of mentioning for physical touch and mimicry across all the disciplines is unlikely to emerge through chance, $\chi^2(7) = 20.04$, Fisher $p < .01$ and $\chi^2(7) = 40.07$, Fisher $p < .001$, respectively. Law textbooks mentioned physical touch less frequently than education and medicine, χ^2's$(1) \geq 5.34$, Fisher p's $\leq .04$, but not differently than sales, coaching, clinical, business, and leadership (which also did not mention physical touch), χ^2's$(1) \leq 4.90$, Fisher p's $\geq .05$. For mimicry, law textbooks mentioned it less frequently than clinical, medicine, and leadership, χ^2's$(1) \geq 5.24$, Fisher p's $\leq .04$, but not differently from education, sales, business, and coaching (which also did not mention mimicry), χ^2's$(1) \leq 5.41$, Fisher p's $\geq .05$. As discussed later, mimicry is generally an interpersonal behavior and most effective in private one-on-one interactions in which both persons are actively participating (see Chartrand & Van Baaren, 2009). With respect to physical contact, a critical reason for its omission is legal: Most jurisdictions prohibit attorneys from physically touching jurors or judges.

Law textbooks, however, did place an emphasis on how behavioral expressions could both develop trust *and* convey expertise. Textbooks emphasized that attorneys are encouraged to exude confidence, power, and status (Findley & Sales, 2012), such that the attorney's disposition must always communicate "forthright confidence and belief in the strength of the case" (Murray, 1995, p. 78). "A lawyer whose body language lacks confidence or certainty is unable to be persuasive" (Haydock & Sonsteng, 2015, p. 27). Behaviorally, attorneys were instructed to sit in a relaxed position to demonstrate their confidence (e.g., "arm position asymmetry, sideways lean, leg position asymmetry, hand relaxation, neck relaxation, slight reclining angles," Suggs & Sales, 1978, as cited in Findley & Sales, 2012, p. 111).

Sales

Eleven of 12 sales textbooks recommended a set of nonverbal behavior, and those textbooks mentioned an average of 6.73 (SD = 2.69) behaviors. Of the behaviors mentioned, 54% were the "core" behaviors, including maintaining sufficient eye contact (to convey sincerity, R. Anderson et al., 2014; Ingram et al., 2012), nodding one's head while listening to the client, smiling, maintaining an appropriate physical distance, and leaning forward. In addition to the "core" behaviors, these textbooks also recommend sitting with an open posture and crossing one's legs in an open position (to indicate cooperativeness), and modulating the volume of one's voice (to emphasize key points and to force clients to lean in to hear critical information; Lill & Lill, 2008).

There was a clear consensus regarding the function that such nonverbal behaviors serve. Nonverbal behaviors are communicated to establish a "good relationship" (e.g., Lill & Lill, 2008), in which clients can communicate their needs and understand that the salesperson is there to help (e.g., Futrell, 2008; Johnston & Marshall, 2010), produce trust (Marks, 1991), and build rapport (Cant & van Heerden, 2004). Whereas there may be the belief that a good salesperson talks extensively to demonstrate their expertise and enthusiasm about their product, some textbooks stressed the opposite strategy, in which listening is the key to both understanding what the buyer wants and to the development of trust and rapport (e.g., Castleberry & Tanner, 2011; Johnston & Marshall, 2010; Marks, 1991). Indeed, one textbook stated that "good relationships" were based on the so-called "80/20 rule," in which salespersons listen 80% of the time and talk for 20% (Castleberry & Tanner, 2011). In this way, the nonverbal behaviors mentioned for being a good listener were the same behaviors used to develop trust. For instance, silence was mentioned not only as part of being a good listener, but it was cited repeatedly as crucial to the development of trust (e.g., Castleberry & Tanner, 2011; Jones et al., 2006; Marks, 1991), such that it allows time for the client to process information (Lill & Lill, 2008).

Moreover, nine of the 11 textbooks mentioned regulating the amount of distance between persons, a pattern unlikely to occur by chance, $\chi^2(1) = 4.46$, $p = .03$. The regulation of physical distance between people, and its relation to trust and attraction,

has a long history in psychology and communication research (e.g., Argyle & Dean, 1965; Hayduk, 1978; Kleck, 1969; Little, 1965; Lott & Sommer, 1967; Mehrabian, 1968a, 1968b; Patterson & Gullion, 1968; Sally, 1995), and the textbooks' descriptions of the role of physical distance aligns with the larger empirical literature.

Clinicians

Eight of 12 clinical textbooks mentioned nonverbal behaviors, and of those texts, they mentioned an average of 7.75 (*SD* = 3.88) behaviors. There was tremendous agreement across the clinical textbooks, both in terms of each behavior's proposed importance and the recommendations for how to act. The importance of engaging in various nonverbal behaviors focused on creating an environment in which clients felt free to communicate (Ivey et al., 2010; Sommers-Flanagan & Sommers-Flanagan, 2015), felt safe and comfortable (Hill, 2009), in which clinicians can grow empathic and trusting relationships (Ivey et al., 2010), and express intimacy and provide feedback (Beier & Young, 1998). As noted in Table 2, the textbooks generally agreed on the importance of several behaviors, including eye contact, nodding one's head, smiling, maintaining physical proximity, mimicry, and leaning forward.

The across-textbook agreement was evident by inspecting two behaviors: eye contact and mimicry. Eye contact was mentioned by six of the eight textbooks, though this frequency was not different from chance, $\chi^2(1) = 2.00$, $p = .15$. Clinical textbooks claimed that eye contact is (a) critical given its importance to regulating the intensity of social interactions (Hill, 2009), (b) is used to communicate the clinician's interest and that they want to hear what the client has to say (Egan, 2002), and (c) a part of a larger strategy to produce "facilitative" relationships that contribute to positive evaluations of clinicians (Cormier et al., 2003). These mechanisms align with the larger literature on the role of eye contact. Eye contact is widely considered to be the "gateway" behavior to the development of trust. Eye contact's importance begins with its ability to focus attention (Cappella, 1981; Posner, 1980), and can thus be used functionally to change the social distance between people (Andersen, 1979; Mehrabian, 1969), strengthen interpersonal trust, and deepen levels of intimacy (e.g., Jones et al., 2006; King et al., 2011; Mason et al., 2005; Vuilleumier et al., 2005; Wyland & Forgas, 2010).

For mimicry, five of the eight clinical textbooks mentioned its importance for developing trust, though this frequency was not different from chance, $\chi^2(1) = 0.17$, $p = .68$. Mimicry—which may be accomplished by something as simple as changing one's speech rate to match the client's rate or leaning in to align with the client's lean—produces a "connection" between the client and the clinician (Brems, 2001; Hill, 2009) and is used to heighten the clinician's understanding of how their clients see the world (Cormier et al., 2003; Ivey et al., 2010). Such descriptions are consistent with the importance the broader literature places on mimicry. The broader empirical literature concludes that mimicry increases (a) persuadability (Bailenson & Yee, 2005), (b) the likelihood that people will

follow recommendations (Jacob et al., 2011), (c) rapport and trust (Bernieri, 1988; for reviews, see Farley, 2014; Guéguen, 2009), (d) attraction (Chartrand & Bargh, 1999), (e) interdependent self-construals (van Baaren et al., 2003), and (f) the amount of personal information disclosed (Guéguen et al., 2012).

Moreover, as with most of the other domains, clinical textbooks emphasized the relevance of the quality of the clinician's voice in the therapeutic context. Clinical textbooks agreed that the quality of the clinician's voice, when spoken audibly and at a slow rate, was associated with acceptance and respect (Cormier et al., 2003), enhanced interest and empathy (Sommers-Flanagan & Sommers-Flanagan, 2015), warmth and interest (Ivey et al., 2010), and stronger rapport and comfort (Hill, 2009). Higher vocal frequency, similarly, has been linked to efforts to gain another person's acceptance. Vocal pleasantness is considered part of the expression of emotion (Scherer, 2003) and, relevant here, as an affiliation cue (Cappella, 1981; Farley et al., 2013; Hughes et al., 2010). For instance, people speak with a high-pitched voice when flirting (Puts et al., 2011) and when talking to infants or to the elderly (Bombar & Littig, 1996; Caporael, 1981).

Coaching

Of the 18 coaching textbooks, seven spoke to the importance of using behavior when communicating with players. An average of 3.43 (SD = 1.27) behaviors were mentioned per textbook. The function of nonverbal behavior was proposed to (a) make the athlete feel accepted and important (Martens, 2012; Moore & Tschannen-Moran, 2010; Murphy, 2005; Weinberg & Gould, 2007), (b) facilitate active listening (Burton & Raedeke, 2008; J. M. Williams, 2010), and (c) enhance the coach's overall effectiveness (Moore & Tschannen-Moran, 2010; Murphy, 2005).

Compared with other disciplines, coaching textbooks included fewer citations and mentioned fewer different behaviors. One textbook based their description of the proscribed nonverbal behaviors on the SOLER method. The SOLER method states that the listener should *s*quare up and face the client, *o*pen their posture, *l*ean toward the client, maintain *e*ye contact, and *r*elax one's posture (Egan, 2002). Among the behaviors most commonly mentioned by textbooks from other disciplines, only eye contact, physical contact, and body orientation was mentioned by three or more coaching textbooks, and those behaviors were each mentioned through the SOLER method.

Business

Twelve of the 19 business textbooks included a description of how people in a business setting should act to build trusting relationships with coworkers. They mentioned an average of 6.08 (SD = 3.40) behaviors per textbook. The purpose of various behaviors is to engage in empathic listening (e.g., Bovée & Thill, 2008; Munter & Hamilton, 2012) and develop trust (e.g., Bovée & Thill, 2008; Reece, 2014). Business textbooks mentioned eye

contact, nodding in agreement, smiling frequently, maintaining an appropriate physical distance, leaning forward, and sitting upright.

As with descriptions from other disciplines, empathic listening was presented as engaging in several nonverbal behaviors, including eye contact, leaning forward, smiling, nodding along with what the speaker says, and keeping an open posture (e.g., Kinicki & Fugate, 2016; Raman & Singh, 2012). As with the clinical context, there was an emphasis on the use of one's voice. Some textbooks proposed that the speaker's credibility was affected by their voice's tempo, tone, and pacing. Indeed, these changes to the quality of one's voice may affect views of authority and firmness (Raman & Singh, 2012) and varying tone keeps interest by emphasizing key points (Martel & Martel, 1989).

Education

Of the 38 education textbooks, 13 made mention of nonverbal behaviors, and they mentioned an average of 3.85 (SD = 2.08) behaviors per textbook. The textbooks mentioned a similar set of behaviors compared with other disciplines, including eye contact, head nodding, smiling, laughter, and maintaining close proximity.

However, this discipline, compared with other disciplines, was split regarding the theoretical foundation for why it was important to engage in various affiliative displays. On the one hand, a large portion of the textbook authors emphasized the ability of affiliative behavior to produce a trusting and warm learning environment. Such behaviors thus communicate "liking and affect" (P. J. Cooper & Simonds, 2007) and help students feel comfortable and is key to unlocking the "authentic teacher" who is trustworthy and sincere (Henley, 2006). On the other hand, a minority of textbooks took a different theoretical approach, such that they focused on positive reinforcement as the reason for expressing affiliative behavior. From this perspective, their expression operates to reward students for engaging in desirable behavior, and its absence works to reduce undesirable behavior (e.g., Kellough et al., 2006).

With regards to specific behaviors, the education textbooks stressed the value of smiling. Although smiling was not mentioned at a rate different from chance, $\chi^2(1) = 1.92$, $p = .16$, the justifications of those who did recommend it conformed to other literatures. Wong and Wong (2018), for instance, noted that smiles communicate graciousness and hospitality, they also communicate understanding, peace, and harmony. The reasoning behind the recommendations for smiling was consistent with the broader research on the function that smiles play in interpersonal interactions. Smiles are detected, perceived, and used as a cue to develop trust (Cashdan, 1998; Fridlund, 1994; Godoy et al., 2005; Krumhuber et al., 2013; Mehu et al., 2007; Scharlemann et al., 2001). Other researchers have gone farther to propose that smiles are "costly signals," such that they increase trust while increasing the chance of being taken advantage of (Centorrino et al., 2011; Mehu & N'Diaye, 2010).

A noteworthy conclusion from the education textbooks was the recommendation regarding physical contact with students. On the one hand, the textbooks stressed the value that physical contact—a hand on the shoulder, a pat on the back, a touch on the arm—has on developing trust (Chesebro & McCroskey, 2002; P. J. Cooper & Simonds, 2007; Emmer & Evertson, 2013; Weinstein & Mignano, 2007). However, touch was not recommended at a rate different from chance, $\chi^2(1) = 0.69$, $p = .40$. For the textbooks that did recommend it, touch provides emotional support, tenderness, and encouragement. Touch is thus used to communicate caring and understanding (P. J. Cooper & Simonds, 2007) and as a form of reinforcement (Chesebro & McCroskey, 2002). Touch has been described as the most direct and immediate developer of trust (Thayer, 1986). This view of touch aligns with the broader literature's, such that physical contact is a powerful cue to develop trust and liking (Hornik, 1991, 1992; Hornik & Ellis, 1988; S. A. Rose, 1990; Whitcher & Fisher, 1979; for a review, see Gallace & Spence, 2010). Beyond the educational realm, other disciplines pointed to the role of physical touch. Future medical professionals were encouraged to initiate physical contact to convey empathy (e.g., Bickley et al., 2007; Roter & Hall, 2006), relax and provide comfort (e.g., Birrer, 1987), and reassure and express concern (e.g., Lipkin et al., 1995; Myerscough & Ford, 1996). For coaching, Anshel (2012) recommended that coaches use physical touch, most commonly as a pat on the back or an arm around the shoulders, to benefit their interactions with their athletes.

On the other hand, textbook authors acknowledged that changing cultural norms (e.g., the MeToo movement) and age-specific norms makes it problematic to make any physical contact despite its benefits (e.g., Sommers-Flanagan & Sommers-Flanagan, 2015). Teachers are often warned not to touch students and that the anxiety around touching tends to decline with teaching experience (Weinstein & Mignano, 2007), but Henley (2006) noted that touch can be comforting in appropriate situations, such as with an emotionally distraught 6-year-old (who had fallen or had a disagreement with a fellow student).

Leadership

Of the 11 leadership textbooks, nine mentioned nonverbal behaviors, and they mentioned an average of 3.82 ($SD = 1.33$) behaviors per textbook. There was less of a consensus in this discipline, as only one behavior, eye contact, was mentioned by more than half of the sources. Indeed, eye contact was mentioned at a frequency unlikely to occur by chance, $\chi^2(1) = 5.44$, $p = .02$. Other behaviors mentioned by a third of textbooks included eye contact, head nodding, smiling, laughter, and maintaining close proximity.

The one point of consensus was eye contact, with textbook authors noting that it worked to communicate interest and intimacy (e.g., Hart, 2010; Polack & Avtgis, 2011), facilitate empathic engagement (Hojat, 2006), enhance the ability to read emotional cues

and recognize distress (Roter & Hall, 2006), facilitate client's comfort (Birrer, 1987), and help with active listening (Polack & Avtgis, 2011; Roter & Hall, 2006).

As with law, there was a pattern whereby the function of affiliative behavior was described as relevant to communicate trust *and* expertise. Such behaviors—which were summarized by "SOFTEN," proscribed *s*miles, *o*pen stance, *f*orward lean, *t*one, *e*ye contact, and head *n*od—project both confidence and approachability (Cardon, 2018) and competence and trust (Gamble & Gamble, 2013; Hackman & Johnson, 2009). These behaviors were viewed as strengthening credibility by being seen as confident (Halpern & Lubar, 2004).

Personal Domains

Behaviors mentioned in the attraction and parent-infant interaction literatures are presented in Table 2. Behaviors with clear empirical support were indicated with an X.

Interpersonal Attraction

The literature on the nonverbal communication of attraction provides a list of affiliative behaviors that are associated with the expression of liking. Specifically, Montoya et al. (2018), in a meta-analysis of 54 studies, identified a number of behaviors associated with the experience of attraction, including laughter, eye contact, engaging in mimetic behavior, frequency of smiling, conversation initiation, and maintaining proximity. The findings of the meta-analysis agreed with specific taxonomies in the dating context. For instance, Givens (1978) observed that people engaged in a number of behaviors during the courtship process, from eye contact, primping, smiling, laughing, gesticulating, to initiating physical contact. In a cross-cultural analysis, Eibl-Eibesfeldt (1972) noted a similar list of behaviors, including smiling while nodding, eye contact, and laughing.

Parent-Infant Interactions

The literature has identified a consistent list of behaviors that parents in Western cultures use in their interactions with infants. Specifically, the developmental psychology literature notes, most prominently, that eye contact, smiling, touch, soft voice, and behavioral mimicry are most commonly used (Schachner et al., 2005). For mimicry, parents and infants mimic each other's vocalizations, gaze, and head turns (e.g., Cappella, 1981; Condon & Sander, 1974; Gewirtz & Boyd, 1977; Matarazzo & Wiens, 1972), with such mimetic behavior proposed to strengthen their bond (e.g., Beebe et al., 1982; Bernieri et al., 1988; Fogel et al., 1988). For eye contact, interactions between parents and securely attached infants are marked by higher levels of mutual eye contact and "positive" facial expressions (Colonnesi et al., 2012; see also Keller & Gauda, 1987). Moreover, parents change their speech patterns when directing their speech toward infants, which is theorized to help a parent and infant emotionally bond (Arias & Peña, 2016). This adjusted speech, referred to as "infant-directed speech," involves slower speech rate, more

variable prosody, and simpler grammatical structures (R. P. Cooper & Aslin, 1990). And for smiles, their expression between caregiver and infant is proposed to be instrumental for strengthening their bond (Messinger & Fogel, 2007; Messinger et al., 2001).

Ancillary Questions

Rapid Development of Trust

This question centered on whether the presumed need for rapid trust development affected the behaviors recommended for use. Clinical textbooks mentioned "core" behaviors at a higher rate than business, education, law, leadership, and coaching, χ^2's (1) ≥ 7.52, p's < .01, but not a different rate than sales or medicine, χ^2's (1) ≤ 1.88, p's > .17. For specific behaviors, one trend was that the tendency to recommend mimicry-like behaviors (e.g., matching vocal tone, facial expression, body position) occurred more often in clinical textbooks (a discipline where patient-client relationships can be lengthy) than the other disciplines. Clinical textbooks did mention these three mimicry-like behaviors more than any of the other seven disciplines, χ^2's(1) ≥ 5.07, Fisher p's < .03.

Relative Status

To examine whether relative status affected which behaviors were recommended, business and leadership textbooks were compared because they share a similar context (business) but differ in the status of the potential audience. Leadership and business textbooks neither differed in their tendency to recommend core behaviors overall, $\chi^2(1) = 0.03$, $p = .86$ nor differed across each core behavior, χ^2's(1) ≤ 2.95, Fisher p's ≥ .17.

Discussion

An analysis of scores of textbooks used to teach the next generation of professionals provided insight into the nonverbal behaviors proposed to build interpersonal trust. Despite largely drawing from different literatures and source material, textbooks from various disciplines arrived at similar sets of behavior. The most frequently mentioned behaviors included establishing eye contact, smiling, standing/sitting in close proximity, physical contact, and mimicry. The proposed explanations for the importance of each behavior were also similar, with textbooks converging on a small set of functions, including empathic listening, building trust, and exuding confidence. Moreover, and importantly, the behaviors proposed by the various disciplines largely aligned with the behaviors that parents use with their infants and what people use to express liking.

The consensus of the textbooks was that eight behaviors were critical (the "core" behaviors displayed in Table 2, plus mimicry) to build interpersonal trust. Not only was there strong consistency across the various disciplines, but there was consistency between the andragogical sources and the larger empirical literature. The behaviors

associated with attraction did not meaningfully differ from the behaviors associated with the trust-producing behaviors in the mother-infant context, which did not meaningfully differ from the behaviors associated with trust in the various professional contexts. Indeed, in an analysis of the behaviors communicated between therapist and clients during psychotherapy sessions, Scheflen (1965) concluded that those behaviors matched those commonly seen in courtship displays.

Of all the recommended behaviors, 56.7% were "core" behaviors, indicating that textbooks generally did a good job of recommending behaviors that the larger literature had identified as important to the development of trust. When textbooks did go beyond the established taxonomy, they did so by overfocusing on a specific manifestation of a specific behavior. For instance, law, sales, and clinical textbooks spoke to "gestures synchronized with message" (R. Anderson et al., 2014; Findley & Sales, 2012; Ivey et al., 2010), rather than "mimicry." Although this specific manifestation may be effective, it has not received clear empirical support.

Despite tremendous agreement across the disciplines, not all disciplines mentioned each behavior to the same degree. Smiling, for instance, was mentioned by 69% of education texts, 64% of sales texts, but only 20% of medical textbooks. In this case, context likely matters: Smiles can communicate trust, but also happiness (Finch & Fernández, 2019), and the serious nature of what a doctor visit may indicate suggests that a behavior that may communicate "happiness" might be inappropriate. Alternatively, although mimicry has considerable support for its role in developing trust, it was not consistently recommended across disciplines, with no textbooks in law, sales, coaching, or business mentioning it. Two reasons for its omission are most likely. First, mimicry may be paired with undesirable outcomes when third party observers are present (Genschow & Alves, 2020; Kavanagh et al., 2011), as they may view the mimicry negatively and evaluate those involved less favorably. Second, mimicry can be less effective when observers evaluate it as a cue of submissiveness (Genschow & Alves, 2020), as an employee might be viewed as a sycophant for mimicking their boss.

There are often questions about whether a specific behavior produces interpersonal trust. Montoya et al. (2018) proposed a heuristic for distinguishing between those behaviors predictive of trust and those not. They submit that if it is possible to communicate a "lewd" version of the behavior, it is a predictor of trust. For instance, a smile with eye contact communicates trust, but sustained eye contact with an overwrought smile at the discotheque might be considered "creepy." Alternatively, a 60-degree head tilt would not likely be considered "lewd," and thus a less dramatic head tilt would not be communicative of trust. For some of the andragogical recommendations without clear empirical support, "match voice with one's facial expression," for instance, such an act is difficult to visualize as a "lewd" act.

Several disciplines discussed communicating cues of expertise rather than trust (specifically, law and education). Although practitioners from any discipline may benefit

from being viewed as experts, they all emphasized that effective communication develops through enhancing trust rather than through demonstrating expertise (e.g., Cormier et al., 2003; White & Gardner, 2012). Some disciplines went farther by recommending that practitioners should *avoid* appearing confident (e.g., sales, Futrell, 2008), as it can lead to lower client outcomes (e.g., Beck et al., 2002). In contrast, law textbooks most commonly couched the importance of engaging in various affiliative behaviors in terms of communicating expertise. However, the behaviors presented as important to being evaluated as an expert were not distinguishable from those recommended to develop trust. The various textbooks proposed, in essence, that such behaviors pull "double duty" by simultaneously building trust and establishing expertise. In the courtroom, for example, eye contact is used to establish both "credibility and sincerity" (Haydock & Sonsteng, 2015, p. 27) and "confidence and trustworthiness" (Perrin et al., 2011, p. 150). Whether such behaviors affect both trust and expertise, however, remains unclear.

An underappreciated issue is that the perception and expression of nonverbal affiliative behaviors may be affected by culture, race, gender, ethnicity, among other characteristics. Unquestionably, the same behavior may be perceived differently given cultural considerations. For instance, people from the Middle East gaze longer at relationship partners than people from the United States (Hall, 1963), in South African cultures, compared to Western cultures, excessive eye contact is a sign of aggression or hostility (Du Preez, 1997), and in some cultures, physical contact is only acceptable in the context of a committed relationship (Du Plooy-Cilliers & Venter, 2005). Additionally, the typical conversational seating distance tends to be closer for those in the United States than for people in Japan (Sussman & Rosenfeld, 1982). For the presented analyses, the textbooks were drawn exclusively from the United States. However, despite cultural variability in the degree to which these various behaviors are expressed, the frequency—and the meaning—of the expression of various affiliative cues to trust is proposed to remain similar.

Ancillary Questions

A secondary question focused on whether different behaviors were recommended in situations in which trust needed to be built quickly versus more slowly. One difference emerged in the tendency to recommend mimicry-like behaviors. The clinical textbooks recommended behaviors fitting into the category of mimicry (e.g., matching vocal tone, body position) more often than other disciplines. This could be due in part to the training that therapists receive. Indeed, mimicry is difficult to perform, and if done poorly or incorrectly, it could have negative consequences (Casasanto et al., 2020) or become less effective (Kulesza et al., 2016).

Another ancillary question focused on whether relative status (higher vs. equal) affected which affiliative behaviors were recommended. Two disciplines allowed for a specific comparison: business and leadership. One difference was the emphasis placed

on sitting/standing behavior and body lean, which was recommended in the business textbooks, but not as often in leadership textbooks. One reason for this was thought to be the implied audiences. Leadership texts assumed the speaker was presenting to a group of employees whereas business texts focused more on one-on-one communication with peers and supervisors (e.g., Barrett, 2006; Cardon, 2018). However, the contrast between the behaviors for leadership and business revealed no differences between these areas.

The Importance of Nonverbal Behavior and Trust

An important question is the degree to which nonverbal behavior "matters" in the professional context. On the one hand, estimates of how much information is conveyed nonverbally indicates the answer to the question may be "quite a bit." For instance, Mehrabian and Ferris (1967) are reported as claiming that 93% of all information is communicated nonverbally. Similarly, Hall (1966) claimed that 90% of communication cues was "hidden cultural grammar," and other researchers propose similarly high estimates: Munter and Hamilton (2012) proposed 60–90%, Birdwhistell (1970) advocated for 65%, McElhaney (2005) proposed 60%, Ingram et al. (2012) proposed 50%, and Futrell (2008) and Quintanilla and Wahl (2014) both suggested 55%. On the other hand, the percentage of information that is convoyed nonverbally may be highly dependent on the context. Although the most often cited statistic is Mehrabian and colleague's 93%, Mehrabian (1995, as cited in Lapakko, 1997, p. 65) himself later stated that this question was difficult to answer, "My findings are often misquoted.... Clearly, it is absurd to imply or suggest that the verbal portion of all communication constitutes only 7% of the message. Suppose I want to tell you that the eraser you are looking for is in the second right-hand drawer of my desk in my third-floor office. How could anyone contend that the verbal part of this message is only 7% of the message?"

Whatever percentage nonverbal behavior plays, trust improves outcomes with clients. In the medical field, the absence of trust can take the form of failure to continue treatment (Hillen et al., 2011; Zolnierek & DiMatteo, 2009), reduced information sharing and closed off communication (Mechanic, 1998), greater patient fear (Hillen et al., 2011), and lowered patient satisfaction (Mowen et al., 1993; Ong et al., 1995; S. Williams et al., 1998). Similarly, in the therapeutic context, clients who do not trust their therapist are more opposed to the proposed treatment (Castonguay et al., 1996). Alternatively, in coaching, players who trust their coach report higher levels of satisfaction with the coaching (Kao et al., 2017) and demonstrate increases in performance, commitment, and cooperation (Zhang & Chelladurai, 2013). But when athletes mistrust their coach or perceive a breach in trust, they report a higher likelihood of leaving the team (Barnhill & Turner, 2013). In the marketplace, trust predicts the strength of a buyer-seller relationship (Ganesan, 1994) and the perceived continuity of a buyer-seller relationship (E. Anderson & Weitz, 1989).

Conclusion

Despite the disparate nature of the examined disciplines, an analysis of 86 textbooks across 8 disciplines arrived at a consistent set of recommendations for how to build interpersonal trust. A small subject of behaviors, including eye contact, mimicry, smiling, and maintaining physical proximity, were repeatedly recommended. Not only were the recommended behaviors consistent, but those behaviors were consistent with the behaviors used by parents and by people when they communicate liking. Although subtle differences persisted across disciplines—making domain-specific examination relevant—a core set of nonverbal behaviors remained important.

Funding: The authors have no funding to report.

Acknowledgments: We are grateful to Ridhwan Shakil for help with the coding and to the SCAR group and Zubin Discotheque for their assistance with this research.

Competing Interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Author Contributions: *R. Matthew Montoya*—Conceptualization | Methodology | Writing – original draft | Project administration. *Brandon Porter*—Conceptualization | Formal analysis | Investigation | Resources | Data curation | Writing – original draft.

Supplementary Materials

For this article, a complete listing for each behavior from each textbook is available (see Porter, 2023).

Index of Supplementary Materials

Porter, B. (2023). *An interdisciplinary investigation into the behaviors that build (and express) interpersonal trust* [Complete listing for each behavior from each textbook]. OSF. https://osf.io/wydpr

References

Andersen, J. F. (1979). Teacher immediacy as a predictor of teaching effectiveness. *Annals of the International Communication Association, 3*(1), 543–559. https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.1979.11923782

Anderson, E., & Weitz, B. (1989). Determinants of continuity in conventional industrial channel dyads. *Marketing Science, 8*(4), 310–323. https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.8.4.310

Anderson, J. R. (1985). *Cognitive psychology and its implications.* W. H. Freeman

Anderson, R., Dubinskym, A. J., & Mehta, R. (2014). *Personal selling: Building relationships and partnerships*. Kendall Hunt.

Anshel, M. H. (2012). *Sport psychology: From theory to practice*. Pearson Benjamin Cummings.

Argyle, M., & Dean, J. (1965). Eye-contact, distance and affiliation. *Sociometry, 28*(3), 289–304. https://doi.org/10.2307/2786027

Arias, D., & Peña, M. (2016). Mother-infant face-to-face interaction: The communicative value of infant-directed talking and singing. *Psychopathology, 49*(4), 217–227. https://doi.org/10.1159/000447640

Bailenson, J. N., & Yee, N. (2005). Digital chameleons: Automatic assimilation of nonverbal gestures in immersive virtual environments. *Psychological Science, 16*(10), 814–819.

Baker, R. D. (2018). *Trust me, I'm lying: The art of deception and the truth teller's toolkit*. John Wiley & Sons.

Barnhill, C. R., & Turner, B. A. (2013). Broken promises: The effect of psychological contract violation on student-athlete trust and intentions to leave their team. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport, 6*(2), 179–195. https://doi.org/10.1123/jis.6.2.179

Barrett, D. (2006). *Leadership communication*. McGraw-Hill.

Beck, R. S., Daughtridge, R., & Sloane, P. D. (2002). Physician-patient communication in the primary care office: A systematic review. *The Journal of the American Board of Family Practice, 15*(1), 25–38.

Beebe, B., Gerstman, L., Carson, B., Dolins, M., Zigman, A., Rosensweig, H., Faughey, K., & Korman, M. (1982). Rhythmic communication in the mother-infant dyad. In M. Davis (Ed.), *Interaction rhythms: Periodicity in communicative behavior* (pp. 79–100). Human Sciences Press.

Beier, E. G., & Young, D. M. (1998). *The silent language of psychotherapy: Social reinforcement of unconscious processes*. Aldine de Gruyter.

Berger, M. J., Mitchell, J. B., & Clark, R. H. (2015). *Trial advocacy: Planning, analysis, and strategy*. Wolters Kluwer Law & Business.

Bernieri, F. J. (1988). Coordinated movement and rapport in teacher-student interactions. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 12*(2), 120–138. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00986930

Bernieri, F. J., Reznick, J. S., & Rosenthal, R. (1988). Synchrony, pseudosynchrony, and dissynchrony: Measuring the entrainment process in mother-infant interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(2), 243–253. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.2.243

Bickley, L. S., Szilagyi, P. G., & Bates, B. (2007). *Bates' guide to physical examination and history taking*. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Birdwhistell, R. L. (1970). *Kinesics and context: Essays on body motion communication*. Ballantine.

Birrer, R. B. (1987). *Urban family medicine*. Springer-Verlag.

Bombar, M. L., & Littig, L. W., Jr. (1996). Babytalk as a communication of intimate attachment: An initial study in adult romances and friendships. *Personal Relationships, 3*(2), 137–158. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.1996.tb00108.x

Boone, R. T., & Buck, R. (2003). Emotional expressivity and trustworthiness: The role of nonverbal behavior in the evolution of cooperation. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 27*(3), 163–182.

Bovée, C. L., & Thill, J. V. (2008). *Business communication today*. Pearson Prentice Hall.

Brems, C. (2001). *Basic skills in psychotherapy and counseling*. Brooks/Cole Thomson Learning.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language use: Politeness phenomena. In E. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56–289). Cambridge University Press.

Burton, D., & Raedeke, T. D. (2008). *Sport psychology for coaches*. Human Kinetics.

Canales, B. (2019). *How to analyze people: Instantly learn body language, social skills, and secret techniques that psychologists and FBI agents use to read people.* Habits of Wisdom.

Cant, M. C., & van Heerden, C. H. (2004). *Personal selling*. JUTA Academic.

Caporael, L. R. (1981). The paralanguage of caregiving: Baby talk to the institutionalized aged. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40*(5), 876–884. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.40.5.876

Cappella, J. N. (1981). Mutual influence in expressive behavior: Adult–adult and infant–adult dyadic interaction. *Psychological Bulletin, 89*(1), 101–132.

Cardon, P. W. (2018). *Business communication: Developing leaders for a networked world.* McGraw-Hill Education.

Carnegie, D. (2009). *How to win friends and influence people.* Simon and Schuster. (Original work published 1936).https://doi.org/10.2307/20629470

Casasanto, D., Casasanto, L. S., Gijssels, T., & Hagoort, P. (2020). The reverse chameleon effect: Negative social consequences of anatomical mimicry. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, Article 1876. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01876

Cashdan, E. (1998). Smiles, speech, and body posture: How women and men display sociometric status and power. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 22*, 209–228.

Castleberry, S. B., & Tanner, J. F. (2011). *Selling: Building partnerships.* McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Castonguay, L. G., Goldfried, M. R., Wiser, S., Raue, P. J., & Hayes, A. M. (1996). Predicting the effect of cognitive therapy for depression: A study of unique and common factors. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64*(3), 497–504. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.64.3.497

Centorrino, S., Djemai, E., Hopfensitz, A., Milinski, M., & Seabright, P. (2011). *Smiling is a costly signal of cooperation opportunities: Experimental evidence from a trust game.* (Institute of Industrial Economics [IDEI] Working Paper 669). Toulouse, France: Institut d'Economie Industrielle

Chartrand, T. L., & Bargh, J. A. (1999). The chameleon effect: The perception–behavior link and social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*(6), 893–910. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.76.6.893

Chartrand, T. L., & Van Baaren, R. (2009). Human mimicry. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 41*, 219–274.

Chesebro, J. L., & McCroskey, J. C. (2002). *Communication for teachers.* Allyn and Bacon.

Cialdini, R. B. (2001). *Influence: Science and practice.* Allyn & Bacon.

Cole, S., & Bird, J. (2014). *The medical interview: The three function approach* (3rd ed.). Elsevier.

Colonnesi, C., Zijlstra, B. J. H., van der Zande, A., & Bogels, S. M. (2012). Coordination of gaze, facial expressions and vocalizations of early infant communication with mother and father. *Infant Behavior and Development, 35*(3), 524–532. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infbeh.2012.02.004

Condon, W. S., & Sander, L. W. (1974). Synchrony demonstrated between movements of the neonate and adult speech. *Child Development, 45*(2), 456–462.

Cooper, P. J., & Simonds, C. (2007). *Communication for the classroom teacher*. Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.

Cooper, R. P., & Aslin, R. N. (1990). Preference for infant-directed speech in the first month after birth. *Child Development, 61*(5), 1584–1595. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1990.tb02885.x

Cormier, L. S., Nurius, P., & Cormier, L. S. (2003). *Interviewing and change strategies for helpers: fundamental skills and cognitive behavioral interventions*. Thomson/Brooks/Cole.

Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (1992). Cognitive adaptations for social exchange. In J. Barkow, L. Cosmides, & J. Tooby (Eds.), *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture* (pp. 163–228). Oxford University Press.

Du Plooy-Cilliers, F., & Venter, L. (2005). Does the flirting behaviour of a selection of black South African youths differ from Western perspectives on flirting? An exploration. *Communicare, 24*(2), 82–104.

Du Preez, H. (1997). *Meet the rainbow nation*. Kagiso Tertiary.

Egan, G. (2002). *The skilled helper: A problem-management and opportunity-development approach to helping* (7th ed.). Brooks/Cole Publishing Company. (Original work published 1994)

Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I. (1972). Similarities and differences between cultures in expressive movements. In R. A. Hinde (Ed.), *Non-verbal communication.* Cambridge University Press.

Ekman, P. (1992). An argument for basic emotions. *Cognition and Emotion, 6*(3-4), 169–200.

Ellsberg, M. (2010). *The power of eye contact: Your secret for success in business love and life* (1st ed.). HarperPaperbacks.

Emmer, E. T., & Evertson, C. M. (2013). *Classroom management for middle and high school teachers*. Pearson.

Farley, S. D. (2014). Nonverbal reactions to an attractive stranger: The role of mimicry in communicating preferred social distance. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 38*(2), 195–208. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-014-0174-4

Farley, S. D., Hughes, S. M., & LaFayette, J. N. (2013). People will know we are in love: Evidence of differences between vocal samples directed toward lovers and friends. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 37*(3), 123–138. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-013-0151-3

Ferrazzi, K. (2008). *Never eat alone and build powerful relationships that drive success*. Crown Business.

Finch, J. K., & Fernández, C. (2019). What's in a smile?: Happiness and communication from a cultural perspective. In J. A. Muñiz Velázquez & C. M. Pulido (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of positive communication* (pp. 41–49). Routledge.

Findley, J. D., & Sales, B. D. (2012). *The science of attorney advocacy: How courtroom behavior affects jury decision making*. American Psychological Association.

Fogel, A., Toda, S., & Kawai, M. (1988). Mother-infant face-to-face interaction in Japan and the United States: A laboratory comparison using 3-month-old infants. *Developmental Psychology, 24*(3), 398–406.

Fortin, A. H., & Smith, R. C. (2012). *Smith's patient-centered interviewing: An evidence-based method.* McGraw-Hill Medical.

Fridlund, A. J. (1994). *Human facial expression: An evolutionary view.* Academic Press.

Futrell, C. (2008). *Fundamentals of selling: Customers for life through service.* McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Gallace, A., & Spence, C. (2010). The science of interpersonal touch: An overview. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews, 34*(2), 246–259. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2008.10.004

Gallo, C. (2014). *Talk like TED: The 9 public-speaking secrets of the world's top minds.* St. Martin's Press.

Gamble, T. K., & Gamble, M. (2013). *Leading with communication: A practical approach to leadership communication.* SAGE Publications.

Ganesan, S. (1994). Determinants of long-term orientation in buyer-seller relationships. *Journal of Marketing, 58*(2), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.2307/1252265

Genschow, O., & Alves, H. (2020). The submissive chameleon: Third-party inferences from observing mimicry. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 88*, Article 103966. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2020.103966

Gewirtz, J. L., & Boyd, E. F. (1977). Experiments on mother-infant interaction underlying mutual attachment acquisition: The infant conditions the mother. In P. Alloway, P. Pliner, & L. Krames (Eds.), *Attachment behavior* (pp. 109–143). Springer.

Givens, D. B. (1978). The nonverbal basis of attraction: Flirtation, courtship, and seduction. *Psychiatry, 41*(4), 346–359.

Godoy, R., Reyes-García, V., Huanca, T., Tanner, S., Leonard, W. R., McDade, T., & Vadez, V. (2005). Do smiles have a face value? Panel evidence from Amazonian Indians. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 26*(4), 469–490. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2004.10.004

Goei, R., Lindsey, L. L. M., Boster, F. J., Skalski, P. D., & Bowman, J. M. (2003). The mediating roles of liking and obligation on the relationship between favors and compliance. *Communication Research, 30*(2), 178–197. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650202250877

Guéguen, N. (2009). Mimicry and seduction: An evaluation in a courtship context. *Social Influence, 4*(4), 249–255. https://doi.org/10.1080/15534510802628173

Guéguen, N., Martin, A., Simon, J., & Meineri, S. (2012). Mimicry, sensitive topics, and surveys: When mimickers obtain more intimate revelations through mimicry. *Field Methods, 25*(1), 47–57. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X12449710

Hackman, M. Z., & Johnson, C. E. (2009). *Leadership: A communication perspective.* Waveland Press.

Hall, E. T. (1963). A system for the notation of proxemic behavior. *American Anthropologist, 65*(5), 1003–1026. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1963.65.5.02a00020

Hall, E. T. (1966). *The hidden dimension.* Doubleday.

Halpern, B. L., & Lubar, K. (2004). *Leadership presence: Dramatic techniques to reach out, motivate, and inspire.* Gotham Books.

Hareli, S., & Parkinson, B. (2008). What's social about social emotions? *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 38*(2), 131–156. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.2008.00363.x

Hart, V. (2010). *Patient-provider communications: Caring to listen.* Jones and Bartlett.

Haydock, R. S., & Sonsteng, J. O. (2015). *Trial: Advocacy before judges, jurors, and arbitrators.* West Academic Publishing.

Hayduk, L. A. (1978). Personal space: An evaluative and orienting overview. *Psychological Bulletin, 85*(1), 117–134.

Helweg-Larsen, M., Cunningham, S. J., Carrico, A., & Pergram, A. M. (2004). To nod or not to nod: An observational study of nonverbal communication and status in female and male college students. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28*(4), 358–361. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00152.x

Henley, M. (2006). *Classroom management: A proactive approach.* Prentice Hall.

Higgins, C. A., Judge, T. A., & Ferris, G. R. (2003). Influence tactics and work outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*(1), 89–106. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.181

Hill, C. E. (2009). *Helping skills: Facilitating exploration, insight, and action.* American Psychological Association.

Hillen, M. A., de Haes, H. C. M., & Smets, E. M. (2011). Cancer patients' trust in their physician—A review. *Psycho-Oncology, 20*(3), 227–241. https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.1745

Hojat, M. (2006). *Empathy in patient care: Antecedents, development, measurement, and outcomes.* Springer.

Hornik, J. (1991). Shopping time and purchasing behavior as a result of in-store tactile stimulation. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 73*(3), 969–970. https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1991.73.3.969

Hornik, J. (1992). Tactile stimulation and consumer response. *The Journal of Consumer Research, 19*(3), 449–458. https://doi.org/10.1086/209314

Hornik, J., & Ellis, S. (1988). Strategies to secure compliance for a mall intercept interview. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 52*(4), 539–551. https://doi.org/10.1086/269129

Hughes, S. M., Farley, S. D., & Rhodes, B. C. (2010). Vocal and physiological changes in response to the physical attractiveness of conversational partners. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 34*(3), 155–167. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-010-0087-9

Ingram, T. N., LaForge, R. W., Avila, R. A., Schwepker, C. H., Jr., & Williams, M. R. (2012). *Sell.* Cengage Learning.

Ivey, A. E., Ivey, M. B., & Zalaquett, C. P. (2010). *Intentional interviewing and counseling: Facilitating client development in a multicultural society.* Brooks/Cole.

Jacob, C., Guéguen, N., Martin, A., & Boulbry, G. (2011). Retail salespeople's mimicry of customers: Effects on consumer behavior. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 18*(5), 381–388. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2010.11.006

Johnston, M. W., & Marshall, G. W. (2010). *Relationship selling.* McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Jones, B. C., DeBruine, L. M., Little, A. C., Conway, C. A., & Feinberg, D. R. (2006). Integrating gaze direction and expression in preferences for attractive faces. *Psychological Science, 17*(7), 588–591. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01749.x

Kao, S. F., Hsieh, M. H., & Lee, P. L. (2017). Coaching competency and trust in coach in sport teams. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 12*(3), 319–327. https://doi.org/10.1177/1747954117710508

Kavanagh, L. C., Suhler, C. L., Churchland, P. S., & Winkielman, P. (2011). When it's an error to mirror: The surprising reputational costs of mimicry. *Psychological Science, 22*(10), 1274–1276. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611418678

Keller, H., & Gauda, G. (1987). Eye contact in the first months of life and its developmental consequences. In H. Rauh & H. C. Steinhausen (Eds). *Psychobiology and early development.* Elsevier Science Publishers.

Kellough, R. D., Carjuzaa, J., & Callahan, J. F. (2006). *Teaching in the middle and secondary schools.* Pearson/Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Kim, S. S., Kaplowitz, S., & Johnston, M. V. (2004). The effects of physician empathy on patient satisfaction and compliance. *Evaluation & the Health Professions, 27*(3), 237–251. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163278704267037

King, D., Rowe, A., & Leonards, U. (2011). I trust you; hence I like the things you look at: Gaze cueing and sender trustworthiness influence object evaluation. *Social Cognition, 29*(4), 476–485. https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2011.29.4.476

Kinicki, A., & Fugate, M. (2016). *Organizational behavior: A practical, problem-solving approach.* McGraw-Hill Education.

Kleck, R. (1969). Physical stigma and task oriented interactions. *Human Relations, 22*(1), 53–60. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872676902200103

Krumhuber, E. G., Kappas, A., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2013). Effects of dynamic aspects of facial expressions: A review. *Emotion Review, 5*(1), 41–46. https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073912451349

Kulesza, W., Dolinski, D., & Wicher, P. (2016). Knowing that you mimic me: The link between mimicry, awareness and liking. *Social Influence, 11*(1), 68–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/15534510.2016.1148072

Kurzban, R. (2001). The social psychophysics of cooperation: Nonverbal communication in a public goods game. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 25*(4), 241–259. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1012563421824

Lapakko, D. (1997). Three cheers for language: A closer examination of a widely cited study of nonverbal communication. *Communication Education, 46*(1), 63–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634529709379073

Lill, D. J., & Lill, J. K. (2008). *Selling: The profession: Focusing on building relationships.* DM Bass Publications.

Lipkin, M., Putnam, S. M., & Lazare, A. (1995). *The medical interview: Clinical care, education, and research.* Springer.

Little, K. B. (1965). Personal space. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1*(3), 237–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(65)90028-4

Lott, D. F., & Sommer, R. (1967). Seating arrangements and status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 7*(1), 90–95. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0024925

Malisz, Z., Włodarczak, M., Buschmeier, H., Skubisz, J., Kopp, S., & Wagner, P. (2016). The ALICO corpus: Analysing the active listener. *Language Resources and Evaluation, 50*(2), 411–442. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10579-016-9355-6

Marks, R. B. (1991). *Personal selling: An interactive approach.* Allyn and Bacon.

Martel, M., & Martel, M. (1989). *The persuasive edge: The executive's guide to speaking and presenting*. Ballantine Books.

Martens, R. (2012). *Successful coaching*. Human Kinetics.

Mason, M. F., Tatkow, E. P., & Macrae, C. N. (2005). The look of love: Gaze shifts and person perception. *Psychological Science, 16*(3), 236–239. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.00809.x

Matarazzo, J. D., & Wiens, A. N. (1972). *The interview: Research on its anatomy and structure.* Aldine-Atherton.

McClave, E. Z. (2000). Linguistic functions of head movements in the context of speech. *Journal of Pragmatics, 32*(7), 855–878. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00079-X

McElhaney, J. W. (2005). *McElhaney's trial notebook*. American Bar Association Section of Litigation and the Division for Professional Education.

Mechanic, D. (1998). The functions and limitations of trust in the provision of medical care. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law, 23*(4), 661–686. https://doi.org/10.1215/03616878-23-4-661

Mehrabian, A. (1968a). Inference of attitude from the posture, orientation and distance of a communicator. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32*(3), 296–308. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0025906

Mehrabian, A. (1968b). Relationship of attitude to seated posture, orientation, and distance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10*(1), 26–30. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0026384

Mehrabian, A. (1969). Significance of posture and position in the communication of attitude and status relationships. *Psychological Bulletin, 71*(5), 359–372. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0027349

Mehrabian, A. (1972). *Nonverbal communication.* Aldine-Atherton.

Mehrabian, A., & Ferris, S. R. (1967). Inference of attitudes from nonverbal communication in two channels. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 31*(3), 248–252. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0024648

Mehrabian, A., & Ksionzky, S. (1970). Models for affiliative and conformity behavior. *Psychological Bulletin, 74*(2), 110–126. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0029603

Mehu, M., Little, A. C., & Dunbar, R. I. M. (2007). Duchenne smiles and the perception of generosity and sociability in faces. *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology, 5*(1), 183–196. https://doi.org/10.1556/JEP.2007.1011

Mehu, M., & N'Diaye, K. (2010). The proximate mechanisms and ultimate functions of smiles. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 33*(6), 454–455. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X10001561

Messinger, D. S., & Fogel, A. (2007). The interactive development of social smiling. In R. V. Kail (Ed.), *Advances in child development and behavior* (pp. 327–366). Elsevier Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-009735-7.50014-1https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-009735-7.50014-1

Messinger, D. S., Fogel, A., & Dickson, K. L. (2001). All smiles are positive, but some smiles are more positive than others. *Developmental Psychology, 37*(5), 642–653. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.37.5.642

Montoya, R. M., & Horton, R. S. (2020). Understanding the attraction process. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 14*(4), Article e12526. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12526

Montoya, R. M., Kershaw, C., & Prosser, J. L. (2018). A meta-analytic investigation of the relation between interpersonal attraction and enacted behavior. *Psychological Bulletin, 144*(7), 673–709. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000148

Moore, M. M., & Tschannen-Moran, B. (2010). *Coaching psychology manual.* Wolters Kluwer Health/Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins.

Morris, D. (1977). *Manwatching: A field guide to human behavior.* H. N. Abrams.

Mowen, J. C., Licata, J. W., & McPhail, J. (1993). Waiting in the emergency room: How to improve patient satisfaction. *Marketing Health Services, 13*(2), 26–33.

Munter, M., & Hamilton, L. (2012). *Guide to managerial communication: Effective business writing and speaking.* Pearson.

Murphy, S. M. (2005). *The sport psych handbook.* Human Kinetics.

Murray, P. L. (1995). *Basic trial advocacy.* Little, Brown & Co.

Myerscough, P. R., & Ford, M. J. (1996). *Talking with patients: Keys to good communication.* Oxford University Press.

Ong, L. M., De Haes, J. C., Hoos, A. M., & Lammes, F. B. (1995). Doctor-patient communication: A review of the literature. *Social Science & Medicine, 40*(7), 903–918. https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(94)00155-M

Osugi, T., & Kawahara, J. I. (2018). Effects of head nodding and shaking motions on perceptions of likeability and approachability. *Perception, 47*(1), 16–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/0301006617733209

Patterson, G. R., & Gullion, M. E. (1968). *Living with children: New methods for parents and teachers.* Research Press.

Perrin, L. T., Caldwell, H. M., & Chase, C. A. (2011). *The art & science of trial advocacy.* Carolina Academic Press.

Polack, E. P., & Avtgis, T. A. (2011). *Medical communication: Defining the discipline.* Kendall Hunt.

Posner, M. I. (1980). Orienting of attention. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 32*(1), 3–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335558008248231

Puts, D. A., Barndt, J. L., Welling, L. L. M., Dawood, K., & Burriss, R. P. (2011). Intrasexual competition among women: Vocal femininity affects perceptions of attractiveness and flirtatiousness. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*(1), 111–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.09.011

Quintanilla, K. M., & Wahl, S. T. (2014). *Business and professional communication: Keys for workplace excellence.* Sage.

Raman, M., & Singh, P. (2012). *Business communication.* Oxford University Press.

Ray, G. B., & Floyd, K. (2006). Nonverbal expressions of liking and disliking in initial interaction: Encoding and decoding perspectives. *The Southern Communication Journal, 71*(1), 45–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/10417940500503506

Read, D. S. (2007). *Winning at trial*. National Institute for Trial Advocacy.

Reece, B. L. (2014). *Effective human relations: Interpersonal and organizational applications*. South-Western.

Rieke, R. D., & Stutman, R. K. (1990). *Communication in legal advocacy*. University of South Carolina Press.

Robinson, S. L. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological construct. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*(4), 574–599. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393868

Rogers, C. R., Farson, R. E., & University of Chicago (1957). *Active listening*. Industrial Relations Center, University of Chicago.

Rose, C. H. (2011). *Fundamental trial advocacy*. Thomson/West.

Rose, S. A. (1990). The sense of touch. In K. E. Barnard & T. B. Brazelton (Eds.), *Touch: The foundation of experience* (pp. 299–324). International Universities Press.

Roter, D. L., & Hall, J. A. (2006). *Doctors talking with patients/patients talking with doctors: Improving communication in medical visits*. Praeger.

Sally, D. (1995). Conversation and cooperation in social dilemmas: A meta-analysis of experiments from 1958 to 1992. *Rationality and Society, 7*(1), 58–92. https://doi.org/10.1177/1043463195007001004

Schachner, D. A., Shaver, P. R., & Mikulincer, M. (2005). Patterns of nonverbal behavior and sensitivity in the context of attachment relationships. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 29*(3), 141–169. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-005-4847-x

Scharlemann, J. P. W., Eckel, C. C., Kacelnik, A., & Wilson, R. K. (2001). The value of a smile: Game theory with a human face. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 22*(5), 617–640. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-4870(01)00059-9

Scheflen, A. E. (1965). Quasi-courtship behavior in psychotherapy. *Psychiatry, 28*(3), 245–257. https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.1965.11023433

Scherer, K. R. (2003). Vocal communication of emotion: A review of research paradigms. *Speech Communication, 40*(1-2), 227–256. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6393(02)00084-5

Schwarzwald, J., Raz, M., & Zvibel, M. (1979). The applicability of the door-in-the face technique when established behavioral customs exist. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 9*(6), 576–586. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1979.tb00817.x

Simons, H. W. (1976). *Persuasion: Understanding practice and analysis*. Addison-Wesley Pub.

Sommers-Flanagan, J., & Sommers-Flanagan, R. (2015). *Clinical interviewing*. John Wiley.

Soorjoo, M. (2012). *Here's the pitch: How to pitch your business to anyone, get funded, and win clients*. John Wiley & Sons.

Sussman, N. M., & Rosenfeld, H. M. (1982). Influence of culture, language, and sex on conversational distance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42*(1), 66–74. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.42.1.66

Tai-Seale, M., McGuire, T. G., & Zhang, W. (2007). Time allocation in primary care office visits. *Health Services Research, 42*(5), 1871–1894. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6773.2006.00689.x

Thayer, S. (1986). Touch: Frontier of intimacy. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 10*, 7–11. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00987201

Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. John Wiley.

Tooby, J., & Cosmides, L. (1990). The past explains the present: Emotional adaptations and the structure of ancestral environments. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 11*(4-5), 375–424. https://doi.org/10.1016/0162-3095(90)90017-Z

van Baaren, R. B., Maddux, W. W., Chartrand, T. L., De Bouter, C., & Van Knippenberg, A. (2003). It takes two to mimic: Behavioral consequences of self-construals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(5), 1093–1102. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.5.1093

Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K., & Manstead, A. S. (2010). An interpersonal approach to emotion in social decision making: The emotions as social information model. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 42, pp. 45–96). Academic Press.

Vuilleumier, P., George, N., Lister, V., Armony, J., & Driver, J. (2005). Effects of perceived mutual gaze and gender on face processing and recognition memory. *Visual Cognition, 12*(1), 85–101. https://doi.org/10.1080/13506280444000120

Weinberg, R. S., & Gould, D. (2007). *Foundations of sport and exercise psychology*. Human Kinetics.

Weinstein, C. S., & Mignano, A. J. (2007). *Elementary classroom management: Lessons from research and practice*. McGraw-Hill.

Wexley, K. N., Fugita, S. S., & Malone, M. P. (1975). An applicant's nonverbal behavior and student-evaluators' judgments in a structured interview setting. *Psychological Reports, 36*(2), 391–394. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1975.36.2.391

Whitcher, S. J., & Fisher, J. D. (1979). Multidimensional reaction to therapeutic touch in a hospital setting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*(1), 87–96. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.37.1.87

White, J., & Gardner, J. (2012). *The classroom X-Factor: The power of body language and nonverbal communication in teaching*. Routledge.

Williams, J. M. (2010). *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance*. McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Williams, S., Weinman, J., & Dale, J. (1998). Doctor-patient communication and patient satisfaction: A review. *Family Practice, 15*(5), 480–492. https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/15.5.480

Wong, H. K., & Wong, R. T. (2018). *The first days of school: How to be an effective teacher*. Harry K. Wong Publications.

Wyland, C. L., & Forgas, J. P. (2010). Here's looking at you kid: Mood effects on processing eye gaze as a heuristic cue. *Social Cognition, 28*(1), 133–144. https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2010.28.1.133

Zhang, Z., & Chelladurai, P. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of athlete's trust in the coach. *Journal of Sport and Health Science, 2*(2), 115–121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jshs.2012.03.002

Zolnierek, K. B. H., & DiMatteo, M. R. (2009). Physician communication and patient adherence to treatment: A meta-analysis. *Medical Care, 47*(8), 826–834. https://doi.org/10.1097/MLR.0b013e31819a5acc

Social Psychological Bulletin (SPB) is an official journal of the Polish Social Psychological Society (PSPS).

PsychOpen GOLD is a publishing service by Leibniz Institute for Psychology (ZPID), Germany.