Received: 29 August 2023 | Revised: 25 October 2023 | Accepted: 13 November 2023

DOI: 10.1002/arcp.1092

REVIEW

Listen to this: Why consumer behavior researchers should care about listening

Guy Itzchakov[1] | S. Christian Wheeler[2]

[1]Department of Human Services, University of Haifa, Haifa, Israel

[2]Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, Stanford, California, USA

Correspondence
Dr. Guy Itzchakov, Department of Human Services, University of Haifa, Abba Khoushy Ave 199, Haifa 349883, Israel.
Email: gitzchako@univ.haifa.ac.il

Funding information
Israel Science Foundation, Grant/Award Number: 1235/21

Abstract

Consumers' decisions are intricately interwoven with their conversations. Whether it is an animated discussion with a trusted friend extolling the virtues of a newly acquired car (i.e., Word-of-Mouth), an engaging dialogue with a salesperson, or a clarifying call to a help center seeking guidance on a just-purchased smartwatch, every exchange hinges on a pivotal factor: the quality of listening. Listening quality shapes perceptions, affects social influence, drives behavioral intentions, and, ultimately, determines purchase and post-purchase outcomes. Yet, despite its importance to these consumer behavior outcomes, listening has received scant attention in consumer psychology. In this paper, we review the effects of listening on consumer behavior-relevant outcomes and unpack the components of quality listening to reveal their independent mechanisms. We also point to new frontiers in listening research beyond the in-person, dyadic interactions that have been the primary focus of listening research to date. By doing this, we elucidate how listening and consumer behavior are connected and encourage more research on listening in consumer psychology.

KEYWORDS
attitudes and persuasion, communication, imagery and nonverbal communication

1 | INTRODUCTION

Consumers have frequent conversations about products and services. Some conversations occur between consumers and sales representatives. For example, a customer may interact with a salesperson to determine what type of ski jacket would best match their needs, or a customer may interact with a company representative to resolve an issue with a faulty product. Other conversations occur between customers, something typically called word of mouth. For example, a customer might recommend a restaurant to a co-worker or relate experiences with a doctor to a friend. Research in consumer behavior has typically focused on one side of these conversations, specifically on the role of the speaker. For example, some research has focused on how a salesperson's tactics can influence assessments of whether they have ulterior motives (DeCarlo, 2005). Similarly, research on word of mouth has typically focused on what makes people decide to talk about products and what they say when they do (e.g., Berger, 2014).

The focus of this review is on the recipient side of conversational exchanges and, in particular, on the recipient's listening. Listening is a comprehensive process that involves unobservable processes

Guy Itzchakov and S. Christian Wheeler are co-first authors.

(e.g., attention, comprehension, and a positive intention toward the speaker) and observable manifestations of those processes (e.g., eye contact and nodding) with the consequence that the speaker feels listened to (Kluger & Itzchakov, 2022). These processes are associated with a host of important consumer behavior consequences. Those who engage in careful listening are liked and trusted more, and they exert greater social influence and persuasion. Moreover, those who are carefully listened to exhibit demonstrable shifts in their emotional and attitudinal responses. Each of these outcomes can extend beyond the conversation partner to the company or brand that is the topic of the discussion. Of course, conversation is a two-way process. Not only can consumers be listened to with varying degrees of effort, but also consumers themselves can listen or not, and so we discuss factors that induce listening and the consequences of that listening on the part of consumers. In some cases, listening on the part of one agent has spillover effects on the other agent, as might be expected from any dyadic exchange. In most conversations, each person plays the role of both speaker and listener.

Traditional definitions of listening restrict listening behaviors to synchronous, in-person, dyadic verbal exchanges. According to one definition, listening is a multifaceted activity that involves cognitive, attitudinal, and motivational processes aimed at shaping meaning from verbal and nonverbal behavior (International Listening Association, 1996). In this paper, we focus primarily on such contexts but also take a broader view to include technologically mediated interactions. The potential risk of this approach is conflating very different processes colloquially referred to as "listening." Nevertheless, unpacking the component processes of listening permits theorizing of how they may operate similarly across communication modes (e.g., synchronous and asynchronous).

It also permits the examination of how the individual components of listening function. Although listening as a topic of study has typically been examined holistically (e.g., Lipetz et al., 2020), considerable work in consumer behavior and social psychology has examined its individual parts and revealed consequences similar to those using more holistic approaches. Therefore, we review both the holistic and reductive sets of research intending to acquaint consumer behavior researchers with holistic listening research published in other fields and link listening research to findings on component ingredients that may be more familiar to consumer behavior researchers.

2 | HOLISTIC EXAMINATIONS OF LISTENING

Listening research has utilized three primary methodologies. The first and most prominent is survey research, which includes self-reports (Neill & Bowen, 2021; Rave et al., 2022) and more advanced approaches, such as Social Relation Models (Kluger et al., 2021; Malloy et al., 2021). The Social Relations Model is a statistical approach for studying how individuals' behaviors and perceptions contribute to social dynamics within groups, considering factors like individuals' similarities and differences and the social context (Kenny et al., 2006). The second methodology is laboratory experiments. Researchers who study listening in laboratory experiments often manipulate the quality of listening behavior either using instructions to participants (Castro et al., 2018; Pasupathi & Billitteri, 2015) or trained confederates (Itzchakov et al., 2020; Itzchakov & Weinstein, 2021; Itzchakov, Weinstein, Saluk, & Amar, 2023). The third approach is quasi-experiments. Quasi-experiments are employed when random assignment of employees to experimental conditions is not possible. Quasi-experiments include pre-post measurements with an experimental (i.e., listening training group) and control group (Itzchakov, 2020; Itzchakov, Weinstein, & Cheshin, 2022; Itzchakov, Weinstein, Vinokur, & Yomtovian, 2023) or pre-post designs without a control group (Aakre et al., 2016; Edwards et al., 2006; Janusik, 2023).

This holistic research has revealed several consequences of central importance to consumer behavior. Listening improves perceptions of the listener, enhances their social influence, and increases their sales and operational performance. Listening also has effects on the speaker, including increased openness to change and decreased defensiveness during disagreement.

2.1 | Effects on the listener

2.1.1 | Perceptions of the listener

Listening leads others to form more positive impressions of the listener. First, people like those who listen to them (Lopez-Rosenfeld et al., 2015). A recent meta-analysis found a strong correlation of $r = .66$ between perceived listening and liking across three studies and 4672 participants (Kluger et al., 2023). Speakers also view listeners as more competent (Bodie, 2023). Interestingly, listening can improve both speakers' perceptions of the listeners' competence (Weinstein et al., 2022) and listeners' perceptions of their own competence. Service providers given listening training have reduced anxiety during difficult conversations with customers and have greater self-perceived competence (Itzchakov, 2020).

Good listeners are also seen as more trustworthy. Studies of various types of relationships, including those between subordinates and supervisors (Stine et al., 1995), patients and physicians (Keating et al., 2004), customers and salespeople (Bergeron & Laroche, 2009), and mock theft suspects and Dutch police-detective interviewers (Beune et al., 2009) all link good listening to increased trust in the listener. Meta-analyses have shown that when salespeople listen well, they gain the trust of their customers (Itani et al., 2019) and experience improved trust and relationship outcomes in job settings (Kluger et al., 2023). Most of these effects are correlational and do not necessarily suggest causality, but experimental evidence supports the same conclusion. Leaders manipulated to exhibit good listening (e.g., by asking clarifying questions, taking notes, and rephrasing the members'

statements) were subsequently trusted more, and they received more commitment from their team members in their ultimate decisions (Korsgaard et al., 1995). These effects parallel prior work on trust in consumer behavior research. That work has shown that a source's trustworthiness affects whether consumers take that source's advice (Barnett White, 2005) and uncritically accept his or her claims (Priester & Petty, 1995). Trust also increases purchase intentions, brand loyalty (Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001), and customer satisfaction (Selnes & Sallis, 2003).

2.1.2 | Social influence

Not surprisingly, given the positive impressions people draw of good listeners, good listeners exert greater social influence. Attentive and active listeners are viewed as more influential and as being better able to influence others and to build coalitions; these effects persist even after controlling for the listener's skill in presentation (e.g., being able to communicate clearly, candidly, and logically; Ames et al., 2012). Listeners may also have greater influence over the spread of information on social networks. Corazzini et al. (2012) created a network that systematically manipulated the structure of social networks and examined the spread of information over a series of repeated rounds. Specifically, some individuals in the network were manipulated to have multiple outgoing links, such that all others received information from that member. Other individuals in the network were manipulated to have multiple incoming links, such that they listened to more information than others did. Interestingly, increasing the number of outgoing links in the network did not increase influence, but increasing the number of incoming links did. As the authors summarized, "the beliefs of agents communicating through a social network tend to be swayed towards the opinions of *influential listeners*" (p. 1286). This research found that the most influential agents within the networks were those who listened to a substantial number of others. Moreover, when consensus beliefs emerged, meaning everyone adopted the same beliefs through communication, they tended to reflect the viewpoints of these influential listeners (Corazzini et al., 2012).

2.1.3 | Sales and operational performance

Salespeople who listen well sell more. A meta-analysis of 16 studies involving almost 4000 participants found an average correlation of 0.38 between salesperson listening and sales volume (Itani et al., 2019). This correlation is above the 75th percentile of the correlations' effect sizes in applied psychology (Bosco et al., 2015). One way salespeople can signal their listening is through concrete language. Salespeople and customer service representatives who use concrete language are perceived to be better listeners, and they achieve greater customer satisfaction and purchases as a result (Packard & Berger, 2021). There is also some evidence for indirect effects of listening on organizational performance. Specifically, plants with workers who reported being listened to well experienced more positive changes in net income than those that did not (Johnston & Reed, 2017).

2.2 | Effects on the speaker

2.2.1 | Openness to change

Listening also has effects on the speaker. In particular, being listened to can open people up to attitude change (DeMarree et al., 2023). People often hold attitudes that are highly resistant to change, either because they concern emotionally charged topics or simply because the attitudes are deeply entrenched. People may have strongly held attitudes toward social or political issues; they may have a strong reluctance to try new technology; they may cling to beliefs formed through unreliable media outlets; or they may be upset about a service or product failure. In these cases, reducing the defensiveness of such emotionally charged attitudes is critical to opening the person to change. Acknowledging that one holds incorrect views can be threatening to one's self-image (Cohen et al., 2000), and feeling that one is the subject of a persuasive attempt can induce resistance and reactance (Brehm & Brehm, 1981; Eisend & Tarrahi, 2022). Listening, however, is a powerful tool for reducing defensiveness and opening the person to change.

In one intervention (Kalla & Broockman, 2020), political canvassers exchanged personal narratives with constituents. They were trained to listen nonjudgmentally to understand the constituent's views and experiences on topics such as unauthorized immigrants and transgender rights. In the most powerful form of the intervention, the listeners encouraged the constituents to explicitly consider the implications of their narratives that ran counter to their previously stated attitudes. The results showed that this form of listening shifted attitudes; these shifts persisted for over 4.5 months after the intervention. Hence, nonjudgmental listening allows people to explore their views more fully, understand inconsistencies, and do so in a context that reduces the threat that can naturally arise from considering counterattitudinal information.

Parallel results have been found in carefully controlled laboratory experiments. For example, one set of studies (Itzchakov et al., 2020) examined whether emotionally charged attitudes (in this case, prejudicial attitudes) could be affected by listening. The studies manipulated listening quality at multiple levels. They found that high-quality listening (relative to moderate or poor listening) increased participants' perceived reflective self-awareness (i.e., inner exploration and analysis) and self-insight (i.e., the extent to which they thought more deeply and understood more thoroughly themselves and their attitudinal positions). Rather than solidifying the prejudicial attitudes, this self-insight led to greater openness to change and greater attitude change in favorability toward the outgroup. High-quality listening prompted people to reflect on their sources of resistance and bias and removed them as barriers to change.

Two other sets of studies (Itzchakov et al., 2017, 2018) manipulated listening quality through multiple means and found that one

basis for the lowered resistance comes from lowered social anxiety. High-quality listening lowers social anxiety (e.g., concerns about what the listener thinks of them). This nonjudgmental component opens the avenues for change. The lowered social anxiety resulting from high-quality listening has the effect of reducing defensive processing, which can trigger subsequent changes in attitude structure. For example, those receiving high-quality listening on emotionally charged topics such as euthanasia or organ donation reported less of a need to justify their position on the issue and indicated having fewer defensive thoughts (e.g., concerning self-judgment, self-justification, attitude bolstering, or closed-mindedness; Itzchakov et al., 2017). Hence, listening reduces people's need to cling defensively to their prior attitudes. There are additional fascinating downstream consequences of these attitudinal shifts. Attitudes are characterized by varying degrees of "strength," that is, the extent to which the attitude is stable over time, resistant to change, and influential over thoughts and behavior (Krosnick & Petty, 1995). There are multiple indicators of attitude strength, including ambivalence, extremity, and certainty, and these indicators typically move in concert. The attitude strength shifts from careful listening show a different pattern by increasing some attitude strength indicators and decreasing others. Put another way, listening can reduce the correlation between some of these attitude strength indicators. For example, ambivalence researchers have distinguished between objective ambivalence (i.e., the presence of both positive and negative reactions to the same attitude target) and subjective ambivalence (i.e., the feeling of attitudinal tension that results). Those receiving high-quality listening on charged attitudinal topics increase their objective ambivalence—that is, they incorporate both sides of an issue into their attitudinal representation to a greater degree, with the effect that it reduces the extremity of their attitudes (Itzchakov & Kluger, 2017a). Although listening increases objective ambivalence, it decreases its relationship with subjective ambivalence (Itzchakov et al., 2017). That is, people who are carefully listened to have more two-sided evaluations but do not experience a concomitant increase in evaluative tension.

One might expect that the increased objective ambivalence that results from careful listening would also be accompanied by lower attitude certainty, but that is not the case—careful listening *increases* attitude certainty. However, listening affects different types of attitude certainty differently. Careful listening increases the attitude holder's sense of attitude clarity (Itzchakov et al., 2018), which is defined as the extent to which one clearly knows what one's attitude is but not the attitude holder's sense of attitude correctness—the extent to which one feels that one's attitude is the correct one to have (Petrocelli et al., 2007). Hence, listening increases insight without making one closed-minded to other points of view. Furthermore, speakers who experienced good listening wanted to share their attitudes with others more than speakers who received lower listening qualities but did not want to persuade them to change their attitudes (Itzchakov et al., 2018). This finding was replicated in work that found that high-quality listening increased speakers' self-disclosure intentions during difficult conversations (Weinstein et al., 2021).

2.2.2 | Defensiveness during disagreement

Disagreements often trigger defensiveness between conversation partners. Listeners often internally counterargue speakers they disagree with, which can extremetize their initial attitudes (Worchel & Brehm, 1970). High-quality listening mitigates this tendency and helps listeners find common ground. For example, in one series of studies (Itzchakov, Weinstein, Leary, et al., 2023), high-quality listeningconfederates made their speakers feel greater social comfort and connection during disagreements than listeners who exhibited lower-quality listening. This, in turn, prompted speakers to reflect on their attitudes less defensively, fostering self-insight. As a result, the speakers perceived that their attitudes had become less one-sided (i.e., extreme) and closer to those of the listeners. However, the valence of the speakers' attitudes did not change. Namely, speakers did not shift from being positive (negative) toward the attitude topic to being negative (positive).

Listening in disagreements can also increase speakers' subjective well-being (Weinstein et al., 2021, 2022). Specifically, across three experiments that included topics such as disagreement toward hiring a potential candidate for a role, speakers who experienced high-quality listening from their confederate listeners reported higher subjective well-being than speakers who experienced moderate quality of listening. This effect was mediated by increased satisfaction of speakers' basic psychological needs: autonomy, relatedness, and competence.

These findings are relevant to consumer psychology as they illuminate the impact of listening quality during disagreements on individuals' attitudes and subjective well-being. In consumer behavior, where disagreements or differing opinions can arise in product preferences, purchasing decisions, or brand loyalty, these findings underscore the importance of attentive and empathetic listening in bridging divides and potentially positively influencing consumer attitudes and well-being. Moreover, the role of basic psychological needs in mediating the effects suggests that businesses and marketers should consider listening quality in enhancing consumers' satisfaction and overall well-being when addressing disputes or concerns.

In sum, listening affects many different dimensions of speakers' attitudes and does so in ways that change the typical correlations between those dimensions. It uniquely alters speakers' attitudes, making them more complex and less defensive. It makes speakers more open to sharing their views but less interested in changing others'. Moreover, it creates a positive cycle such that the well-listened-to become good listeners themselves.

3 | THE COMPONENTS OF LISTENING AND THEIR CONSTITUENTS

As noted earlier, listening has been construed as a holistic, multicomponent process, including unobservable behaviors on the part of the listener (e.g., attention), observable behaviors on the part of the listener (e.g., eye contact and body orientation), and perceptions on the

part of the speaker (e.g., that one has been heard; Kluger & Itzchakov, 2022). Theorizing suggests that a listening mindset or orientation on the listener's part creates unobservable responses, manifesting in responses observable to the speaker. Although this process is intuitive, there are contexts in which they are not perfectly related. There is no one-to-one translation of internal states to external manifestations, and observers are typically not skilled at making accurate inferences about people's internal states. For example, people's ratings of their own receptiveness correlate only weakly with others' perceptions of their receptiveness (Yeomans et al., 2020). Similarly, listeners' perceptions of their own listening have a low correlation with speakers' and third-party perceptions (Bodie et al., 2014), though this relationship can depend on the level of acquaintance between the speaker and the listener (Kluger et al., 2021, 2022). Some behaviors that could appear to signal a lack of attention on the part of listeners can actually increase attention and comprehension. For example, one study randomly assigned participants to doodle or not to doodle while listening to a monotonous telephone message. They were asked to monitor the message for the names of people coming to a party. Those instructed to doodle performed better on the monitoring test and had 29% better recall on a surprise memory task than those not instructed to doodle (Andrade, 2010). Doodling, which could be interpreted as signaling a lack of attention and comprehension, actually facilitated it.

Even observable listening behaviors sometimes go unnoticed by speakers. For example, listeners trained to engage in reflective listening (i.e., encouraging someone to talk by verifying what they said nonjudgmentally) successfully did so, but this was not reflected in perceptions of listening (Rautalinko & Lisper, 2004). This is all to say that actual listening, as reflected in the nonobservable components, can differ from observable comopnents of listening, which in turn can differ from perceptions of listening.

Because the unobservable and observable components of listening can independently create outcomes previously shown in holistic listening research, it is illustrative to consider them separately. By reviewing them separately in conjunction with the holistic results above, we hope to provide insight into how these holistic effects emerge as well as to make predictions for listening-related behaviors that extend beyond in-person dyadic changes between humans, as we do near the end of the paper.

3.1 | Listeners' unobservable behaviors

Listening comprises a variety of unobservable internal states on the part of the listener. These include attention to the spoken content, comprehension of the communication, and a benevolent intention (Kluger & Mizrahi, 2023). Though related on the listener's part, these components are distinct. Nevertheless, each feature can have important consumer behavior outcomes such as influencing learning, persuasion, and the agent's liking (e.g., salesperson).

3.1.1 | Attention and comprehension

The first two unobservable states involved in listening are attention and comprehension. Good listeners attend carefully to communications and achieve strong comprehension of the speaker's message through this listening. Attention and subsequent comprehension require both motivation and ability (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986a). Motivational factors include things such as the self-relevance or importance of the topic (Petty & Cacioppo, 1990), dispositional tendencies (Haugtvedt & Petty, 1992), and violated expectancies (Maheswaran & Chaiken, 1991).

Motivation is itself insufficient; the ability to listen carefully is also required. Ability factors include both features of the person (e.g., relevant knowledge; Wood et al., 1995) and the environment. External distractions such as text messages (Lopez-Rosenfeld et al., 2015) or flickering computer screens (Castro et al., 2018; Itzchakov et al., 2017) interfere with a listener's ability to attend to a speaker. Interestingly, distracted listeners also affect the cognitive processing of *speakers*. In one study, people played a game and talked about it with distracted or undistracted listeners. One month later, those talking to distracted (vs. undistracted) listeners recalled less about the game and had more inaccurate memories of the conversation (Pasupathi & Hoyt, 2010).

Although consumer behavior research has focused primarily on the attention and comprehension of consumers in response to communications by companies and company representatives, these parties are themselves listeners in many contexts. Salespeople must attend to and comprehend consumers' desires to close a sale; startups must attend to and comprehend consumers' pain points to develop superior products; customer service representatives must attend to and comprehend customers' complaints to develop mutually attractive solutions. Satisfying consumers requires being able to listen to them well.

The research reviewed above indicates that salespeople who listen better achieve greater sales outcomes, though the mechanism for those findings has not yet been established. One plausible mechanism concerns message tailoring. Message tailoring is "using any combination of information or attitude change strategy that is intended to reach one specific person based on characteristics that are unique to that person, related to the outcome of interest, and derived from an individual assessment" (Petty et al., 2009, p. 198). The better a salesperson listens carefully to consumers, the better they can tailor their communication specifically for that consumer. Matching communications to a person's characteristics and needs can often increase persuasion (Petty et al., 2000; Teeny et al., 2021).

Interestingly, one reason tailoring can be effective is that it increases cognitive elaboration (Wheeler et al., 2005). In fact, simply using a person's name can be sufficient to increase interest in and attention to communication (Sahni et al., 2018). Hence, in dyadic contexts, attention and comprehension on the part of one communicator can beget attention and comprehension on the part of the other. A

salesperson who attends carefully to what a customer is saying can more effectively tailor their communication to the customer, thereby increasing the attention and comprehension of the customer.

3.1.2 | Benevolent intentions

The third unobservable component of listening is benevolent intentions. As originally conceived by Rogers and Roethlisberger (1991/1952), benevolent intentions include factors such as validation, positive regard, and a nonjudgmental orientation toward the speaker. Benevolent, or positive intentions, refers to the extent to which listeners are willing to help speakers explore their needs, interests, and wishes without judgment. It also includes the extent to which the listeners are willing to help the speakers gain insights and solve their challenges on their own (Rogers, 1951).

Benevolent intentions resemble features of a more recent construct in the field, receptiveness (Minson & Chen, 2022). Although the receptiveness construct was designed to apply to conversational contexts involving opposing views, it can presumably apply to listening contexts even when people agree.

In contrast to manipulating attention and comprehension, manipulating benevolent intentions can be difficult, particularly when there is a disagreement between the communicators (e.g., when a company representative suspects a customer is making an unreasonable request). One intuitively appealing approach for fostering benevolent intentions is instructing listeners to adopt others' perspectives. Although perspective-taking can sometimes have its intended effects (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000; Todd & Galinsky, 2014), it can also backfire, leading to increased selfishness (Epley et al., 2006), increased stereotyping (Skorinko & Sinclair, 2013), and reduced openness (Catapano et al., 2019). Hence, merely telling people to engage in perspective-taking can often fail. Rather, good listeners have truly benevolent intentions and a curiosity about their conversation partners. This allows them to learn unbiased information about them. Accordingly, perspective-taking increases accuracy best when a person gains conversational information from the target by carefully asking questions and listening to the answers (Eyal et al., 2018).

3.2 | Listeners' observable behaviors

The unobservable behaviors of attention, comprehension, and benevolent intentions often (but do not always) manifest in behaviors observable to the speaker. For example, a sales representative attending carefully to a customer might make more eye contact and a sales representative with benevolent intentions may adapt their facial expression to the customer's facial expressions and ask more follow-up questions.

Observable behaviors associated with listening include both verbal and nonverbal behaviors. Verbal behaviors include asking questions, reflecting (repeating or paraphrasing what the speaker has said), using validating utterances, hedging or expressing uncertainty, allowing silence, and naming emotions. Nonverbal behaviors include nodding, maintaining eye contact, orienting toward the speaker, and facial expressions. We review each of these factors in turn.

3.2.1 | Verbal behaviors

Contrary to a common misperception, listening is not a passive act of merely being silent. Listening includes a variety of verbal behaviors (Collins, 2022). Below, we describe the most frequent verbal behaviors in listening.

Asking questions

Perhaps the most studied observable listener behavior is asking questions. Questions can take many forms, including follow-up, input-seeking, tag, and rhetorical questions, among others (Huang et al., 2017). Follow-up questions request elaboration of what the speaker has just said and convey an active interest in what the speaker is saying (Van Quaquebeke & Felps, 2018). The use of follow-up questions affects both the listener and the speaker. Listeners who ask follow-up questions are better liked than those who do not because they are perceived to be more responsive (Chen et al., 2010). The effects of follow-up questions on liking are restricted to the listener. Outside observers do not like those who ask follow-up questions more (Huang et al., 2017), suggesting that people only like more those responsive to them personally. Interestingly, asking follow-up questions also shapes the listener's perceptions of their conversation partner. Those instructed to ask follow-up questions viewed the perspective of their conversation partner more favorably and had greater intentions to interact with their conversation partner in the future (Chen et al., 2010).

It is natural to think of listeners asking questions of speakers, but speakers can also ask questions to invite input or promote thinking on the part of the listener. For example, a speaker could explicitly ask a listener what they think about a given topic, something we call input-seeking questions. A speaker, after delivering information, could ask the listener a question like, "What do you think about [this topic]?" or "How do you think I should approach [this issue]?" This type of question invites the listener to take over the conversation and to share their opinions, although they are also used in asynchronous communication contexts such as email exchanges (e.g., Cojuharenco & Karelaia, 2020). Input-seeking questions affect perceptions of the speaker's competence and humility. For example, the questions as information model (Cojuharenco & Karelaia, 2020) suggests that input-seeking questions lower perceptions of the question-asker's competence but increase perceptions of their humility. The net effect, therefore, depends on prior perceptions of the question-asker. Specifically, competence penalties arise only when the question-asker's competence is in doubt ex-ante, and the positive effects on humility perceptions often offset any perceived losses of competence.

A weaker type of input-seeking question is the tag question, a question appended to the end of a sentence that invites input. For example, a speaker might say, "I think we should move ahead with the

product launch, don't you?" Like some of the research above, tag questions can increase persuasion, but only when the source's competence (here: expertise) is high (Blankenship & Craig, 2007). Tag questions can also increase persuasion when the self-relevance of the communication is low, and this is because the question increases listener processing from this low baseline (Blankenship & Holtgraves, 2005).

Interestingly, even rhetorical questions can have similar effects. A rhetorical question is one in which no answer or reply is expected, such as, "Isn't it important to purchase a safe car for your family?" As with tag questions, research shows that rhetorical questions can effectively elicit persuasion (Zillmann, 1972) and compliance (Enzle & Harvey, 1982). In addition, as with tag questions, these effects can depend on the listener's initial involvement. Specifically, rhetorical questions can enhance persuasion when involvement is low (Burnkrant & Howard, 1984; Petty et al., 1981) because they increase attention and elaboration processes in the listener, but when involvement is high, they can serve as a distraction.

Hence, asking questions can shape the perceptions of both the speaker and the listener and affect persuasion. Questions can affect perceptions of the question-asker's likability, competence, and humility and affect how persuasive the question-asker is. The effects on persuasion can depend on the ex-ante perceptions of the question-asker as well as the baseline elaboration likelihood of the person being influenced (Hussein & Tormala, 2021; Pogacar et al., 2018). It is also worth pointing out that, like most observable listening behaviors, question-asking can both reflect unobservable listener behaviors (e.g., attention) and induce them.

Reflection (paraphrasing)

Reflection involves repeating back to the speaker what they have said. It originates in Rogerian therapy (Rogers, 1957) and is a core component of active listening (Nemec et al., 2017). Reflective listening has been frequently misunderstood, and Rogers' articulation of the construct shifted over the decades of his writing (Arnold, 2014). We, therefore, review various forms of reflective listening and their consequences.

Rogers' (1942) initial conceptualization of reflective listening was the most restrictive; the listener tries to reflect the emotional experience of the speaker like a mirror without adding any new content or interpretation. The intention of one using reflective listening is not to increase the listener's comprehension but rather to enhance the speaker's insight. That is, the speaker understands their viewpoint better by hearing their own statements repeated to them. By reflecting stated but not fully realized perceptions, the listener helps the speaker to understand their feelings better.

Reflection can have effects on listener perceptions that may go beyond self-insight. For example, the simplest form of reflection is verbal mimicry—repeating someone's words to them verbatim—and it significantly affects liking, trust, and compliance. In one study, waiters at a restaurant were instructed to repeat customers' orders when taking them (vs. making their understanding clear without verbal mimicry). Those instructed to repeat the orders verbatim received higher tips (Kulesza et al., 2019; Van Baaren et al., 2003). Negotiators who mimicked the verbal expressions of their counterparts elicited more trust and achieved better outcomes than those who did not, but only when the mimicry occurred early (vs. late) in the negotiation (Swaab et al., 2011). The rationale for this finding is that mimicry fosters trust and that the most critical time to establish trust is at the beginning of the negotiation.

Interestingly, the repetition of consumers' language need not be strictly verbatim. Using the same words but rearranging the order can have the same effect. In one study, currency exchange officers were instructed to repeat customers' instructions verbatim, use the same words but in a different order (paraphrase condition), or reply with a different statement containing the same number of words (Kulesza et al., 2014). Officers in two control conditions simply indicated understanding (e.g., "Right away!") or engaged in the transaction without comment. At the end of the transaction, they requested a donation to charity. Results indicated that both forms of verbal reflection (i.e., copying and paraphrasing) increased the frequency and amount of donation relative to the control groups.

The above effects derive from the exact or near exact repetition of a speaker's words, a technique associated with Rogers that he later claimed was misunderstood (Rogers, 1975). He introduced the terms "empathic listening" (Rogers, 1975) and "testing understandings" (Rogers, 1986) to clarify what he intended by reflection. Empathic listening involves verbalizing the listener's *understanding* of what the speaker has said to receive feedback regarding comprehension of the message. Hence, like asking questions, this form of reflective listening, though often modeled as an outcome of unobservable listener behaviors such as comprehension, could actually be a cause of them.

Verbalizing understandings can also help resolve disputes. This listening approach is frequently employed in conflict-resolution settings (Itzchakov & Kluger, 2017b) and has clear applicability to consumer behavior contexts such as complaint resolution. Empathic paraphrasing has been found to help reduce negative physiological and affective responses in speakers (Seehausen et al., 2012). It has also been shown to improve the listener's social attractiveness but not the speakers' conversational satisfaction or feelings of being understood (Weger et al., 2010).

Backchannel behaviors

Listeners influence the conversation through backchannel behaviors—verbal and nonverbal cues that listeners use to convey attentiveness, understanding, or encouragement to the speaker. These behaviors acknowledge the speaker's message and maintain a positive flow of communication (Pasupathi & Billitteri, 2015). Backchannel responses include short phrases such as "I see," "Uh-huh," and "Really?" and exclamations like "Wow!" or "Oh, interesting!" (Bavelas et al., 2000).

These types of backchannel responses superficially signal agreement and could improve outcomes due to perceived similarity, a well-known driver of attraction (Byrne, 1961). However, actual agreement

is not necessary for the effects to emerge. People simply instructed to use positive statements and to find points of agreement (along with hedges—reviewed next) are viewed as more persuasive and receive higher collaboration intentions (Yeomans et al., 2020).

Uncertainty and hedges

Expressed uncertainty can make people more receptive to others' ideas. Active and unbiased engagement with others' ideas is fostered by recognizing that you may have something to learn from others (Church & Barrett, 2016), and so recognizing limitations in your understanding or weaknesses in your opinions can promote open-minded attention to others. Considering how your own ideas might be wrong (Lord et al., 1984) or attending to unknown features of a problem (Walters et al., 2017) could potentially make people more receptive to the ideas of others because it induces uncertainty in one's own opinions. Hence, listener uncertainty can make people more open and attentive to communications from others (Maheswaran & Chaiken, 1991). That said, *prior* to information exposure, *high* certainty can sometimes foster receptivity because the certainty leads one to believe (inaccurately) in one's ability to resist changing one's views and, therefore, be more likely to expose oneself to counterattitudinal information (Albarracín & Mitchell, 2004).

Interestingly, a speaker's expression of uncertainty or conflict can also lead listeners to become more open to information because they signal receptiveness on the speaker's part (Hussein & Tormala, 2021). One reason this can occur is due to expectancy violation (Karmarkar & Tormala, 2010). Expert speakers who express uncertainty (e.g., "I don't have complete confidence in my opinion, but …") can elicit greater information processing from the listener, leading to greater persuasion when arguments are strong. However, these effects are limited to expert sources; nonexpert sources are less persuasive when uncertain.

Similarly, hedging one's opinion by acknowledging both sides of an issue can be more persuasive. Advertisements that acknowledge the negative features of new products (e.g., beer or cold/headache remedies) in addition to positive ones are more persuasive than ads providing only positive information (Etgar & Goodwin, 1982). Two-sided messages can be particularly effective for audiences with deeply entrenched attitudes, and research suggests another possible mechanism for the effects—speakers who explicitly acknowledge both sides of an issue are perceived to be more honest (Crowley & Hoyer, 1994) and receptive (Yeomans et al., 2020), and this openness and receptiveness is hypothesized to increase receptiveness in the listener (Xu & Petty, 2022). Specifically, norms of reciprocity dictate that when someone treats you well or does you a favor, you should reciprocate in kind (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004). A speaker who explicitly acknowledges the validity of a counterpoint of view in a recipient obligates the listener to become equally even-handed and open to opposing points of view.

Hence, uncertainty and hedging can have effects through multiple mechanisms. Uncertainty of either the speaker or the listener can, under some circumstances, make listeners process information more carefully. However, uncertainty or hedges on the part of speakers also improve impressions of the speaker and make listeners generally more receptive to their ideas.

Allowing silence

Silence is an indicator of good listening, and it naturally occurs in conversation. However, it can mean different things depending on the nature of the relationship between the conversants. Among strangers, silence can signal lower social connection, whereas among friends, silence can signal heightened social connection (Templeton et al., 2023; Templeton & Wheatley, 2023). Silence prompts speakers to introspect and become aware of new thoughts and emotions (Buffington et al., 2016). For example, in the context of negotiation, the deliberate use of silence can lead parties to "think outside the box." That is, silence provides time for parties to think thoroughly about new and creative options, which reduces "fixed-pie" perceptions (Curhan et al., 2021). The degree to which speakers benefit from silence hinges on their personality traits. For example, in an experiment involving a time-sharing exercise in which conversants listened silently for 3 min, the influence of personality traits became evident. Compared with unrestricted conversation, silent listening led those with high narcissism to experience reduced social anxiety but led those with elevated depression to experience increased social anxiety (Weis-Rappaport & Kluger, 2022). Attachment style also moderates the effect of silence, such that those with an avoidant attachment style (i.e., those with a fear of intimacy; Bartholomew, 1990) are more uncomfortable with silence.

Naming emotions

Verbalizing others' emotions shows that one is listening and allows the speaker to correct any misinterpretation. It also helps the speaker gain clarity (Itzchakov et al., 2018) and insight (Itzchakov et al., 2020) into their own emotions, facilitating emotional processing and potentially fostering resolution or support. Paraphrasing someone's emotions in response to a negative event (e.g., a social conflict) paradoxically increases autonomic responses (e.g., heart rate, skin conductance), but it improves speakers' emotional state, suggesting that paraphrasing prompts the processing and resolution of emotions (Seehausen et al., 2012). Most relevant to consumer behavior, acknowledging others' emotions can foster interpersonal trust. This is because, according to Costly Signaling Theory, such acknowledgment serves as a costly signal of the listener's willingness to meet the emotional needs of the target (Yu et al., 2021).

3.2.2 | Nonverbal behaviors

Some work shows that nonverbal cues can account for 10 times as much variance in impressions as verbal cues (Argyle et al., 1970). Nonverbal behaviors associated with good listening include orienting toward the speaker, making eye contact, exhibiting positive facial expressions, and nodding. These nonverbal displays often naturally co-occur (Mehrabian & Friar, 1969), and they are often studied jointly, making their independent effects challenging to isolate.

Body orientation and eye gaze

Listeners who are attentive to a speaker and interested in connecting with the speaker often orient their body toward them (Itzchakov & Grau, 2022). It generally conveys to speakers that the listener likes them, though there are gender effects in how orientation manifests (see Mehrabian, 1969, for a review). Eye gaze tends to coincide with body orientation. We tend to orient toward those we are looking at (Mehrabian & Friar, 1969). Eye gaze can serve more complicated functions, however. Speakers periodically gaze at listeners in what are called "gaze windows" to manage conversational turn-taking (Bavelas et al., 2002; Ho et al., 2015; Hömke et al., 2017).

Eye gaze, therefore, regulates interpersonal interaction and expresses intimacy, among other functions (Kleinke, 1986).

Eye gaze during conversation is associated with greater perceived likability, competence, credibility, honesty (Kleinke, 1986), politeness, genuineness, and respect (Kelly & True, 1980). Those who make eye contact are more likely to be believed (Kreysa et al., 2016). Many papers show that compliance is higher in response to those who gaze more (Kleinke, 1986), and laypeople have this intuition; those instructed to be persuasive gaze at others more (Mehrabian & Williams, 1969). However, persuasion and compliance can depend on the nature of the request in ways consistent with an elaboration explanation. For example, gaze increases compliance with "legitimate" requests (e.g., asking for change to make a phone call at a time prior to cellular phones) but not with "illegitimate" requests (e.g., asking for change to buy a candy bar; Kleinke, 1980), suggesting that eye gaze makes people think more carefully about what the speaker is saying.

Eye gaze is also related to power, which could be another reason it is associated with perceived competence and compliance. Visual dominance ratio refers to the ratio of time looking while speaking relative to the percentage of time looking while listening. High-dominance people have a higher visual dominance ratio (Exline et al., 1975). Men typically exhibit larger visual dominance ratios, but these sex differences disappear when men and women are given power in the form of expertise or control over rewards (Dovidio et al., 1988). People tend to look away from those they disagree with (vs. agree with) in conversation, but when instructed to maintain eye contact, exhibit greater resistance to persuasion (Chen et al., 2013).

Smiling and nodding

Smiling generally signals benevolent intentions in a person. Smiling has a significantly larger effect than eye gaze on evaluative impressions of others (Graham & Argyle, 1975). Not surprisingly, those who smile are perceived to be kinder, but they are also perceived to be more attractive (Otta et al., 1996). Nevertheless, controlling for attractiveness ratings, those who smile are also viewed as more trustworthy (Oh et al., 2023) and more sincere, sociable, and competent (Belkin & Rothman, 2017; Reis et al., 1990). Smiling also has positive downstream consequences. Those who smile are seen as more moral and elicit greater trust (Belkin & Rothman, 2017) and acceptance in ultimatum games (Mussel et al., 2013). Last, nodding conveys attention to and engagement with the speaker (Willis & Williams, 1976), encouraging speakers to continue sharing their thoughts and ideas (Grover, 2005).

Nonverbal behaviors associated with listening are therefore associated with a host of positive consequences for impressions of the listener as well as some downstream consequences related to trust. More holistic examinations of affiliative behaviors reveal similar effects. One study in a counseling context manipulated smiling, nodding, gesticulations, eye contact, and body orientation to be either affiliative or unaffiliative (LaCrosse, 1975). Those using affiliative body language were rated as more "attractive" and more persuasive.

4 | HOW DOES LISTENING "WORK?"

As is apparent from the above discussion, listening is a multifaceted construct. There are both observable states and unobservable states of both the speaker and listener, and these states can have reciprocal effects on one another. Moreover, the speaker and listener continuously shift roles in a conversation, and both exert influence over one another during the interaction. This makes presenting a simple, general model of listening effects impossible. Nevertheless, it is possible to summarize some key outcomes of listening and some of their underlying causes, and we provide a few generalizations here.

4.1 | Perceptions of the listener

One category of listening outcomes concerns the perceptions of the speaker. Good listeners are liked more. Some specific listening behaviors associated with liking include eye gaze, smiling, mimicry, and asking questions. These pathways are relatively straightforward. Eye gaze is a known signal of relational valuation (Wirth et al., 2010); smiling is a known indicator of warmth (Wang et al., 2017), a dimension indicating one's intention toward others; and mimicry is a known cause and outcome of liking (Tanner et al., 2008). More generally, behaviors such as backchannel responding, asking questions, nodding, and making eye contact are associated with increased receptiveness. These responses signal a presence of interest and a lack of judgment, if not outright agreement, all of which are positively viewed by interaction partners.

Listening behaviors such as smiling, making eye contact, asking questions, nodding, mimicry, and reflection also promote perceptions that the listener is trustworthy. These effects likely operate through similar mechanisms. They suggest benevolent intentions by indicating good intentions, similarity, and interest, all components of warmth.

4.2 | Effects on the speaker

Among the most impressive outcomes from listening are those that occur in the speaker. As reviewed above, listening reduces speaker defensiveness and decreases speaker social anxiety (Itzchakov et al., 2017, 2018). It also increases self-insight and self-awareness in

the speaker (Itzchakov et al., 2018, 2020). This has the downstream effects of increasing openness to change, increasing consideration of counterattitudinal viewpoints, and reducing extremity (Itzchakov et al., 2017, 2020). Interestingly, despite "weakening" the attitude by reducing extremity and increasing ambivalence, these processes "strengthen" the attitude by increasing attitude clarity and expression of intentions (Itzchakov et al., 2018).

4.3 | Combinatory effects

Good listeners exert greater influence over others. Some of this influence could be due to the effects on the speaker just described—listening opens speakers to change. It increases the consideration of alternative viewpoints (Itzchakov et al., 2017, 2020), allowing the listeners greater influence. Some of this influence is also likely due to the perceptions of the listener outlined above. Viewing a person as trustworthy (Ramsey & Sohi, 1997), likable (Huang et al., 2017), and competent (Drollinger & Comer, 2013) can all increase that person's influence when baseline cognitive elaboration is low (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986b).

Some of these perceptions can also determine the extent of elaboration. For example, untrustworthy sources can prompt greater scrutiny of the arguments a source presents, which can lead to either more or less persuasion, depending on the quality of the arguments (Priester & Petty, 2003). Competence can likewise determine the extent of elaboration. Competent sources whose receptiveness signals doubt could trigger greater elaboration due to surprise (see Hussein & Tormala, 2021, for a review of these types of findings).

Adding further to the complexity, the same persuasion outcome can result from different processes, making it difficult to infer process from outcome when careful process-oriented methodologies are not employed. For example, recall that receptiveness is more likely to increase persuasion for sources that are a priori highly (vs. not highly) competent. This outcome could result for multiple reasons. One account already reviewed is that receptiveness lowers perceived competence but increases perceived humility, and hence, the humility benefits outweigh the competence costs for sources with high a priori competence. This type of outcome would be consistent with a peripheral cue-type mechanism (e.g., this person seems humble and relatively smart, so I'll go with whatever they say). Nevertheless, the same outcome could result from increased elaboration due to a surprise mechanism when the source's arguments are strong. In this latter case, the persuasion would result not from source perceptions per se but rather from a careful consideration of the merits of the source's arguments.

Last, as described earlier, a listener who better understands the concerns and interests of a speaker can subsequently better construct communications to influence them. Hence, a good listener might exert greater influence by affecting their conversation partner's perception of them, affecting their partner's level of receptivity, affecting their partner's level of elaboration, or by better targeting their partner's needs or concerns. The multiplicity of processes all operating in the same direction is likely one reason why listening exerts such reliable effects on persuasion and influence. That is, the persuasion outcomes are multiply determined.

4.4 | Reciprocal effects

In dyadic contexts, multiple forms of reciprocal and reinforcing cycles can emerge. For example, listening increases liking by the speaker, but speaker liking also increases listener liking through reciprocity processes (Folkes & Sears, 1977; Kluger et al., 2021). Likewise, self-disclosure tends to beget reciprocal self-disclosure (Dindia et al., 2002). Receptiveness and open-mindedness similarly exert reciprocity (Xu & Petty, 2022).

Indirect cycles (i.e., reciprocal cycles with intermediate steps) also occur. Liking begets self-disclosure, and self-disclosure begets liking (Collins & Miller, 1994). Liking also begets mimicry (Likowski et al., 2008), and mimicry begets liking (Chartrand & Bargh, 1999). Mimicry promotes attitude similarity (Ramanathan & McGill, 2008), and attitude similarity promotes mimicry (Van Swol & Drury-Grogan, 2017).

These reinforcing cycles can also operate more holistically. As a listener signals interest through observable behaviors such as back-channel responses, it can prompt a speaker to self-disclose (Weinstein et al., 2021) and speak authentically (Ryan & Ryan, 2019). This, in turn, can promote further interest in the listener, triggering even better listening quality. Hence, another reason for the strength of listening effects stems from these reciprocal and reinforcing cycles. Such cycles make the isolation and modeling of listening mechanisms more complicated; at the same time, they make listening outcomes easier to detect.

5 | FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Listening is clearly relevant to consumer behavior outcomes but has yet to emerge as a separate area of research within consumer psychology. We have already articulated some of the methodological challenges associated with listening research, all of which are potential areas for fruitful exploration. Below, we relate listening research to emerging topics in consumer behavior research to suggest additional avenues for future study.

5.1 | Why consumers speak

A growing body of research has examined what motivates people to share their opinions with others. People are more likely to share their opinions when they feel they can significantly affect others' attitudes (Akhtar & Wheeler, 2016; Bechler et al., 2020). Other motivations include self-enhancing, regulating emotions, and bonding with others (see Berger, 2014, for a review). According to one perspective (Berger, 2014), these various word-of-mouth motivations are all self-

serving, that is, driven by their own goals rather than by the needs and interests of their audience. Put another way, these motivations are all intrapersonal.

There is an underexplored interpersonal dimension to word-of-mouth—satisfaction of these motivations requires others to listen and respond. A consumer can only persuade others who listen attentively and comprehend; a consumer can only reap the rewards of self-enhancement online if others attend to the communication and validate it; a consumer can more effectively regulate emotions when supported by others; and a consumer can only bond with others, obviously, when those others participate. Word-of-mouth motivations are satisfied to the extent that others listen.

Similar issues are present in consumers' conversations with company representatives. Although consumers often have targeted and concrete motivations for speaking with companies (e.g., to seek compensation or improve a company's offerings), they often communicate with companies simply to be heard. In fact, studies of complaints have shown that over 75% of complaints are noninstrumental (Alicke et al., 1992). That is, they are not aimed at changing the current state of affairs but rather at satisfying emotional needs such as venting or eliciting sympathy. The complaining is also aimed at being listened to.

Therefore, the desire to be listened to may be a common underlying factor in the various forms of word of mouth between consumers and in consumer-initiated conversations with companies. Some have characterized consumer disclosure as akin to a physiological drive state—it can be a visceral state, driven by emotions and physical arousal, that is only satiated through disclosure (Carbone & Loewenstein, 2023). We suggest that this drive is best satisfied by a good listener.

5.2 | Human listening mediated by technology

Listening has been studied primarily in in-person, dyadic contexts, but consumer communication occurs through channels that differ from these contexts across multiple dimensions. One such dimension is synchrony, something that can vary continuously. For example, in-person conversations typically involve relatively rapid responses, whereas chat conversations or voicemail exchanges involve varying degrees of delay. Multiple papers have examined how the delay affects the types of things people talk about (Berger et al., 2022; Berger & Iyengar, 2013), but there is a dearth of research on listening behaviors in contexts that vary in synchrony. Some listening components (eye contact, body orientation, etc.) are impossible with asynchronous communication, whereas others (e.g., verbal mimicry) would be unaffected. It seems likely, however, that even these latter types of responses may have different effects across synchronous and asynchronous contexts.

Some media theories (e.g., Media Synchronicity Theory; Dennis et al., 2008) have articulated the processes required in communication and related them to synchrony. Conveyance processes, which involve transmitting new information so the receiver can create or revise a mental model of the raw information, require little synchrony. Transmitting raw information can be achieved as easily, or perhaps more easily, via a written document as in a face-to-face conversation. By contrast, convergence processes, which involve developing a shared interpretation of the raw information, require considerable synchrony. These processes are aided by interactive dialogue and exchange. An exciting direction for future research is to examine how the various component processes of listening are affected by synchrony and how this affects the outcomes described in this review.

Technology can vary how listening behaviors operate, even within synchronous communications. In technology-mediated communications (e.g., Zoom), some signals of listening (e.g., orienting toward the speaker) are eliminated, whereas others persist in altered form. For example, in digital communication, such as online chats or virtual meetings, backchanneling can take the form of emojis, reactions (like thumbs up or clapping), or text-based responses like "LOL" (laughing out loud) or "I agree." Other forms of listening are altered in unpredictable ways. Perceptions of eye contact, for example, will depend on the camera and screen configuration of the listener, as well as whether they keep the video on during the exchange. Finally, much communication occurs through written media (e.g., emails, chats, or texts), which eliminates some overt indicators of listening (head nodding, orienting toward the speaker, etc.) but retains "verbal" indicators (e.g., asking questions or paraphrasing). Important communicative functions such as facial expressions of emotion (Frijda, 1953) or vocal prosody (tone of voice; Elfenbein et al., 2022) are eliminated in written communication, limiting both speakers' ability to communicate emotion and listeners' ability to reflect it. Perhaps not surprisingly, research shows that written communication leads to dehumanized perceptions of communicators relative to verbal communication (Schroeder et al., 2017). Over time, consumers have introduced various "hacks" to introduce emotional nuances into written communication. These include features such as emojis and emoticons, spellings, and capitalization (e.g., "This coffee is AMAZING." or "This coffee is amazingggggg."), punctuation signaling tempo (e.g., "This. Coffee. Is. Amazing."), and the like (Luangrath et al., 2023). Short video clips (e.g., animated gifs) serve a similar purpose. The extent to which these additional tools compensate for the "leanness" of written language and the means by which they do so requires further research.

5.3 | Computer "listening"

The reduced information present in lean communications, such as text messages, make it possible for computers to simulate human listening behavior (e.g., through chatbots). Rapid technological advances will soon enable computer-generated human representations to emulate humans even in videoconferencing communications. These possibilities raise questions about the nature of listening. Although computers, at least at present, are incapable of some components of holistic listening (e.g., attention or comprehension), even rather primitive technologies can give the impression of listening.

For example, ELIZA, a chatbot developed in the mid-60s, was designed to mimic Rogerian therapy by verbally reflecting the text of

its human interaction partner. In response to a statement like, "I'm depressed much of the time," ELIZA might reply, "I'm sorry to hear that you're depressed." ELIZA would also ask generic follow-up questions, such as "Can you think of a specific example?" or "Can you explain why you are depressed?" Weizenbaum, its creator, reported that people interacting with ELIZA forgot they were interacting with a computer and became emotionally attached to it (Weizenbaum, 1976).

A long line of research suggests that people apply social concepts to computers (Nass & Moon, 2000). For example, when interacting with a computer that "speaks" in a gendered voice, they believe that a computer with a female voice is more informative about facts relating to love, but a computer with a male voice is more informative (oddly) about facts relating to computers (Nass et al., 1997). More relevant to listening behaviors, people exhibit responses such as reciprocity in self-disclosure to computers just as they do to humans. In one series of experiments (Moon, 2000), participants responded to intimate questions about themselves (e.g., "What have you done in your life that you feel most guilty about?"). Some participants were randomly assigned to answer those same questions following "self-disclosure" from the computer (e.g., "There are times when this computer crashes for reasons that are not apparent to its user. It usually does this at the most inopportune time, causing great inconvenience to the user. What have you done in your life that you feel most guilty about?"). Those with the self-disclosing computer revealed more about themselves than those with the non-self-disclosing computer. They also rated the computer as likable, kind, friendly, and helpful. A subsequent experiment showed that participants reported greater purchase intentions of products presented by a self-disclosing versus a non-self-disclosing computer. However, this effect emerged only when that computer was the same as the one that had previously self-disclosed to them.

More recent forays into human–computer interaction have moved beyond physical computers. Considerable ongoing research is examining how to make chatbots appear more human and likable. Some of this research has focused on incorporating active listening techniques into dialogues with customers. Such a dialogue presents multiple challenges. The chatbot must accept open-ended consumer inputs and allow for naturally occurring dialogue nonlinearity (e.g., digressions) while more broadly staying on topic. Chatbots that can surmount these obstacles achieve similar benefits of self-disclosure. For example, chatbots that engage in more intimate, humanlike self-disclosure elicit more self-disclosure from their conversing human counterparts, particularly for sensitive questions (Lee et al., 2020). These effects increase over time, mimicking the increased reciprocal self-disclosure in human relationships.

More germane to listening per se, one recent application (Cho et al., 2022) incorporated backchannel responses ("hm," "go on," etc.) into an Alexa app to examine its effects on perceptions of active listening. In the study, participants discussed topics such as weekly goals and personal life choices with the app and were randomly assigned to receive backchannel responses or not. Those receiving the backchannel responses from the Alexa app perceived more active listening (e.g., "Alexa seemed to listen to me for more than just spoken words"), which in turn predicted greater perceived emotional support. Another examination (Xiao et al., 2020) incorporated four components of active listening into a chatbot: paraphrasing (restating user input to convey understanding), verbalizing emotions (reflecting user emotions to convey empathy), summarizing (summarizing key ideas to convey understanding), and encouraging (offering ideas and suggestions and encouraging elaboration). When compared with a baseline chatbot that did not incorporate active listening, the active listening chatbot led to longer and more thorough user engagement. More germane, the chatbot was seen as more informative and comprehending, resulting in a more positively rated experience.

These outcomes parallel those found with humans who use similar techniques and raise interesting questions about the nature of listening. If nonhuman agents presumably incapable of actual comprehension can appear to comprehend through active listening responses, it suggests that perceptions of listening are dissociable from the internal responses of the listener or listening agent. Similarly, it suggests that additional drivers of perceptions of listening might find application in nonhuman interaction contexts.

5.4 | Overt versus covert components of listening

An additional important direction for future research is isolating whether and which listening dimensions and behaviors are associated with specific outcomes. To date, listening research has measured listening as a holistic construct (e.g., Itzchakov, Weinstein, Leary, et al., 2023; Lipez et al., 2020). Additionally, listening has been defined as covert behaviors leading to overt behaviors that consequently affect the speaker's holistic perception (Kluger & Itzchakov, 2022). Nevertheless, this notion has never been empirically tested. It could be very interesting to isolate and compare the effects of overt and covert listening behaviors to learn which is more important and under what conditions. Recently, listening researchers have theorized that covert behavior plays a more important role than overt behavior (Kluger & Mizrahi, 2023). Yet, if, for example, a chatbot can produce high-quality listening perception and lead to listening-induced outcomes, it would imply the opposite, as a chatbot does not have a positive (or any) intention toward the speaker.

6 | CONCLUSION

Listening research spans disciplines but has seen little attention from consumer behavior researchers despite its relevance to central consumer behavior outcomes. This review is an attempt to remedy that. It introduces consumer behavior researchers to listening research and provides a review of listening-related outcomes and mechanisms. It also advances listening research by calling for a move beyond strictly holistic examinations to more fine-grained analyses of its component parts. Doing so, we argue, not only better isolates how and why listening has its benefits but also opens pathways to understanding

novel listening-related contexts such as those brought on by new, technology-mediated consumer conversations. We hope this paper inspires others to consider how listening can inform their own areas of inquiry.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research was funded by grant Number 1235/21 from the Israeli Science Foundation to Dr. Guy Itzchakov.

ORCID

Guy Itzchakov https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1516-6719

REFERENCES

Aakre, J. M., Lucksted, A., & Browning-McNee, L. A. (2016). Evaluation of Youth Mental Health First Aid USA: A program to assist young people in psychological distress. *Psychological Services*, *13*, 121–126. https://doi.org/10.1037/ser0000063

Akhtar, O., & Wheeler, S. C. (2016). Belief in the immutability of attitudes both increases and decreases advocacy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *111*, 475–492. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000060

Albarracín, D., & Mitchell, A. L. (2004). The role of defensive confidence in preference for proattitudinal information: How believing that one is strong can sometimes be a defensive weakness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *30*, 1565–1584. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271180

Alicke, M. D., Braun, J. C., Glor, J. E., Klotz, M. L., Magee, J., Sederhoim, H., & Siegel, R. (1992). Complaining behavior in social interaction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *18*, 286–295. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167292183004

Ames, D., Maissen, L. B., & Brockner, J. (2012). The role of listening in interpersonal influence. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *46*, 345–349. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2012.01.010

Andrade, J. (2010). What does doodling do? *Applied Cognitive Psychology: The Official Journal of the Society for Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, *24*, 100–106. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1561

Argyle, M., Salter, V., Nicholson, H., Williams, M., & Burgess, P. (1970). The communication of inferior and superior attitudes by verbal and nonverbal signals. *The British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *9*, 222–231. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8260.1970.tb00668.x

Arnold, K. (2014). Behind the mirror: Reflective listening and its tain in the work of Carl Rogers. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, *42*, 354–369. https://doi.org/10.1080/08873267.2014.913247

Barnett White, T. (2005). Consumer trust and advice acceptance: The moderating roles of benevolence, expertise, and negative emotions. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *15*, 141–148. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp1502_6

Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *7*(2), 147–178.

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

Bavelas, J. B., Coates, L., & Johnson, T. (2000). Listeners as co-narrators. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*, 941–952. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.6.941

Bavelas, J. B., Coates, L., & Johnson, T. (2002). Listener responses as a collaborative process: The role of gaze. *Journal of Communication*, *52*, 566–580. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2002.tb02562.x

Bechler, C. J., Tormala, Z. L., & Rucker, D. D. (2020). Choosing persuasion targets: How expectations of qualitative change increase advocacy intentions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *86*, 103911. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2019.103911

Belkin, L. Y., & Rothman, N. B. (2017). Do I trust you? Depends on what you feel: Interpersonal effects of emotions on initial trust at zero-acquaintance. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *10*, 3–27. https://doi.org/10.1111/ncmr.12088

Berger, J. (2014). Word of mouth and interpersonal communication: A review and directions for future research. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *24*, 586–607. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2014.05.002

Berger, J., & Iyengar, R. (2013). Communication channels and word of mouth: How the medium shapes the message. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *40*, 567–579. https://doi.org/10.1086/671345

Berger, J., Rocklage, M. D., & Packard, G. (2022). Expression modalities: How speaking versus writing shapes word of mouth. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *49*, 389–408. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucab076

Bergeron, J., & Laroche, M. (2009). The effects of perceived salesperson listening effectiveness in the financial industry. *Journal of Financial Services Marketing*, *14*, 6–25. https://doi.org/10.1057/fsm.2009.1

Beune, K., Giebels, E., & Sanders, K. (2009). Are you talking to me? Influencing behaviour and culture in police interviews. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *15*, 597–617. https://doi.org/10.1080/10683160802442835

Blankenship, K. L., & Craig, T. Y. (2007). Language and persuasion: Tag questions as powerless speech or as interpreted in context. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *43*, 112–118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2005.12.012

Blankenship, K. L., & Holtgraves, T. (2005). The role of different markers of linguistic powerlessness in persuasion. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *24*, 3–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X04273034

Bodie, G. (2023). Listening as a positive communication process. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *53*, 101681. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2023.101681

Bodie, G. D., Jones, S. M., Vickery, A. J., Hatcher, L., & Cannava, K. (2014). Examining the construct validity of enacted support: A multitrait–multimethod analysis of three perspectives for judging immediacy and listening behaviors. *Communication Monographs*, *81*, 495–523. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2014.957223

Bosco, F. A., Aguinis, H., Singh, K., Field, J. G., & Pierce, C. A. (2015). Correlational effect size benchmarks. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*, 431–449. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038047

Brehm, S. S., & Brehm, J. W. (1981). *Psychological reactance: A theory of freedom and control*. Academic Press.

Buffington, A., Wenner, P., Brandenburg, D., Berge, J., Sherman, M., & Danner, C. (2016). The art of listening. *Minnesota Medicine*, *99*(6), 46–48.

Burnkrant, R. E., & Howard, D. J. (1984). Effects of the use of introductory rhetorical questions versus statements on information processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *47*, 1218–1230. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.47.6.1218

Byrne, D. (1961). Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *62*, 713–715. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0044721

Carbone, E., & Loewenstein, G. (2023). The drive to disclose. *Consumer Psychology Review*, *6*, 17–32. https://doi.org/10.1002/arcp.1086

Castro, D. R., Anseel, F., Kluger, A. N., Lloyd, K. J., & Turjeman-Levi, Y. (2018). Mere listening effect on creativity and the mediating role of psychological safety. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, *12*, 489–502. https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000177

Catapano, R., Tormala, Z. L., & Rucker, D. D. (2019). Perspective taking and self-persuasion: Why "putting yourself in their shoes" reduces openness to attitude change. *Psychological Science*, *30*, 424–435. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797618822697

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

Chaudhuri, A., & Holbrook, M. B. (2001). The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: The role of brand loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, *65*, 81–93. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.65.2.81.18255

Chen, F. S., Minson, J. A., Schöne, M., & Heinrichs, M. (2013). In the eye of the beholder: Eye contact increases resistance to persuasion. *Psychological Science*, *24*, 2254–2261. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613491968

Chen, F. S., Minson, J. A., & Tormala, Z. L. (2010). Tell me more: The effects of expressed interest on receptiveness during dialog. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*, 850–853. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.04.012

Cho, E., Motalebi, N., Sundar, S. S., & Abdullah, S. (2022). Alexa as an active listener: How backchanneling can elicit self-disclosure and promote user experience. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, *6*, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1145/3555164

Church, I. M., & Barrett, J. L. (2016). Intellectual humility. In *Handbook of humility* (pp. 78–91). Routledge.

Cialdini, R. B., & Goldstein, N. J. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *55*, 591–621. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.142015

Cohen, G. L., Aronson, J., & Steele, C. M. (2000). When beliefs yield to evidence: Reducing biased evaluation by affirming the self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*, 1151–1164. https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672002611011

Cojuharenco, I., & Karelaia, N. (2020). When leaders ask questions: Can humility premiums buffer the effects of competence penalties? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *156*, 113–134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2019.12.001

Collins, H. K. (2022). When listening is spoken. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *47*, 101402. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2022.101402

Collins, N. L., & Miller, L. C. (1994). Self-disclosure and liking: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *116*, 457–475. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.116.3.457

Corazzini, L., Pavesi, F., Petrovich, B., & Stanca, L. (2012). Influential listeners: An experiment on persuasion bias in social networks. *European Economic Review*, *56*, 1276–1288. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2012.05.005

Crowley, A. E., & Hoyer, W. D. (1994). An integrative framework for understanding two-sided persuasion. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *20*, 561–574. https://doi.org/10.1086/209370

Curhan, J. R., Overbeck, J. R., Cho, Y., Zhang, T., & Yang, Y. (2021). Silence is golden: Extended silence, deliberative mindset, and value creation in negotiation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *107*, 78. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000877

DeCarlo, T. E. (2005). The effects of sales message and suspicion of ulterior motives on salesperson evaluation. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *15*, 238–249. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp1503_9

DeMarree, K. G., Chang, Y.-H., Lee, T., & Venezia, A. (2023). Listening and attitude change. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *53*, 101641. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2023.101641

Dennis, A. R., Fuller, R. M., & Valacich, J. S. (2008). Media, tasks, and communication processes: A theory of media synchronicity. *MIS Quarterly*, *32*, 575–600. https://doi.org/10.2307/25148857

Dindia, K., Allen, M., Preiss, R., Gayle, B., & Burrell, N. (2002). Self-disclosure research: Knowledge through meta-analysis. In M. Allen, R. W. Preiss, B. M. Gayle, & N. Burrell (Eds.), *Interpersonal communication research: Advances through meta-analysis* (pp. 169–185). Routledge.

Dovidio, J. F., Brown, C. E., Heltman, K., Ellyson, S. L., & Keating, C. F. (1988). Power displays between women and men in discussions of gender-linked tasks: A multichannel study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *55*, 580–587. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.55.4.580

Drollinger, T., & Comer, L. B. (2013). Salesperson's listening ability as an antecedent to relationship selling. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, *28*, 50–59. https://doi.org/10.1108/08858621311285714

Edwards, N., Peterson, W. E., & Davies, B. L. (2006). Evaluation of a multiple component intervention to support the implementation of a 'therapeutic relationships' best practice guideline on nurses' communication skills. *Patient Education and Counseling*, *63*, 3–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2006.07.008

Eisend, M., & Tarrahi, F. (2022). Persuasion knowledge in the marketplace: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *32*, 3–22. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1258

Elfenbein, H. A., Laukka, P., Althoff, J., Chui, W., Iraki, F. K., Rockstuhl, T., & Thingujam, N. S. (2022). What do we hear in the voice? An open-ended judgment study of emotional speech prosody. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *48*, 1087–1104. https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672211029786

Enzle, M. E., & Harvey, M. D. (1982). Rhetorical requests for help. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *45*, 172–176. https://doi.org/10.2307/3033650

Epley, N., Caruso, E. M., & Bazerman, M. H. (2006). When perspective taking increases taking: Reactive egoism in social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*, 872–889. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.91.5.872

Etgar, M., & Goodwin, S. A. (1982). One-sided versus two-sided comparative message appeals for new brand introductions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *8*, 460–465. https://doi.org/10.1086/208888

Exline, R. V., Ellyson, S. L., & Long, B. (1975). Visual behavior as an aspect of power role relationships. In P. Pliner, L. Krames, & T. Alloway (Eds.), *Nonverbal communication of aggression* (pp. 21–52). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4684-2835-3_2

Eyal, T., Steffel, M., & Epley, N. (2018). Perspective mistaking: Accurately understanding the mind of another requires getting perspective, not taking perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *114*, 547–571. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000115

Folkes, V. S., & Sears, D. O. (1977). Does everybody like a liker? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *13*, 505–519. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(77)90050-6

Frijda, N. H. (1953). The understanding of facial expression of emotion. *Acta Psychologica*, *9*, 294–362. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6918(53)90021-3

Galinsky, A. D., & Moskowitz, G. B. (2000). Perspective-taking: Decreasing stereotype expression, stereotype accessibility, and in-group favoritism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *78*, 708–724. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.708

Graham, J. A., & Argyle, M. (1975). A cross-cultural study of the communication of extra-verbal meaning by gestures (1). *International Journal of Psychology*, *10*, 57–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207597508247319

Grover, S. M. (2005). Shaping effective communication skills and therapeutic relationships at work: The foundation of collaboration. *AAOHN Journal*, *53*, 177–182. https://doi.org/10.1177/216507990505300408

Haugtvedt, C. P., & Petty, R. E. (1992). Personality and persuasion: Need for cognition moderates the persistence and resistance of attitude changes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *63*, 308–319. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.63.2.308

Ho, S., Foulsham, T., & Kingstone, A. (2015). Speaking and listening with the eyes: Gaze signaling during dyadic interactions. *PLoS ONE*, *10*, e0136905. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0136905

Hömke, P., Holler, J., & Levinson, S. C. (2017). Eye blinking as addressee feedback in face-to-face conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *50*, 54–70. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2017.1262143

Huang, K., Yeomans, M., Brooks, A. W., Minson, J., & Gino, F. (2017). It doesn't hurt to ask: Question-asking increases liking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *113*, 430–452. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000097

Hussein, M. A., & Tormala, Z. L. (2021). Undermining your case to enhance your impact: A framework for understanding the effects of acts of receptiveness in persuasion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *25*, 229–250. https://doi.org/10.1177/10888683211001269

International Listening Association. (1996). Definition of listening.

Itani, O. S., Goad, E. A., & Jaramillo, F. (2019). Building customer relationships while achieving sales performance results: Is listening the holy grail of sales? *Journal of Business Research*, *102*, 120–130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.04.048

Itzchakov, G. (2020). Can listening training empower service employees? The mediating roles of anxiety and perspective-taking. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *29*, 938–952. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2020.1776701

Itzchakov, G., DeMarree, K. G., Kluger, A. N., & Turjeman-Levi, Y. (2018). The listener sets the tone: High-quality listening increases attitude clarity and behavior-intention consequences. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *44*, 762–778. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167217747874

Itzchakov, G., & Grau, J. (2022). High-quality listening in the age of COVID-19: A key to better dyadic communication for more effective organizations. *Organizational Dynamics*, *51*, 100820. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2020.100820

Itzchakov, G., & Kluger, A. N. (2017a). Can holding a stick improve listening at work? The effect of Listening Circles on employees' emotions and cognitions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *26*, 663–676. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2017.1351429

Itzchakov, G., & Kluger, A. N. (2017b). Listening with understanding in negotiation and conflict resolution. In C. Honeyman & A. Schneider (Eds.), *The negotiator's desk reference* (Vol. 1) (pp. 409–420). DRI Press.

Itzchakov, G., Kluger, A. N., & Castro, D. R. (2017). I am aware of my inconsistencies but can tolerate them: The effect of high quality listening on speakers' attitude ambivalence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *43*, 105–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167216675339

Itzchakov, G., & Weinstein, N. (2021). High-quality listening supports speakers' autonomy and self-esteem when discussing prejudice. *Human Communication Research*, *47*, 248–283. https://doi.org/10.1093/hcr/hqab003

Itzchakov, G., Weinstein, N., & Cheshin, A. (2022). Learning to listen: Downstream effects of listening training on employees' relatedness, burnout, and turnover intentions. *Human Resource Management*, *62*, 565–580. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22103

Itzchakov, G., Weinstein, N., Leary, M., Saluk, D., & Amar, M. (2023). Listening to understand: The role of high-quality listening on speakers' attitude depolarization during disagreements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000366

Itzchakov, G., Weinstein, N., Legate, N., & Amar, M. (2020). Can high quality listening predict lower speakers' prejudiced attitudes? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *91*, 104022. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2020.104022

Itzchakov, G., Weinstein, N., Saluk, D., & Amar, M. (2023). Connection heals wounds: Feeling listened to reduces speakers' loneliness following a social rejection disclosure. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *49*, 1273–1294. https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672221100369

Itzchakov, G., Weinstein, N., Vinokur, E., & Yomtovian, A. (2023). Communicating for workplace connection: A longitudinal study of the outcomes of listening training on teachers' autonomy, psychological safety, and relational climate. *Psychology in the Schools*, *60*, 1279–1298. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22835

Janusik, L. (2023). Listening training in organizations. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *52*, 101631. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2023.101631

Johnston, M., & Reed, K. (2017). Listening environment and the bottom line: How a positive environment can improve financial outcomes. *International Journal of Listening*, *31*, 71–79. https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2014.965391

Kalla, J. L., & Broockman, D. E. (2020). Reducing exclusionary attitudes through interpersonal conversation: Evidence from three field experiments. *American Political Science Review*, *114*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055419000923

Karmarkar, U. R., & Tormala, Z. L. (2010). Believe me, I have no idea what I'm talking about: The effects of source certainty on consumer involvement and persuasion. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *36*, 1033–1049. https://doi.org/10.1086/648381

Keating, N. L., Gandhi, T. K., Orav, E. J., Bates, D. W., & Ayanian, J. Z. (2004). Patient characteristics and experiences associated with trust in specialist physicians. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, *164*, 1015–1020. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.164.9.1015

Kelly, E. W. Jr., & True, J. H. (1980). Eye contact and communication of facilitative conditions. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *51*, 815–820. https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1980.51.3.815

Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). *Dyadic data analysis*. Guilford Press.

Kleinke, C. L. (1980). Interaction between gaze and legitimacy of request on compliance in a field setting. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *5*, 3–12. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00987050

Kleinke, C. L. (1986). Gaze and eye contact: A research review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *100*, 78–100. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.100.1.78

Kluger, A. N., Borut, L., Lehmann, M., Nir, T., Azoulay, E., Einy, O., & Gordoni, G. (2022). A new measure of the Rogerian schema of the good listener. *Sustainability*, *14*, 12893. https://doi.org/10.3390/su141912893

Kluger, A. N., & Itzchakov, G. (2022). The power of listening at work. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *9*, 121–146. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-091013

Kluger, A. N., Lehmann, M., Aguinis, H., Itzchakov, G., Gordoni, G., Zyberaj, J., & Bakaç, C. (2023). A meta-analytic systematic review and theory of perceived listening and job outcomes (performance, relationship quality, affect, and cognition). *Journal of Business and Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-023-09897-5

Kluger, A. N., Malloy, T. E., Pery, S., Itzchakov, G., Castro, D. R., Lipetz, L., Sela, Y., Turjeman-Levi, Y., Lehmann, M., New, M., & Borut, L. (2021). Dyadic listening in teams: Social relations model. *Applied Psychology*, *70*, 1045–1099. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12263

Kluger, A. N., & Mizrahi, M. (2023). Defining listening: Can we get rid of the adjectives? *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *52*, 101639. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2023.101639

Korsgaard, M. A., Schweiger, D. M., & Sapienza, H. J. (1995). Building commitment, attachment, and trust in strategic decision-making teams—The role of procedural justice. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*, 60–84. https://doi.org/10.2307/256728

Kreysa, H., Kessler, L., & Schweinberger, S. R. (2016). Direct speaker gaze promotes trust in truth-ambiguous statements. *PLoS ONE*, *11*, e0162291. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0162291

Krosnick, J. A., & Petty, R. E. (1995). Attitude strength: An overview. In *Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences* (pp. 1–24). Psychology Press.

Kulesza, W., Dolinski, D., Huisman, A., & Majewski, R. (2014). The echo effect: The power of verbal mimicry to influence prosocial behavior. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *33*, 183–201. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X13506906

Kulesza, W., Dolinski, D., Szczęsna, K., Kosim, M., & Grzyb, T. (2019). Temporal aspects of the chameleon effect and hospitality: The link between mimicry, its impact, and duration. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, *60*, 212–215. https://doi.org/10.1177/1938965518797075

LaCrosse, M. B. (1975). Nonverbal behavior and perceived counselor attractiveness and persuasiveness. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *22*, 563–566. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.22.6.563

Lee, Y.-C., Yamashita, N., Huang, Y., & Fu, W. (2020). "I hear you, I feel you": Encouraging deep self-disclosure through a chatbot. Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems

Likowski, K. U., Mühlberger, A., Seibt, B., Pauli, P., & Weyers, P. (2008). Modulation of facial mimicry by attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*, 1065–1072. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2007.10.007

Lipetz, L., Kluger, A. N., & Bodie, G. D. (2020). Listening is listening is listening: Employees' perception of listening as a holistic phenomenon. *International Journal of Listening*, *34*, 71–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2018.1497489

Lopez-Rosenfeld, M., Calero, C. I., Slezak, D. F., Garbulsky, G., Bergman, M., Trevisan, M., & Sigman, M. (2015). Neglect in human communication: Quantifying the cost of cell-phone interruptions in face to face dialogs. *PLoS ONE*, *10*, e0125772. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0125772

Lord, C. G., Lepper, M. R., & Preston, E. (1984). Considering the opposite: A corrective strategy for social judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *47*, 1231–1243. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.47.6.1231

Luangrath, A. W., Xu, Y., & Wang, T. (2023). Paralanguage classifier (PARA): An algorithm for automatic coding of paralinguistic nonverbal parts of speech in text. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *60*, 388–408. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222437221116058

Maheswaran, D., & Chaiken, S. (1991). Promoting systematic processing in low-motivation settings: Effect of incongruent information on processing and judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *61*, 13–25. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.61.1.13

Malloy, T. E., Kluger, A. N., Martin, J., & Pery, S. (2021). Women listening to women at zero-acquaintance: Interpersonal befriending at the individual and dyadic levels. *International Journal of Listening*, *37*, 212–226. https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2021.1884080

Mehrabian, A., & Friar, J. T. (1969). Encoding of attitude by a seated communicator via posture and position cues. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *33*, 330–336. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0027576

Mehrabian, A., & Williams, M. (1969). Nonverbal concomitants of perceived and intended persuasiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *13*, 37–58. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0027993

Minson, J. A., & Chen, F. S. (2022). Receptiveness to opposing views: Conceptualization and integrative review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *26*, 93–111. https://doi.org/10.1177/10888683211061037

Moon, Y. (2000). Intimate exchanges: Using computers to elicit self-disclosure from consumers. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *26*, 323–339. https://doi.org/10.1086/209566

Mussel, P., Göritz, A. S., & Hewig, J. (2013). The value of a smile: Facial expression affects ultimatum-game responses. *Judgment and Decision Making*, *8*, 381–385. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1930297500006045

Nass, C., & Moon, Y. (2000). Machines and mindlessness: Social responses to computers. *Journal of Social Issues*, *56*, 81–103. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00153

Nass, C., Moon, Y., & Green, N. (1997). Are machines gender neutral? Gender-stereotypic responses to computers with voices. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *27*, 864–876. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1997.tb00275.x

Neill, M. S., & Bowen, S. A. (2021). Employee perceptions of ethical listening in US organizations. *Public Relations Review*, *47*, 102123. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2021.102123

Nemec, P. B., Spagnolo, A. C., & Soydan, A. S. (2017). Can you hear me now? Teaching listening skills. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, *40*, 415–417. https://doi.org/10.1037/prj0000287

Oh, D., Wedel, N., Labbree, B., & Todorov, A. (2023). Trustworthiness judgments without the halo effect: A data-driven computational modeling approach. *Perception*, *52*, 590–607. https://doi.org/10.1177/03010066231178489

Otta, E., Abrosio, F. F. E., & Hoshino, R. L. (1996). Reading a smiling face: Messages conveyed by various forms of smiling. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *82*, 1111–1121. https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1996.82.3c.1111

Packard, G., & Berger, J. (2021). How concrete language shapes customer satisfaction. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *47*(5), 787–806.

Pasupathi, M., & Billitteri, J. (2015). Being and becoming through being heard: Listener effects on stories and selves. *International Journal of Listening*, *29*, 67–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2015.1029363

Pasupathi, M., & Hoyt, T. (2010). Silence and the shaping of memory: How distracted listeners affect speakers' subsequent recall of a computer game experience. *Memory*, *18*, 159–169. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658210902992917

Petrocelli, J. V., Tormala, Z. L., & Rucker, D. D. (2007). Unpacking attitude certainty: Attitude clarity and attitude correctness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*, 30–41. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.30

Petty, R. E., Barden, J., & Wheeler, S. C. (2009). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion: Developing health promotions for sustained behavioral change. In *Emerging theories in health promotion practice and research* (Vol. 2, pp. 185–214).

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986a). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. In *Communication and persuasion* (pp. 1–24). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-4964-1_1

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986b). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. In *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60214-2

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1990). Involvement and persuasion: Tradition versus integration. *Psychological Bulletin*, *107*, 367–374. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.3.367

Petty, R. E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Goldman, R. (1981). Personal involvement as a determinant of argument-based persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *41*, 847–855. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.41.5.847

Petty, R. E., Wheeler, S. C., & Bizer, G. Y. (2000). Attitude functions and persuasion: An elaboration likelihood approach to matched versus mismatched messages. In *Why we evaluate: Functions of attitudes* (pp. 133–162). Psychology Press.

Pogacar, R., Shrum, L., & Lowrey, T. M. (2018). The effects of linguistic devices on consumer information processing and persuasion: A language complexity× processing mode framework. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *28*, 689–711. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1052

Priester, J. R., & Petty, R. E. (1995). Source attributions and persuasion: Perceived honesty as a determinant of message scrutiny. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *21*, 637–654. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167295216010

Priester, J. R., & Petty, R. E. (2003). The influence of spokesperson trustworthiness on message elaboration, attitude strength, and advertising effectiveness. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *13*, 408–421. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327663JCP1304_08

Ramanathan, S., & McGill, A. L. (2008). Social influences on moment-to-moment and retrospective evaluations of experiences. *Minnesota Journal of Law, Science & Technology*, *9*, 827.

Ramsey, R. P., & Sohi, R. S. (1997). Listening to your customers: The impact of perceived salesperson listening behavior on relationship outcomes. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *25*, 127–137. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02894348

Rautalinko, E., & Lisper, H.-O. (2004). Effects of training reflective listening in a corporate setting. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *18*, 281–299. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOBU.0000016712.36043.4f

Rave, R., Itzchakov, G., Weinstein, N., & Reis, H. T. (2022). How to get through hard times: Principals' listening buffers teachers' stress on turnover intention and promotes organizational citizenship behavior. *Current Psychology*, *42*, 24233–24248. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03529-6

Reis, H. T., Wilson, I. M., Monestere, C., Bernstein, S., Clark, K., Seidl, E., Franco, M., Gioioso, E., Freeman, L., & Radoane, K. (1990). What is smiling is beautiful and good. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *20*, 259–267. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420200307

Rogers, C. R. (1942). *Counseling and psychotherapy: Newer concepts in practice*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Rogers, C. R. (1951). *Client-centered therapy, its current practice, implications, and theory*. Houghton Mifflin.

Rogers, C. R. (1957). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, *21*, 95–103. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0045357

Rogers, C. R. (1975). Empathic: An unappreciated way of being. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *5*, 2–10. https://doi.org/10.1177/001100007500500202

Rogers, C. R. (1986). Reflection of feelings and transference. *Person-Centered Review*, *1*, 375–377.

Rogers, C. R., & Roethlisberger, F. J. (1991/1952). HBR Classic—Barriers and gateways to communication (reprinted from Harvard Business Review, July August, 1952). *Harvard Business Review*, *69*, 105–111. https://hbr.org/1991/11/barriers-and-gateways-to-communication

Ryan, W. S., & Ryan, R. M. (2019). Toward a social psychology of authenticity: Exploring within-person variation in autonomy, congruence, and genuineness using self-determination theory. *Review of General Psychology*, *23*, 99–112. https://doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000162

Sahni, N. S., Wheeler, S. C., & Chintagunta, P. (2018). Personalization in email marketing: The role of noninformative advertising content. *Marketing Science*, *37*, 236–258. https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.2017.1066

Schroeder, J., Kardas, M., & Epley, N. (2017). The humanizing voice: Speech reveals, and text conceals, a more thoughtful mind in the midst of disagreement. *Psychological Science*, *28*, 1745–1762. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617713798

Seehausen, M., Kazzer, P., Bajbouj, M., & Prehn, K. (2012). Effects of empathic paraphrasing–extrinsic emotion regulation in social conflict. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *3*, 482. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00482

Selnes, F., & Sallis, J. (2003). Promoting relationship learning. *Journal of Marketing*, *67*, 80–95. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.67.3.80.18656

Skorinko, J. L., & Sinclair, S. A. (2013). Perspective taking can increase stereotyping: The role of apparent stereotype confirmation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *49*, 10–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.07.009

Stine, M., Thompson, T., & Cusella, L. (1995). The impact of organizational structure and supervisory listening indicators on subordinate support, trust, intrinsic motivation, and performance. *International Journal of Listening*, *9*, 84–105. https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.1995.10499143

Swaab, R. I., Maddux, W. W., & Sinaceur, M. (2011). Early words that work: When and how virtual linguistic mimicry facilitates negotiation outcomes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *47*, 616–621. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.01.005

Tanner, R. J., Ferraro, R., Chartrand, T. L., Bettman, J. R., & Baaren, R. V. (2008). Of chameleons and consumption: The impact of mimicry on choice and preferences. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *34*, 754–766. https://doi.org/10.1086/522322

Teeny, J. D., Siev, J. J., Briñol, P., & Petty, R. E. (2021). A review and conceptual framework for understanding personalized matching effects in persuasion. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *31*, 382–414. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1198

Templeton, E. M., Chang, L. J., Reynolds, E. A., Cone LeBeaumont, M. D., & Wheatley, T. (2023). Long gaps between turns are awkward for strangers but not for friends. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, *378*, 20210471. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2021.0471

Templeton, E. M., & Wheatley, T. (2023). Responding fast and slow. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *53*, 101658. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2023.101658

Todd, A. R., & Galinsky, A. D. (2014). Perspective-taking as a strategy for improving intergroup relations: Evidence, mechanisms, and qualifications. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *8*, 374–387. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12116

Van Baaren, R. B., Holland, R. W., Steenaert, B., & Van Knippenberg, A. (2003). Mimicry for money: Behavioral consequences of imitation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *39*, 393–398. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031(03)00014-3

Van Quaquebeke, N., & Felps, W. (2018). Respectful inquiry: A motivational account of leading through asking questions and listening. *Academy of Management Review*, *43*, 5–27. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2014.0537

Van Swol, L. M., & Drury-Grogan, M. L. (2017). The effects of shared opinions on nonverbal mimicry. *SAGE Open*, *7*, 2158244017707243.

Walters, D. J., Fernbach, P. M., Fox, C. R., & Sloman, S. A. (2017). Known unknowns: A critical determinant of confidence and calibration. *Management Science*, *63*, 4298–4307. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2016.2580

Wang, Z., Mao, H., Li, Y. J., & Liu, F. (2017). Smile big or not? Effects of smile intensity on perceptions of warmth and competence. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *43*, 787–805.

Weger, H., Castle, G. R., & Emmett, M. C. (2010). Active listening in peer interviews: The influence of message paraphrasing on perceptions of listening skill. *International Journal of Listening*, *24*, 34–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/10904010903466311

Weinstein, N., Huo, A., & Itzchakov, G. (2021). Parental listening when adolescents self-disclose: A preregistered experimental study. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *209*, 105178. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2021.105178

Weinstein, N., Itzchakov, G., & Legate, N. (2022). The motivational value of listening during intimate and difficult conversations. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *16*, e12651. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12651

Weis-Rappaport, H., & Kluger, A. N. (2022). The effects of listening with "time-sharing" on psychological safety and social anxiety: The moderating role of narcissism and depression. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2022.2161337

Weizenbaum, J. (1976). Computer power and human reason: From judgment to calculation. *Physics Today*, *30*, 68–71. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3037375

Wheeler, S. C., Petty, R. E., & Bizer, G. Y. (2005). Self-schema matching and attitude change: Situational and dispositional determinants of message elaboration. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *31*, 787–797. https://doi.org/10.1086/426613

Willis, F. N., & Williams, S. J. (1976). Simultaneous talking in conversation and sex of speakers. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *43*, 1067–1070. https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1976.43.3f.1067

Wirth, J. H., Sacco, D. F., Hugenberg, K., & Williams, K. D. (2010). Eye gaze as relational evaluation: Averted eye gaze leads to feelings of ostracism and relational devaluation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *36*, 869–882. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167210370032

Wood, W., Rhodes, N., & Biek, M. (1995). Working knowledge and attitude strength: An information-processing analysis. In *Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences* (Vol. 4) (pp. 189–202). Psychology Press.

Worchel, S., & Brehm, J. W. (1970). Effect of threats to attitudinal freedom as a function of agreement with the communicator. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *14*, 18–22. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0028620

Xiao, Z., Zhou, M. X., Chen, W., Yang, H., & Chi, C. (2020). If I hear you correctly: Building and evaluating interview chatbots with active listening skills. Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems,

Xu, M., & Petty, R. E. (2022). Two-sided messages promote openness for morally based attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *48*, 1151–1166. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167220988371

Yeomans, M., Minson, J., Collins, H., Chen, F., & Gino, F. (2020). Conversational receptiveness: Improving engagement with opposing views. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *160*, 131–148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2020.03.011

Yu, A., Berg, J. M., & Zlatev, J. J. (2021). Emotional acknowledgment: How verbalizing others' emotions fosters interpersonal trust. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *164*, 116–135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2021.02.002

Zillmann, D. (1972). Rhetorical elicitation of agreement in persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *21*, 159–165. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0032316

How to cite this article: Itzchakov, G., & Wheeler, S. C. (2023). Listen to this: Why consumer behavior researchers should care about listening. *Consumer Psychology Review*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1002/arcp.1092