



ELSEVIER

Review

Listening and perceived responsiveness: Unveiling the significance and exploring crucial research endeavors

Guy Itzchakov¹ and Harry T. Reis²**Abstract**

Listening and perceived responsiveness evoke a sense of interpersonal connection that benefits individuals and groups and is relevant to almost every field in Psychology, Management, Education, Communication, and Health, to name a few. In this paper, we, researchers who have devoted their careers to studying listening (first author) and perceived responsiveness (second author), address the necessity of integrating the two constructs. Moreover, we offer several questions for future research that we believe are crucial to produce a more profound and comprehensive understanding of this important process. These research questions include empirical issues, cross-cultural and inter-racial interactions, age differences, the emergence of new technologies, and opportunities to bridge political, ethnic, and social divides. By highlighting the undeniable impact of listening and perceived responsiveness on interpersonal connection across diverse domains, we emphasize the need to integrate these constructs in future research. Our proposed set of eight pivotal research questions is intended as a starting point for gaining a deeper and more holistic understanding of this critical study area while building a strong empirical foundation for interventions. By addressing these questions, we can foster meaningful advances that have the potential to bridge gaps, improve relationships, and enhance the well-being of individuals and communities alike.

Addresses¹ Department of Human Services, University of Haifa, Israel² Department of Psychology, University of Rochester, IsraelCorresponding author: Itzchakov, Guy (gitzchako@univ.haifa.ac.il)**Current Opinion in Psychology** 2023, 53:101662This review comes from a themed issue on **Listening & Responsiveness (2024)**Edited by **Harry Reis** and **Guy Itzchakov**For a complete overview see the [Issue](#) and the [Editorial](#)

Available online 17 July 2023

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsy.2023.101662>

2352-250X/© 2023 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Listening and perceived responsiveness: Unveiling the significance and exploring next directions

The longing for positive evaluation and social connection is deeply ingrained in human nature [1,2]. Hundreds of studies have documented that positive interpersonal connections, conceptualized in diverse ways, yield numerous favorable affective, cognitive, and behavioral outcomes for individuals and groups [3–7]. Among these varied constructs, two that consistently evoke a feeling of interpersonal connection are perceived responsiveness and high-quality listening [8,9]. Perceived responsiveness, defined as the degree to which individuals feel understood, validated, and cared for by close others, has received a great deal of attention in relationship research since first proposed in the intimacy process model in 1988 [10]. More recently, listening started to receive systematic empirical attention in psychology not too long ago [11–15].

Although listening and perceived responsiveness might seem similar, they have been studied independently, with little theoretical integration or empirical overlap [16]. To be sure, however, they are not isomorphic. Listening is composed of specific behaviors, whereas perceived responsiveness is a subjective sense “within the head” of the receiver. In fact, listening has been theorized as an antecedent of perceived responsiveness [17]. The extent to which listeners effectively engage in high-quality listening behaviors is theorized to help determine their speakers’ perceived responsiveness. For example, consider a conversation between two close friends, Jamie and Morgan. Jamie shares an exciting travel experience, and Morgan demonstrates genuine attention and a desire to understand Jamie’s experience. Morgan maintains direct eye contact, nods, asks relevant follow-up questions, and paraphrases specific details to ensure understanding. On the other hand, imagine Morgan frequently glancing at her smartphone, displaying disinterested facial expressions, not asking further questions, and quickly changing the topic after Jamie pauses. In the first example, Jamie would likely

perceive Morgan as a responsive friend, while in the second example, Jamie would likely feel that Morgan had been unresponsive.

In introducing this special issue of *Current Opinion in Psychology*, we noted that, despite their strong conceptual dependency, to date, these two constructs had been studied in largely parallel streams [16]. We further made the case that conceptual and theoretical integration has the potential to bring about significant advances in the field. Some of the articles in this special issue illustrate this potential. In this article, we seek to encourage forward progress by describing what we believe are some of the most pressing research questions that warrant attention. Some of these questions are basic to the integration we call for, necessitated by the fact that this special issue (“Listening and Responsiveness 2024”) is the first systematic attempt to promote theory and research integrating the two constructs. Others take the integration as a stepping-stone, seeking deeper insights and new directions. Along with the other articles in this special issue, we hope that these questions can stimulate novel research and even more penetrating questions.

Can listening and perceived responsiveness Be disentangled empirically?

While listening and perceived responsiveness, with rare exceptions, should be strongly correlated in natural interaction, it is essential to disentangle them empirically. One way to do so would involve mixed-method research in a naturalistic interaction paradigm. One group of coders is asked to describe a listener’s behavior without access to any information about the speaker; separately, speakers are asked to rate their reaction to the conversation. In this way, we could determine whether an objective account of listening predicts perceptions of responsiveness. More compelling evidence would come from studies examining situations where each construct is instantiated independently of the other. Perceived responsiveness can occur without listening in situations that do not involve conversations. For example, Laura may be perceived as responsive to her friend Nicole’s needs by giving Nicole the gift of a kitten she has secretly wanted for a long time. It is also possible to imagine circumstances where listening quality is high, but perceived responsiveness is low. A listener might make it crystal clear that she is paying close attention to and fully comprehending a speaker’s message, yet she opts not to become involved or be helpful. In this circumstance, the speaker seems unlikely to feel well responded to. Although these situations are admittedly atypical, they are nonetheless useful in demonstrating how the constructs differ. In this vein, we remind readers of Mook’s defense of artificiality in laboratory experiments: they are designed to support theoretical distinctions by showing “what could happen” as opposed to “what does happen.” [18].

What are the effects of cultural contexts?

Cultural context is vital in understanding listening and perceived responsiveness because it shapes communication norms, expectations, and behaviors [19]. Different cultures stress different values, and these implicate distinct communication styles, such as directness, indirectness, or the importance of nonverbal cues. These cultural factors also influence how individuals enact, interpret, and respond to listening behaviors and their perceptions of responsiveness. For example, in Western cultures, good listeners are expected to display frequent direct eye contact, nod, and provide ongoing verbal affirmations like “I see” or “I understand” to enable their speakers to perceive responsiveness. In contrast, in Japan, a non-Western culture, high-quality listening may involve maintaining respectful silence, minimal nonverbal cues, and allowing pauses for reflection. The emphasis is on paying close attention without interrupting or imposing on the speaker’s thoughts; perceived responsiveness is likely fostered by a thoughtful response given after carefully considering the speaker’s message. Cross-cultural psychology has shown that some of the most influential cultural differences involve social interaction norms, especially the interactions that involve one person’s response to another’s self-referential disclosures. Continual advances in conceptualizing the dimensions that underlie cultural differences should help researchers systematically approach this question [20]. Also, these distinct cultural norms around listening and perceived responsiveness underscore the significance of understanding and respecting cultural differences for the kind of effective communication that can establish meaningful connections in cross-cultural interactions.

How do listening and perceived responsiveness interplay in intergroup interactions?

Researchers often assume that listening and responsiveness are abstract processes that do not depend on specific content, but listening quality and perceived responsiveness can vary based on the values and goals of the groups involved. For example, in the U.S., in political conversations, Republicans may emphasize arguments prioritizing limited government intervention, individual liberty, and free-market principles, perceiving responsiveness when their listeners acknowledge and validate these values and engage in discussions that align with conservative ideologies. On the other hand, Democrats may perceive responsiveness when their listeners understand and support values regarding social justice, equality, and government backing for individual welfare. The specific concerns of each group may influence their expectations of listening and perceived responsiveness from each other. Put differently, the topic emphasized in conversation might moderate the association between listening and perceived responsiveness.

Similarly, social experiences and historical contexts might influence cross-racial interactions in which listening and perceived responsiveness are present. For example, in a cross-racial conversation, high-quality listening from a white listener might involve acknowledging the Black speaker's experiences of racial discrimination and systemic inequality. Perceived responsiveness could be promoted by expressing empathy, validating the speaker's experiences, and showing a willingness to oppose racial injustice. On the other hand, a Black partner may listen better to the white individual's perspective and be perceived as more responsive when acknowledging the white speaker's cultural sensitivity and readiness to learn. The general point here is that in intergroup conversations, listening is most likely to be experienced as high-quality, and perceived responsiveness is most likely to be engendered when partners carefully consider how best to match their responses to the other's needs and concerns [21].

Do listening and perceived responsiveness vary across age?

To our knowledge, no study to date has examined the nature or impact of listening and perceived responsiveness across different age groups. Understanding how listening and perceived responsiveness vary across age groups can provide valuable insights into intergenerational communication dynamics. Each age group may have unique communication styles, expectations, and preferences—for instance, young adults may experience brief text messages (e.g., LOL, IMHO, TTYL) as responsive, whereas older adults may require considerably more detailed responses. Examining the role and form of listening and perceived responsiveness across age groups can help identify potential barriers or challenges that affect intergenerational communication. For example, older adults may have hearing or cognitive processing limitations that affect their listening ability. By recognizing these barriers, interventions and adaptations can be developed to improve communication and bridge generational gaps.

This direction for future research can also shed light on the impact of generational attitudes, values, and experiences on communication dynamics that reflect upbringing, cultural influences, and historical events [22]. It seems plausible to us that, for example, individuals in a generation raised to be sensitively attuned to events, issues, and statements that might cause personal distress would respond differently to a speaker's revelation of a traumatic secret than individuals brought up in a more stoic era [23]. This topic has considerable generality as societies become increasingly diverse in terms of age and cultural demographics [24] and can inform policies, interventions, and programs to promote positive interactions and social cohesion across the age spectrum.

How do listening and perceived responsiveness change as relationships lengthen?

Another important question asks how the dynamics of listening and perceived responsiveness evolve as relationships lengthen and people become more familiar with each other. This question applies across nearly all relationship types: romantic partners, kin, friends, co-workers, teammates, and neighbors. When people know each other well, they can draw on an extensive history of experience and interactions, developing insights and communication systems that capitalize on this knowledge [25,26]. What happens when individuals have been in a relationship for an extended period, giving them a deep reservoir of intuition into what the other person thinks, feels, and perhaps even is about to say? [27] Such insights make it possible for listeners to believe—sometimes accurately but often mistakenly—they can quickly appraise the significance of a speaker's message and respond optimally and supportively [28]. On the other hand, these assumptions may be counterproductive for at least two reasons. First, even in long-term close relationships, empathic accuracy is often suboptimal [29], and listeners may make erroneous assumptions about how the speaker is feeling or the reaction they seek. Second, shared knowledge can sometimes interfere with the communication process: Speakers may prefer to express their sentiments fully and to have the listener respond to those expressions rather than to their historical knowledge (even if that knowledge is correct). High-quality listening may therefore emphasize patient and thoughtful attention as a behavioral process rather than as a quest to reach appropriate conclusions. Research is sorely needed to examine how listening and perceived responsiveness are differentially displayed and experienced as relationships evolve over time.

What is the impact of technology on listening and perceived responsiveness?

In today's digital age, the impact of technology on listening and perceived responsiveness is essential to consider [30]. Technological advances have revolutionized how individuals communicate, presenting opportunities and challenges to foster effective listening and perceived responsiveness. One key area where technology influences listening is in the realm of digital communication platforms. How do people show listening on digital platforms? Mobile-device-based interactions and social media (e.g., Twitter, Facebook) have become prevalent modes of interpersonal communication [31], but they lack the rich nonverbal cues, vocal intonations, and synchronicity integral to face-to-face communication. As a result, the ability to convey and accurately interpret emotions, intentions, and nuances of meaning may be compromised. This can hinder listening and perceived responsiveness, as

individuals may feel a limited sense of engagement or even misinterpretation in digital exchanges [32]. Furthermore, the sheer volume and speed of information exchange facilitated by technology can also challenge listening and perceived responsiveness. In a digital world with constant notifications, distractions, and information overload, individuals may struggle to listen attentively. The tendency to skim through messages or respond hastily can hinder genuine understanding and responsiveness.

Another significant direction in which technology may influence listening and perceived responsiveness stems from the proliferation of AI-powered systems and chatbots [33]. Will their algorithmic nature hinder the perception of authenticity and responsiveness in communications? When individuals are cognizant that they are interacting with a machine rather than a human, they may question the depth of genuine understanding or emotional connection. On the other hand, AI-powered systems are becoming increasingly sophisticated, so much so that they may soon be indistinguishable from human-to-human communication. If so, AI-powered systems and chatbots may be capable of engendering many of the benefits of high-quality listening. This is an important avenue for future research.

As these technologies become ubiquitous and often intrusive, many commentators call for curbs on how and when they are used. To effectively navigate the impact of technology on listening and perceived responsiveness, it is essential to understand the dynamic nature of AI's influence, striking a balance between leveraging its benefits and mitigating its limitations. This likely will involve promoting digital literacy and awareness among users to manage expectations and better understanding what AI systems can and cannot do. Minimally, cultivating mindfulness and intentionality in digital communication can help foster active listening and enhance perceived responsiveness.

Healing divides: What happens to the listener/responsiveness provider?

The link between listening and perceived responsiveness suggests a potentially useful strategy for healing contemporary societal divides. When individuals feel listened to, acknowledged, and understood, they are more likely to perceive a sense of responsiveness from others [16,17,34]. This perception of responsiveness, in turn, fosters trust [35] and a willingness to engage in constructive and open-minded dialogue [36]. In the context of societal divides, listening and perceived responsiveness may help bridge gaps and encourage mutual understanding. When individuals from different groups or with opposing views engage in high-quality listening, they create a space for open dialogue and meaningful exchange of ideas. By genuinely listening to

each other's concerns, fears, hopes, and aspirations, we can establish a foundation of psychological safety [37] and open the door to compromise and coexistence [38].

There are several possible psychological processes through which we believe listening and perceived responsiveness can heal divides and reduce group polarization. We will not list all the possible mechanisms in this paper. However, a critical construct that is worth acknowledging is trust. Trust has been found to serve as a key antecedent for reducing intergroup conflicts [39]. At the same time, listening and perceived responsiveness are antecedents of enhanced trust. With regard to listening, a recent meta-analysis [15] found a very strong correlation between listening and trust $r = .57$ ($\rho = .62$; corrected for reliability). This effect was found across 27 effects and 15,343 participants. Perceived responsiveness was found to increase trust in several domains, such as the relationship between citizens and the police [40], children—parent relationships [41], and romantic relationships [42]. Similar findings have been obtained in research on felt understanding, a proxy perceived responsiveness in intergroup relations [43]. Thus, it seems plausible that listening can mitigate intergroup conflict by increasing perceived responsiveness and trust.

In the coming years, it may prove fruitful to test interventions based on the dynamic interplay of high-quality listening and perceived responsiveness to contribute to healing divides and depolarization of extremism.

What are the effects on the listener and responsiveness provider?

Most research on listening and perceived responsiveness focused on the speaker [11] or the responsiveness receiver [44]. Therefore, a knowledge gap exists between the psychological processes and outcomes of the listeners and the responsiveness receiver. For example, in the context of attitude change, listening has been found to reduce speakers' prejudiced attitudes [36,45]. However, what happens to the attitude of a conversant who listens well to a speaker disclosing such attitudes? One possibility is that the listener will change an attitude in the same direction as the speaker because listening and its beneficial effects are reciprocated within the dyad [46,47]. However, would this effect differ for listeners who are part of the social group that the speaker discloses a prejudiced attitude toward, relative to listeners who are not? The studies about the dyadic nature of listening did not ask about situations of difficult conversations, such as when the speaker discloses anger or fear. Such conversations might benefit speakers by reducing their negative emotions [48,49] but might increase the listeners' negative emotions [50]. The same questions are also relevant to perceived responsiveness.

Conclusion

The interplay between listening and perceived responsiveness is important for various exciting avenues for future research in Psychology and the remainder of the behavioral sciences. Individuals can foster myriad positive outcomes by engaging in high-quality listening and creating its downstream effect on perceived responsiveness. The need to disentangle and study the unique roles of listening and perceived responsiveness and their variations across age groups, cultural contexts, and intergroup interactions is central to a comprehensive understanding of social interaction and engagement. This knowledge can inform interventions, policies, and programs to promote positive communication and a sense of belonging, bridge divides, and foster social cohesion.

Funding

This work is supported by grant Number 1235/21 from the Israel Science Foundation and grant number 30687 from Templeton World Charity Foundation to the first author.

Author discloser statement

Given the role as Guest Editor, Guy Itzchakov, Harry Reis had no involvement in the peer review of the article and had no access to information regarding its peer-review. Full responsibility for the editorial process of this article was delegated to Paul van Lange.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors have no conflict of interest.

Data availability

No data was used for the research described in the article.

References

Papers of particular interest, published within the period of review, have been highlighted as:

** of outstanding interest

- Baumeister RF, Leary M: **The need to belong: desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation.** *Psychol Bull* 1995, **117**:497–529.
- Dutton JE, Heaphy ED: **The power of high-quality connections. Positive organizational scholarship.** *Foundations of a new discipline* 2003, **3**:263–278.
- Stephens JP, Heaphy E, Dutton JE: **High-quality connections.** In *The oxford handbook of positive organizational scholarship*. Edited by Spreitzer GM, Cameron KS, Oxford University Press; 2012:385–399.
- Carmeli A, Gittell JH: **High-quality relationships, psychological safety, and learning from failures in work organizations.** *J Organ Behav* 2009, **30**:709–729.
- Holt-Lunstad J, Smith TB, Layton JB: **Social relationships and mortality risk: a meta-analytic review.** *PLoS Med* 2010, **7**, e1000316.
- Lyubomirsky S, King L, Diener E: **The benefits of frequent positive affect: does happiness lead to success?** *Psychol Bull* 2005, **131**:803–855.
- Holt-Lunstad J, et al.: **Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for mortality: a meta-analytic review.** *Perspect Psychol Sci* 2015, **10**:227–237.
- Itzchakov G, et al.: **Connection heals wounds: feeling listened to reduces speakers' loneliness following a social rejection disclosure.** *Pers Soc Psychol Bull* 2022, **01461672221100369**.
This research suggests that being listened to while sharing an experience of social rejection increases a sense of connection (i.e., relatedness need satisfaction) to the listener and consequently reduces speakers' state of loneliness.
- Reis HT, Clark MS, Holmes JG: **Perceived partner responsiveness as an organizing construct in the study of intimacy and closeness.** In *Handbook of closeness and intimacy*. Edited by Mashek DJ, Aron AP, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers; 2004:201–225.
A comprehensive review of perceived responsiveness in the context of romantic relationships
- Reis HT, Shaver PR: **Intimacy as an interpersonal process.** In *Handbook of personal relationships*. Edited by Duck S, Chichester, UK: Wiley; 1988:367–389.
- Kluger AN, Itzchakov G: **The power of listening at work.** *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* 2022, **9**:121–146.
- Bodie GD, Vickery AJ, Gearhart CC: **The nature of supportive listening, I: exploring the relation between supportive listeners and supportive people.** *Int J List* 2013, **27**:39–49.
- Yip J, Fisher M: **Colline Listening in organizations: a Synthesis and future agenda.** *Academy of Management Annals*; 2022null (ja).
This review organizes the literature around listening in Management and suggests insightful directions for future research on the topic.
- Collins HK: **When listening is spoken.** *Current Opinion in Psychology* 2022:101402.
In this paper, Collins refutes the misperception that listening is a passive behavior. Namely, that listening is not merely being silent. Listening also includes important verbal behaviors.
- Kluger AN, et al.: **A meta-analytic systematic review and theory of perceived listening and job outcomes (performance, relationship quality, affect, and cognition).** *J Bus Psychol* 2021. in press.
A meta-analysis of all the effects found in the context of listening in the workplace. This research shows strong correlations between being listened to on interpersonal constructs such as trust, social support, and relationship satisfaction.
- Reis HT, Itzchakov G: **"Can you hear me?": understanding the interplay of listening and perceived partner responsiveness.** Elsevier; 2023:101615.
- Itzchakov G, Reis HT, Weinstein N: **How to foster perceived partner responsiveness: high-quality listening is key.** *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 2022, **16**, e12648.
- Mook DG: **Defense of external invalidity.** *Am Psychol* 1983, **38**: 379.
- Ting-Toomey S, Dorjee T: *Communicating across cultures*. Guilford Publications; 2018.
- Markus HR, Kitayama S, Heiman RJ: **Culture and basic psychological principles.** In *Social psychology: handbook of basic principles*. Edited by Higgins ET, Kruglanski AW, New York: The Guilford Press; 1996:857–913.
- Shnabel N, et al.: **Promoting reconciliation through the satisfaction of the emotional needs of victimized and perpetrating group members: the needs-based model of reconciliation.** *Pers Soc Psychol Bull* 2009, **35**:1021–1030.
- Janssen D, Carradini S: **Generation Z workplace communication habits and expectations.** *IEEE Trans Prof Commun* 2021, **64**:137–153.

6 Listening & Responsiveness (2024)

23. Lukianoff G, Haidt J: *The coddling of the American mind: how good intentions and bad ideas are setting up a generation for failure*. Penguin; 2019.
24. Bergstrom MJ, Holmes ME: **Organizational communication and aging: age-related processes in organizations**. In *Handbook of communication and aging research*. Routledge; 2004:325–348.
25. Lavner JA, Karney BR, Bradbury TN: **Does couples' communication predict marital satisfaction, or does marital satisfaction predict communication?** *J Marriage Fam* 2016, **78**: 680–694.
26. Knapp ML, Daly JA: *Handbook of interpersonal communication*. Sage; 2002.
27. Funder DC, Colvin CR: **Friends and strangers: acquaintance-ship, agreement, and the accuracy of personality judgment**. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 1988, **55**:149–158.
28. Thoits PA: **Stress, coping, and social support processes: where are we? What next?** *J Health Soc Behav* 1995:53–79.
29. Sened H, et al.: **Empathic accuracy and relationship satisfaction: a meta-analytic review**. *J Fam Psychol* 2017, **31**: 742–752.
30. Itzchakov G, Grau J: **High-quality listening in the age of COVID-19: a Key to better dyadic communication for more effective organizations**. *Organ Dynam* 2022, **51**:100820.
31. Storch SL, Ortiz Juarez-Paz AV: **Family communication: exploring the dynamics of listening with mobile devices**. *Int J List* 2018, **32**:115–126.
32. Sbarra DA, Briskin JL, Slatcher RB: **Smartphones and close relationships: the case for an evolutionary mismatch**. *Perspect Psychol Sci* 2019, **14**:596–618.
33. Taylor SH, Choi M: **Lonely algorithms: a longitudinal investigation into the bidirectional relationship between algorithm responsiveness and loneliness**. *J Soc Pers Relat* 2023, 02654075231156623.
34. Reis HT, et al.: **Sociability matters: downstream consequences of perceived partner responsiveness in social life**. In *The psychology of sociability: understanding human attachment*. Edited by Forgas JP, Crano W, Fiedler K, New York: Routledge; 2022:239–257.
35. Livingstone AG, et al.: *You get us, so you like us: feeling understood by an outgroup predicts more positive intergroup relations via perceived positive regard*. 2022.
36. Itzchakov G, et al.: **Can high quality listening predict lower speakers' prejudiced attitudes?** *J Exp Soc Psychol* 2020, **91**: 104022.
37. Itzchakov G, DeMarree KG: **Attitudes in an interpersonal context: psychological safety as a route to attitude change**. *Front Psychol* 2022:4242.
38. Murray SL: **Regulating relationship risk: partner responsiveness as a safety signal**. *Current Opinion in Psychology* 2023: 101582.
39. Dovidio JF, et al.: **Majority and minority perspectives in intergroup relations: the role of contact, group representation, threat, and trust in intergroup conflict and reconciliation**. In *Social psychology of intergroup reconciliation*. Edited by Nadler A, Malloy TE, Fisher JD, New York: Oxford University Press; 2008: 227–253. pp. 227–253.
40. Van Craen M, Skogan WG: **Trust in the Belgian police: the importance of responsiveness**. *Eur J Criminol* 2015, **12**: 129–150.
41. Ter Kuile H, et al.: **Predicting adaptation to parenthood: the role of responsiveness, gratitude, and trust**. *Pers Relat* 2017, **24**:663–682.
42. Dooley MK, et al.: **Perceptions of romantic partners' responsiveness during a period of stressful uncertainty**. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 2018, **115**:677–687.
43. Livingstone AG: **Felt understanding in intergroup relations**. *Current Opinion in Psychology* 2023:101587.
44. Reis HT, Clark MS: **Responsiveness**. In *The Oxford handbook of close relationships*. Edited by Simpson JA, Campbell L, Oxford University Press: Oxford library of psychology; 2013:400–423.
45. Kalla JL, Brookman DE: **Reducing exclusionary attitudes through interpersonal conversation: evidence from three field experiments**. *Am Polit Sci Rev* 2020:1–16.
46. Malloy TE, et al.: **Women listening to women at zero-acquaintance: interpersonal befriending at the individual and dyadic levels**. *Int J List* 2021:1–15.
47. Kluger AN, et al.: **Dyadic listening in teams: social relations model**. *Appl Psychol* 2021, **70**:1045–1099.
48. Weinstein N, Itzchakov G, Legate N: *The motivational value of listening during intimate and difficult conversations*. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*; 2022.
49. Behfar KJ, Cronin MA, McCarthy K: **Realizing the upside of venting: the role of the "challenger listener"**. *Acad Manag Discov* 2020, **6**:609–630.
50. Michelson T, Kluger AN: **Can listening hurt you? A meta-analysis of the effects of exposure to trauma on listener's stress**. *Int J List* 2021:1–11.