Nonverbal Behavior and Communication in the Workplace: A Review and an Agenda for Research

Silvia Bonaccio
Jane O'Reilly
Sharon L. O'Sullivan
François Chiocchio
University of Ottawa

Nonverbal behavior is a hot topic in the popular management press. However, management scholars have lagged behind in understanding this important form of communication. Although some theories discuss limited aspects of nonverbal behavior, there has yet to be a comprehensive review of nonverbal behavior geared toward organizational scholars. Furthermore, the extant literature is scattered across several areas of inquiry, making the field appear disjointed and challenging to access. The purpose of this paper is to review the literature on nonverbal behavior with an eye towards applying it to organizational phenomena. We begin by defining nonverbal behavior and its components. We review and discuss several areas in the organizational sciences that are ripe for further explorations of nonverbal behavior. Throughout the paper, we offer ideas for future research as well as information on methods to study nonverbal behavior in lab and field contexts. We hope our review will encourage organizational scholars to develop a deeper understanding of how nonverbal behavior influences the social world of organizations.

Keywords: *nonverbal behavior; communication; social interactions*

1

Nonverbal behavior is a popular management press hot topic. In a Forbes blog post, for example, employees are encouraged to display 10 cues to show greater confidence (Smith, 2013). Job seekers are told that interviewers form an opinion of them within 7 s of meeting (Pitts, 2013). Leaders have a "silent language," and body language can win negotiations and build trust (Goman, 2011). Women are told to display specific "power poses" if they want to succeed (Cuddy, 2013). Finally, Sheryl Sandberg, Facebook executive and author of *Lean In*, is not immune to body language criticism. Her 2013 *Time* magazine cover was condemned for making her look like "a little girl" (Wall Street Journal, 2013).

Given the clear interest in the popular press for body language and nonverbal behavior in general, it is surprising to notice that management scholars have lagged behind in understanding this seemingly important form of communication. Although some theories discuss limited aspects of nonverbal behavior, there has yet to be a comprehensive review of nonverbal behavior geared toward organizational scholars. Furthermore, the extant literature is scattered across several fields, most notably communication, gender studies, cross-cultural studies, social psychology, anthropology, and criminology. Even some of the key researchers of nonverbal behavior have characterized aspects within the field as "disjointed" in several respects (Harrigan, Rosenthal, & Scherer, 2005: 137). As a result, it can be a challenge for organizational scientists interested in studying nonverbal behavior to access a concise treatment of this topic.

The purpose of this article is to review the literature on nonverbal behavior with an eye towards applying it to organizational phenomena. We begin by defining nonverbal behavior and its components. We then review several areas in the organizational sciences that are ripe for further explorations into nonverbal behavior. We organize our review around several nonverbal behavior functions that have implications for organizational life. We also discuss methodological considerations when relevant. By doing so, our review offers a helpful guide for organizational scholars wishing to navigate the vast literature on nonverbal behavior. To guide the reader and provide additional ideas and directions, we provide an overview of the five areas of inquiry relevant to management research, as well as pose some research questions for future inquiry, in Table 1. We hope our review will encourage organizational scholars to develop a deeper understanding of how nonverbal behavior influences the social world of organizations—an important endeavor, given that it is estimated that 65% to 93% of all human interaction is fueled by nonverbal cues (Birdwhistell, 1970).

Defining Nonverbal Behavior and Communication

Early definitions of nonverbal communication highlighted that it does not rely on words or language (see Knapp, 2011, for a historical overview). However, this definition draws a superficial distinction between verbal and nonverbal communication. Indeed, nonverbal communication differs from verbal communication in that it is communication that is *not* linguistic (Burgoon, Guerrero, & Manusov, 2011), which is why American Sign Language, for instance, is considered verbal communication. Adding a layer of complexity, both verbal and nonverbal communication possess vocal characteristics, with verbal vocalic referring to the content of the message and nonverbal vocalic to how the message is conveyed (e.g., voice tone, accent, pitch; Hargie, 2011). Thus, *nonverbal communication* is understood as "the sending and receiving of thoughts and feelings via nonverbal behavior" (Ambady & Weisbuch, 2010: 465).

Any nonverbal behavior has the *potential* to communicate meaning (Burgoon et al., 2011). We emphasize the term *potential* because while nonverbal behavior represents objective

Table 1

A Functional Approach to the Role of Nonverbal Behaviors in Organizations

Function	Select Relevant Topics in Organizational Research	Sample Organizational Research Questions and Problems
Display Personal Attributes	• Recruitment, selection, and assessment • Performance appraisal • Detection of dishonesty • Displays of integrity	• Which NVB cues are most relevant to assessment/selection decisions, and how do they influence assessors? • How might context moderate the influence of NVBs on assessment/selection decisions? • How might assessors best be trained to discern deception versus integrity?
Exercise Social Control and Establish Hierarchy	• Power and dominance • Abusive supervision • Harassment/bullying • Discrimination • Negotiation • Socialization • Organizational culture • Executive influence	• How might NVB displays of dominance influence negotiations or conflict management? • How might hostile NVB codes differ depending on relationship (e.g., supervisor-subordinate vs. coworker)? • How might sensitivity training help in detecting, documenting, and minimizing hostile NVBs in the workplace? • To what extent do hostile NVBs affect organizational climate?
Promote Social Functioning	• Charismatic leadership • Motivation • Trust • Interactional justice • Organizational commitment	• How might NVB denoting diversity (e.g., appearance cues, such as the wearing of religious symbols) influence ascriptions of charisma, credibility, and persuasiveness? • How might NVB enhance or detract from perceptions of interactional justice? • Are the different types of commitment associated with different NVBs?
Foster High-Quality Relationships	• Teams • Mentoring • Leader-follower exchange • Workplace compassion • Organizational identity	• How might NVB denoting rapport operate in specific organizational contexts, such as mentor-mentee relationships and leader-member exchange? • How might NVB, other than chronemics, influence synchrony in team contexts? • How does NVB mimicry develop in leader-follower or mentor/protégé relationships?
Emotional Displays	• Emotional labor • Emotional management • Emotional leakage • Emotional contagion	• Which NVBs are most relevant to the suppression of negative emotions and the display of positive emotions? • Are some NVBs more likely to betray inauthentic emotional labor (or which NVBs are more prone to leakage)? • How do NVBs support verbal communication to produce emotional contagion?

Note: NVB = nonverbal behavior.

manifestations, meaning resides in perceivers' ascriptions and whether a nonverbal behavior is implicitly or explicitly noticed. The term *behavior* is best thought of as synonymous with *cue*, broadly defined as "any numerical, verbal, graphical, pictorial, or other sensory information which is available to a judge for potential use in forming a judgment" (Cooksey, 1996: 368). We offer this clarification for two reasons. First, this conceptualization draws a distinction between nonverbal behaviors as cues versus acts. A number of constructs studied in management (e.g., organizational citizenship and counterproductive behaviors) refer to behaviors as acts and, thus, do not fall under the rubric of nonverbal behavior. Second, the label *behavior* can be a misnomer as certain elements (e.g., physical environment, appearance) are considered nonverbal behaviors, even though there is no discernible "movement" involved.

Despite the distinction, nonverbal and verbal communication are related in several ways (Richmond & McCroskey, 2004). Nonverbal behavior can *repeat* verbal discourse (e.g., a nod to show agreement), *substitute* it (e.g., an eye roll instead of a statement of contempt), *complement* it (e.g., reddening while talking to an intimidating person), *accent* it (e.g., a slap on the back following a joke), or *contradict* it (e.g., wiping tears away while asserting that one is fine).

Nonverbal behavior displays and the meaning attached to them depend on both biological and cultural origins. From a biological perspective, nonverbal behaviors, and their meanings, are a result of adaptation (Floyd, 2006). Supporting evidence points to the universality of certain nonverbal cues across cultures. For example, early work by Ekman (1972) indicates that displays of basic emotions (happiness, sadness, fear, anger, disgust, and surprise) are recognized across cultures. Yet cultural forces also shape nonverbal behavior (see Matsumoto, 2006). For example, social-based theories can explain some of the differences in men and women's nonverbal displays. Compared to men, women tend to be more expressive in their face and body movements, prefer less physical distance, and use less speech dysfluencies (J. A. Hall, 2006).

Codes of Nonverbal Communication

Nonverbal behaviors are organized into a typology of codes. "Codes are the systematic means through which meanings are created (encoded), transmitted, perceived, and interpreted (decoded)" (Burgoon et al., 2011: 240). A researcher's focus can range from micro, concentrating on discrete codes (e.g., eye gaze, body posture), to macro, examining composites of codes that represent a higher-level construct (e.g., the display of warmth; Ambady & Weisbuch, 2010). Theory will drive one's focus and empirical approach. Codes can be grouped according to three categories, denoting the modalities of communication—body, sensory and contact, and spatiotemporal codes, as shown in Table 2.

Body Codes

Body codes encompass kinesics, physical appearance, and oculesics. *Kinesics* is communication through body movement, including gestures, posture and gait, and facial expression (Burgoon et al., 2011). Kinesics are a primary means of communicating, often supporting or even superseding verbal communication. Seminal work by Ekman and Friesen (1969b)

Table 2

Codes of Nonverbal Communication and Examples of Commonly Used Methods and Measures in Nonverbal Behavior Research

Category	Definition	Nonverbal Examples	Examples of Common Methods and Measures
Body Codes			
Kinesics	Communication through body movement	Facial expressions, gestures, interactive synchrony, posture (the majority of the work has focused on movement of hands and head; Harrigan, 2005)	Facial kinesics • Facial Action Coding System (Ekman, Friesen, & Hager, 2002; Scherer & Ekman, 2005): Most used coding scheme. See Cohn and Ekman (2005) for other coding systems and how to evaluate coding systems. • Automated analysis: Computer software that automatically measures and recognizes NVB, especially used to measure facial action (Cohn & Kanade, 2007). See Cohn and Ekman (2005) for technical considerations. • Electromyography: Uses electrodes to measure muscular activity. It is useful for capturing emotional responses that are quick and short (Cohn & Ekman, 2005). Nonfacial kinesics • Ekman and Friesen (1969b). Codes for adaptors, emblems, illustrators, regulators, and affect display. Still widely used. • Harrigan and Carney (2005; see also Harrigan, 2005: 181). Codes for body positions, body actions, and proxemics. • The Bernese System: Kinesics are recorded by numerical codes plotted on Cartesian axes (see Harrigan, 2013). • Software for coding audiovisual data: http://www.anvil-software.org/.
Appearance (including chromatics)	Communication through one's appearance	Attire, makeup, height, weight, attractiveness	See Todorov, Olivola, Dotsch, and Mende-Siedlecki (2015) for a review of work on social attributions made from facial appearance (see also Facial Kinesics, above).
Oculesics	Communication via the eyes	Eye contact, pupil dilation, blinking, eye movements	Eye-tracking instruments and software: (Eizenman et al., 2003; Harrigan, 2005). Frequency/total/average duration of individual gaze/proportion of time gazing. Recording facial orientation: Used as a proxy for gaze (Harrigan, 2013).
Sensory and Contact Codes			
Haptics	Communication through touch	Types of touch, touch avoidance	Touch Log Record (Jones, 2005) and The Body Chart (Andersen & Guerrero, 2005) record the location and characteristics of touch.

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Category	Definition	Nonverbal Examples	Examples of Common Methods and Measures
Vocalics (paralanguage or prosody)	Communication through voice qualities	Characteristics (e.g., laugh), qualifiers (e.g., pitch, volume), segregates (e.g., "eh," "hmm"), silence	Checklist of qualities associated with vocal production (see http://ncvs.org/e-learning/tutorials/qualities.html). Software: for example, PRAAT (freely available at http://www.fon.hum.uva.nl/praat/). National Center for Voice and Speech (http://www.ncvs.org/). See their tutorials for a helpful guide: http://ncvs.org/e-learning/tutorials/index.html.
Olfactics	Communication through smell	Body odor, use of perfume or cologne	The Sniffin' Sticks Test assesses threshold, discrimination, and identification of odors (Hummel, Sekinger, Wolf, Pauli, & Kobal, 1997). The proxemics notation system (E. T. Hall, 1973) includes an olfaction component.
Spatiotemporal Codes			
Proxemics	Communication through physical space	Personal space, territory	Projective approaches ask participants to imagine their comfort distance with another person and indicate it by manipulating figurines or choosing among several photographs, for example. See also the Comfort Interpersonal Distance Scale (Duke & Nowicki, 1972). The proxemics notation system (E. T. Hall, 1973) includes distance, posture, orientation of body, touch, vision, audition, olfaction, and temperature. Harrigan and Carney (2005; see Kinetics, above).
Chronemics	Communication through the use of time	Talk time, body speed	Software designed to analyze voice quality (such as PRAAT) can measure speech rate (also called velocity of speech; see Juslin & Scherer, 2005). Response latencies in computer-mediated communication, such as e-mail. Gait speed can be assessed via technology, such as GPS, infrared sensors, or stopwatches (i.e., manual chronometry; Doyen, Klein, Pichon, & Cleeremans, 2012). Individual and organizational differences in time preferences can be assessed through questionnaires (e.g., Bluedorn, Kalliath, Strube, & Martin, 1999; Poposki & Oswald, 2010).
Environment and Artifacts	Communication through objects	Built environments, design and objects, landscape of natural environments	The servicescape literature (e.g., see Table 1 in Ezeh & Harris, 2007) discusses aspects of the physical environment that contain communicative properties. Approaches to organizational culture that focus on artifacts (e.g., Rafaeli & Pratt, 2006).

Note: NVB = nonverbal behavior.

identifies five categories of nonverbal communication through kinesics. First, *adaptors* refer to self-touch, which often reveals someone's internal state. For example, touching one's face or hair in an interview may reveal anxiety. Second, *emblems* are gestures that have a socially understood meaning, such as a thumbs-up to denote good performance. Third, *illustrators* are gestures that accompany verbal messages. Illustrators include *batons* (using hands to emphasize a point), *ideographs* (sketching a relationship or a direction), *pointers/deictic movements* (pointing to an entity or object), *spatials* (depicting the distance or size), *rhythmic movements* (gestures that convey rhythm or timing), *kinetographics* (mimicking human or nonhuman action), and *pictographs* (drawing a picture or shape in the air). Emblems and, to a lesser extent, illustrators are culturally specific. Fourth, *regulators* help maintain the flow of the conversation (e.g., nods). And fifth, *affect displays* refer to facial expressiveness.

An example of management-related research that focuses on kinesics is the embodiment of power through "power postures" (e.g., Carney, Cuddy, & Yap, 2010; Park, Streamer, Huang, & Galinsky, 2013). High power postures are generally defined by physical expansiveness (Carney et al.), such as standing straight with a broad chest and hands on hips. In contrast, a low power posture could be characterized by standing hunched with arms folded and head lowered.

Kinesics can be controlled to different degrees. Genuine facial expressions are generally considered to be involuntary (Ekman & Friesen, 1974), and the face can often reveal verbal deception (Vrij, 2006). It can be difficult to suppress certain behaviors, such as reddening when embarrassed or fidgeting when uncomfortable, but other gestures can be trained. Public speakers often enact scripted hand gestures and trunk posture to emphasize their verbal message. In organizations, the importance of gestures in complementing inspirational visions is recognized as a central component of charismatic leadership training (Frese, Beimel, & Schoenborn, 2003).

Another broad category, *physical appearance*, ranges from characteristics such as height, weight, skin, and eye and hair color to style and color of clothing and accessories, body art, and grooming (Burgoon et al., 2011). While some of these communication codes are easily alterable (e.g., clothing, hair color), others are less so (e.g., skin color). The evaluation of physical appearance contains a certain degree of within-culture and cross-cultural consistency. Physical characteristics are interpreted as signals of traits, and stereotypes are often rooted in these interpretations. For example, adults characterized by "baby-facedness" are seen as warmer and more honest, and such a face can help African American men climb up the ranks of their organizations (Livingston & Pearce, 2009). Furthermore, positive ascriptions of intelligence, competence, courage, and health are made for physical attractiveness (see Zebrowitz, Montepare, & Strom, 2013, for a review). Research has shown that interviewers are sensitive to physical appearance. Applicants with a facial scar or port-wine stain birthmark on a cheek were rated as less desirable than their nonstigmatized counterparts in a selection interview, and the interviewers recalled less information about them (Madera & Hebl, 2012).

Finally, *oculesics* has to do with eye gaze, eye contact, and ocular expression (Harrigan, 2005). Eye contact during conversations is culturally prescribed and part of conversational norms (Matsumoto & Hwang, 2013). Eye movements, blinking, and pupil dilation are also considered oculesics. By and large, oculesics is involuntary, except for eye contact, which can be controlled.

Sensory and Contact Codes

These codes encompass haptics, vocalics, and olfactics. The act of touching another person as a form of communication is known as *haptics* (Andersen, Gannon, & Kalchik, 2013). The location of touch as well as the intensity and type of touch (e.g., a stroke, a pat, a slap) convey different meanings (Burgoon et al., 2011). Norms for touch vary across cultures. Individuals from "contact cultures" (e.g., Latin American, Mediterranean, Middle Eastern, and to some extent North American countries) engage in greater frequency of touching as compared to individuals from "noncontact cultures" (e.g., northern European and Asian countries; Andersen et al.). A number of types of touch exist, and each communicates varying levels of intimacy (Andersen et al.). At work, touch carries generally one of two purposes: The functional-professional touch occurs as part of a job requirement (e.g., between a physician and a patient), and the social-polite touch occurs to assist social interactions. The importance of the social-polite touch is exemplified by preferences for firm handshakes over limp ones (Stewart, Dustin, Barrick, & Darnold, 2008). Whether the friendship-warmth touch is appropriate nonverbal work behavior may depend on the norms of the organization and the individuals involved. For example, a subordinate may welcome a brief congratulatory hug from a supervisor in an egalitarian work culture but not in a hierarchical one.

Second, the auditory aspects of how a verbal message is conveyed are known as *vocalics* (Burgoon et al., 2011). Vocalics are just as important as the message itself: Pitch level, range, intonation, volume, accent, and pronunciation influence discourse perception. For example, *uptalk*, a speech pattern in which declarative statements are pronounced with the rising intonation of an interrogation, is associated with displays of uncertainty (Linneman, 2013). Dysfluencies, such as excessive pauses or segregates (e.g., "hmm"), and other vocal cues tend to involuntarily convey emotions. In organizations, vocal cues, such as pitch and volume, are related to hierarchy such that listeners can infer speakers' hierarchy on the basis of vocalics, and speakers adopt different vocalics on the basis of their hierarchy (Ko, Sadler, & Galinsky, 2015).

Finally, *olfactics* is communication through scent and smell (Richmond & McCroskey, 2004). Scent plays a role in social functioning—pleasant scents serve to attract, and unpleasant ones to deter, others. One's scent is influenced by natural body odor, habits (e.g., hygiene, use of perfume), activities (e.g., sweat-inducing exercise), and health (e.g., certain illnesses have an odor). In organizations, scent is less studied than the other codes discussed herein. Nonetheless, the importance of smell is seen in "scent-free" organizational policies (De Vader & Barker, 2009) or managers' dilemma of confronting a foul-smelling employee.

Spatiotemporal Codes

These codes include proxemics, chronemics, and environment. *Proxemics* refers to the use of personal space to communicate (Andersen et al., 2013). What is considered appropriate personal space is dictated by culture (e.g., North Americans prefer greater physical space during a conversation than Mediterraneans or South Americans; see Matsumoto & Hwang, 2013) and the relationship between two individuals (e.g., standing closer to a friend than a supervisor). North Americans prefer public interactions to occur at greater than 8 feet apart, professional interactions to occur between 4 and 8 feet apart, friendly interactions to occur between 1.5 and 4 feet, and intimate interactions to occur closer (E. T. Hall, 1968). A

violation of personal space can be communicative of a threat (e.g., from a bully to a victim) or an overture (e.g., when flirting with another) and experienced negatively if it is unwanted. The importance of respecting personal space is seen in guidelines for expatriate employees.

Chronemics includes walking speed, work speed, promptness, and punctuality, all of which communicate meaning about how time is perceived, interpreted, and used by a person or in a culture (McGrath & Tschan, 2004; White, Valk, & Dialmy, 2011). Recently, leadership and team research has advanced with the inclusion of temporal individual differences, such as time urgency (feeling hurried or not), polychronicity (a preference for multitasking), time perspective (focusing on past, present, or future), and pacing style (Mohammed & Harrison, 2013). For example, Mohammed and Nadkarni (2011) showed that temporal team leaders, those who help structure, coordinate, and manage the pacing of work, have positive influences on team performance, especially when teams differ in temporal composition.

Environment is considered a nonverbal spatiotemporal code (Burgoon et al., 2011) because one's surroundings (e.g., an office's floorplan or decor) convey meaning. Symbols in organizations possess communicative properties. Artifacts conveying status (Rafaeli & Vilnai-Yavetz, 2004) and servicescapes influencing a patron's experience in a service organization (Ezeh & Harris, 2007) are illustrations of the communicative properties of this code.

Nonverbal Behaviors and Organizational Research

Nonverbal behavior is a ubiquitous element of communication and has the ability to produce meaning across all forms of social interaction. While most progress in nonverbal behavior research has occurred in other fields, nonverbal behavior and its communicative properties have not been entirely ignored in management research, as our examples have already illustrated. Yet it is our assertion that management research could benefit from further systematic application of nonverbal behavior research. Thus, the purpose of this section is two-fold. First, we review a selection of management research that has recognized nonverbal behavior in some capacity. Second, we highlight specific nonverbal behavior–related research questions that could be answered to better understand and enhance organizational functioning. For management scholars wishing to address these and other questions, we provide a list of useful empirical instruments (Tables 2 and 3), discuss essential methodological considerations (see Table 4), and suggest other readings (Gray & Ambady, 2006; Harrigan, 2013; Harrigan et al., 2005; Manusov, 2005). The methodological considerations discussed in Table 4 are relevant to any research design aimed at the study of nonverbal behavior, but we provide some illustrations of how these considerations come into play throughout the next sections.

We organize our review and research agenda around several nonverbal behavior functions relevant for organizational research. Functional models of nonverbal behavior recognize nonverbal behaviors as socially *pragmatic*—they either implicitly or explicitly achieve social goals (Patterson, 1991). According to Patterson, nonverbal behaviors are meaningful primarily once they are considered in terms of an interpersonal exchange. The functional perspective of nonverbal behavior is consistent with work that has put an emphasis on understanding emotional displays as pieces of social information (Van Kleef, 2014). Consistent across both perspectives is the assumption that the social world can be ambiguous and nonverbal behaviors can help to coordinate and bring clarity to social interactions. Emotional displays are

Table 3

Examples of Assessments of Competence in Nonverbal Behavior Research

Nonverbal Competence	Examples of Measures
Decoding competence	Diagnostic Analysis of Nonverbal Accuracy (DANVA; Nowicki & Duke, 2001): Photographs of emotional expressions (anger, fear, happiness, and sadness). In the DANVA-2, the emotions vary in intensity and different races are used. Vocal cues are also available. Response accuracy is scored with a key. See also Japanese and Caucasian Brief Affect Recognition Test (Matsumoto et al., 2000): Series of photographs of faces showing emotions (happiness, sadness, disgust, fear, surprise, anger, and contempt). Males and females and Caucasian and Japanese individuals are represented in the photographs. Photographs are projected for less than one-fifth of a second.
	Profile of Nonverbal Sensitivity (Rosenthal, Hall, DiMatteo, Rogers, & Archer, 1979): Test for accuracy in decoding affective nonverbal cues (face, body, voice tone). Two hundred twenty 2-s audio, video, or combined audio/video clips. Short forms (audio or video only) are also available (see http://repository.neu.edu/collections/neu:193290/contents/0).
	Interpersonal Perception Task (Archer, Constanzo, & Ackert, 2001): Filmed interactions of kinship, deception, competition, status, and intimacy. Thirty-item and 15-item versions are available. Multiple-choice questions with objectively correct answers are available.
	Test of Nonverbal Cue Knowledge (Rosip & Hall, 2004): Individual differences in knowledge of meaning and use of nonverbal cues assessed via an 81-item true/false test.
Encoding competence	Cultural Intelligence Scale–Observer Report: Ability to modify verbal behavior and nonverbal behavior in a culturally appropriate manner (van Dyne, Ang, & Koh, 2008).
	Emotional intelligence measures (e.g., Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2003) assess both encoding and decoding competence.

encompassed within nonverbal behaviors broadly, but as we describe below, emotional displays also uniquely affect certain social processes and are worthy of specific attention.

Our review of the literature identified five functions of nonverbal behaviors that have implications for organizational life: displaying personal attributes, exercising social control and establishing hierarchy, promoting social functioning, fostering high-quality relationships, and displaying emotional expression. These functions are not mutually exclusive, but for the sake of clarity, we discuss each independently. We also review a selection of related organizational topics to illustrate the relevance of each function. Given the centrality of nonverbal behavior in human communication, it is perhaps not surprising that a wide variety of topics typically found in management research are related to at least one function. An exhaustive discussion of each of these topics is beyond the scope of a single article, so we suggest additional topics in Table 1.

Function 1: Display Personal Attributes

One of the primary functions of nonverbal behaviors is that they reveal information about a person's personality, intentions, and attitudes (Ambady, Bernieri, & Richeson, 2000). Goffman (1959) noted that we are constantly "giving off signals" via nonverbal behavior that are interpreted by those around us (either accurately or inaccurately) as expressive of our underlying attributes. In fact, some consider nonverbal behaviors to be irrepressible (DePaulo, 1992); even a seeming lack of nonverbal behavior will be interpreted by an observer as an

Table 4

Methodological Considerations When Studying Nonverbal Behaviors

Issue	Choices	Details
Variable type	Independent vs. dependent vs. both	One's research question will guide whether NVB is studied as an IV, a DV, or both an IV and a DV. For example, the effect of leader eye contact with follower (IV) on follower persuasion, leader persuasion on follower eye contact with leader (DV), and leader eye contact on follower eye contact (IV/DV).
Focus	Individual vs. interactions between individuals	Research focus can rest on individuals' specific displays of NVBs or on the interactive displays of NVBs within dyadic and group interpersonal interactions.
Sampling decisions (Scherer & Ekman, 2005)	NVB sampling/unit of analysis	Unit of analysis can range from micro (i.e., isolated NVB, such as a smile) to macro (i.e., composite of NVBs related to a trait or attribute, such as all NVBs that can convey warmth).
	Stimuli sampling	This consideration is important when the research question involves NVB as an IV. Using several stimuli with a common attribute of interest (e.g., multiple pictures of power poses) increases generalizability and validity. Must also determine: Single sex or not? Single-culture or cross-cultural research?
		On a related note, researchers must consider how the demographic and background details of study participants will influence results. For example, the meaning of an NVB can differ across cultures.
Setting decisions (Scherer & Ekman, 2005)	Laboratory vs. field	The setting of the study will drive many decisions for both IVs and DVs of NVB. Lab research is not only for scripted NVB; partners can come to the laboratory to be observed in freeform interactions.
	Naturally occurring vs. staged/scripted behavior	Is the NVB stimulus observed as it naturally unfolds or is it staged? Are confederates involved? This question is related to internal and external validity decisions. Scripted behavior offers the most experimental control, while sampling naturally occurring behavior offers the least.
	Live vs. recorded behaviors	Do observers view the NVB live or is it recorded? A benefit of recording is that coders can slow it down and replay it (see Frank, Juslin, & Harrigan, 2005, for technical points on recording).
Coding (Cohn & Ekman, 2005)	Judgment-based vs. sign-based coding	Judgment coding relies on raters' evaluations based on NVB displays. Sign coding relies on raters' recording of specific NVB cues. Judgment and sign coding yield different information. For example, if a researcher is interested in warmth, judgment coding captures whether one is perceived as warm as a result of his or her NVBs; sign coding captures which NVBs convey warmth.
		Considerations: selection of judges, calculations of reliability indices, and forming composite variables (Rosenthal, 2005).

(continued)

Table 4 (continued)

Issue	Choices	Details
Technological considerations for generating and recording samples of NVB	Standard content (J. A. Hall, Bernieri, & Carney, 2005)	Participants read standardized material of neutral affective content (e.g., the alphabet). Used to study paralanguage.
	Mood induction (Westerman, Spies, Stahl, & Hesse, 1996)	Moods are induced by techniques such as exposing participants to emotion-laden stimuli or by asking them to recall emotional events. Affords some experimental control while capturing natural expressions.
	Photographs/still images	Photos can be used to present IV or record DV.
	Voice recording (Juslin & Scherer, 2005)	For paralanguage and chronemics, as IV and DV. Decisions include which vocal qualities to record (pitch, intensity, temporal cues, and voice quality) and how to segment the speech (see Frank et al., 2005). Random splicing is a voice recording split into short segments, randomized, and rendered unintelligible while retaining vocalic qualities. Useful when message content can influence appraisal (J. A. Hall et al.). Douglas-Cowie, Campbell, Cowie, and Roach (2003) list speech recording databases.
	Video (Frank et al., 2005)	Technical decisions include shot angle, lighting, staging, and camera positioning/hiding.
	Thin slices (Ambady, Bernieri, & Richeson, 2000)	Presentation of a "brief excerpt of expressive behavior sampled from the behavioral stream" (Ambady et al., 2000: 203). NVB as the IV.
	Point light displays (Johansson, 1973)	Stimulus moves in the dark with lights positioned at specific points of the body. Permits evaluations of NVBs, such as kinesics, proxemics, or chronemics, without other visual cues.

Note: NVB = nonverbal behavior; IV = independent variable; DV = dependent variable.

indicator of some attribute. For example, observers may interpret one's lack of expression (in an attempt to display neutrality) as an expression of aloofness or disinterest (Keating, 2006) and react accordingly. At the same time, Goffman recognized that people can also "give signals" in a more controllable sense. Thus, nonverbal behavior plays an important role in both impression formation and impression management. Past research on personnel decisions—such as selection and performance appraisal—has recognized these impacts.

Personnel selection and performance appraisal.   Research has shown not only that people make relatively quick judgments of others on the basis of their nonverbal behavior (Albright, Kenny, & Malloy, 1988) but also that brief observations (labeled "thin slices") of nonverbal behavior can result in accurate impressions (Ambady et al., 2000). Accuracy is measured on the basis of the correspondence between raters' judgments and other measures of effectiveness. For example, ratings from thin slices correspond to supervisor ratings, objective measures of job performance, and other relevant outcomes, such as customer satisfaction (Ambady et al., 2000; Ambady, Krabbenhoft, & Hogan, 2006; DeGroot & Motowidlo, 1999; J. A. Hall, Roter, & Rand, 1981; Hecht & LaFrance, 1995). However, the extent to which raters' perceptions are accurate depends on the attribute being inferred (Borkenau & Liebler, 1992; Carney, Colvin, & Hall, 2007). For example, individuals tend to be more accurate when relying on nonverbal behaviors to assess social skills than to assess work motivation (Gifford, Ng, & Wilkinson, 1985).

Other research has looked at micro (or discrete) nonverbal behaviors and attributions in the selection and assessment process. A firm, brief handshake, for example, can confer sociability, friendliness, and confidence and is positively associated with hiring decisions (Chaplin, Phillips, Brown, Clanton, & Stein, 2000). Other nonverbal behaviors that can influence interviewers' assessments include smiles, eye contact, expressiveness, hand gesturing, facial appearance, and head nodding (e.g., Burgoon, Manusov, Mineo, & Hale, 1985; Howard & Ferris, 1996; McElroy, Summers, & Moore, 2014; McGovern & Tinsley, 1978; Woodzicka, 2008). While some research indicates that physical appearance affects interviewers' assessments (Riggio & Throckmorton, 1988), other research suggests that this impact is not relevant once other nonverbal behaviors and contextual factors are taken into account (Tsai, Huang, & Yu, 2010).

Consistent with the functional perspective of nonverbal behaviors, results show that the interviewer and interviewee will influence the nonverbal behaviors each displays (Dipboye, 1982; Liden, Martin, & Parsons, 1993; see also Cuperman & Ickes, 2009). Similar findings are shown in assessment center exercises (Oliver, Hausdorf, Lievens, & Conlon, in press).

A critical research question is whether nonverbal behavior is a source of impression management, or relatedly, a source of bias. That is, to what extent can people use nonverbal behaviors intentionally or strategically? Impression management captures efforts to manage others' favorable impressions of oneself and can involve verbal and nonverbal tactics (Lievens & Peeters, 2008; Peeters & Lievens, 2006). Scholars generally conceptualize nonverbal behavior as contaminants in the interview process (Kristof-Brown, Barrick, & Franke, 2002; McFarland, Yun, Harold, Viera, & Moore, 2005) and advocate the use of more structured interviews to eliminate potential biasing effects of impression management (Barrick, Shaffer, & DeGrassi, 2009; Howard & Ferris, 1996; Tsai, Chen, & Chiu, 2005). Although

structured interviews are not completely immune (McFarland et al.), research has shown that nonverbal behavior is both less controllable and less adversely impactful as an impression management tactic compared to verbal tactics (Lievens & Peeters; Peeters & Lievens).

Nonverbal behavior can even overcome other sources of perceiver bias. For example, women often face backlash when they use verbal self-promotion, but a firm handshake can be used to make a positive first impression (Chaplin et al., 2000). Using nonverbal cues to convey warmth and/or competence can help individuals of certain social groups overcome being unfairly stereotyped (Cuddy, Glick, & Beninger, 2011).

Future research. Whether and how nonverbal behaviors influence personnel selection and performance appraisals warrants further research attention. However, a deeper understanding of the nonverbal behavior literature suggests that the research question should ultimately be more nuanced than this. If nonverbal behaviors are indeed ubiquitous and pragmatic, then it is reasonable to assume that they do have a functional role in personnel decisions. The goal should be to build an understanding of which behaviors are relevant, how the context might influence nonverbal cues, and how to best distinguish between genuine versus inauthentic nonverbal behavior. DeGroot and Gooty support this assertion; they argue that "no matter how much an interview is structured, nonverbal cues cause interviewers to make attributions" (2009: 179). They also advocate that rather than try to eliminate the impact of nonverbal displays, interviewers should be equipped with the "social tools" needed to be able to recognize valid and invalid nonverbal cues. DeGroot and Gooty's proposition is intriguing, but further empirical research is needed to apply it. This is no small task, given that detecting suspicious behavior is difficult, even when it is essential to good task performance (e.g., police officers; Vrij, 2006). In short, while nonverbal forms of communication are more difficult to use strategically than verbal forms, it can still be difficult to assess when nonverbal behavior is used deceptively (Ekman & Friesen, 1969a; Ekman & O'Sullivan, 2006; Vrij).

One promising avenue is developing training programs that enhance individuals' implicit understanding of nonverbal behavior broadly rather than focusing on explicit nonverbal behaviors. For example, research on lie detection has indicated that our tacit notions of deception cues are more accurate than our explicit knowledge (Hartwig & Bond, 2011). This approach is in line with organizational scholars' call to better understand the role of intuition in management decision making (Dane & Pratt, 2007). Thin slices are likely a particularly useful approach to expose intuitive processes regarding nonverbal behavior (see Table 4; Ambady et al., 2000). Another relevant research endeavor using nonverbal behavior is the focus on enhancing employees' emotional intelligence (i.e., the ability to understand one's own and others' emotions and to respond accordingly; Côté & Miners, 2006) broadly rather than focusing training programs on specific nonverbal cues (e.g., Kotsou, Nelis, Grégoire, & Mikolajczak, 2011; see also Sheldon, Dunning, & Ames, 2004). Typically, emotional intelligence will be assessed through self- and other-report. However, the nonverbal literature highlights a critical empirical limitation of this approach: It is important to distinguish between self-report measures of decoding of nonverbal cues and objective empirical measures of participants' actual decoding skills (Riggio, 2006). We encourage researchers studying emotional intelligence to use these objective measures (see Table 3 for measures employed to assess individual differences in nonverbal behavior encoding and decoding ability; see

also Riggio). Self-reports of emotional displays differ from actual displays (Bosson, Haymovitz, & Pinel, 2004), and self-reports of one's ability to decode others' emotions do not capture objective ability (Davies, Stankov, & Roberts, 1998).

Function 2: Exercise Dominance and Establish Hierarchy

Another function of nonverbal behavior is to communicate dominance and establish social hierarchy (Burgoon & Dunbar, 2006; J. A. Hall, Coats, & Smith Lebeau, 2005; Ridgeway, Berger, & Smith, 1985). In healthy and successful social systems, nonverbal cues of power are responded to with nonverbal cues that signify submission (Tiedens & Fragale, 2003; Tracy, Shariff, Zhao, & Henrich, 2013). While concepts such as power, dominance, and status are not synonymous, they are related; each is concerned with the *vertical dimension* of human relationships (J. A. Hall et al.). The vertical dimension is associated with social connection through the use of control and is contrasted with the *horizontal dimension*, which refers to social connection through liking and trust. The vertical dimension and its associated function of dominance and hierarchy is particularly relevant for organizational research, given that organizations represent structured social relations that generally entail some degree of hierarchy.

The aforementioned "power posture" is an example of a nonverbal cue representing power. Other nonverbal behaviors associated with power include talking time and interruption (Mast, 2002), eye contact (Kleinke, 1986), vocal pitch (Stel, van Dijk, Smith, van Dijk, & Djalal, 2012), facial appearance (Olivola, Eubanks, & Lovelace, 2014; Spisak, Grabo, Arvey, & van Vugt, 2014), and size and strength (Hamstra, 2014). Consistent with the biological perspective, results show that certain nonverbal markers of power and status are universal across cultures (Tracy et al., 2013). However, culture can influence particular nuances. For example, feet up on one's desk is considered a power posture to Americans but not to East Asians (Park et al., 2013; see also Semnani-Azad & Adair, 2011). A selected area of organizational research has looked at differences between displays of, and reactions to, the power cues for men and women.

Gender differences in power cues. Gender influences both what constitutes nonverbal displays of power for each sex (e.g., Aguinis & Henle, 2001; Aguinis, Simonsen, & Pierce, 1998) and the extent to which having power will influence one's nonverbal behavior (e.g., Brescoll, 2011; Mast, 2002; Semnani-Azad & Adair, 2011). In explaining the differences between communication patterns and power between men and women, scholars have relied on two broad theoretical perspectives: the socialization/expectations perspective, which suggests that men and women develop different norms for their communication through stereotypes and their experiences growing up (e.g., Tannen, 1990), and the structuralist perspective, which suggests that men and women differ because of different opportunities linked to their distinct stratified roles within society (e.g., Henley, 1977).[1] Johnson (1994) tested both perspectives simultaneously in a series of leader-subordinate conversations. She found that gender expectations had a stronger effect on nonverbal behavior (laughing and smiling) but that formal authority influenced verbal communication more so than gender expectations. Others have shown that expectations about how women *should* behave have a potent impact on their nonverbal behavior and others' perceptions (Ridgeway et al., 1985). Having power is

associated with greater volubility (i.e., the total talking time in a group) for men but not women, and the threat of backlash prevents powerful women from increasing volubility (Brescoll). Relatedly, followers tend to direct more negative nonverbal displays towards female, compared to male, leaders (D. Butler & Geis, 1990), and men who convey anger are conferred more social status, whereas women who convey anger are conferred less (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008).

Future research.   Nonverbal cues that signify power and dominance are no doubt important for a host of organizational topics, including research on negotiations (e.g., Curhan & Pentland, 2007; de Melo, Carnevale, Read, & Gratch, 2014) and supervisor-subordinate relationships (Farmer & Aguinis, 2005). One specific area of organizational research that we have identified as benefiting from a greater application of research on nonverbal displays of power is mistreatment in organizations. Mistreatment, broadly, is intrinsically linked to power differences (Aquino & Lamertz, 2004). Furthermore, scholars have implicitly recognized that toxic interactions often involve at least some degree of nonverbal behavior. Bullying, for example, can involve a sustained stare or uninvited invasion of personal space (Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaersa, 2009). As organizations and society at large continue to adopt policies against overt workplace mistreatment, and punish those who verbally threaten, belittle, or intimidate others, it is likely that workplace mistreatment will be accomplished through more covert means, including subtle nonverbal cues. Such a trend has been recognized in the literature on racism via *microaggressions*, subtle behaviors that can communicate denigration (Nadal, 2011; see also Cortina, 2008). Subtle discrimination includes hostile body language, such as less smiling, a rude tone of voice, or little eye contact (Hess, 2013; King, Shapiro, Hebl, Singletary, & Turner, 2006). These behaviors are likely not as recognized by observers and not punished in organizations as frequently as overt mistreatment.

A number of research questions surround nonverbal cues and mistreatment. For example, how do hostile nonverbal behaviors impede or facilitate interpersonal conflict management? How do hostile nonverbal behaviors contribute to the overall social climate of an organization? Perhaps a starting point for this line of research is to build a repertoire of instruments to identify and study a wide range of subtle nonverbal hostile behaviors, particularly in a field setting. One option can be found in King et al. (2006), in which observers used a coding scheme to rate another's subtle hostile nonverbal cues. Additional empirical instruments that could potentially be adapted for such an endeavor are provided in Table 2. Technological advances can also help researchers capture subtle (non)hostile cues in a field setting. Such advances include computer software that can analyze nonverbal cues in pictures and videos (e.g., software assessing kinesics, oculesics, and vocalics; see Table 2) and wearable "emotion detection devices" that can be used in a real-time interaction (Khatchadourian, 2015). Table 4 further details coding and technical considerations researchers will want to attend to when designing their research protocols, whether they take place in a lab or field settings.

This area of research could also be extended and applied to creating more effective sensitivity training programs. Often, nonverbal cues that convey disdain and hostility are unconscious—people do not recognize that they are engaging in these behaviors (Lakin, 2006). Becoming aware of the nonverbal behavior messages one is inadvertently sending could help change one's behavior. Respect-based training programs have shown some success in

building more respectful interpersonal climates (e.g., Leiter, Laschinger, Day, & Oore, 2012), and incorporating nonverbal behaviors into these programs will likely enhance their effectiveness.

Function 3: Promote Social Functioning

Another function of nonverbal behaviors is to promote social functioning. Beyond influencing others via dominance and power cues, followership and social coordination can be achieved via nonverbal displays of competence, prestige, and persuasion (Driskell, Olmstead, & Salas, 1993). People are more likely to follow those who exhibit charisma, enthusiasm, and capability, and nonverbal behaviors can be an effective tool in communicating these elements in charismatic leaders (Bass, 1998; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Tskhay, Xu, & Rule, 2014).

Charismatic leadership. Nonverbal behaviors can augment a charismatic leader's visionary message and strengthen the influence of verbal communication via a *strong delivery* (characterized by eye contact, verbal fluency, facial and body expressions, vocal tone and variety). How a message is delivered, regardless of its content, has a positive impact on listeners' perceptions of charisma and subsequent attitudes (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; DeGroot, Aime, Johnson, & Kluemper, 2011; Howell & Frost, 1989). The combination of a nonvisionary message with a strong delivery is more effective than the combination of a visionary message with a weak delivery (Holladay & Coombs, 1994).

Beyond competence and credibility, charismatic leadership is also associated with persuasion through immediacy and mimicry. *Immediacy* includes nonverbal behaviors that convey liking and approach, such as genuine smiling and leaning towards another (Mehrabian, 1967). *Mimicry* is the automatic imitation of nonverbal cues and can be important for promoting social functioning (see Chartrand & Lakin, 2013, for a review). Immediacy and mimicry capture categories of nonverbal behaviors that help interacting partners develop a smooth, natural, and reciprocal pattern of exchanges (Bernieri & Rosenthal, 1991). Charismatic leaders who effectively use immediacy tend to be socially contagious (i.e., produce more mimicry; Cherulnik, Donley, Wiewel, & Miller, 2001). Finally, conveying passion through body language, such as animated body gestures and voice and message-appropriate expressions, also contributes to a charismatic leader's effectiveness (Bono & Ilies, 2006; Frese et al., 2003; Towler, 2003; see also Babad, 2007). Training programs for charismatic leadership have incorporated these nonverbal behaviors (Antonakis, Fenley, & Liechti, 2012).

Future research. The extent to which cross-cultural similarities and differences influence the effective use of nonverbal cues in leadership is understudied. Whether nonverbal behaviors are universal or culturally specific is a complex issue. Yet some important cross-cultural differences do exist and they likely influence leadership effectiveness. The same nonverbal behavior can be *interpreted* or *valued* differently across cultures. In particular, the nonverbal behaviors that convey immediacy, noted above as an important element of charismatic leadership, can vary. For example, immediacy can be conveyed through seating position; however, some cultures prefer to sit side by side, while others prefer to sit face-to-face (Cline & Puhl, 1984). Cultures also differ in the degree of immediacy they deem appropriate. For

example, standing close to an interaction partner would be appropriate in contact cultures but impolite in noncontact cultures (Andersen et al., 2013). These proxemics preferences can be assessed through observation, self-report, or projective approaches, as described in Table 2.

Cultural differences also shape prototypical leadership attributes (Javidan, Dorfman, Sully de Luque, & House, 2006). For example, Gaal (2007) found that participants in the United States and Hungary perceived nonverbal behaviors, such as voice tone, eye contact, and natural hand movements, as charismatic. However, participants from Hungary perceived aggressive hand and arm gestures as charismatic, while those from the United States did not. We can thus expect cultural differences in leaders' effective use of, and followers' responses to, nonverbal behaviors. Appropriate follower behaviors are also shaped by culture. For example, looking down conveys respect in some cultures (Kleinke, 1986), yet Western leaders would consider averted gaze as impolite.

Finally, nonverbal behaviors can be understood and used effectively only "in context." People either naturally or through socialization come to expect certain nonverbal behaviors in particular interactions (Burgoon et al., 2011). When a person's nonverbal behavior is inconsistent with an interacting partner's expectations, it can cause interpersonal discomfort. Thus, effective leadership requires one to be able to decode others' nonverbal behaviors in a given context and encode proper nonverbal behaviors in response (Remland, 1981).

Function 4: Foster High-Quality Relationships

Beyond promoting followership through affiliation, a fourth relevant function of nonverbal behavior is that it helps generate and maintain trusting and committed interpersonal relationships. Developing high-quality relationships is directly in line with the aforementioned horizontal dimension of relationships. A relevant concept within this function is *rapport*, defined as a meaningful human experience characterized by a harmonious connection with those around us (Tickle-Degnen, 2006). To have a rapport with others requires mutual attentiveness and seamless responsiveness to others' intentions, emotional states, and attitudes.

Nonverbal behaviors can both promote and threaten the development of rapport (Grahe & Bernieri, 1999). One nonverbal element of rapport is self-expression; individuals must be willing to reveal potentially vulnerable aspects of themselves through their nonverbal displays (e.g., E. A. Butler, Egloff, Wilhelm, Smith, Erickson, & Gross, 2003). However, negative nonverbal expression (such as conveying panic) without a shared experience, in a chaotic environment, or in the early stages of a relationship can erode rapport (Bernieri, Gillis, Davis, & Grahe, 1996; Boone & Buck, 2003). Finally, coordination behaviors, such as immediacy and mimicry, can also help rapport via the creation of affiliation and trust (Tickle-Degnen, 2006) and by promoting prosocial behavior (van Baaren, Holland, Kawakami, & Van Knippenberg, 2004).

Despite these findings, the impact of nonverbal behaviors on the development of high-quality relationships has not received much explicit scholarly attention in organizational research. This is surprising, given that rapport is intricately connected to a number of constructs commonly studied in management research, such as commitment, trust, and cohesion. Relatedly, research on the mentor-mentee relationship has shown that the concept of *psychological intimacy* is important in successful mentorship (e.g., Lobel, Quinn, St. Clair, & Warfield, 1994). However, little research has investigated the nonverbal dynamics that

contribute to psychological intimacy. One area of organizational research that has recognized nonverbal behaviors and the development and maintenance of high-quality relationships is compassion in the workplace.

Compassion in the workplace.   Relationships in the workplace can be an important source of compassion, which can be conveyed through nonverbal behavior. The link between high-quality relationships and compassion is likely reciprocal—a relationship characterized by rapport will produce more compassionate nonverbal behaviors, which in turn reinforce rapport. Much of the field research on rapport has occurred in "compassion industries," such as the therapist-client and doctor-patient relationships (Tickle-Degnen, 2006). While compassion need be expressed not only through nonverbal behaviors, narratives of compassion have recognized their existence predominately through compassionate touch (e.g., hugs; Frost, Dutton, Worline, & Wilson, 2000). Gentle nonthreatening touch can produce an instant connection even amongst strangers (Andersen et al., 2013; Crusco & Wetzel, 1984). Furthermore, nonverbal rapport is present both prior to and after compassionate touch: Nonverbal behaviors denoting rapport lead to nonverbal behaviors denoting compassion and vice versa (Miller, 2007).

Future research.   Understanding the role of nonverbal behaviors in developing high-quality relationships characterized by rapport offers many opportunities for organizational research. First, "touch" is one of the least understood nonverbal codes (Burgoon, Walther, & Baesler, 1992), and the workplace offers a unique opportunity to better understand this form of communication. Indeed, touch in the workplace is provocative because it can come in many forms and be interpreted in myriad ways from positive (e.g., compassion) to negative (e.g., threatening; Lee & Guerrero, 2011). Variables such as culture, gender, sexual orientation and relative hierarchical position of interaction partners, location, duration and type of touch (e.g., social polite vs. functional; see Table 2), and presence of an audience may all influence whether touch strengthens or hinders rapport. Touch avoidance is an equally interesting avenue of inquiry (Richmond & McCroskey, 2004). Rapport can be impeded when social-polite touch is appropriate (e.g., shaking hands) but avoided by one party (e.g., as a result of religious beliefs).

Another focus of study could be on the use of social coordination behaviors to develop rapport amongst organizational team members. We have already noted two overarching social coordination behaviors: immediacy and mimicry. In addition, *synchrony behaviors* capture the degree to which interaction partners' nonverbal behaviors are rhythmic and simultaneous (Bernieri & Rosenthal, 1991). Research on verbal dynamics in teams shows that synchrony behaviors influence, and are influenced by, coordination behaviors (Chiocchio & Lafrenière, 2009). This may translate to nonverbal behavior. It may be that the development of teams' mental models (Mohammed, Ferzandi, & Hamilton, 2010) is facilitated by synchrony in nonverbal behaviors among team members or, alternatively, that nonverbal synchrony emerges as team mental models are developed. Empirical work could examine the causality.

Finally, the leader-member exchange perspective of leadership could also benefit from a nonverbal focus. This theory recognizes that the quality of the relationships between leaders

and their individual followers can vary (Gerstner & Day, 1997). Future work could explore what nonverbal behaviors characterize quality relationships and how team dynamics change when leaders display rapport-building nonverbal behaviors with some team members and not others. Researchers interested in these interpersonal processes will have to make several decisions related to setting, as detailed in Table 4.

Function 5: Display Emotions

A fifth function of nonverbal behaviors is that they display emotions. Importantly, emotions broadly, and emotional displays specifically, serve multiple social purposes (Keltner & Haidt, 1999). The use of nonverbal cues to display emotions is relevant to each of the aforementioned functions (see Hareli & Rafaeli, 2008; Van Kleef, 2014). However, we highlight emotional displays as a fifth function because they influence several unique social processes. For example, one's emotional displays influence others' emotional *experiences.* This element of emotional displays is relevant for phenomena such as emotion contagion (Barsade & Gibson, 2012) and emotion cycles (Hareli & Rafaeli). These social processes can have a wide range of impacts on organizational functioning and the social climate of a workplace. For example, positive emotions can broaden individuals' otherwise habitual modes of thinking, and when displayed, this process can spread to others and elevate organizational functioning as a whole (Fredrickson, 2000). Second, emotional displays also provide information about not only the actor but also the context at large. For example, if an employee leaves the boss' office with a look of distress, it can signal to bystanders that something is amiss. As a result, one's emotional displays contribute to others' understanding and interpretation of the work environment.

Emotions are manifested via facial expressions, bodily gestures, and tone of voice as well as the verbal language used in the interaction (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1989). Indeed, most of the body, sensory, and contact codes listed in Table 2 are relevant to the study of authentic or managed displays of emotions. From an organizational perspective, the controllability of emotional displays has important practical implications regarding the adherence to formal and informal emotional display rules (norms) of a given workplace (Rafaeli & Sutton).

Emotional displays at work. Research on emotional displays has often focused on work contexts that have a customer service component (e.g., restaurant and hospitality industry, Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jansen, & Sideman, 2005; supermarkets, Rafaeli & Sutton, 1990). When employees are required to manage or alter their emotional displays, management researchers speak of *emotional labor* (e.g., Grandey et al.).

Emotional expressions are an important part of work interactions because they influence individual and organizational performance. For example, smiling and eye contact lead to positive outcomes for the actor (e.g., larger tips; see Rafaeli & Sutton, 1989). However, how emotional displays are perceived by others depends on the authenticity of this nonverbal behavior. Authenticity refers to the consistency between an emotion experienced and an emotion displayed. Very subtle variations in the muscles associated with smiling can reveal (in)authenticity (Ekman, Friesen, & O'Sullivan, 1988). Inauthentic displays may be susceptible to *leakages* in the form of subtle microexpressions that reveal one's "true emotions" (Ekman & Friesen, 1968). Consistent with these findings, results show that customers in service

encounters can detect inauthentic (vs. authentic) emotional displays (Grandey et al., 2005; Groth, Hennig-Thurau, & Walsh, 2009). Furthermore, as compared to inauthentic smiles, authentic smiles (i.e., Duchenne smiles; Ekman & O'Sullivan, 2006) lead to greater positive customer emotional reactions and perceptions of good customer-employee rapport, which itself influences customer satisfaction (Hennig-Thurau, Groth, Paul, & Gremler, 2006; see also Groth et al.). Finally, meta-analytic estimates further indicate that authentic positive emotional displays lead to greater customer satisfaction and third-party perceptions of employee "emotional performance" (adherence to organizational display rules), whereas inauthentic displays had negative relationships with these constructs (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011).

The effects of nonverbal emotional displays may also depend on the relational quality between the interaction partners and the context of the interaction. Gabriel, Acosta, and Grandey (2015) found that positive emotional displays matter most when employees and customers are less familiar with one another. Furthermore, Wang and Groth (2014) showed that inauthentic displays of emotions via suppressing negative emotions are more detrimental to customer satisfaction when the employee-customer relationship is weak and that inauthenticity is more detrimental to satisfaction when customers expect personalized service (e.g., a doctor's visit vs. a supermarket visit).

Much research on emotional labor has focused on the display of positive emotions and the suppression of negative emotions. Also important is research on the display of negative emotions and the suppression of positive ones. Negative emotions are relevant to task performance in some occupations, such as bill collectors or interrogators (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1989), and may be a relevant component of many jobs. For example, displays of anger can help negotiators obtain concessions from opponents (Van Kleef, van Dijk, Steinel, Harinck, & van Beest, 2008). Anger can also help leaders influence followers to work harder (Sy, Côté, & Saavedra, 2005), especially when followers are motivated to pay attention to these displays (Van Kleef, Homan, Beersma, Van Knippenberg, Van Knippenberg, & Damen, 2009). Again, the authenticity of anger displays matters. When negotiators display inauthentic anger, opponents tend to become intransigent and are less satisfied with the negotiation. When negotiators display authentic anger, opponents are less demanding and the negotiator is perceived to be tougher (Côté, Hideg, & Van Kleef, 2013).

Future research. Research on emotional displays in organizations would benefit further from a more specific application of the nonverbal behavior perspective. However, given the extant work, our recommendations focus on the importance of paying closer attention to how nonverbal emotional displays are *operationalized* in empirical work. Indeed, regardless of whether the focus is on the effect of positive or negative emotions on organizational processes, studies vary in how emotions are manipulated or measured. Manipulations range from written scenarios containing no nonverbal interactions between partners (e.g., Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005; Van Kleef & Côté, 2007) to specific manipulations of nonverbal emotional displays (e.g., Van Kleef et al., 2009). Measurement varies from self-report (e.g., Wang & Groth, 2014) to third-party observation of nonverbal behavior (e.g., Gabriel et al., 2015, Study 2). Furthermore, nonverbal behaviors are often treated globally rather than discretely such that nonverbal emotional displays are operationalized through different cues in different studies. For example, bodily posture is included in the manipulation of positive emotional

displays in Van Kleef et al. but not in the assessment of emotional displays in Gabriel et al. (Study 2). This difference in operationalization may become problematic for meta-analytic efforts, given that a full-body manipulation of nonverbal emotional displays may be stronger than one that does not take into account the entire range of nonverbal cues (see Table 4 for a discussion of decisions related to sampling of nonverbal behavior). In this vein, we also encourage future researchers to be more explicit in terms of how they manipulate or measure nonverbal emotional displays (for examples to follow, see Côté et al., 2013; Van Kleef et al.).

Second, researchers wishing to manipulate emotional displays must also consider the most appropriate control condition. We have already noted that a lack of nonverbal behavior can still "mean" something to an observer (DePaulo, 1992). Keating goes further to argue that "when it comes to the nonverbal engine that powers self-presentation, there seems to be no 'neutral' gear, only 'forward' and 'reverse'" (2006: 324). Nonverbal cues either draw the interaction partner in (e.g., eye gaze, smiling) or push the partner away (e.g., frowns, gaze avoidance). Attending to such nonverbal cues is important when manipulating emotion (or lack thereof) as even a supposedly neutral display might influence participants' attributions and study findings. Control conditions should be pretested to ensure that they do not convey something a researcher does not intend.

Finally, because the face is the primary physical medium for emotional displays, research has focused mostly on facial expressions and associated vocalics. However, many of the codes described in Table 2 can accompany facial emotional displays or even convey emotions independently of facial displays. For example, haptics (touch) can accompany positive facial emotions, while trembling hands can betray an interviewee who otherwise appears poised.

Concluding Remarks

Throughout this review, we have defined nonverbal behaviors and communication and summarized five functions that have important implications for a vast array of organizational phenomena. The breadth of the topics covered in this review speaks to the ubiquitous nature of nonverbal behaviors in organizations. In line with nonverbal scholars who have argued that a complete understanding of human communication and interaction must incorporate the role of nonverbal behavior, we believe that a systematic focus on nonverbal behavior can produce a more comprehensive understanding of organizational life. The social context in which work occurs has a pervasive influence on employee attitudes and behaviors (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978), and relationship-based views of organizations suggest that the interpersonal connections employees form is one of the fundamental elements of organizational effectiveness (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003). Drawing from the functional perspective of nonverbal behaviors, we have demonstrated that nonverbal behaviors convey important pieces of social information and contribute to the nature of the relationships that form in organizations. We hope our review will encourage the development of a management research paradigm that formally recognizes the importance of nonverbal behaviors in the social context of organizations and supports the notion that even seemingly minor and fleeting cues can have widespread repercussions.

Moving forward with such a goal is not without its challenges. Empirical research on nonverbal behavior is complex, and a researcher must consider a number of theoretically driven methodological choices. An informed decision must take into account at least three

elements: the nonverbal cues senders convey, the meaning receivers interpret, and the inter-action between the two. This process becomes exponentially more complex and, thus, an area ripe for empirical work when studying group dynamics. Given that nonverbal research includes both an objective component (i.e., the cues or actual displays) and a subjective component (i.e., the interpreted meaning), it may be difficult to ascertain which is the best starting point—the cues or the meaning. Where a researcher begins depends on one's research question and what has already been established in the literature. Additionally, nonverbal behavior is ubiquitous, and even a lack of nonverbal display can provide tacit meaning. In any given social interaction, an infinite number of cues can be present, and combinations of cues might carry meaning in a way that individual cues cannot. As a result, while remaining cognizant of the need to attend to multiple cues, a researcher must make educated decisions regarding which cues are meaningful to examine in a given context and at what level of granularity (i.e., composite of cues vs. distinct cues). We help to simplify these challenges by compiling measures and methods from across the nonverbal behavior literature and by summarizing methodological decisions researchers must make in Tables 2 and 3 and in Table 4, respectively. Furthermore, by providing a glossary of nonverbal behavior terms in Table 2, we hope to have rendered this literature more accessible for management researchers.

Finally, systematically incorporating nonverbal behaviors into organizational research offers a number of practical implications. Specifically, understanding nonverbal behavior and communication will allow us to develop evidence-based tools to better equip managers to address a host of workplace challenges. Throughout this review, we have highlighted a number of research directions, including developing better selection instruments and inter-viewer training programs that incorporate nonverbal behaviors; understanding the role of nonverbal behaviors in interpersonal conflict and discrimination, and combining this knowl-edge with preexisting civility training programs for better results; and enhancing leadership nonverbal behaviors and communication across cultures. Given the pervasive nature of non-verbal behavior, there are insights to be gained across a number of areas in management theory and practice.

In closing, Sapir stated in 1949 that nonverbal communication is "an elaborate secret code that is written nowhere, known by none, and used by all" (as quoted in Hall, Bernieri, & Carney, 2005: 240). We hope to have provided a comprehensive and up-to-date treatment of nonverbal behavior to shed light on this "secret code" and to encourage future management research in this area.

Note

1. In addition, certain power cues, such as facial width to height ratio, are more relevant for men than women because of biological origins of nonverbal behavior (e.g., Wong, Ormiston, & Haselhuhn, 2011).

References

Aguinis, H., & Henle, C. A. 2001. Effects of nonverbal behavior on perceptions of a female employee's power bases. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 141: 537-549.

Aguinis, H., Simonsen, M. M., & Pierce, C. A. 1998. Effects of nonverbal behavior on perceptions of power bases. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 138: 455-469.

Albright, L., Kenny, D. A., & Malloy, T. E. 1988. Consensus in personality judgments at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55: 387-395.

Ambady, N., Bernieri, F. J., & Richeson, J. A. 2000. Toward a histology of social behavior: Judgmental accuracy from thin slices of behavioral stream. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 32: 201-271.

Ambady, N., Krabbenhoft, M. A., & Hogan, D. 2006. The 30-sec sale: Using thin-slice judgments to evaluate sales effectiveness. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 16: 4-13.

Ambady, N., & Weisbuch, M. 2010. Nonverbal behavior. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology*: 464-497. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Andersen, P., Gannon, J., & Kalchik, J. 2013. Proxemic and haptic interaction: The closeness continuum. In J. A. Hall & M. L. Knapp (Eds.), *Nonverbal communication*: 295-329. Boston: DeGruyter.

Andersen, P. A., & Guerrero, L. K. 2005. Measuring live tactile interaction: The Body Chart Coding approach. In V. Manusov (Ed.), *The sourcebook of nonverbal measures*: 83-92. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Antonakis, J., Fenley, M., & Liechti, S. 2011. Can charisma be taught? Tests of two interventions. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10: 374-396.

Archer, D., Costanzo, M., & Ackert, R. 2001. The interpersonal perception task (IPT): Alternative approaches to problems in theory and design. In J. A. Hall & F. J. Bernieri (Eds.), *Interpersonal sensitivity: Theory and measurement*: 89-101. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Aquino, K., & Lamertz, K. 2004. A relational model of workplace victimization: Social roles and patterns of victimization in dyadic relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89: 1023-1034.

Awamleh, R., & Gardner, W. L. 1999. Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness: The effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10: 345-373.

Babad, E. 2007. Teachers' nonverbal behavior and its effects on students. In R. P. Perry & J. C. Smart (Eds.), *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education: An evidence-based perspective*: 201-261. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Barrick, M. R., Shaffer, J. A., & DeGrassi, S. W. 2009. What you see may not be what you get: Relationships among self-presentation tactics and ratings of interview and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94: 1394-1411.

Barsade, S. G., & Gibson, D. E. 2012. Group affect: Its influence on individual and group outcomes. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 21: 119-123.

Bass, B. M. 1998. *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bernieri, F. J., Gillis, J. S., Davis, J. M., & Grahe, J. E. 1996. Dyad rapport and the accuracy of its judgment across situations: A lens model analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71: 110-129.

Bernieri, F. J., & Rosenthal, R. 1991. Interpersonal coordination: Behavior matching and interactional synchrony. In R. S. Feldman & B. Rimé (Eds.), *Fundamentals of nonverbal behavior*: 401-432. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Birdwhistell, R. L. 1970. *Kinesics and context*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press.

Bluedorn, A. C., Kalliath, T. J., Strube, M. J., & Martin, G. D. 1999. Polychronicity and the Inventory of Polychronic Values (IPV): The development of an instrument to measure a fundamental dimension of organizational culture. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 14: 205-230.

Bono, J. E., & Ilies, R. 2006. Charisma, positive emotions and mood contagion. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17: 317-334.

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

Borkenau, P., & Liebler, A. 1992. Trait inferences: Sources of validity at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62: 645-657.

Bosson, J. K., Haymovitz, E. L., & Pinel, E. C. 2004. When saying and doing diverge: The effects of stereotype threat on self-reported versus non-verbal anxiety. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40: 247-255.

Brescoll, V. L. 2011. Who takes the floor and why: Gender, power, and volubility in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 56: 621-640.

Brescoll, V. L., & Uhlmann, E. L. 2008. Can an angry woman get ahead? Status conferral, gender, and expression of emotion in the workplace. *Psychological Science*, 19: 268-275.

Burgoon, J. K., & Dunbar, N. E. 2006. Nonverbal expressions of dominance and power in human relationships. In V. Manusov & M. Patterson (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of nonverbal communication*: 279-297. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Burgoon, J. K., Guerrero, L. K., & Manusov, V. 2011. Nonverbal signals. In M. L. Knapp & J. Daly (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication*: 239-280. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Burgoon, J. K., Manusov, V., Mineo, P., & Hale, J. L. 1985. Effects of gaze on hiring, credibility, attraction and relational message interpretation. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 9: 133-146.

Burgoon, J. K., Walther, J. B., & Baesler, E. J. 1992. Interpretations, evaluations and consequences of interpersonal touch. *Human Communication Research*, 19: 237-263.

Butler, D., & Geis, F. L. 1990. Nonverbal affect responses to male and female leaders: Implications for leadership evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58: 48-59.

Butler, E. A., Egloff, B., Wilhelm, F. H., Smith, N. C., Erickson, E. A., & Gross, J. J. 2003. The social consequences of expressive suppression. *Emotion*, 3: 48-67.

Carney, D. R., Colvin, C. R., & Hall, J. A. 2007. A thin slice perspective on the accuracy of first impressions. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41: 1054-1072.

Carney, D. R., Cuddy, A. J., & Yap, A. J. 2010. Power posing brief nonverbal displays affect neuroendocrine levels and risk tolerance. *Psychological Science*, 21: 1363-1368.

Chaplin, W. F., Phillips, J. B., Brown, J. D., Clanton, N. R., & Stein, J. L. 2000. Handshaking, gender, personality, and first impressions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79: 110-117.

Chartrand, T. L., & Lakin, J. L. 2013. The antecedents and consequences of human behavioral mimicry. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64: 285-308.

Cherulnik, P. D., Donley, K. A., Wiewel, T. S. R., & Miller, S. R. 2001. Charisma is contagious: The effect of leaders' charisma on observers' affect. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31: 2149-2159.

Chiocchio, F., & Lafrenière, A. 2009. A project management perspective on student's declarative commitments to goals established within asynchronous communication. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 25: 294-305.

Cline, R. J., & Puhl, C. A. 1984. Gender, culture, and geography: A comparison of seating arrangements in the United States and Taiwan. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 8: 199-219.

Cohn, J. F., & Ekman, P. 2005. Measuring facial action. In J. A. Harrigan, R. Rosenthal, & K. R. Scherer (Eds.), *The new handbook of methods in nonverbal behavior research*: 9-64. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cohn, J. F., & Kanade, T. 2007. Automated facial image analysis for measurement of emotion expression. In J. A. Coan & J. B. Allen (Eds.), *The handbook of emotion elicitation and assessment*: 222-238. New York: Oxford University Press.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. A. 1988. *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organization effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cooksey, R. W. 1996. *Judgment analysis: Theory, methods, and applications*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Cortina, L. M. 2008. Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 33: 55-75.

Côté, S., Hideg, I., & Van Kleef, G. A. 2013. The consequences of faking anger in negotiations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49: 453-463.

Côté, S., & Miners, C. T. 2006. Emotional intelligence, cognitive intelligence, and job performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51: 1-28.

Crusco, A. H., & Wetzel, C. G. 1984. The Midas touch: The effects of interpersonal touch on restaurant tipping. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 10: 512-517.

Cuddy, A. 2013. Want to lean in? Try a power pose [*Harvard Business Review* blog post]. March 20. http://blogs.hbr.org/2013/03/want-to-lean-in-try-a-power-po-2/. Accessed June 18, 2014.

Cuddy, A. J., Glick, P., & Beninger, A. 2011. The dynamics of warmth and competence judgments, and their outcomes in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 31: 73-98.

Cuperman, R., & Ickes, W. 2009. Big Five predictors of behavior and perceptions in initial dyadic interactions: Personality similarity helps extraverts and introverts, but hurts "disagreeables." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97: 667-684.

Curhan, J. R., & Pentland, A. 2007. Thin slices of negotiation: Predicting outcomes from conversational dynamics within the first 5 minutes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 802-811.

Dane, E., & Pratt, M. G. 2007. Exploring intuition and its role in managerial decision making. *Academy of Management Review*, 32: 33-54.

Davies, M., Stankov, L., & Roberts, R. D. 1998. Emotional intelligence: In search of an elusive construct. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75: 989-1015.

DeGroot, T., Aime, F., Johnson, S. G., & Kluemper, D. 2011. Does talking the talk help walking the walk? An examination of the effect of vocal attractiveness in leader effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22: 680-689.

DeGroot, T., & Gooty, J. 2009. Can nonverbal cues be used to make meaningful personality attributions in employment interviews? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 24: 179-192.

DeGroot, T., & Motowidlo, S. J. 1999. Why visual and vocal interview cues can affect interviewers' judgments and predict job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84: 986-993.

de Melo, C. M., Carnevale, P. J., Read, S. J., & Gratch, J. 2014. Reading people's minds from emotion expressions in interdependent decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 106: 73-88.

DePaulo, B. M. 1992. Nonverbal behavior and self-presentation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111: 203-243.

De Vader, C. L., & Barker, P. 2009. Fragrance in the workplace is the new second-hand smoke. *Proceedings of the ASBBS*, 16(1). http://asbbs.org/files/2009/PDF/D/De%20VaderC.pdf.

Dipboye, R. L. 1982. Self-fulfilling prophecies in the selection-recruitment interview. *Academy of Management Review*, 7: 579-586.

Douglas-Cowie, E., Campbell, N., Cowie, R., & Roach, P. 2003. Emotional speech: Towards a new generation of databases. *Speech Communication*, 40: 33-60.

Doyen, S., Klein, O., Pichon, C. L., & Cleeremans, A. 2012. Behavioral priming: It's all in the mind, but whose mind? *PLoS ONE*, 7(1): e29081. http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0029081.

Driskell, J. E., Olmstead, B., & Salas, E. 1993. Task cues, dominance cues, and influence in task groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78: 51-60.

Duke, M. P., & Nowicki, S., Jr. 1972. A new measure and social-learning model for interpersonal distance. *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality*, 6: 119-132.

Dutton, J. E., & Heaphy, E. D. 2003. The power of high-quality connections. *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline*, 3: 263-278.

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Notelaersa, G. 2009. Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire–Revised. *Work Stress*, 23: 24-44.

Eizenman, M., Yu, L. H., Grupp, L., Eizenman, E., Ellenbogen, M., Gemar, M., & Levitan, R. D. 2003. A naturalistic visual scanning approach to assess selective attention in major depressive disorder. *Psychiatry Research*, 118: 117-128.

Ekman, P. 1972. Universals and cultural differences in facial expressions of emotions. In J. K. Coles (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation*: 207-283. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. 1968. Nonverbal behavior in psychotherapy research. In J. M. Shield (Ed.), *Research in psychotherapy*: 179-216. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. 1969a. Nonverbal leakage and clues to deception. *Psychiatry*, 32: 88-106.

Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. 1969b. The repertoire of nonverbal behavior: Categories, origins, usage, and coding. *Semiotica*, 1: 48-98.

Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. 1974. Detecting deception from the body or face. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 29: 288-298.

Ekman, P., Friesen, W. V., & Hager, J. C. 2002. *Facial action coding system*. Salt Lake City: Research Nexus, Network Research Information.

Ekman, P., Friesen, W. V., & O'Sullivan, M. 1988. Smiles when lying. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54: 414-420.

Ekman, P., & O'Sullivan, M. 2006. From flawed self-assessment to blatant whoppers: The utility of voluntary and involuntary behavior in detecting deception. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 24: 673-686.

Ezeh, C., & Harris, L. C. 2007. Servicescape research: A review and a research agenda. *The Marketing Review*, 7: 59-78.

Farmer, S. M., & Aguinis, H. 2005. Accounting for subordinate perceptions of supervisor power: An identity-dependence model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90: 1069-1083.

Floyd, K. 2006. An evolutionary approach to understanding nonverbal communication. In V. Manusov & M. L. Patterson (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of nonverbal communication*: 139-157. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Frank, M. J., Juslin, P. N., & Harrigan, J. I. 2005. Technical issues in recording nonverbal behavior. In V. Manusov & M. L. Patterson (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of nonverbal communication*: 449-470. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fredrickson, B. L. 2000. Why positive emotions matter in organizations: Lessons from the broaden-and-build model. *The Psychologist Manager Journal*, 4: 131-142.

Frese, M., Beimel, S., & Schoenborn, S. 2003. Action training for charismatic leadership: Two evaluations of studies of a commercial training module on inspirational communication of a vision. *Personnel Psychology*, 56: 671-698.

Frost, P. J., Dutton, J. E., Worline, M. C., & Wilson, A. 2000. Narratives of compassion in organizations. *Emotion in Organizations*, 2: 25-45.

Gaal, M. 2007. *Cross-cultural comparison of nonverbal communication, culture, and the attribution of charismatic leadership among Hungarian and American university students*. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (UMI no. 3283799).

Gabriel, A. S., Acosta, J. D., & Grandey, A. A. 2015. The value of a smile: Does emotional performance matter more in familiar or unfamiliar exchanges? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 30: 37-50.

Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. 1997. Meta-analytic review of leader–member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82: 827-844.

Gifford, R., Ng, C. F., & Wilkinson, M. 1985. Nonverbal cues in the employment interview: Links between applicant qualities and interviewer judgments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70: 729-736.

Goffman, E. 1959. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. London: Penguin.

Goman, C. K. 2011. *The silent language of leaders: How body language can help or hurt how you lead*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Grahe, J. E., & Bernieri, F. J. 1999. The importance of nonverbal cues in judging rapport. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 23: 253-269.

Grandey, A. A., Fisk, G. M., Mattila, A. S., Jansen, K. J., & Sideman, L. A. 2005. Is "service with a smile" enough? Authenticity of positive displays during service encounters. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 96: 38-55.

Grandey, A. A., Fisk, G. M., & Steiner, D. D. 2005. Must "service with a smile" be stressful? The moderating role of personal control for American and French employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90: 893-904.

Gray, H. M., & Ambady, N. 2006. Methods for the study of nonverbal communication. In V. Manusov & M. L. Patterson (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of nonverbal communication*: 41-58. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Groth, M., Hennig-Thurau, T., & Walsh, G. 2009. Customer reactions to emotional labor: The roles of employee acting strategies and customer detection accuracy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52: 958-974.

Hall, E. T. 1968. *Proxemics*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Hall, E. T. 1973. *Handbook for proxemics research*. Washington, DC: Society for the Anthropology of Visual Communication.

Hall, J. A. 2006. Women's and men's nonverbal communication. In V. Manusov & M. L. Patterson (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of nonverbal communication*: 201-218. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hall, J. A., Bernieri, F. J., & Carney, D. R. 2005. Nonverbal behavior and interpersonal sensitivity. In J. A. Harrigan, R. Rosenthal, & K. R. Scherer (Eds.), *The new handbook of methods in nonverbal behavior research*: 237-281. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Hall, J. A., Coats, E. J., & Smith LeBeau, L. 2005. Nonverbal behavior and the vertical dimension of social relations: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131: 898-924.

Hall, J. A., Roter, D. L., & Rand, C. S. 1981. Communication of affect between patient and physician. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 22: 18-30.

Hamstra, M. R. 2014. "Big" men: Male leaders' height positively relates to followers' perception of charisma. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 56: 190-192.

Hareli, S., & Rafaeli, A. 2008. Emotion cycles: On the social influence of emotion in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 28: 35-59.

Hargie, O. 2011. *Skilled interpersonal communication: Research, theory and practice*. New York: Routledge.

Harrigan, J. A. 2005. Proxemics, kinesics, and gaze. In J. A. Harrigan, R. Rosenthal, & K. R. Scherer (Eds.), *The new handbook of methods in nonverbal behavior research*: 137-198. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Harrigan, J. A. 2013. Methodology: Coding and studying nonverbal behavior. In J. A. Hall & M. L. Knapp (Eds.), *Nonverbal communication*: 35-68. Boston: DeGruyter.

Harrigan, J. A., & Carney, D. R. 2005. *A coding method for body/head positions and actions: Laboratory manual*. Fullerton, CA: California State University.

Harrigan, J. A., Rosenthal, R., & Scherer, K. R. 2005. *The new handbook of methods in nonverbal behavior research*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hartwig, M., & Bond, C. F., Jr. 2011. Why do lie-catchers fail? A lens model meta-analysis of human lie judgments. *Psychological Bulletin*, 137: 643-659.

Hecht, M. A., & LaFrance, M. 1995. How (fast) can I help you? Tone of voice and telephone operator efficiency in interactions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25: 2086–2098.

Henley, N. M. 1977. *Body politics: Power, sex and nonverbal communication*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hennig-Thurau, T., Groth, M., Paul, M., & Gremler, D. D. 2006. Are all smiles created equal? How emotional contagion and emotional labor affect service relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 70(3): 58-73.

Hess, K. P. 2013. Investigation of nonverbal discrimination against women in simulated initial job interviews. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43: 544-555.

Holladay, S. J., & Coombs, W. T. 1994. Speaking of visions and visions being spoken: An exploration of the effects of content and delivery on perceptions of leader charisma. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 8: 165-189.

Howard, J. L., & Ferris, G. R. 1996. The employment interview context: Social and situational influences on interviewer decisions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 26: 112-136.

Howell, J. M., & Frost, P. J. 1989. A laboratory study of charismatic leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 43: 243-269.

Hülsheger, U. R., & Schewe, A. F. 2011. On the costs and benefits of emotional labor: A meta-analysis of three decades of research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16: 361-389.

Hummel, T., Sekinger, B., Wolf, S. R., Pauli, E., & Kobal, G. 1997. "Sniffin'sticks": Olfactory performance assessed by the combined testing of odor identification, odor discrimination and olfactory threshold. *Chemical Senses*, 22: 39-52.

Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., Sully de Luque, M., & House, R. J. 2006. In the eye of the beholder: Cross-cultural lessons in leadership from Project GLOBE. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20(1): 67-90.

Johansson, G. 1973. Visual perception of biological motion and a model for its analysis. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 14: 201-211.

Johnson, C. 1994. Gender, legitimate authority, and leader-subordinate conversation. *American Sociological Review*, 59: 122-123.

Jones, S. E. 2005. The Touch Log Record: A behavioral communication measure. In V. L. Manusov (Ed.), *The sourcebook of nonverbal measures: Going beyond words*: 67-81. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Juslin, P. N., & Scherer, K. R. 2005. Vocal expression of affect. In J. A. Harrigan, R. Rosenthal, & K. R. Scherer (Eds.), *The new handbook of methods in nonverbal behavior research*: 65-135. New York: Oxford University Press.

Keating, C. F. 2006. Why and how the silent self speaks volumes. In V. Manusov & M. L. Patterson (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of nonverbal communication*: 321-339. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Keltner, D., & Haidt, J. 1999. Social functions of emotions at four levels of analysis. *Cognition & Emotion*, 13: 505-521.

Khatchadourian, R. 2015. We know how you feel: Computers are learning to read emotions, and the business world can't wait. *New Yorker*, January 19: 50-59.

King, E. B., Shapiro, J. R., Hebl, M. R., Singletary, S. L., & Turner, S. 2006. The stigma of obesity in customer service: A mechanism for remediation and bottom-line consequences of interpersonal discrimination. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91: 579-593.

Kleinke, C. L. 1986. Gaze and eye contact: A research review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 100: 78-100.

Knapp, M. L. 2011. An historical overview of nonverbal research. In V. Manusov & M. L. Patterson (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of nonverbal communication*: 3-19. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ko, S. J., Sadler, M. S., & Galinsky, A. D. 2015. The sound of power: Conveying and detecting hierarchical rank through voice. *Psychological Science*, 26: 3-14.

Kotsou, I., Nelis, D., Grégoire, J., & Mikolajczak, M. 2011. Emotional plasticity: Conditions and effects of improving emotional competence in adulthood. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96: 827-839.

Kristof-Brown, A., Barrick, M. R., & Franke, M. 2002. Applicant impression management: Dispositional influences and consequences for recruiter perceptions of fit and similarity. *Journal of Management*, 28: 27-46.

Lakin, J. 2006. Automatic cognitive processes and nonverbal communication. In In V. Manusov & M. L. Patterson (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of nonverbal communication*: 59-78. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lee, J. W., & Guerrero, L. K. 2001. Types of touch in cross-sex relationships between coworkers: Perceptions of rational and emotional messages, inappropriateness, and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 29: 197-220.

Leiter, M. P., Laschinger, H. K. S., Day, A., & Oore, D. G. 2012. The impact of civility interventions on employee social behavior, distress, and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96: 1258-1274.

Liden, R. C., Martin, C. L., & Parsons, C. K. 1993. Interviewer and applicant behaviors in employment interviews. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36: 372-386.

Lievens, F., & Peeters, H. 2008. Interviewers' sensitivity to impression management tactics in structured interviews. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 24: 174-180.

Linneman, T. J. 2013. Gender in jeopardy! Intonation variation on a television game show. *Gender & Society*, 27: 82-105.

Livingston, R. W., & Pearce, N. A. 2009. The teddy-bear effect: Does having a baby face benefit Black chief executive officers? *Psychological Science*, 20: 1229-1236.

Lobel, S. A., Quinn, R. E., Clair, L. S., & Warfield, A. 1994. Love without sex: The impact of psychological intimacy between men and women at work. *Organizational Dynamics*, 23: 5-16.

Madera, J. M., & Hebel, M. R. 2012. Discrimination against facially stigmatized applicants in interviews: An eye-tracking and face-to-face investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97: 317-330.

Manusov, V. 2005. *The sourcebook of nonverbal measures: Going beyond words*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Mast, M. 2002. Dominance as expressed and inferred through speaking time: A meta-analysis. *Human Communication Research*, 28: 420-450.

Matsumoto, D. 2006. Culture and nonverbal behavior. In V. Manusov & M. L. Patterson (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of nonverbal communication*: 219-236. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Matsumoto, D., & Hwang, H. C. 2013. Culture and nonverbal communication. In J. A. Hall & M. L. Knapp (Eds.), *Nonverbal communication*: 697-728. Boston: DeGruyter.

Matsumoto, D., LeRoux, J., Wilson-Cohn, C., Raroque, J. M., Kooken, K., Ekman, P., Yrizarry, N., Loewinger, S., Uchida, H., & Yee, A. 2000. A new test to measure emotion recognition ability: Matsumoto and Ekman's Japanese and Caucasian Brief Affect Recognition Test (JACBART). *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 24: 179-209.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. 2003. Measuring emotional intelligence with the MSCEIT V2.0. *Emotion*, 3: 97-105.

McElroy, J. C., Summers, J. K., & Moore, K. 2014. The effect of facial piercing on perceptions of job applicants. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 125: 26-38.

McFarland, L., Yun, G. J., Harold, C. M., Viera, L., & Moore, L. G. 2005. An examination of impression management use and effectiveness across assessment center exercises: The role of competency demands. *Personnel Psychology*, 58: 949-980.

McGovern, T. V., & Tinsley, H. E. 1978. Interviewer evaluations of interviewee nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 13: 163-171.

McGrath, J. E., & Tschan, F. 2004. *Temporal matters in social psychology: Examining the role of time in the lives of groups and individuals*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Mehrabian, A. 1967. Orientation behaviors and nonverbal attitude communication. *Journal of Communication*, 17: 324-332.

Miller, K. I. 2007. Compassionate communication in the workplace: Exploring processes of noticing, connecting, and responding. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 35: 223-245.

Mohammed, S., Ferzandi, L., & Hamilton, K. 2010. Metaphor no more: A 15-year review of the team mental model construct. *Journal of Management*, 36: 876-910.

Mohammed, S., & Harrison, D. 2013. The clocks that time us are not the same: A theory of temporal diversity, task characteristics, and performance in teams. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 122: 244-256.

Mohammed, S., & Nadkarni, S. 2011. Temporal diversity and team performance: The moderating role of temporal leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54: 489-508.

Nadal, K. L. 2011. The Racial and Ethnic Microaggressions Scale (REMS): Construction, reliability, and validity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 58: 470-480.

Nowicki, S., & Duke, M. P. 2001. Nonverbal receptivity: The Diagnostic Analysis of Nonverbal Accuracy (DANVA). In J. A. Hall & F. J. Bernieri (Eds.), *Interpersonal sensitivity: Theory and measurement*: 183-198. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Oliver, T., Hausdorf, P., Lievens, F., & Conlon, P. in press. Interpersonal dynamics in assessment center exercises effects of role player portrayed disposition. *Journal of Management*. doi:10.1177/0149206314525207

Olivola, C. Y., Eubanks, D. L., & Lovelace, J. B. 2014. The many (distinctive) faces of leadership: Inferring leadership domain from facial appearance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25: 817-834.

Park, L. E., Streamer, L., Huang, L., & Galinsky, A. D. 2013. Stand tall, but don't put your feet up: Universal and culturally-specific effects of expansive postures on power. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49: 965-971.

Patterson, M. L. 1991. A functional approach to nonverbal exchange. In R. S. Feldman & B. Rime (Eds.), *Fundamentals of nonverbal behavior*: 458-495. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Peeters, H., & Lievens, F. 2006. Verbal and nonverbal impression management tactics in behavior description and situational interviews. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 14: 206-222.

Pitts, A. 2013. You only have 7 seconds to make a strong first impression. *Business Insider*, April 8. http://www.businessinsider.com/only-7-seconds-to-make-first-impression-2013-4. Accessed June 18, 2014.

Poposki, E. M., & Oswald, F. L. 2010. The Multitasking Preference Inventory: Toward an improved measure of individual differences in polychronicity. *Human Performance*, 23: 247-264.

Rafaeli, A., & Pratt, M. G. 2006. *Artifacts and organizations: Beyond mere symbolism*. New York: Psychology Press.

Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. I. 1989. The expression of emotion in organizational life. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 11: 1-42.

Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. I. 1990. Busy stores and demanding customers: How do they affect the display of positive emotion? *Academy of Management Journal*, 33: 623-637.

Rafaeli, A., & Vilnai-Yavetz, I. 2004. Emotion as a connection of physical artifacts and organizations. *Organization Science*, 15: 671-686.

Remland, M. 1981. Developing leadership skills in nonverbal communication: A situational perspective. *Journal of Business Communication*, 18: 17-29.

Richmond, V. A., & McCroskey, J. C. 2004. *Nonverbal behavior in interpersonal relations* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Ridgeway, C. L., Berger, J., & Smith, L. 1985. Nonverbal cues and status: An expectation states approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90: 955-978.

Riggio, R. E. 2006. Nonverbal skills and abilities. In V. Manusov & M. Patterson (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of nonverbal communication*: 79-96. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Riggio, R. E., & Throckmorton, B. 1988. The relative effects of verbal and nonverbal behavior, appearance, and social skills on evaluations made in hiring interviews. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 18: 331-348.

Rosenthal, R. 2005. Conducting judgment studies: Some methodological issues. In J. A. Harrigan, R. Rosenthal, & K. R. Scherer (Eds.), *The new handbook of methods in nonverbal behavior research*: 199-234. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rosenthal, R., Hall, J. A., DiMatteo, M. R., Rogers, P. L., & Archer, D. 1979. *Sensitivity to nonverbal communications: The PONS Test*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rosip, J. C., & Hall, J. A. 2004. Knowledge of nonverbal cues, gender, and nonverbal decoding accuracy. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 28: 267-286.

Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. 1978. A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23: 224-253.

Scherer, K. R., & Ekman, P. 2005. Methodological issues in studying nonverbal behavior. In J. A. Harrigan, R. Rosenthal, & K. R. Scherer (Eds.), *The new handbook of methods in nonverbal behavior research*: 471-512. New York: Oxford University Press.

Semnani-Azad, Z., & Adair, W. L. 2011. The display of "dominant" nonverbal cues in negotiation: The role of culture and gender. *International Negotiation*, 16: 451-479.

Sheldon, O. J., Dunning, D., & Ames, D. R. 2014. Emotionally unskilled, unaware, and uninterested in learning more: Reactions to feedback about deficits in emotional intelligence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99: 125-137.

Smith, J. 2013. 10 nonverbal cues that convey confidence at work. *Forbes*, March 11. http://www.forbes.com/sites/jacquelynsmith/2013/03/11/10-nonverbal-cues-that-convey-confidence-at-work/. Accessed June 18, 2014.

Spisak, B. R., Grabo, A. E., Arvey, R. D., & van Vugt, M. 2014. The age of exploration and exploitation: Younger-looking leaders endorsed for change and older-looking leaders endorsed for stability. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25: 805-816.

Stel, M., van Dijk, E., Smith, P. K., van Dijk, W. W., & Djalal, F. M. 2012. Lowering the pitch of your voice makes you feel more powerful and think more abstractly. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3: 497-502.

Stewart, G. L., Dustin, S. L., Barrick, M. R., & Darnold, T. C. 2008. Exploring the handshake in employment interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93: 1139-1146.

Sy, T., Côté, S., & Saavedra, R. 2005. The contagious leader: Impact of the leader's mood on the mood of group members, group affective tone, and group processes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90: 295-305.

Tannen, D. 1990. *You just don't understand: Women and men in communication*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Tickle-Degnen, L. 2006. Nonverbal behavior and its functions in the ecosystem of rapport. In V. Manusov & M. L. Patterson (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of nonverbal communication*: 381-401. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tiedens, L. Z., & Fragale, A. R. 2003. Power moves: Complementarity in dominant and submissive nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84: 558-568.

Todorov, A., Olivola, C. Y., Dotsch, R., & Mende-Siedlecki, P. 2015. Social attributions from faces: Determinants, consequences, accuracy, and functional significance. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66: 519-545.

Towler, A. J. 2003. Effects of charismatic influence training on attitudes, behavior, and performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 56: 363-381.

Tracy, J. L., Shariff, A. F., Zhao, W., & Henrich, J. 2013. Cross-cultural evidence that the nonverbal expression of pride is an automatic status signal. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 142: 163-180.

Tsai, W. C., Chen, C. C., & Chiu, S. F. 2005. Exploring boundaries of the effects of applicant impression management tactics in job interviews. *Journal of Management*, 31: 108-125.

Tsai, W., Huang, R., & Yu, H. 2010. Investigating the unique predictability and boundary conditions of applicant physical attractiveness and non-verbal behaviours on interviewer evaluations in job interviews. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85: 60-79.

Tskhay, K. O., Xu, H., & Rule, N. O. 2014. Perceptions of leadership success from nonverbal cues communicated by orchestra conductors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25: 901-911.

van Baaren, R. B., Holland, R. W., Kawakami, K., & Van Knippenberg, A. 2004. Mimicry and prosocial behavior. *Psychological Science*, 15: 71-74.

van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Koh, C. 2008. Development and validation of the CQS: The Cultural Intelligence Scale. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook on cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement and applications*: 16-38. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Van Kleef, G. A. 2014. Understanding the positive and negative effects of emotional expressions in organizations: EASI does it. *Human Relations*, 67: 1145-1164.

Van Kleef, G. A., & Côté, S. 2007. Expressing anger in conflict: When it helps and when it hurts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 1557-1569.

Van Kleef, G. A., Homan, A. C., Beersma, B., Van Knippenberg, D., Van Knippenberg, B., & Damen, F. 2009. Searing sentiment or cold calculation? The effects of leader emotional displays on team performance depend on follower epistemic motivation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52: 562-580.

Van Kleef, G. A., van Dijk, E., Steinel, W., Harinck, F., & van Beest, I. 2008. Anger in social conflict: Cross-situational comparisons and suggestions for the future. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, 17: 13-30.

Vrij, A. 2006. Nonverbal communication and deception. In V. Manusov & M. Patterson (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of nonverbal communication*: 341-359. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wall Street Journal. 2013. Body language expert Sharon Sayler says Sheryl Sandberg falls flat, not leans in. June 11. http://online.wsj.com/article/PR-CO-20130611-905369.html?mod=googlenews_wsj. Accessed June 18, 2014.

Wang, K. L., & Groth, M. 2014. Buffering the negative effects of employee surface acting: The moderating role of employee–customer relationship strength and personalized services. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99: 341-350.

Westerman, R., Spies, K., Stahl, G., & Hesse, F. W. 1996. Relative effectiveness and validity of mood induction procedures: A meta-analysis. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26: 557-580.

White, L. T., Valk, R., & Dialmy, A. 2011. What is the meaning of "on time"? The sociocultural nature of punctuality. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 42: 482-493.

Wong, E. M., Ormiston, M. E., & Haselhuhn, M. P. 2011. A face only an investor could love: CEO's facial structure predicts their firm's financial performance. *Psychological Science*, 22: 1478-1483.

Woodzicka, J. A. 2008. Sex differences in self-awareness of smiling during a mock job interview. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 32: 109-121.

Zebrowitz, L. A., Montepare, J. M., & Strom, M. A. 2013. Face and body physiognomy: Nonverbal cues for trait impressions. In J. A. Hall & M. L. Knapp (Eds.), *Nonverbal communication*: 263-294. Boston: DeGruyter.