

Appendix

Representative Comparative Thin-Slice Research Studies

This table is provided as a resource to locate relevant studies regarding the reliability and validity of thin slices and is not intended to be exhaustive of all comparative thin-slice research. Importantly, the final column simply indicates whether the construct was examined and does *not* indicate that the study necessarily found support for the comparative construct. In many cases, a study found support for some measured variables or constructs but not others. We encourage researchers to review specific studies if looking for evidence or justification of their own slice decisions.

Article	Description	Slice length(s)	Variable(s)	Comparative construct
Ambady et al. (1999)	Student discussions of campus activities	1 and 10 s	Sexual orientation	Accuracy-length validity
Ambady & Rosenthal (1993)	High-school and college teachers' class lectures	2, 5, and 10 s	15 molar behaviors with teacher effectiveness	Predictive validity
Blackman & Funder (1998)	Friend and zero-acquaintanceship dyadic interactions	5 to 25 min	Personality profiles	Accuracy-length validity
Caperton et al. (2018)	Client-therapist counseling sessions	~8 min	Therapist MI codes for: reflection-to-question ratio, complex reflections, open questions, MI-consistent responses	Slice-whole validity
Carcone et al. (2015)	Patient-counselor clinical interactions	1 or 2 min	20 MI patient and counselor communication codes	Slice-whole validity
Carney et al. (2007)	Zero-acquaintanceship interactions	5, 20, 45, 60 s	Personality traits and affect	Accuracy-length validity
Foster (2015)	Patient-physician interactions	1.5 min	Attention, coordination, liking, rapport, trust	Slice-whole validity
Fowler et al. (2009)	Prison inmate interviews	5, 10, and 20 s	Psychopathy	Accuracy-length validity
Hall et al. (2008)	Database of 109 studies	<1 s to 45 min	Various states and traits	Accuracy-length validity
Hall et al. (2009)	Patient-medical student interactions	1 and 3 min	Rapport	Inter-slice reliability; predictive validity

Hall et al. (2014)	Technical support calls	2 min	Satisfaction	Inter-slice reliability
Hall et al. (2021)	Written personal narratives	281 to 1299 words	Big 5 personality traits	Accuracy-length validity
Hirschmann et al. (2018)	Mother-child interactions	10 min	Maternal feedback, joint attention, sensitivity	Slice-whole validity
James et al. (2012) ^a	Mother-deaf child interactions	3 min	Gaze, vocalizations	Slice-whole validity
Klonek et al. (2015)	Clinical interviews	5 and 10 min	7 MI verbal codes	Slice-whole validity
Krzyzaniak et al. (2019)	Zero-acquaintanceship group interactions	30 s; 1, 3, and 5 min	Big Five personality traits	Accuracy-length validity
Lepri et al. (2009)	Group game interactions	1 min	Speaker emphasis, activity, influence, mimicry, body/hand movement with game performance	Predictive validity
Letzring et al. (2006)	Zero-acquaintanceship group interactions	50 min	Personality profiles	Accuracy-length validity
Murphy (2005)	Zero-acquaintanceship dyadic interactions	1 min	Gaze, gestures, nods, self-touch, smiles	Slice-whole validity
Murphy et al. (2015)	4 studies; various zero-acquaintanceship dyadic interactions	30 s to 4.5 min	Gaze, gestures, nods, self-touch, smiles, speaking time	Inter-slice reliability; slice-whole validity
Murphy et al. (2019)	5 studies; various zero-acquaintanceship dyadic interactions	1, 2, 3, and 4 min	Gaze, gestures, nods, self-touch, smiles, speaking time with 33 various outcome variables	Predictive validity
Nguyen & Gatica-Perez (2015)	Job interviews	2 s to 2 min	Speaking behaviors, body and head movements with hireability impressions	Predictive validity
Perrault (2020)	Clinician biography videos	46 and 63 s	Patient ratings of anticipated satisfaction, behavioral intention, ease of selection, expertise, likeability, trust, uncertainty	Slice-whole validity
Roter et al. (2011)	Patient-medical student interactions	1 and 3 min	Various rapport-based and verbal behaviors	Slice-whole validity; predictive validity

Satterstrom et al. (2019)	Student groups in decision-making tasks	10, 30, and 60 s	Group effectiveness	Accuracy-length validity
Tskhay et al. (2017)	Persuasive speeches	5, 15, and 30 s	Leadership variables, speaker appearance variables, with speaker charisma	Predictive validity
Wang et al. (2019)	Zero-acquaintanceship dyads	1, 2, 3, and 4 min	Smiling, nodding, leaning in, humor/telling stories, speaking about self with various outcome variables	Predictive validity

Note. Accuracy-length validity = whether interpersonal judgment accuracy depends on the length of the slice. Predictive validity = how well thin slices can predict variables that are different from the behavior measured in the slice. MI = Motivational Interviewing counseling style (Levounis et al., 2017). Slice-whole validity = whether thin slices can adequately approximate the total of the recorded behavior. Inter-slice reliability = how interchangeable individual slices are in relation to one another.

^a See James et al. (2012) Table 1 for a list of studies using thin slices in parent–child interactions.

Appendix References

- Ambady, N., & Rosenthal, R. (1992). Thin slices of expressive behavior as predictors of interpersonal consequences: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111(2), 256–274. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.111.2.256>
- Ambady, N., & Rosenthal, R. (1993). Half a minute: Predicting teacher evaluations from thin slices of nonverbal behavior and physical attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64(3), 431–441. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.64.3.431>
- Blackman, M. C., & Funder, D. C. (1998). The effect of information on consensus and accuracy in personality judgment. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 34(2), 164–181. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1997.1347>
- Caperton, D. D., Atkins, D. C., & Imel, Z. E. (2018). Rating motivational interviewing fidelity from thin slices. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 32(4), 434–441. <https://doi.org/10.1037/adb0000359>
- Carcone, A. I., Naar, S., Eggly, S., Foster, T., Albrecht, T. L., & Brogan, K. E. (2015). Comparing thin slices of verbal communication behavior of varying number and duration. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 98(2), 150–155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2014.09.008>
- 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(5), 1054–1072. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2007.01.004>
- Foster, T. S. (2015). The reliability and validity of the thin slice technique: Observational research on video recorded medical interactions [ProQuest Information & Learning]. In *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering* (Vol. 75, Issue 8–B(E)).
- Fowler, K. A., Lilienfeld, S. O., & Patrick, C. J. (2009). Detecting psychopathy from thin slices of behavior. *Psychological Assessment*, 21(1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014938.supp> (Supplemental)
- Hall, J. A., Andrzejewski, S. A., Murphy, N. A., Mast, M. S., & Feinstein, B. A. (2008). Accuracy of judging others' traits and states: Comparing mean levels across tests. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42(6), 1476–1489. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.06.013>
- Hall, J. A., Harvey, S. E., Johnson, K. E., & Colvin, C. R. (2021). Thin-slice accuracy for judging Big Five traits from personal narratives. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 171, 110392. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110392>
- Hall, J. A., Roter, D. L., Blanch, D. C., & Frankel, R. M. (2009). Observer-rated rapport in interactions between medical students and standardized patients. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 76(3), 323–327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2009.05.009>
- Hall, J. A., Verghis, P., Stockton, W., & Goh, J. X. (2014). It takes just 120 seconds: Predicting satisfaction in technical support calls. *Psychology & Marketing*, 31(7), 500–508. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20711>
- Hirschmann, N., Kastner-Koller, U., Deimann, P., Schmelzer, M., & Pietschnig, J. (2018). Reliable and valid coding of thin slices of video footage: Applicability to the assessment of mother-child interactions. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 40, 249–258. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10862-017-9630-x>
- James, D. M., Wadnerkar, M. B., Lam-Cassettari, C., Kang, S., & Telling, A. L. (2012). Thin slice sampling of video footage for mother/child interaction: Application to single

- cases. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 34(3), 351–360.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10862-012-9282-9>
- Klonek, F. E., Quera, V., & Kauffeld, S. (2015). Coding interactions in Motivational Interviewing with computer-software: What are the advantages for process researchers? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 44, 284–292.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.10.034>
- Krzyzaniak, S. L., Colman, D. E., Letzring, T. D., McDonald, J. S., & Biesanz, J. C. (2019). The effect of information quantity on distinctive accuracy and normativity of personality trait judgments. *European Journal of Personality*, 33(2), 197–213.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2196>
- Lepri, B., Mana, N., Cappelletti, A., & Pianesi, F. (2009). Automatic prediction of individual performance from "thin slices" of social behavior. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 733–736.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/1631272.1631400>
- Letzring, T. D., Wells, S. M., & Funder, D. C. (2006). Information quantity and quality affect the realistic accuracy of personality judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(1), 111–123. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.91.1.111>
- Levounis, P., Arnaout, B., & Marienfeld, C. (2017). *Motivational interviewing for clinical practice* (P. Levounis, B. Arnaout, & C. Marienfeld (Eds.)). American Psychiatric Publishing, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9781615371860>
- Murphy, N. A. (2005). Using thin slices for behavioral coding. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 29(4), 235–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-005-7722-x>
- Murphy, N. A., Hall, J. A., Mast, M. S., Ruben, M. A., Frauendorfer, D., Blanch-Hartigan, D., Roter, D. L., & Nguyen, L. (2015). Reliability and validity of nonverbal thin slices in social interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41(2), 199–213.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167214559902>
- Murphy, N. A., Hall, J. A., Ruben, M. A., Frauendorfer, D., Schmid Mast, M., Johnson, K. E., & Nguyen, L. (2019). Predictive validity of thin-slice nonverbal behavior from social interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 45(7), 983–993.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167218802834>
- Nguyen, L. S., & Gatica-Perez, D. (2015). I would hire you in a minute: Thin slices of nonverbal behavior in job interviews. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM on International Conference on Multimodal Interaction (ICMI '15)*, Association for Computing Machinery (pp. 51–58). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2818346.2820760>
- Perrault, E. K. (2020). The diminishing returns for longer healthcare provider video biographies: A thin slice examination of patient decision-making. *Health Communication*, 36(5), 650–658. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2020.1733230>
- Roter, D. L., Hall, J. A., Blanch-Hartigan, D., Larson, S., & Frankel, R. M. (2011). Slicing it thin: New methods for brief sampling analysis using RIAS-coded medical dialogue. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 82(3), 410–419.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2010.11.019>
- Satterstrom, P., Polzer, J. T., Kwan, L. B., Hauser, O. P., Wiruchnipawan, W., & Burke, M. (2019). Thin slices of workgroups. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 151, 104–117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2018.12.007>

- Tskhay, K. O., Zhu, R., & Rule, N. O. (2017). Perceptions of charisma from thin slices of behavior predict leadership prototypicality judgments. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(4), 555–562. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.03.003>
- Wang, M. Z., Chen, K., & Hall, J. A. (2020). Predictive validity of thin slices of verbal and nonverbal behaviors: Comparison of slice lengths, locations, and rating methodologies. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 44, 53-66. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-020-00343-1>