

Use of Tactile Contact Accompanying Health Promotion Messages During Routine Health & Physical Examinations: A Technique for Improving Compliance

Ralph Jay Johnson^{1,*}

¹Research PA-C/Research Coordinator University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center

Corresponding author:

Ralph Jay Johnson, Research PA-C/Research Coordinator University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center

Running Title:

Touch-accompanied Health Promotion Messages in Health & Physicals

Keywords:

Tactile contact, touching, program compliance, anchoring, treatment compliance, health improvement, health promotion

Received: Feb 02, 2022

Accepted: Feb 07, 2022

Published: Feb 09, 2022

Editor:

ANUBHA BAJAJ, Consultant Histopathology, A.B. Diagnostics, New Delhi, India

Abstract

A daunting challenge for health providers and medical practitioners is communicating the vital importance of health promotion and medical treatment adherence and compliance. This article is an evidence-based, best-practices commentary

advocating the use of touch-accompanied verbal suggestions during the touching portions of routine, near-universal Health & Physical examinations. Notional case examples are presented; based on the professional literature, underlying Behavioral Mechanics are discussed. Touch-accompanied verbal health promotion messages skillfully deployed in routine Health & Physical examinations offer a non-harmful and efficient technique to synergistically and substantially enhance the probability of patient compliance with health improvement and medical treatment regimens. Though it is not a magic panacea, the public health applications, extensions and benefits are incalculable in terms of healthy behavior adoption. Additionally, if deftly conducted in accordance with best practices, it has the potential to greatly improve practitioner-patient relations and increase patient satisfaction. Further avenues of research inquiry are considered.

Introduction

A Health and Physical (i.e., "H&P") examination is commonly considered a universal medical procedure performed as part of most face-to-face health care encounters in which medical practitioners interview and examine patients for any medical signs and symptoms of medical conditions.[1

-4] Even as telemedicine encounters become common and accepted, almost everyone invariably at some point must meet face-to-face with a medical practitioner for an H&P.[5-7] This examination typically includes a series of questions regarding patients' medical histories, followed by tactically-based examinations on reported symptoms. [1,8,9] The aim naturally is to preliminarily rule-out a diagnosis, order more definitive objective/empirical tests, and formulate a treatment plan.[9,10] Substantial research supports the contention that patients universally expect these examinations; these examinations are variously depicted as a necessary ritual that plays a vital and substantial role in fostering the medical practitioner- patient relationship, which improves subsequent medical encounters.[11-13] When these examinations are not performed, patients may feel the validity of their illness and treatment are insufficient and slighted, which then mars the medical practitioner-patient relationship.[11,13,14, 15]

The H&P may involve standard tests (e.g., vital signs such as temperature, heart rate, respiration, blood pressure etc.).[16] It also involves the medical practitioner using various senses, especially hearing and particularly touch, starting at the head of the patient and ending at the toes.[9,16,17] Medical practitioners examine patients visually and tactically through inspection, palpation, percussion, auscultation, and even manipulation such as shaking.[17,18] During touching, there is ample opportunity for verbal communication between medical practitioners and patients.[9,16,19,20] Notably, whereas in some contexts touching is prohibited and taboo, in the context of an authoritative H&P, medical practitioners' legitimate and acceptable touching is expected and encouraged.[11-15][17] Indeed, during this process, beneficial health promotion messages can be delivered subtly to patients to powerfully improve their treatment compliance and outcomes.[21] This is because the messages are delivered in a particular manner and simultaneously combined with touch in a legitimate, authoritative medical encounter.[21-23]

The purpose of this commentary / review is to

advance the notion of deploying subtle beneficial health improvement messages, accompanied by appropriate touching, during the portion of H&Ps that involve medical practitioner's touching assessments. This is done in order to augment more formal and even written health instructions, and thus to achieve beneficial outcomes for patients. These may include a strengthened therapeutic medical practitioner- patient alliance.

Background

A traditionally challenging task for medical practitioners is communicating the importance of treatment plan compliance, including but not limited to healthcare follow-up—be it therapeutic regimen adherence, medication schedules, diet restrictions, or follow-up visits[24-30]. Additionally, one of the most primal and powerful modes of communication is touch; research conclusively suggests that along with a suggestion, request, or directive, touch has a synergistic effect on reciprocal compliance.[31, 32] In a series of foundational field experiments in varied natural settings over several years, Gueguen et al. [33-37] clearly demonstrated that brief touching with a direct gaze, when accompanied by a request, had a maximally positive influence on compliance—whether or not the subjects even were aware they had been touched. Hornik;[38] Smith; Gier; and Willis;[39] Willis and Hamm;[40] and Crusco and Wetzel found that tactile contact enhanced spontaneous compliance or improved compliance— even when no explicit verbal request was made. Johnson(2021)[42] conducted a field experiment with street drug users attending a health improvement outreach program and found a statistically significant difference; those who were socially appropriately touched and requested with direct gaze to continue to attend the program were more likely to do so than those who were not touched but similarly requested. This body of conclusive research convincingly demonstrates the viability of a similar best-practices practical extension and application during the touching portion of the H&P encounter. That is, socially acceptable touch in an H&P encounter can synergistically enhance the potential for

compliance even with recalcitrant patients if accompanied by a subtle yet direct suggestion or request. Additionally, the minimally non-intrusive but efficient technique is relatively innocuous and not harmful or intrusive; it demonstrates genuine interest and appreciation of patients, thus improving the medical practitioner-patient relationship.[26,32,41,43,44, 45]

Step-by-Step Technique

The following are two descriptive step-by-step examples.

Example 1

1. During a routine examination, a medical practitioner smelled tobacco smoke and residue on a patient and inquired about their smoking history. The patient admitted to smoking but expressed a desire to quit, and stated having tried several times yet not having the willpower to do so;
2. while auscultating with a stethoscope and listening to the patient's respirations and touching the patient, that is, holding the stethoscope to the patient's body;
3. the medical practitioner looked into the patient's eyes; and,
4. very gently and subtly says, "You will get the willpower to quit smoking."

Or,

Example 2

1. A physician has a patient where it is imperative that they return for follow-up appointments, but the patient expressed ambivalence and vacillated about doing so;
2. during a routine H&P, the practitioner is palpating their extremities for abnormalities while the patient is reclining on the examination table;
3. the physician looks the patient directly in the eyes; and,
4. subtly yet mildly directs, "You will come back for your follow-up appointment."

In each case, there are pre-existing histories from which the practitioners draw, and the verbal suggestions

are integrated with appropriate assessment touching during the H&P. The medical practitioners' verbal suggestions constitute a clear, concise, understandable reframing of patients' words only into a gentle yet firm directive or command with direct gaze. Research confirms that verbal communications accompanying touch should work optimally when delivered in a gentle, nonjudgmental, subtle yet directing / instructing manner.[46] They are centered on reframing patients' own expressions of thoughts, feelings, preferences, observations, and expectations; the practitioner serves as an interpreter and synthesizer as seen in the above examples.[46, 47] This can be promoted by an initial exchange of information between practitioner and patient, usually during the Medical History portion of the H&P. [47-51] For example:

Patient (during Medical History interview) spontaneously expresses: "I am really having a lot of trouble keeping the pounds off."

Medical Practitioner (during Auscultation Touching) reframes/synthesizes: "You will lose weight." (Direct gaze, if possible, is ideal.)

That is in accordance with best practices. To be maximally effective, suggestions should be brief, clear, concise, structured, and prescriptive. Instructive or directive messages are reframed from patients' own self-centered expositions and expressions of concerns to an attentive practitioner [46-51][52]. Also, the practitioners' reframing shows patients the practitioner is attentive.[48-53] It is simple yet very effective, when accompanied by touch.[33-42]

Behavioral Mechanics Explained

Though the behavioral mechanics of touch and suggestibility are not well-understood, the nursing profession has long been aware of and asserted the power of the therapeutic alliance between touch, accompanied by instructive verbal instruction, in transforming behavior.[21,55] The nursing literature has asserted that the more a patient needs instructive help, the more they help by touching accompanied by supportive communication, the better the results.[56] (Note:

Supplementary direct gaze merely quickly alerts recipients' attentiveness to touch and suggestion without (re-)focusing attention.[21]) According to the nursing literature, touch and verbal communication are powerful, complementary and synergistic in their intended outcome—literally tethering the mind of the nurse to the patient's mind and body.[56, 57, 22]* The nursing literature claims that appropriate gentle touch has the formidable potential to soothe and heal (i.e., “laying on of hands”), allowing patients pause and permission to apprehend and accept accompanied communication and instruction.[58]

Montagu (1958)[58] notes that the oldest and most sensitive sense organ—the skin—is the first and paramount medium for communication. Touch is a more powerful (re-)enforcer than the content of language; when combined, the two become so commanding they cannot be denied. Appropriate touch in the H&P is defined as diagnostic assessment through inspecting, palpating, auscultating, probing, exploring, and manipulating the body object. If combined with verbal health improvement messages, it has the potential to synergize the healing communication process.[58] Skillfully deployed by the examiner and welcomed by the patient as a full participant in the communication, it triggers a concordance, acceptance, and internalization of accompanied instructions for response and compliance with the health promotion messages.[58,59,60]** Therefore, when a skilled medical practitioner incorporates legitimate, acceptable touch accompanied by health promotion messages in the setting of the H&P encounter, it has great potential not only for reinforcing positive healthy practices but also the practitioner-patient relationship.[61]

Research has shown that collection and reinforcement of patient-centered expositions is related to a more formative medical practitioner-patient relationship and higher patient satisfaction with their treatment—if only in that it shows the medical practitioner is listening to the patient.[48-53][62] That is, research shows there is a mutual concordance between effective communication, compliance, and patient

satisfaction. Combined with touch, it can become that much more significant, consuming, and beneficial.

Conclusion

This report advanced the idea of using the “touching portion” of the medical H&P as an ideal opportunity for health/medical practitioners to combine and deliver subtle beneficial health and treatment improvement messages via touching (and preferably with direct gaze) in achieving maximum effectiveness and augmenting more formal and written instructions—even helping to cultivate the therapeutic medical practitioner-patient alliance. Put differently, if skillfully deployed in routine Health and Physical examinations, touch-accompanied verbal health promotion messages offer an inexpensive, minimally invasive, and non-harmful technique to substantially augment health improvement, medical treatment regimens, enhance patient satisfaction, and advance public health initiatives through healthy behaviors adoption. Its beneficial uses in the health field are practically limitless. Though exactly how it works may still be a mystery, what matters is that it does work, often powerfully—and that it can be marshalled into H&Ps for patients' well-being. What is also unknown is the extent to which this technique already is being used, perhaps by the more successful practitioners. It is plausible that touch and verbal communication are so common a part of the H&P process that it has been overlooked in terms of designing meaningful evaluative studies.

Given that communication in such encounters is always two-way, a question might be to what extent and how medical practitioners are themselves affected by it.[63] Also, with issues about the appropriateness of touch in medical encounters, particular contexts under which this technique can be optimally rendered or should be avoided should be considered (e.g., cultural / gender prohibitions). Specifically, prescriptions and prohibitions must be codified regarding when it should be used and when it should not be used. [61]

The deft and skilled use of touch should be considered in health care professionals' academic

curricula and residencies, and this should be guided by best practices informed by scientific research.[19,64] To reiterate, any ethical qualms first must be considered; just because touch can be optimally used in an H&P setting does not necessarily mean it should be used. However, while sophisticated technologies can be relied upon for diagnosis and treatment, interpersonal communication is the primary tool to influence patients' health behaviors. As such, every synergist such as touch-accompanied communication should be considered in the interest of patients' well-being.[50] And despite a general awareness that touch accompanied by verbal directive communication has potentially powerful implications for positive behavioral outcomes, particularly in H&Ps, it is clearly under-taught across the medical professions where it is most likely to be used. [19,64] As with any skillset, understanding, training, and practice can only improve it.

Footnotes

*(Hypnotherapists have long recognized the “anchoring” power of touch accompanied by a subtle yet commanding suggestion. Touch refocuses attention to the area affected, thereby alerting the state of consciousness and making recipients more suggestible and even setting into motion internal auto-suggestion. Hypnotherapists' common parlance for this auto- suggestive process is “dropping an anchor.” [65,66] This is done without the lengthy process of hypnotherapeutic induction. Note: The commentary herein is not advocating the hypnotizing of patients, nor is the process described herein hypnosis.)

**[Note: Auto-suggestive properties are commonly referred to in lay terms as “putting a bug in someone's ear.”[67,68] In the Transtheoretical Model Stages of Change, this also may be referred to as enabling a shift from Pre-contemplation to Contemplation, and eventually, Action. [69]]

Declarations

Ethical Approval and Consent to Participate

Non-applicable, this was a commentary accompanied by a review of supporting open-source documents and analyses of anonymous publically

available data.

Consent for Publication

Yes.

Availability of Data and Materials

Yes, publications and sources are available on-line or provided by author upon request.

Competing Interests

None declared.

Funding

This project was supported in part by a grant from the National Institute on Drug Abuse to the University of Texas—Houston School of Public Health RO3 DA12328. The author gratefully acknowledges UT-MDACC for in-kind support.

Authors' Contribution

Non-applicable, there is one sole Author.

Acknowledgements

The Author wishes to gratefully acknowledge in-kind support of the Department of Lymphoma and Myeloma, UT-MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX. in the preparation of this manuscript. Also, the author thanks Mr. Jasper Olsem for his encouragement in pursuing the subject matter. The author also expresses appreciation for Dr. David A. Lee, Ms. Annie Zachariah, Ms. Celia Ann Savoie, Ms. Jessica C. Chen for proof of concept and / or review and Ms. Aileen “Acey” Cho freelance-copy editor for proofing and copyediting drafts. The opinions expressed are solely those of the Author. Reprints and correspondence should be addressed to the author at ralph.johnson@txsg.state.tx.us, rjohnson@mdanderson.org, or, jayjohnson131313@gmail.com UT-MDACC, Unit 429 1515 Holcombe, Houston, Texas, 77030-400, U.S.A.. (713-745-2207)

References

1. Gawlik KS, Melnyk BM, & Teal AM (Eds.).(2021) Evidence-Based Physical Examination: Best Practices for Health and Well-Being Assessment (Ch. 1). NY, NY: Springer Publishing Company: xxvii xxix and 3-42.

- <https://www.springerpub.com/evidence-based-physical-examination-9780826164537.html>
2. Raffle, AE.; Muir Gray, J. A. (2007). Screening: Evidence and Practice. Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199214495.001.0001. ISBN 978-0-19-921449-5. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2647432/>
 3. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Medicaid Learning Network. (2017; August) Evaluation and Management Services. Retrieved from <https://www.cms.gov/Outreach-and-Education/Medicare-Learning-Network-MLN/MLNProducts/Downloads/eval-mgmt-serv-guide-ICN006764.pdf>
 4. Hirschtick RE. (2016) The quick physical exam. JAMA, 316(13), 1363 – 1364. PMID: 27701664 DOI: 10.1001/jama.2016.8182 <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/article-abstract/2565293>
 5. Reeves JJ, Ayers JW, & Longhurst CA. (2021) Telehealth in the COVID-19 Era: A balancing act to avoid harm. J Med Internet Res. 2021 Feb; 23(2): e24785. doi: 10.2196/24785 PMID: 33477104 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7857524/>
 6. Pappan N, Benkhadra Raed , Papincak D, Ashker K 1, et al.. (2021) Values and limits of Telemedicine: a case report. SN Compr Clin Med: Jan 4;1-3. doi: 10.1007/s42399-020-00725-y. PMID: 33426473 PMID: PMC7781422 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7781422/>
 7. Krogsbøll LT, Jørgensen KJ, Gøtzsche PC.. (2019) General health checks in adults for reducing morbidity and mortality from disease. The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. Jan 31, 1: CD009009. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD009009.pub3. ISSN 1469-493X. PMC 6353639. PMID 30699470 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30699470/>
 8. Vojnović M, Martinov-Cvejin M, & Grujić V. (1997) Biosocial aspects of physician-patient communication in general medicine. Med Pregl: Sep-Oct 1997;50 (9-10):395-8. PMID: 9471538 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9471538/>
 9. Campbell EW Jr and Lynn CK. (1990) The Physical Examination (Ch. 4) in Clinical Methods: The History, Physical, and Laboratory Examinations. 3rd edition. Editors: Walker H, Hall WD, and Hurst JW. NCBI Bookshelf. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK361>
 10. Boulware LE, Marinopoulos S, Phillips KA, et al. (2007) Systematic review: the value of the periodic health evaluation. Ann. Intern. Med. 146 (4): 289–300 (Feb). doi:10.7326/0003-4819-146-4-200702200-00008. PMID 17310053.
 11. Oboler SK, Prochazka AV, Gonzales R, Xu S, Anderson RJ. (2002) Public expectations and attitudes for annual physical examinations and testing. Ann. Intern. Med. 136 (9) (May): 652–9. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-136-9-200205070-00007. PMID 11992300. S2CID 46398009. https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/0003-4819-136-9-200205070-00007?url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori:rid:crossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub%20%20pubmed
 12. Laine C. (2002) The annual physical examination: needless ritual or necessary routine? Editorial Ann Intern Med. May 7;136(9):701-3. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-136-9-200205070-00013. https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/0003-4819-136-9-200205070-00013?url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori:rid:crossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub%20%20pubmed
 13. Hoey J. What does the public want in an annual check-up? CMAJ • JULY 23, 2002; 167 (2), 171. <https://www.cmaj.ca/content/cmaj/167/2/171.full.pdf>
 14. Duan L, Mukherjee EM, & Federman DG. (2020) The physical examination: a survey of patient preferences and expectations during primary care visits. Postgrad Med Jan;132(1):102-108. doi:

- 10.1080/00325481.2020.1713618. Epub 2020 Jan 22.
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7085258/>
15. Wool MS. (2002) *Ann Intern Med*: Nov 5;137(9): 773-4; author reply 773-4. PMID: 12416958 https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/0003-4819-137-9-200211050-00020?url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori:rid:crossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub%20%20pubmed
 16. Baker M, Moots H, Yarberry S, McAuley M, et al. (2021) Approach to the physical examination: general survey and assessment of vital signs (Ch. 5) in *Evidence-Based Physical Examination: Best Practices for Health and Well-Being Assessment* (Eds) Gawlik KS, Melnyk BM, & Teal AM (Eds.).(2021) NY, NY: Springer Publishing Company: 81-99. <https://www.springerpub.com/evidence-based-physical-examination-9780826164537.html>
 17. Nursing 2022. (2006) Assessing patients effectively: Here's how to do the basic four techniques. *Nursing*: November 2006 8;: 6. https://journals.lww.com/nursing/Fulltext/2006/11002/Assessing_patients_effectively_Here_s_how_to_do.5.aspx
 18. Reach G. (2016) Patient education, nudge, and manipulation: defining the ethical conditions of the person-centered model of care. *Patient Prefer Adherence*. 2016; 10: 459-468. Published online 2016 Apr 4. doi: 10.2147/PPA.S99627 PMID: PMC4829190 PMID: 27103791 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4829190/pdf/ppa-10-459.pdf>
 19. Cleland J, de la Croix A, Cotton P, Coull S, et al. (2013) Student-patient communication during physical examination. *Clin Teach*: Apr;10(2):84-7. doi: 10.1111/j.1743-498X.2012.00620.x. PMID: 23480108 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1743-498X.2012.00620.x>
 20. Kourkouta L, Barsamidis K, Lavdaniti M. (2013) Communication skills during the clinical examination of the patients. *Prog Health Sci*,3, 1: 119-122. file:///C:/Users/Jay%20Johnson/Downloads/119-122Kourkouta.pdf
 21. Routasalo P. (2001) Physical touch in nursing studies: a literature review. *JAN*: 30, 4;: 843-850. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1046/j.1365-2648.1999.01156.x>
 22. Sighn C. (2012) Touch in the consultation. *Br J Gen Pract*. Mar; 62(596): 147-148. doi: 10.3399/bjgp12X630133 PMID: PMC3289810 PMID: 22429421 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3289810/pdf/bjgp62-147.pdf>
 23. de Zulueta Paquita (2020) Touch matters: COVID-19, physical examination, and 21st century general practice. *BJ Gen Pract*: 70 (701): 594-595. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp20X713705> <https://bjgp.org/content/70/701/594>
 24. Wisdom JP; Hoffman K; Rechberger E; Seim K; et al.; (2009). Women-focused treatment agencies and process improvement: Strategies to increase client engagement. *Women & Therapy*; 32:69-87. [PubMed: 20046914] <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2748928/pdf/nihms120280.pdf>
 25. Swift JK; Greenberg RP; Tompkins KA; and Parkin SR; (2017). Treatment refusal and premature termination in psychotherapy; pharmacotherapy; and their combination: A meta-analysis of head-to-head comparisons. *Psychotherapy (Chic)*. 2017 Mar;54(1):47-57. doi: 10.1037/pst0000104. [PubMed: 28263651] <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2017-09365-004>.
 26. Garrity T. (1981) Medical compliance and the clinician-patient relationship: a review. *Soc Sci Med* Aug;15(3): 215-22. doi: 10.1016/0271-5384(81)90016-8. PMID: 7323842 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/7323842/>
 27. Cameron C. (1996) Patient compliance: recognition of factors involved and suggestions for promoting compliance with therapeutic regimens. *JAN*: 24, 12, AUG: 244-250. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j>

- 1365-2648.1996.01993.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1046/j.1365-2648.1996.01993>.
28. Eraker SA, Kirscht JP, Becker. (1984) Understanding and Improving Patient Compliance. *Ann Int Med*; Feb;100(2):258-68. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-100-2-258. PMID: 6362512 https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/0003-4819-100-2-258?url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori:rid:crossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub%20%20pubmed
 29. Rosenstock IM. (1985). Understanding and Enhancing Patient Compliance with Diabetic Regimens. *Diabetes Care*; 8(6), 610-616. <https://doi.org/10.2337/diacare.8.6.610> <https://diabetesjournals.org/care/article/8/6/610/31338/Understanding-and-Enhancing-Patient-Compliance>
 30. Heszen-Klemens I and Lapinska E. (1984) Doctor-Patient Relationship. *Soc Sci Med*. 1984;19(1):9-18. doi: 10.1016/0277-9536(84)90132-1. PMID: 6474225 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/6474225/>
 31. Levitan AA and Johnson JM; (1986). The role of touch in healing and hypnotherapy. *Am J Clin Hypn*; 28; 4; 218-223. [PubMed: 3717054] <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00029157.1986.10402657>
 32. Hyman P. (2020) The disappearance of Primary Care physical examination—Losing touch. *JAMA (Internal Medicine)*, Nov 1, 180, 11: 1417 – 1418. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.3546 PMID: 32832987 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32832987/>
 33. Gueguen N and Fischer-Lokou J (2003). Tactile contact and spontaneous help: An evaluation in a natural setting. *Journal of Social Psychology*; 143(6); 785–787. DOI: 10.1080/00224540309600431. [PubMed: 14658752] <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2003-10239-008>
 34. Gueguen N and Fischer-Lokou J (2003). Another evaluation of touch and helping behavior. *Psychological Reports*; 92; 62–64. [PubMed: 12674258] <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.2466/pr0.2003.92.1.62>
 35. Gueguen N and Fischer-Lokou J (2002). An evaluation of touch on a large request: A field setting. *Psychological Reports*; 90; 267–269. [PubMed: 11898995] <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2002-02501-041>
 36. Gueguen N and Jacob C (2002). Direct look versus evasive glance and compliance with a request. *Journal of Social Psychology*; 142 (3); 393–396. [PubMed: 12058977] <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00224540209603907>
 37. Joule JV and Guegen N. (2007). Touch; compliance; and awareness of tactile contact. *Percept Mot Skills*; Apr; 104(2):581–8. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.2466/pms.104.2.581-588> [PubMed: 17566448] <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17566448/>
 38. . Hornik J. (1992). Effects of physical contact on customers' shopping time and behavior. *Marketing Letters*; 3; 49–55. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40216242>
 39. Smith D; Gier J; and Willis F. (1982). Interpersonal touch and compliance with a marketing request. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*; 126; 141–142. http://www.communicationcache.com/uploads/1/0/8/8/10887248/interpersonal_touch_and_compliance_with_a_marketing_request...pdf
 40. Willis FN and Hamm HK. (1980). The use of interpersonal touch in securing compliance. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*; 5(1);49–55. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF00987054>
 41. Crusco AH and Wetzal CG. (1984). The Midas touch: The effects of interpersonal touch on restaurant tipping. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*; 10 (4); 512–517. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1985-30769-001>
 42. Johnson RJ. (2020) Tactile contact as a marketing tool

- for improving an HIV/STD education program's compliance / retention with crack cocaine users. *Psychol Ment Health Care*: 2020 ; 4(1): 1-11. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7059775/>
43. Larsen KM and Smith CK. (1981) Assessment of non-verbal communication in the patient- physician interview. *J Fam Pract*: Mar;12(3):481-8. PMID: 7462949 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/7462949/>
 44. Woolley FR, Kane RL, Hughes CC, and Wright DD. (1978) The effects of doctor--patient communication on satisfaction and outcome of care. *Soc Sci Med*.. 1978 Mar;12(2A):123-8. PMID: 653374 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/653374/>
 45. Krause G, Borchert M, Benzler J, Diesfeldt HJ. (2000) From diagnosis to drug taking: staff compliance with guidelines and patient compliance to prescriptions in Burkina Faso. *Int J Qual Health Care*. Feb;12(1):25-30. doi: 10.1093/intqhc/12.1.25. PMID: 10733080 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10733080/>
 46. Langewitz W, Ackermann S, Heierle A, Hertwig R, et al.. (2015) Improving patient recall of information: Harnessing the power of structure. *Patient Educ Couns*: Jun;98(6):716-21. doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2015.02.003. Epub 2015 Feb 18. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0738399115000725?via%3Dihub>
 47. Orth JE, Stiles WB, Scherwitz L, Hennrikus D, et al. (1987). Patient exposition and provider explanation in routine interviews and hypertensive patients' blood pressure control. *Health Psychol*. 1987;6(1):29-42. doi: 10.1037//0278-6133.6.1.29. PMID: 3816743 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/3816743/>
 48. Barrier PA, Li JTC, and Jensen NM. (2003) Two Words to Improve Physician-Patient Communication: What Else? *Mayo Clin Proc*: Feb;78(2):211-4. doi: 10.4065/78.2.211. PMID: 12583531 [https://www.mayoclinicproceedings.org/article/S0025-6196\(11\)62552-4/fulltext](https://www.mayoclinicproceedings.org/article/S0025-6196(11)62552-4/fulltext)
 49. Tongue JR, Epps HR, and Forese LL. (2005) Communication skills for Patient-Centered Care. *J Bone & Joint Surg*: 87-A, 3, March: 652-652. https://journals.lww.com/jbjsjournal/Citation/2005/03000/Communication_Skills_for_Patient_Centered_Care_.27.aspx
 50. Ong LM, de Haes JC, Hoos AM, and Lammes FB. (1995) Doctor-patient communication: a review of the literature. *Soc Sci Med*: Apr;40(7):903-18. doi: 10.1016/0277-9536(94)00155-m. PMID: 7792630 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/027795369400155M?via%3Dihub>
 51. Paula E O'gara PE and Fairhurst W. (2004) Therapeutic communication part 2: strategies that can enhance the quality of the emergency care consultation. *Acc Emerg Nurs*: Oct;12(4):201-7. doi: 10.1016/j.aaen.2004.03.003. PMID: 15474344 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S096523020400027X?via%3Dihub>
 52. Van Dalen J, Bartholomeus P, Kerkhofs E, Lulofs R. et al.. (2001) Teaching and assessing communication skills in Maastricht: the first twenty years. *Med Teach*: May;23(3):245-251. doi: 10.1080/01421590120042991.
 53. Meeuwesen L, Schaap C, and van der Staak C. (1991) Verbal analysis of doctor-patient communication. *Soc Sci Med*: 32(10):1143-50. doi: 10.1016/0277-9536(91)90091-p. PMID: 2068597 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2068597/>
 54. Stiles WB, Putnam SM, Wolf MH, and James SA. (1979) Interaction exchange structure and patient satisfaction with medical interviews. *Med Care*: Jun;17(6):667-81. doi: 10.1097/00005650-197906000-00010. PMID: 449436 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/449436/>
 55. Bruhn JG. (1978) The doctor's touch: tactile communication in the doctor-patient relationship. *South Med J*: Dec;71(12):1469-73. doi: 10.1097/00007611-197812000-00008. PMID: 364668 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/364668/>

56. Reilly BM, Smith CA, and Lucas BP. (2005) *Med J Aust*: Apr 18;182(8):375-6. doi: 10.5694/j.1326-5377.2005.tb06752.x. PMID: 15850430 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.5694/j.1326-5377.2005.tb06752.x>
57. de Zulueta P. 2020. Touch matters: COVID-19, physical examination, and 21st century general practice. *Br J Gen Pract*: Nov 26;70(701):594-595. doi: 10.3399/bjgp20X713705. PMID: 33243905 PMCID: PMC7707044 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33243905/>
58. Montagu A. (1986) *The Human Significance of the Skin* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Harper Collins. <https://www.amazon.com/Touching-Human-Significance-Ashley-Montagu/dp/0060960280>
59. Kacperek L (1997) Non-verbal communication: The importance of listening. *Br J Nurs*: Mar 13- 26, 6(5): 275-9. doi:10.12968/bjon.1997.6.5.275. PMID: 9155278 https://www.magonlineibrary.com/doi/abs/10.12968/bjon.1997.6.5.275?rfr_dat=cr_pub++0pubmed&url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori%3Arid%3Acrossref.org
60. Cocksedge S, George B, Renwick S, Chew-Graham CA. (2013) Touch in primary care consultations: qualitative investigation of doctors' and patients' perceptions. *Br J Gen Pract*: Apr;63(609):e283-90. doi: 10.3399/bjgp13X665251. PMID: 23540485 PMCID: PMC3609476 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3609476/>
61. Hizar RD and Giger JN (2007) When touch is not the best approach. *J Clin Nurs*: 1997 May;6(3):203-6. PMID: 9188337 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1365-2702.1997.tb00305.x?sid.nlm%3Apubmed>
62. Tan ASL, Moldovan-Johnson M, Parvanta S, Gray SW, et al.. (2012) Patient-clinician information engagement improves adherence to colorectal cancer surveillance after curative treatment: results from a longitudinal study. *Oncologist*. Sep; 17(9): 1155-1162. doi: 10.1634/theoncologist.2012-0173 PMCID: PMC3448408 PMID: 22858794 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3448408/>
63. Kneebone R. (2018) Getting Back in touch. *Lancet*: Apr 7, 391, 723, 731. PMID: 29486933 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30294-0 [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(18\)30294-0/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(18)30294-0/fulltext)
64. Krautter M, Diefenbacher K, Koehl-Hackert N, Buss B, et al. (2015) Short communication: final year students' deficits in physical examination skills performance in Germany. *Z Evid Fortbild Qual Gesundheitswes*: 109(1):59-61. doi: 10.1016/j.zefq.2015.01.003. Epub 2015 Feb 19. PMID: 25839370 [https://www.zefq-journal.com/article/S1865-9217\(15\)00005-7/fulltext](https://www.zefq-journal.com/article/S1865-9217(15)00005-7/fulltext)
65. Levitan AA and Johnson JM; (1986). The role of touch in healing and hypnotherapy. *Am J Clin Hypnosis*; 28; 4; 218-223. doi: 10.1080/00029157.1986.10402657 PubMed: 3717054 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00029157.1986.10402657>
66. Donatone B; (2013). Focused suggestion with somatic anchoring technique: Rapid self-hypnosis for pain management. *Am J Clin Hypn*. Apr;55(4):325-42. [PubMed: 23724568]
67. Abarbanel-Brandt A. (1965) Semantics of auto-suggestion. *Br J Med Hypn*.: 16:2-7. PMID: 14324850 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/14324850/>
68. Brown W. (1928) Theories of Suggestion. *Proc R Soc Med*: Feb;21(4):573-82. PMID: 19986306 PMCID: PMC2102090 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2102090/>
69. Prochaska JO and Velicer WF. (1997) *Am J Health Promot*: Sep-Oct ;12(1):38-48. doi: 10.4278/0890-1171-12.1.38. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.4278/0890-1171-12.1.38?url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori:rid:crossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub%20%20pubmed