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CHAPTER 1
RESEARCH CONCERN

This study examined the relationship between leadership style and listening practices as perceived by team leaders, their supervisor, and those they supervise. The study demonstrates the relationship between the variables of leadership style and listening practices.

The first chapter introduces the research concern and presents a concise statement of the purpose of this study. This chapter identifies the intentional research limits and research questions, defines relevant terminology, outlines the research assumptions, and presents a synopsis of the research methodology.

Introduction to the Research Problem

Effective leadership has long been a determining factor in successful teams and organizations. Literature on leadership styles suggests three types of leaders: transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant (Downton 1973, 230; Burns 1978, 19). Transformational leaders build a relational bond between the leader and followers with a sense of shared vision, purpose, and goals. Through their relationships, transformational leaders motivate followers by inspiring and encouraging them to achieve more than the followers themselves believed possible (Bass 2008, 618-19). Transactional leadership is based on the premise that followers are motivated by either giving rewards or administering punishment (Bass 1985, 11). This social exchange model is based on
exchanging one thing for another, and these “transactions” are the core of the relationship between leaders and followers (Burns 1978, 3). The last leadership model, suggested by James McGregor Burns, is the passive/avoidant leadership style in which the leader essentially abdicates or avoids leadership through a “hands-off, let-things-ride” approach (Northouse 2007, 186). This leadership style is an inactive style and considered ineffective in creating change and unresponsive to followers (Bass and Riggio 2006, 8).

Leadership is a communicative process in which leaders influence their followers not only by talking, but also by listening. Communication competence is a basic skill necessary for survival in society (Rubin 1982, 19-30). Effective leadership uses a full range of communication skills including listening and feedback. By utilizing effective communication skills, leaders begin to influence and shape their followers. Using words, effective leaders gain trust and credibility as they share organizational goals and direction. Through keen communication skills, leaders build hope, courage, and enthusiasm in their followers, encouraging them to give their best effort to accomplish shared goals. To reach common or joint goals that frame transformation, the leader must be a listening communicator (Janusik and Wolvin 2009, 143).

When leaders seek to join hearts and purposes with those they lead, listening to others is essential to their leadership task. As leaders share vision and values, they must also translate the vision, values, and mission into understandable, visual, attainable acts and behaviors so that coalitions of individuals can form to implement their vision (Banks and Ledbetter 2004, 18). Effective leaders are skilled communicators and those who are most effective tend to spend a majority of their time listening (Kouzes and Posner 1995, 60; Janusik and Wolvin 2009, 104-19). Supervisors who listen to their employees see
higher levels of motivation and the supervisors are perceived as being more supportive (Stine, Thompson, and Cusella 1995, 100-01). Skillful leaders begin to lead by listening to others as they frame their vision and goals for the future.

**Great Commission Leadership**

Before ascending to heaven, Jesus gave His disciples a command that would radically change the course of human history. He commanded His followers, both then and now, to, “Go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you. And surely I am with you always, to the very end of the age” (Matt 28:19-20). This passage, known as the Great Commission, has motivated countless Christians to go to the farthest reaches of the earth to make disciples, baptize believers, and teach people to obey Christ’s words. The global scope of this command mandates each generation to go out as missionaries in faith and obedience. Following Jesus’ commands, thousands of believers have gone to the ends of the earth as disciplers.

As a leader, Jesus gave purpose to the fledgling church through these final instructions (Lewis and Demarest 1990, 491-92). His leadership was also predicated on His promised presence (Matt 28:20). Jesus’ transformative leadership enabled the disciples to boldly proclaim the Gospel forty days later at Pentecost (Act 2). Learning from Jesus, Peter listened and responded to the God-fearing Jews gathered on that day (Acts 2:14-40). Peter exercised leadership as he listened to those around him. Leadership and listening are intimately linked.

In the late twentieth century, researchers redefined the scope of the Great Commission, moving from a country or geopolitical focus to people groups. This shift is
appropriate because Jesus referred to the *panta ta ethne* or people groups instead of geopolitical nations (France 2007, 1114-15). This transition to a people group focus began with Donald McGavran in the early 1950s. He stressed people movements among ethnically and culturally homogeneous groups as a mission strategy, which departed from a “mission station” approach to evangelism. McGavran suggests that people movements are much more than individual conversions to Christ but the turning of entire population groups to faith (McGavran 1981, 13). This understanding and defining of people groups during the past 50 years has led to a radical redefinition and refocusing of the Great Commission for the Church (McGavran 1981, 11-13).

*People Group Research*

Currently the Joshua Project, World Christian Database, and the International Mission Board, SBC (IMB), are recognized as global leaders in research focusing on people groups (Joshua Project 2010, jp.pdf; World Christian Database 2010, WCD2010.pdf; International Mission Board 2010, imb-grd.pdf). Each of these agencies defines “people group” and “unreached people group” somewhat differently. The variance in people group statistics reflects differences in definitions among these three organizations.

The Joshua Project identifies 16,351 distinct ethnic people groups worldwide, including 6,646 unreached people groups (Joshua Project 2010, jp.pdf). According to the *Atlas of Global Christianity* based on data supplied by the World Christian Database, there are 12,331 global peoples (Johnson and Ross 2009, 315). Despite centuries of Christian missionary work and evangelization, there are still 2,224 World A (unevangelized, non-Christian) people groups who have yet to hear the gospel (Johnson
The IMB lists the total number of people groups as 11,583, with 6,661 unreached (International Mission Board 2010, imb-org.pdf). This research accepts the IMB’s definition of an unreached people group and its people group list. For the purposes of this research, a people group is considered unreached when less than two percent of the people group population are evangelical Christians. The numbers below illustrate the overwhelming unfinished task before the Church today. According to the March 2010 Global Status of Evangelical Christianity report from the IMB, the remaining unreached people groups (6,661) comprise 65.3% of the world’s population. The population of the 4,096 people groups considered evangelical totals 34.7% of the global population (International Mission Board 2010, IMB GSEC March 2010.pdf). The remaining 826 people groups have an unknown evangelical status (International Mission Board 2010, IMB GSEC March 2010.pdf).

**Workers Called Out**

Regardless of the exact number of unreached people groups or their population, the numbers are vast and the implications are clear that workers are needed to fulfill the Great Commission. Jesus recognized the need for more workers to reap a harvest already ripe. In Matthew 9:36-38, Jesus, concerned for the welfare of the crowd, instructed His disciples to ask God “to send out workers into his harvest field” (France 2007, 372-74). France states, “The immediate and explicit appeal to them is not as yet go out and reap, but to pray for reapers” (France 2007, 374). In obedience to Jesus’ desire for more workers, both the Church and her mission agencies endeavor to prepare individuals to serve overseas as laborers in the harvest. The recruitment method varies with specific denomination and mission agency, but the driving force is the unfinished
task of reaching all people with the Gospel. God’s eternal purpose is to reconcile people to Himself and, as such, He sends Christians out as messengers to tell of His love and forgiveness (2 Cor 5:18-21). Matera states that reconciliation between God and man always begins with God, who initiates reconciliation with man (Matera 2003, 138).

Throughout the Scriptures God illustrates His love and desire for man to have a personal relationship with man, and God is unwilling for any person to perish (Isa 1:18-19; 2 Cor 5:18-20; 2 Pet 3:9). In Genesis 12:2-4, God calls Abram to Himself and expresses His intention to bless all nations (peoples) through Abram. This theme continues in Psalm 46:10 as the psalmist writes, “Be still, and know that I am God; I will be exalted among the nations, I will be exalted in the earth.” Psalm 67 echoes a similar refrain calling for people from all ethne or nations to praise God (Ps 67:1-7).

**Concern for People**

God’s intention to bring all peoples to back to Himself is illustrated in the New Testament as Jesus deliberately detours to stop by Jacob’s well in Sychar, Samaria to talk with a socially outcast woman (John 4:4-26; John 4:38-42). Keener suggests that Jesus crossed three barriers: socioethnic prejudice between Jews and Samaritans, gender barriers, and moral barriers (Keener 2003, 585). Jesus increased the disciples’ understanding of the vision of God’s kingdom by explaining that true worship is a matter of heart and spirit, not of worshiping in a specific location. The Jews and Samaritans differed over where appropriate worship of God should occur (John 4:27-38). This encounter illustrates God’s continuing call and concern for all peoples to Himself. Additionally, Jesus’ concern for people is shown when Jesus tells His disciples to feed the crowd that gathered in Galilee, which numbered about five thousand (Luke 9:10-17).
When He tells His disciples to provide food for the crowd rather than sending them away, Jesus demonstrates His compassion for all man’s frailty as well as His desire that believers should minister to others. Bock suggests that Jesus taught and modeled His ability to provide for others and gave the disciples an opportunity to serve (Bock 2003, 265).

Jesus emphasized His concern for all people regardless of ethnicity, gender, or social position when He taught both the Gentile and the Jew, healed both male and female, taught in the synagogue, and dined with sinners and publicans (Mark 5:25-34, Luke 15:1-2, Luke 19:2-7). Although Jesus clearly stated His mission was to the house of Israel, the Syro-Phoenician woman’s request for her daughter’s healing was granted when Jesus saw her faith (Matt 10:5-6, Mark 7:26-30). The woman at the well received Living Water even though she was a Samaritan and not a Jew (Matt 10:4-42).

All Peoples

Fifty days after the resurrection at Pentecost, the Holy Spirit spoke to key communities of the Jewish Diaspora who gathered in Jerusalem that day (Acts 2:5-12). Bock states that this gathering suggests the universal scope of the gospel (Bock 2007, 103). Building on the Pentecost experience and through a vision, the Holy Spirit increased Peter’s understanding about what was ceremonially clean and unclean (Acts 10:9-18). This vision prepared Peter to meet Cornelius, and immediately messengers arrived, inviting Peter to a Gentile home (Acts 10:22-23). When Peter arrived at Cornelius’ home and began speaking, the Holy Spirit came upon these Gentiles just as He came upon the disciples at Pentecost (Acts 10:44-46). Bock says that in every nation, all God-fearing people have access to God (Bock 2007, 396). Peter began to understand the
gospel could not be limited only to Jews but must continue to spread to all peoples (Acts 10:34-35). The inclusiveness of the gospel is brought to completion in Revelation when John witnesses redeemed people “from every nation, tribe, people and language, standing before the throne and in front of the Lamb” (Rev 5:9, 7:9). In obedience to the Great Commission and in devotion to Christ, men and women willingly leave their home cultures and intentionally move into a cross-cultural environment to share the grace and love of Christ with a lost and dying world.

**Increases in Workers and Results**

In response to prayer God has blessed by increasing the number of missionaries responding to His call. In 2003, the United Methodist Church reported a steady increase of missionaries sent out during the 1990s reaching a total of 2,151 persons in 74 countries (United Methodist Church 2010, umc.pdf). The Presbyterian Church (PCUSA) registered an upswing in missionaries in 2009 after a decline of fifty years (Presbyterian Church USA 2010, pcusa.pdf). The IMB increased the number of missionaries from 3,863 in 1990 to 5,495 in 2008 (Mahanes 2010). These numbers reflect only three of the numerous sending agencies deploying missionaries globally. The World Evangelical Fellowship Missions Commission (WEFMC) conservatively estimates the international full-time, cross-cultural missionary force at 150,000 (Taylor 1997, 13). Since Taylor’s 1997 data, anecdotal information suggests that the total evangelical Christian missionary force from the United States and other countries exceeds 250,000. Even so, the task of global evangelization remains unfinished. Why?

With a quarter of a million missionaries deployed, how successful have they been in accomplishing their goals? Obviously, there is no single standard of evaluation
or criteria for success across mission agencies. Some agencies are predominately active in food distribution and caring for orphans, while others are focused almost exclusively on church planting. World Vision is a Christian relief, development, and advocacy organization dedicated to working with children, families, and communities to overcome poverty and injustice, and reported helping more than 100 million individuals in 2008 (World Vision International 2010, wvision.pdf; wv2009annualreport.pdf).

David Garrison, in Church Planting Movements, shares about exciting growth in new churches and rapidly increasing numbers of new believers in many countries around the world (Garrison 2004, 15-17). In one report, the number of churches grew from 235 to more than 4,000 during the 1990s (Garrison 2004, 16). Garrison cites other reports from North Africa where “65 new churches were planted in the last nine months” (Garrison 2004, 17). Reporting on a North Indian people, Garrison writes of a church planter beginning with 28 churches in 1989, and by 2000, the number of churches exploded to more than 4,500 and “an estimated 300,000 baptized believers” (Garrison 2004, 17). More recent unpublished reports confirm significant church growth in Asia where new churches increased from one to forty-two in two years (International Mission Board 2006, 2006 R74-CPMA2 Executive Summary.pdf). The IMB reported more than 500,000 baptisms in their 2008 Annual Statistical Report to the Southern Baptist Convention (International Mission Board 2010, imbfastfacts.pdf).

**The Unfinished Task**

In spite of this remarkable growth, the unfinished task of reaching the approximately 6,600 unreached people groups remains. In response to this overwhelming opportunity, Finishing the Task was formed as a multi-denominational
organization to mobilize individuals, churches, and mission-sending agencies to intentionally engage the unreached peoples of the world with church planting strategies (Finishing The Task 2010, ftt.pdf). The words Christ spoke to His first disciples still ring in the ears of twenty-first century believers with the same clarity and convicting effect heard more than two thousand years ago.

With this clarion call resounding in believers’ hearts, men and women, both married and single, rise to follow in obedience. Their experience is vastly different from individuals responding at the beginning of the modern missionary movement at the 1910 Edinburgh Conference when the Archbishop of Canterbury predicted a “new age of gospel triumph” and individuals departed the meeting intending to purchase a boat ticket and serve overseas (Stanley 2009, 2).

God has graced the modern Church with resources unimaginable one hundred years ago. Linguists, anthropologists, and ethnographers have researched most of the world’s 6,906 known languages and 11,583 people groups so that fewer missionaries are needed to translate the few remaining unwritten languages (Lewis 2009, 7). Transportation and communication enable missionaries to travel more quickly and easily than previous generations who sailed by boat and sent personal letters by post. While the resources have multiplied, language study, travel, communication, and even lifestyle are much less strenuous than for previous generations. Missionary attrition becomes more significant when the resources and time invested in language learning and acculturation are considered.

Depending on the complexity of a language, its similarity with the individual’s mother tongue, and the complexity of the new social culture, the complete language
acquisition and acculturation process to fluency can easily take between three and five years (Winter and Hawthorne 1999, 422-28, 429-37, 438-443). The US government’s Defense Language Institute’s basic intensive courses range between 26 to 64 weeks in duration with a teacher student ratio of two to six (Defense Language Institute, DLI.pdf). Depending on the difficulty of the language, most missionaries attend a language school initially for 12 to 24 months with language learning continuing for a lifetime.

Language and culture are inseparable. Understanding both is essential in presenting the gospel cross-culturally. Intercultural speakers and communicators are those “who can operate their linguistic competence and sociolinguistic awareness to manage across intercultural boundaries” (Byram 1995, 25). Byram states that four types of knowledge are necessary to obtain intercultural competence: attitudes/values, ability to learn, cultural knowledge/perspectives, and skills/knowing how to culturally interpret between cultures (Byram 1995, 25-27). Initial language and cultural acquisition can take up to three years.

With a multiplicity of mission agencies and churches sending missionaries overseas and differences in defining “long-term” service, it is difficult to decide how long the “average” full-time missionary serves overseas is in a term of service. The largest Protestant mission agency’s missionary profile indicates long-term personnel remain on the field for approximately ten years (Meador 2009, 2).

Missionary Attrition

The question arises, therefore, that with these resources and capabilities, why are dedicated and committed missionaries, called by the Holy Spirit to serve overseas, leaving the mission field after a short period of service? Despite the modern
conveniences of travel, Internet, and easy communication, the command of Jesus to make disciples remains unfulfilled. Even though life on the mission field is difficult and draining, Christian mission organizations and churches are sending out well-trained and equipped missionaries. In spite of their pre-field preparation and training, often those called by God to minister cross-culturally leave the mission field after a few short years (Taylor 1997, 49). When these missionaries leave the field, their witness and ministry is lost. Churches supporting them may also lose a significant aspect of their overseas involvement in missions.

There are multiple reasons that cause individuals to leave the mission field. Some are preventable, but some issues are not. The first attrition studies conducted by mission agencies for the decade 1953-1962 reported 1,409 “casualties” from thirty-six mission boards (Taylor 1997, 13). Over the course of the normal missionary term of four years, global attrition figures suggest that approximately 30,500 missionaries leave the field for preventable reasons. This is an alarming number of individuals lost from missionary service. Allan Stirling states, “Missionaries indicated that (86%) of the preventable causes of attrition were attributed to relational struggles” (Stirling 2002).

From 1994 to 1996, the WEFMC conducted the Reducing Missionary Attrition Project (ReMAP) designed to collect data from the fourteen most prominent mission-sending nations “to identify the core causes of undesirable long-term (career) missionary attrition” (Taylor 1997, xiv). Some causes of missionary attrition such as retirement, completion of term of service, and death cannot be prevented. Research indicates sustaining good relationships with other missionaries remains one of the greatest struggles missionaries face (Johnson and Penner 1981, 24-27; Gish 1983, 238-42).
1997 ReMAP study, eight factors were identified and grouped into three general categories: unpreventable and personal (49%), work-related including team, cultural, and other (26%), and marriage/family and society (25%) (Taylor 1997, 85-103).

In light of the fact that 51% of missionary attrition is due to work-related and marriage/family issues, what can be done to equip leaders to more effectively address these issues and retain more personnel? Kang suggests, “Inadequate pastoral care and supervision is responsible for nearly 80% of all attrition” (Taylor 1997, 251). Supervision of missionaries by other missionaries presents unique challenges. Although experienced missionaries are expected to lead those with less experience, not every experienced missionary is equipped or suited to supervise others. What type of training do average missionaries need to equip them to lead a team of nationals or fellow expatriates?

Missionary Leadership

Mission agencies and churches cannot afford to lose experienced missionaries due to poor or inadequate leadership or lack of pastoral care. With the above attrition rates, just at the time individuals learn their new language and culture, becoming effective witnesses to the unreached, they leave the field through attrition. What steps can be taken to retain effective missionaries for the long term?

When many missionaries serve on ministry teams with nationals and other expatriates, team leadership becomes a more important aspect of success. Team leaders must be more effective and transformational to inspire and motivate their teams to evangelize and disciple new believers. Effective teams working from common goals and objectives tend to be more productive in ministry. Zenger and Folkman suggest that
good teamwork is built on trusting relationships. Strong relationships are built on listening and trust (Zenger and Folkman 2002, 198-99).

Blanchard states that substantial organizational change occurs through discussion and collaboration (Blanchard 2007, 233). Blanchard continues, “They [teams] are hard-core units of production. However, they do provide a sense of worth, connection and meaning to people involved with them” (Blanchard 2007, 168). When evaluating the “productivity” of teams, Asian missionaries discovered that smaller teams were more effective and productive than larger ones. They suggested that the larger a team grows, the administrative tasks become more involved and consuming, thereby resulting in a lack of energy and time for the main task (Smith 2002).

Kouzes and Posner identified five practices of exceptional leadership: model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart (Kouzes and Posner 2002, 13). A good leader uses symbols, stories, and testimonies to motivate and encourage his team (Kouzes and Posner 2002, 88-89). These same leadership practices are present in the way Jesus led His disciples. He modeled a deep relationship with His Father through prayer, miracles, and speech (Mark 1:34-36, Matt 9:4-7, Acts 2:22-23, John 10:28-30, 36).

Jesus inspired His disciples to fulfill the Great Commission (Matt 28:19-20, Luke 24:46-49). The Sermon on the Mount is a clear example of Jesus challenging the existing Jewish practices of His day (Matt 5:17, 21-22, 27-28). The opposition from Jewish leaders crystallized because Jesus challenged their religious rights (Mark 14:1, Luke 19:47-48). He enabled others to act and encouraged their hearts by performing miracles and asking individuals to demonstrate their faith through action (Mark 3:5, Mark
10:51-52, Matt 9:18-26). The expressions of faith from those healed resulted in health and encouragement of their hearts. The Last Supper is the prime example of Jesus being a transformational leader as He modeled servant leadership by washing the disciples’ feet, and thus challenging their concept of leadership (John 13:2-7, 12-16). In leading the Twelve, Jesus asked questions and listened to their responses which shaped His leadership (Matt 16:14-16, Mark 8:28-30, Luke 9:19-21, Luke 10:17-20, Mark 6:6-13). Good leadership, based on listening and understanding, allows followers to express their needs, wants, and desires and uses the followers’ needs as motivation to accomplish organizational goals.

**Current Study**

With approximately 112,000 full-time missionaries from North America deployed in more than 211 countries, the impact of this study could significantly influence training of missionary leaders who work within a team environment (Welliver and Northcutt 2004, 11). The impact of effective leadership and communication practices on reaching unreached people groups is what drives the researcher to study the relationship of leadership styles and listening practices. Therefore, this study was designed to determine if a correlation exists between these two variables. Since these two variables are positively correlated, team leaders can be trained in more effective leadership styles. Instruction and coaching in transformational and listening practices can result in more fruitful ministry, increase missionary satisfaction, and possibly increase longevity in service for individuals on teams. Trained leaders may inspire their team members to greater effectiveness in sharing the gospel. Leaders who have more effective leadership and evangelism skills may challenge and model for others so they can become
more effective and use new evangelism methodologies. To further the purpose of equipping team leaders to be more effective, IMB leadership provided an accessible population for this study.

**Research Purpose**

The purpose of this correlational research was to determine if a potential relationship exists between a team leader’s leadership style as defined and measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and six listening dimensions as defined by the Listening Practices Feedback Report (LPFR) as perceived by the team leader and other respondents.

**Delimitations of the Study**

The current research was delimitated to IMB overseas field personnel serving in the role of team leader for more than six months with a team composed of at least four people. The participants in this research study also had Internet access.

Due to the complexity of addressing leadership and communication, this study was limited to researching leadership style as defined by Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio as measured by the MLQ. The listening practices of team leaders were also limited to those dimensions of listening as measured by the LPFR. These instruments are described more fully in chapter 3.

**Research Questions**

The following five questions were addressed in this study:

1. What, if any, is the relationship between *transformational* leadership style and listening practices?
2. What, if any, is the relationship between transactional leadership style and listening practices?

3. What, if any, is the relationship between passive/avoidant leadership style and listening practices?

4. Which leadership style produces the highest total listening practice score?

5. Which leadership style(s) correlate with the highest individual dimensions of listening practices?

**Terminology**

For the purposes of this research, the following terms are defined:

*Affinity group.* An affinity group consists of field personnel within the IMB for administrative purposes such as the Central Asian Peoples or Southeast Asian Peoples.

*Attention.* Giving full attention to the speaker without being occupied with other concerns; allowing others to finish speaking without interrupting; maintaining comfortable eye contact with the speaker; permitting proper closure or agreement before going to another topic; and holding calls and distractions to a minimum during meetings and conversations (Brandt Management Group 1999, 4).

*Cluster leader.* A cluster leader or cluster strategist supervises IMB team leaders.

*Empathy.* Repeating, paraphrasing, or summarizing comments to ensure understanding; placing oneself in another person’s position and understanding their concerns and feelings; encouraging others to share their views on subjects under discussion; thinking about the subject under discussion before making a response; and correctly anticipating where the conversation is going (Brandt Management Group 1999, 5).

*Great Commission Christian.* Great Commission Christians are evangelical
Christians or organizations that are actively engaging in or committed to the fulfillment of the Great Commission (Medical Missions Response, GCC Definition.pdf).

_Idealized influence_. This transformational leadership characteristic is found in leaders who are strong role models for their followers. Leaders scoring high in this characteristic are admired, respected, and trusted by their team members who desire to follow the leader’s example (Bass 1998, 5).

_Inspirational motivation_. This transformational leadership characteristic describes leaders who inspire, motivate, communicate high expectations, and share their vision with their followers (Avolio and Bass 1994, 3).

_Intellectual stimulation_. This transformational leadership characteristic is found in leaders who challenge their followers to innovate and create new ideas through asking questions about existing processes, procedures, values, expectations, and assumptions (Avolio and Bass 2002, 2-3).

_Individual consideration_. This transformational leadership characteristic describes the supportive environment provided by the leader in which the needs of followers are fulfilled (Avolio and Bass 2002, 3-4).

*International Mission Board*. The IMB is a missionary-sending agency of the Southern Baptist Convention, the largest evangelical denomination in the United States, claiming more than 40,000 churches with nearly sixteen million members (International Mission Board 2009, imbfeb2009.pdf). The IMB has personnel serving on most continents worldwide and organized into team structures. Among Protestant mission-sending agencies, the IMB has the most short-term, middle-term, and long-term personnel under appointment (Weber and Welliver 2007, 24, 26, 28).
**Leadership style.** For the purposes of this study, leadership styles are composed of three different styles as defined by Bass as transactional, transformational, and passive/avoidant leadership (Bass 1985, 13, 45, 215).

**Listening.** The International Listening Association (ILA) defines listening as, “The process of receiving, constructing meaning from, and responding to spoken and/or nonverbal messages” (Emmert 1996, 2).

**Listening practices.** Listening Practices Feedback Report (LPFR) identifies listening practices as six separate dimensions: attention, empathy, memory, open mind, respect, and response (Brandt Management Group 1999, 2).

**Memory.** Producing results consistent with agreed-upon instructions or guidelines; accurately recalling comments or positions at a later date; accurately relating messages to a third party; and taking notes when notes are appropriate (Brandt Management Group 1999, 6).

**Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).** The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5x) is an instrument developed to measure the degree of transformational, transactional, or non-leadership behaviors leaders display in their capacity as leaders (Avolio and Bass, 2004, 3).

**Open mind.** Appearing to listen with a mind free from personal bias; considering the content and logic without being critical of delivery, appearance, grammar, vocabulary, etc.; avoiding becoming emotional or defensive when encountering a difficult situation; maintaining an appropriate balance between listening and talking; and avoiding emotion-packed (trigger) words, phrases, or clichés (Brandt Management Group 1999, 8).
**Passive/avoidant leadership.** This represents the absence of leadership and implies a “hands-off, let-things-ride” approach to leadership (Northouse 2007, 186).

**Participant.** The individual whose listening practices are being measured (Brandt Management Group 1998, 2). For the purpose of this study, a participant refers to a team leader.

**Respect.** Keeping a confidence; sincerely listening beyond just going through the motions; taking time and having patience during conversations and meetings; and acknowledging others’ ideas and words regardless of business, social, or economic status (Brandt Management Group 1999, 10).

**Response.** Asking relevant questions to clarify points that are technical or misunderstood; following up with prompt actions; showing appropriate nonverbal responses such as nodding and facial expressions; preparing or becoming properly informed when such preparation is necessary; and smiling or otherwise acknowledging humorous remarks (Brandt Management Group 1999, 12).

**Team.** For the purposes of this study, a team consists of an IMB team leader and a minimum of four IMB and/or GCC team members serving on that team for six months or longer.

**Team leader.** An IMB missionary assigned the responsibility to lead a team and influence others to join in the missionary task.

**Team member.** A person assigned to or working with a specific team, led by a team leader, and other GCC partners who relate strategically to the team. These individuals are also called respondents for survey purposes.

**Transactional leadership.** A leadership style characterized by an exchange of
extrinsic rewards and conditions between leaders and followers based on desired previous or future task performance. “A leader and follower utilizing, as the basis for their relationship transactions, the exchange of gratifications in the marketplace or career . . . . They are bargainers who seek to maximize their position” (Bass 1985, 14).

**Transformational leadership.** A style of leadership usually characterized by a relational bond between leaders and followers in which leaders inspire followers to excel out of a shared sense of purpose, values, and goals to fulfill the organization’s mission. Burns states, “Such leadership occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (Burns 1978, 20). Lewis defines transformational leaders as people who “inspire others to excel, give others individual consideration, and stimulate people to think in new ways. “Transformational leaders transform both the people and organizations within which they work” (Lewis 1996, 6).

**Research Assumptions**

The research assumptions identified below were foundational to this study:

1. Listening is an essential component of communication and communication is a central aspect of effective leadership.

2. It is assumed that some of the natural processes of listening can be measured and examined using empirical research instruments and methodologies.

3. The participants are capable of accurately responding to the survey instruments in a manner that reflects their experience and understanding of the phenomena of listening and leadership styles.

**Procedural Overview**

A list of overseas team leaders, their cluster leader, and team members was obtained from
the IMB. Additionally, team leaders provided contact information for up to five Great Commission Christian partners (GCC) to participate in this survey. All team leaders were invited to participate in this survey and data was collected through a web-based survey, with input from their supervisor, GCCs, and their team. The survey combined the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the Listening Practices Feedback Report (LPFR) into a combined survey. Respondents completed the MLQ and LPFR survey measuring their perceptions of the team leader’s leadership style and listening practices.

The MLQ measures a team leader’s leadership style on a leadership continuum from transformational to passive/avoidant leadership style (Northouse 2007, 180). The LPFR measured the team leader’s self-perception of his or her listening practices. The team leader’s cluster leader and team members assessed their perception of the team leader’s leadership style and listening practices on six dimensions of listening, thereby providing a multi-rater 360-degree feedback process for the team leader.

At the conclusion of an eight-week data collection period, the raw data was compiled from the surveys and the scores for each instrument were calculated. These scores were analyzed statistically to determine if any relationship existed between leadership style and listening practices of team leaders.
CHAPTER 2
PRECEDENT LITERATURE REVIEW

This study explores what relationship exists between leadership styles and listening practices of IMB overseas team leaders. The purpose of this chapter is to provide the theological foundations and theoretical framework for this study. The chapter examines two variables, leadership style and listening practices. Each section begins with an analysis of the biblical and theological foundations of the variable, followed by a review and critique of the theoretical foundations and pertinent research of the issue as found in precedent literature. These components provide the rationale and implications for the current study which concludes each section.

Leadership Style

This section provides a biblical and theological analysis of leadership concepts using the shepherd motif in Scripture. This analysis is followed by a description and evaluation of precedent literature on the issue of leadership style. The section concludes with implications for this research study.

Biblical and Theological Analysis

Leadership is a theme in both the Old and New Testaments as shown in the words lead, leaders, or leadership occurring frequently (Exod 32:34; Num 27:17; Exod 16:22; Exod 18:25; 1 Chr 23:2; Num 33:1; John 7:12). Although God never specifically
calls Himself a “Leader” by the name, His shepherding of the children of Israel throughout the Old Testament provides clear examples of His leadership role and its impact upon them.

**Leadership Motifs**

There are several leadership motifs and roles found in the Scripture such as shepherd, judge, prophet, elder, presbyter, and deacon. Each of these motifs reflects a different need of His people and the church. This review focuses on shepherd leadership. This motif is a consistent theme in Scripture spanning both the Old and New Testaments and presenting leaders as those who shepherd the flock. Jesus, the Good Shepherd, passes this leadership style to the apostle John instructing him to “feed my sheep” (John 21:15-17). First Peter 5:2-4 instructs elders to shepherd “God’s flock” as church leaders (1 Pet 5:2-4).

**Shepherd Leadership**

The concept of shepherd leadership is found in ancient Near Eastern times as a metaphor for rulers and leaders as they led their people and in the Old Testament as God shepherds His people Israel (Laniak 2006, 79). This leadership model begins with God as the Divine Shepherd as He guides, protects, and provides for His people like a shepherd would care for his sheep. This scriptural motif is also seen in the shepherding leadership of Moses, David, and Jesus (Ps 77:20, 78:70-72, John 10:11). The components of presence, protection, and provision are foundational to shepherd leadership. The same leadership model found in the Old Testament continues through the New Testament with Jesus as the Good Shepherd and with Peter’s instructions to the
church elders to serve as shepherds to their flock (John 10:11; Heb 13:19-21; 1 Pet 5:2-4). In Hebrews 13:19-20, the pastoral images of shepherding stem from the words of Jesus, and the same imagery appears in 1 Peter as well (Attridge 1989, 406). Jesus, as the Good Shepherd to the flock, passed this leadership motif to Peter in John 21:15-19 instructing Peter to “feed my sheep.” Following the example of Christ, Peter passes this leadership model to the elders and presbyters in 1 Peter 5:2-4 (Jobes 2005, 304). Jobes suggests, “believers are to follow in the footsteps of the Lord, who is referred to as the ‘shepherd’ and ‘overseer’ in [1 Peter] 2:25” (Jobes 2005, 305). Given the parallels between 1 Peter and Hebrews, Attridge suggests an epistolary connection needs to be recognized (Attridge 1989, 405). Jesus is the example of the Good Shepherd to His flock, and He passes this same shepherd leadership motif on to Peter for the early church (John 21:15-19; Carson 1991, 678).

**God as Shepherd**

The portrayal of God as the shepherd of His people is a consistent leadership motif throughout Scripture and was especially prominent in the wilderness wanderings (Laniak 2006, 77). The example of a leader shepherd is well understood by Middle Eastern people where herding sheep was a common occupation. Abraham and his descendants were semi-nomadic pastoralists who traveled from Ur to Canaan, Canaan to Egypt, and then back to Canaan as the life of faith caused Israel to follow God, their Shepherd, in pursuit of the Promised Land (Gen 11:29-12:11; Brueggeman 2010, 122). Abraham and Lot grew very wealthy and owned many herds of sheep and goats as part of their pastoral lifestyle (Gen 13:1-2, 5; Arnold 2009, 140). Following their fathers, Isaac, Jacob, and Jacob’s twelve sons continue shepherding in Canaan (Gen 29:3-6, 46:31-34).
In Genesis 48:15, Israel pronounces a blessing on Joseph:

Then he blessed Joseph and said, “May the God before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac walked, the God who has been my shepherd all my life to this day, the Angel who has delivered me from all harm – may he bless these boys. May they be called by my name and the names of my fathers Abraham and Isaac, and my they increase greatly upon the earth.”

reminding them, through the shepherd metaphor, of God’s protection, nourishment, and leading as “God who has been my shepherd all my life to this day” (Brueggeman 1982, 362).

**God’s Presence**

As a shepherd watches over his sheep, so God watches over Israel (Psalm 121:3-5). Yahweh guards His people day and night (Allen 1983, 268). The dangers were so great and overwhelming that God is with His people during their daily tasks and rest (Allen 1983, 268). Beginning with the Hebrews’ exodus from Egypt and throughout their wilderness journey to Mount Horeb, God’s guidance was clearly evident to His people as a pillar of smoke by day and a pillar of fire by night (Exod 13:21-22; Stuart 2006, 327). God’s guidance continued in this manner until the consecration of the Tabernacle. This evidence of God’s leadership and guidance guided the Hebrews throughout the wilderness wanderings for forty years.

When the Hebrews camped at Mount Horeb, Moses received the Ten Commandments from God. While Moses was with God, the people reverted to their Egyptian pagan roots and created an idol to worship (Exod 20:1-17, 32:1-6). Exodus 32 begins with the people imploring Aaron to “Come, make us gods who will go before us” (Exod 32:1; Stuart 2006, 659). God’s judgment was to withdraw His presence from the people (Exod 33:3). This passage indicates the importance Israel placed on God’s
presence with them when His judgment was to withdraw His presence from them (Exod 33:3-4; Childs 1974, 588).

When Israel heard of God’s rebuke and intention not to accompany His people in the desert, their first reaction was mourning. They removed all ornamental jewelry as a demonstration of their repentant and changed hearts (Exod 33:4-6; Childs 1974, 588; Stuart 2006, 691). Childs states, “This was not a temporary display but a continuous one from the time of Mount Horeb onward” (Childs 1974, 89).

Moses experienced God’s presence in a unique way as he talked with God in the tent of meeting as one friend talks to another (Exod 33:11). Stuart contends that Moses would experience the same conversational relationship with God in the “tent of meeting” as he did on Mount Horeb (Stuart 2006, 698). Meeting with God at the tent of meeting reflects a deep and ongoing relationship and communication with God. The Hebrews experienced God’s presence during their wanderings in the desert and into the Promised Land. God’s presence often meant His protection (Josh 24:17; Ezra 8:31; Ps 61:7-8).

**God’s Protection**

Shepherds in the Middle East often provided protection for their flock by placing the sheep in a pen where the sheep were gathered together and counted (Ridderbos 1997, 354). These pens took various forms, from brush gathered in the field to form a U-shaped enclosure to a more permanent sheep pen. They were a place of security for the sheep (Borchert 1996, 331). Shepherds provided protection by sleeping in the gate of the pen. Wolves, lions, bears, and leopards were the natural enemies of the flock (Amos 3:12; Isa 11:6; Jere 5:5; 50:17; John 10:12). Additionally, thieves and
robbers menaced the shepherds and their sheep.

Moses expressed a protective instinct when he intervened between two Hebrews in Egypt and at Jethro’s well in Midian when he drove off the shepherds preventing Jethro’s daughters from watering their flock (Exod 2:11-20). Moses was drawn to his people, the Hebrews, as a liberator and redeemer in killing the Egyptian (Gispen 1982, 43). At a well in Midian, Moses again defends the oppressed as he intervenes to drive off shepherds (Gispen 1982, 46). A symbol of this instinct – the protective presence of the shepherds – is the shepherd’s staff which was used to identify a person and was the modern day equivalent of a pistol (Stuart 2006, 139). In many cases, staffs were identified with their owner (Gen 38:18). Shepherds used their staffs for many reasons but a primary one was protection. It was the shepherd’s responsibility to protect his sheep from harm (Ps 23:3). During the burning bush encounter with God, the staff Moses carried as a shepherd was transformed into the rod of God (Exod 4:1-3; 17). In Deuteronomy 23:14, God is both present in the camp for protection and promises to deliver Israel’s enemies to them.

In Exodus 14, the army of Egypt is rapidly approaching the Hebrews, whose backs are against the Red Sea (Exod 14:5-9). Moses cries out to the Lord for protection and deliverance and proclaims to the people a strong confidence and faith in the power of God (Exod 14:14). God’s protective action in destroying the approaching army instills confidence and faith in Moses as a leader and a reverence for God (Howell 2003, 29).

Another young shepherd, David experienced God’s protection as he tended his flock. God protected the shepherd while the shepherd protected his flock against the lion and bear (1 Sam 17:34-36). The young shepherd, David, outraged by the blasphemies
against the living God, faced the army of the Philistines in general and, specifically, Goliath, trusting God to protect him (1 Sam 17:4; Bergen 1996, 193). Howell, referring to 1 Samuel 17, states that David appealed to his “experiences as a shepherd, expressing confidence in the Lord’s protection” before Saul and the mighty Philistine army (Howell 2003, 74).

**God’s Provision**

Just as shepherds must provide protection, they are responsible for providing food and water for their flocks. A constant concern for shepherds in difficult environments was the provision of food and water as both are essential for healthy sheep. A variety of grasses and plants are necessary to provide a balanced diet for sheep, and often shepherds are required to move their flock several times during the day. Shepherds followed a routine in caring for their sheep by grazing them around dawn, bringing the sheep to pools of water mid-morning, and resting the animals during the heat of the day followed by more water and back to pasture for an evening meal (Keener 1999, 811-12).

**God as Shepherd Leader to Moses**

Moses encounters the presence of God in the burning bush experience and becomes familiar with the voice and presence of the Lord when God introduces Himself as the God of Moses’ ancestors (Exod 3:2-6; Coats 1999, 36-37). God prepares and commissions Moses for a divine task to return to Egypt and lead the Hebrews out of their bondage. Moses, who had murdered an Egyptian, returns to Egypt to confront Pharaoh in order to free the Hebrews from slavery. (Exod 3-4; Coats 1999, 36-37). Moses witnesses the plagues designed by God to break Pharaoh’s grasp on His people and humble
Pharaoh. Howell states, “What stands out in the narrative is the relentless obedience of Moses in the face of Pharaoh’s broken promises of conditional release” (Howell 2003, 29). God’s presence with Moses encourages and strengthens him to convey God’s demands to “let my people go.”

A second aspect of God’s shepherd leadership of Moses is seen in Moses’ dependence on intercession with God (Exod 8:12-13, 28-31; 9:28-33; 10:17-19; 33). God’s presence and His guidance are often indistinguishable from one another, such as the pillar of fire and cloud present with the Hebrews in their exodus and desert wanderings (Exod 40:36-38). Childs writes that the parallel of God’s glory descending on the Tabernacle and on Mount Horeb in Exodus 24:17 reveal the theological intention that the presence of God, which led the Hebrews during the wilderness wanderings, is now among them in the Tabernacle (Childs 1974, 638).

**Moses as Shepherd Leader of the Hebrews**

Moses experiences God’s guidance in more concrete terms than almost any other individual in Scripture. From his initial encounter with the burning bush to the plagues of Egypt, Moses receives God’s guidance through intercession and prayer (Exod 3:4-11; 14:10-16). Coats states that the Hebrews clearly cry to their leader, Moses, and Moses “mediates the cry to God” (Coats 1999, 113). The nightly encounter with God in the “tent of meeting” is where God trained and mentored Moses in understanding Him and how Moses was to lead the Hebrews (Exod 33: 7-11; 39:31-33; 40:33-35). Moses’ daily fellowship with God and his time atop Mount Horeb serve as the foundation of all that Moses does as a leader.

As Moses leads the flock of God through the wilderness with the need for
water or food, God directs Moses to the right place to provide for the people’s need with manna, quail, and water (Exod 16-17; Num 30:2-11). Before the Jordan River, God instructs Moses to send out spies into the Promised Land to gather intelligence for coming battles (Deut 1:19-22; Num 14). When Moses deals with dissension over the contradicting reports, God provides wisdom so he can make right decisions and continue moving forward toward the Promised Land (Exod 32:7-8, 31-34; Deut 31:14-18).

At the end of his life, Moses prays for the leader who will replace him. He recognizes that the next leader will need to have God’s Spirit with him to conquer the Promised Land (Deut 31:1-8). Moses commissions Joshua to lead Israel with the reminder that Yahweh will Himself go before the people (von Rad, 1966, 188). Laniak, referring to Joshua 1:5, states “The promise to the new leader was as firm as the one made to Moses: ‘No one will be able to stand up against you all the days of your life. As I was with Moses, so I will be with you’” (Laniak 2006, 91-92). God promised to be with Joshua and never to leave or forsake him (Josh 1:5). Appointed by God, human leadership is dependent on God’s Spirit for effectiveness. The removal of a specific individual, such as Moses, does not end of the leadership of God for His people. As God’s people enjoy and depend upon His presence in their lives, they also experience God’s protection. Another individual who experienced God as Shepherd was David who rose from a shepherd boy to become king of Israel.

**God as Shepherd Leader to David**

During the reign of King Saul, God told the prophet Samuel to anoint a new king because of Saul’s disobedience to Him (1 Sam 15:1-11, 26). The Lord was “grieved” due to Saul’s failure to obey because nothing short of complete obedience
pleases God (Bergen 1996, 170). Samuel, obedient to God’s instruction, went to Bethlehem to the house of Jesse and sought out the next king. David, the youngest son of Jesse, was a shepherd while God prepared him to be a king (Stubbs 2009, 213). As a shepherd, David learned foundational lessons about being with sheep, protecting and providing for them. These experiences shape his leadership over the nation of Israel (Broyles 1999, 123).

Psalm 78:70-71 speaks of God moving David from sheep pens to shepherding “his people Jacob, of Israel his inheritance. And David shepherded them with integrity of heart; with skillful hands he led them” (Ps 78:71-72). Psalm 78 implies that David embodies three outstanding characteristics: a servant of God, the shepherd of Israel, and the leadership ideal identified in Wisdom literature (Hossfeld 2005, 292). This psalm includes election of David in the basic salvific history of God, which will ultimately lead to Christ (Kraus 1989, 130).

The presence of God is evident in the early life of David when he encounters the dangers of tending sheep in the mountains of Judea. In those Judean hills, he defends his flock against a bear and a lion (1 Sam 17:34-36). David’s trust in God is evident when he leaves the battle lines of Israel and walks alone with his God to face and defeat the giant, Goliath (Noll 1997, 53). God’s presence continues with David, who is called a man after God’s own heart, when he encounters Saul who hunts David like a criminal and yet, David responds with grace and restraint (1 Sam 24:1-6; 26:5-16).

As a leader of men in battle, David witnesses God’s presence when he defeats the enemies of Judah and experiences success in battle (1 Chr 11:10-14, 17-19; 1 Sam 8). Saul’s son, Jonathan, recognized David as a leader and was deeply impressed with
David’s trust in the Lord when he kills the Philistine, Goliath (Tsumura 2007, 471). The words of David express his continual trust and faith in God illustrating an abiding sense of God’s presence whether David was experiencing trouble or success, difficulty or joy (Pss 3; 5; 18: 20-30, 46-49; 23; 34:4,18; 52:8-9, 55:22-2; 57:9; 59:16-17; 63). Behind David’s faith and confidence in God, there still beats the heart of fallen man. Following David’s adultery with Bathsheba and murder of her husband, Uriah, Psalm 51 records the prayer of a penitent man desperately desiring God’s forgiveness but also fearing God will remove His presence from him (Ps 51). The psalmist desires liberation from sin and a return to celebrate in God’s presence (Hossfeld 2005, 20).

David also experiences God’s presence during the lonely Judean nights as a shepherd boy and sorrow as a king (1 Sam 16:11, 2 Sam 13:25-38). At the news of Amnon’s death, David’s first reaction is to tear his robes and lay down on the ground as a classic expression of grief, sorrow, and despair (Bergen 1996, 385). The presence and protection of God are mysteriously linked as He abides with David and His people.

In the Old Testament God shepherds His sheep with His presence, protection, and provision. Guiding them through Moses and over a period of forty years, He brings the Hebrews from slavery in Egypt into the Promised Land. David is an Old Testament example of a shepherd leader as he unites Israel into a whole nation and protects the new nation against its enemies (Ezek 37:23-25). The Scriptures foretell of another shepherd king coming after David who would shepherd God’s people as the Good Shepherd (Ps 78:71-72; Ezek 34:23-24; John 10:11). David is the precursor of the ultimate shepherd leader and Isaiah 53 gives a glimpse of a Good Shepherd who is always present, always providing, and continually protecting His sheep. Ultimately, like a lamb brought to the
temple, He will sacrifice His life for His flock only to rise again as the resurrected Lord (Isa 53; Rev 7:17).

**Jesus, The Good Shepherd**

Jesus is the culmination of perfect shepherding. He is the one and only Good Shepherd (John 10:1-21, Matt 9:36; 26:31; Mark 6:34; 14:27; Heb 13:20; 1 Pet 2:25). Alluding directly to Numbers 27:17, with a shepherd’s heart, Jesus looks out on the crowds and has “compassion for them, because they were like sheep without a shepherd (Mark 6:34, Matt 9:36; Stubbs 2009, 213). Keener and other commentators suggest the backdrop for the Good Shepherd discourse is found in the irresponsibility of the Pharisees after they expelled the just-healed blind man from the synagogue in John 9 (Keener 2003, 797; Köstenberger 2004, 297). Ezekiel 34 is considered a source of inspiration for this passage (Ridderbos 1997, 353). Shepherds battle thieves, robbers, and wild animals to protect the sheep and keep them safe, just as Jesus protects the blind man against the Pharisees in chapter 9 (Keener 2003, 797).

**Shepherd’s Relationship**

Jesus builds on this commonly understood metaphor in Jewish life: God is the Shepherd of Israel, and His people are the flock. The usual practice was to combine several herds of sheep within a pen so to lead the sheep out of the pen, the shepherd called them by name (Carson 1991, 381). In His teaching, Jesus contrasts a true shepherd with robbers and thieves. Drawing on this contrast, Jesus recognizes the shepherd as the caretaker of the sheep, whereas the robber intends violence and the thief is described as someone who enters the sheepfold for wicked purposes (Luke 10:30, 36). Shepherds and
sheep have an intimate relationship. The shepherd knows each individual sheep by personal details including its name. The sheep know the shepherd’s voice, and they take comfort in the shepherd’s presence (John 10:4; Carson 1991, 381). The relationship between the shepherd and sheep is a trusting and intimate one based on experience and training (Borchert 1996, 331). Obedient sheep follow their shepherd because they know their master’s voice and are neither distracted nor deceived by the voice of a stranger (John 10:5). People belonging to God hear Jesus because they recognize His voice and know Him as shepherd (Keener 2003, 807). Jesus uses the metaphor of leading His people in the same way a shepherd leads his flock.

**Shepherd’s Protection**

Speaking more plainly about the sheep and shepherd, Jesus states “I am the gate for the sheep” (John 10:7). The gate Jesus refers to may reflect messianic references in Psalm 118:20, a gate for the righteous to enter and the door to the sheepfold, (Brunson 2003, 321). Through the use of this passage and John 14:6, Brunson asserts that Jesus establishes He is the mediator through whom access is granted into the presence of Yahweh and communion with Him (Brunson 2003, 399).

Contrasting His call to the sheep with “all those that came before” reflects upon the character of Pharisees and the “shepherds of Israel” who did not protect, provide for, or have a presence with the sheep (Ezek 34). The religious leaders serve themselves at the expense of the sheep resulting in a scattered flock (Ezek 34).

The Good Shepherd is the true gate for the sheep. “The symbol of the shepherd is more comprehensive than that of a door, since it includes . . . bringing people to God and caring for them” (Beasley-Murray 1987, 169). The provision for sheep who enter
through the true gate is a pasture (Ps 23:2-3). Salvation is assured for all sheep who enter through Him (John 10:9). The Good Shepherd calls His flock and knows them intimately (John 10:14-15). Deuteronomy 28:6 states, “You will be blessed when you come in and blessed when you go out.” Köstenberger suggests the phrase “will go in and out” echoes covenant terminology used for the blessings one receives from obedience to the Shepherd’s voice (Köstenberger 2004, 304).

**Shepherd’s heart**

Identifying Himself as the Good Shepherd, Jesus continues contrasting the intent of robbers and thieves to destroy the flock with His protection of the flock to the point of Him laying down His life for His sheep. Although Moses is portrayed as the “shepherd of his flock,” and David risked his life for a flock, Jesus states His absolute intention to lay down His life for the sheep (1 Sam 17:34-37; Ps 77:20; John 10:11). Laniak suggests the image of the shepherd deliberately dying for the flock forces the metaphor beyond reason (Laniak 2006, 216). Borchert argues that this passage infers a self-sacrificing shepherd and, from a Gospel perspective, carries a substitutionary meaning as the shepherd gives himself for the sheep (Borchert 1996, 334).

Shepherds are indispensable in the barren hills of Israel where sheep could wander off and get lost (Beasley-Murray 1987, 168). A hired hand who is employed by the shepherd to watch the sheep does not have the same level of commitment as the shepherd himself. Hired hands are not required to make payment for sheep attacked by animals and, therefore, are not motivated to defend the flock with the same level of commitment as the shepherd who owns the sheep (Köstenberger 2004, 305). Compared to the shepherd, the hired hand abandons and leaves the sheep defenseless in times of
trouble or threat (John 10:12-13). Putting self-interest and his own safety first, the hired man escapes and leaves the sheep vulnerable to the wolves.

As emphasized in John 10:11, 15, 17, and verse 18, the Good Shepherd intends to lay down His life for His flock. Jesus emphasizes His relationship with both His sheep and His Father through His intentional decision to sacrifice His life for the sheep (Laniak 2006, 216). “Jesus’ relationship with His followers is portrayed as an intimate, trusting relationship in which Jesus, the good shepherd, cares deeply for those in His charge” (Köstenberger 2004, 306). Faithful to the end, Jesus sacrifices His life in obedience to the Father’s command to care for the flock and proves His place as the Good Shepherd by giving Himself willingly for the protection of the sheep. Although the relationship between the Good Shepherd and the sheep is based on interpersonal knowledge, it is modeled on the relationship between Jesus and the Father (John 10:15). The Good Shepherd’s relationship with the Father is the rationale for sacrificing Himself for the sheep (Borchert 1996, 335).

The Old Testament promise that all nations will be blessed through Abraham is seen in Jesus’ having other sheep from another fold. The Gentiles follow the same Shepherd as the flock of Israel, a Shepherd who speaks with a voice understood by both Jews and Gentiles. “A common responsiveness to the same shepherd holds the diverse flocks together” (Laniak 2006, 217). The single shepherd leading one flock speaks to God’s presence and protection for all His sheep is rooted in Old Testament prophetic writings (Köstenberger 2004, 307). Jesus’ sacrifice is for the sheep from both folds and embraces other sheep so “great a multitude that no one could count, from every nation, tribe, people and language, standing before the throne and in front of the Lamb (Rev 7:9).
Leaders Listen to Others

As a shepherd leader, it is important to listen to the people one leads just as a first century shepherd would listen to his flock to determine its circumstances. Biblical leaders listened to God as He communicated with them and also as they listened to the people they served. This section will continue with the earlier motif by exploring examples of listening from the lives of Moses, David, and Jesus who served the people they led as shepherd leaders. The practice of listening to followers continued in the early church in the book of Acts and beyond.

Moses

Instances of Moses listening to the children of Israel are recorded throughout the Exodus as the Hebrews grumbled and complained for forty years. With the Egyptian army behind them and the Red Sea before them, the Israelites cried out to their leader, Moses (Ryken 2005, 379). He heard their cry and distress as Pharaoh’s army approached. As their leader, he recognized the dilemma of the approaching army and responded in faith (Ryken 2005, 387). Coats states the people cried out to Moses and Moses relayed their cry to God (Coats 1999, 113).

Similar experiences occur at Marah and Meribah as the people grumbled concerning the lack of water and Moses heard and responded to the need of the hour (Exod 15:23-25; Exod 17:2-7). The children of Israel framed their complaint as a crisis and implied Moses should resolve this problem (Coats 1999, 124). It was appropriate to address the lack of potable water to Moses, their leader, He, in turn, relayed this urgent cry to his leader, God (Ryken 2005, 416). In both instances, Moses listened to the people’s grumbling and responded to meet their need.
Leaders often enlist the help of advisors and consultants to provide perspective and guidance for the future. After observing Moses in a leadership role, Jethro, Moses’ father-in-law, recommended a new organizational structure for the tribes, so responsibility and authority would be equitably distributed (Exod 18:13-26). Jethro recognized Moses’ fatigue and the unmet needs of the people (Exod 18:18; Durham 1987, 250.) By listening and implementing Jethro’s counsel, Moses enhanced his leadership and delegated leadership to others who were equipped for service (Durham 1987, 252). Effective leaders listen to those they lead and their own leaders.

**David**

Timely and thoughtful advice from others is often sought and heard by a leader. One example of David accepting advice is found in the account of David, Nabal, and Abigail (1 Sam 25). The story traces a negative exchange between David’s men and Nabal, resulting in Nabal insulting David and the protection his men provided to Nabal’s workers (Bergen 1996, 247). Upon hearing of Nabal’s insulting message, David responded with a vow to avenge the wrong (1 Sam 25:13). Nabal’s curt response was relayed to Abigail, who intervened and prepared food as gifts for David and his men (1 Sam 25:18-19). David listened to her intervention and apology and consequently changed his mind about retaliation. Through the conversation with Abigail, David avoided bloodguilt by listening before acting on instinct (1 Sam 25:32-35; Gordon 1986, 185). Leaders are influenced in decision making when they listen to others, but the ultimate responsibility rests with the leader.

Listening with discernment is an important characteristic of a leader. While David and his men were away fighting their enemies, the Amalekites made a
unanticipated raid on Negev and Ziglag, capturing the women and children of David and his men (1 Sam 30:1-2). Upon returning to Ziglag with 600 men, David left 200 exhausted men at the Besor Ravine and continued chasing the Amalekites. David, and the 400 remaining men, caught and defeated the Amalekites. They were reunited with their families and regained all plunder taken by the Amalekites (1 Sam 30:9;16-21).

After the return of their wives and children, those who fought the Amalekites desired a larger share of the plunder than those who did not fight. As a wise leader, David listened to the complaining faction and made his decision to share the plunder with all his men equally as God blessed them all (Bergen 1996, 279). Theologically, the plunder gained was a gift from the Lord and not seen as payment for services. The greater blessings were personal protection and the defeat of the Amalekites, the Lord’s enemies (Bergin 1996, 279). As a leader, David listened to the complaints of his men. He heard their desires; however, his decisions were made on the basis of principles, not on who gave the input.

Kings are not accustomed to listening to others, especially when the information is unpleasant. Second Samuel 12:1-7 records the confrontation between Nathan the prophet and King David concerning his adultery with Bathsheba and murder of Uriah. When Nathan reminded David of his anointing as king by God, David listened to the rebuke and responded in humility, repentance, and remorse (Gordon 1986, 257). Godly leaders respond with contriteness, humility, and ultimately gratitude when confronted with the truth.

**Jesus**

As a leader and teacher, Jesus listened to those around Him, as is seen in the
use of parables which built upon the everyday existence and practices of housewives, farmers, and common people. The Sermon on the Mount illustrates the principle of listening when Jesus spoke of murder, adultery, divorce, making of vows, revenge, or loving one’s enemies (Matt 5:21, 27, 31, 33, 38, 43). He prefaced His remarks with “You have heard that it was said to the people long ago” (Matt 5:21). Jesus contrasted the prevalent teaching of that day with the Law and sought to instill a higher moral vision and challenged moral ideals (Allison 2004, 76). He knew from listening to the discussions with others the common interpretations of the Torah (Luke 2:46-47; Bock 1994, 266-67).

Alone with the disciples, Jesus asked the simple question ‘Who do the crowds say that I am?’ to measure the disciples’ understanding concerning His identity (Luke 9:18-20). This question assumed the disciples had been listening to the people and knew their opinion so Jesus was listening to the crowds indirectly through the voice of the disciples. Jesus asked what the crowds thought of Him immediately after the feeding of the five thousand. Jesus differentiated between those who followed Him for food and those who believed (Bock 1994 840). Through listening to what others thought, Jesus evaluated the faith of the disciples.

**Acts**

Much of the preaching in Acts arises out of leaders listening to people and responding to a question or situation. At Pentecost, Peter, listening to the cry from those gathered at the Temple to explain the phenomena they just heard, responded with a message of repentance and salvation (Acts 2:5-14). As a result of Pentecost, the people gathered asked the all-important question of what does this mean, while others listening
discounted the message in their own language as coming from the inebriated (Fitzmyer 1997, 243-44).

After persecution from Jewish leaders and the deception of Ananias and Sapphira, internal discord arose from within the community of believers (Acts 4:1-21; 5:1-10; 6:1-7). To resolve this disruption of fellowship, the apostles gathered the believers. The selection of the first deacons illustrates the principle of church leaders listening to their congregations in choosing the first seven deacons (Acts 6:1-6). The apostles listened to the complaints of the widows, gathered to discuss the problem, defined their priorities, and empowered the brothers to select “men from among you who are known to be full of the Spirit and wisdom” (Acts 6:3). Peterson suggests the leadership of the apostles was probably challenged (Peterson 2009, 229). Rather than making an uninformed decision, wisely the apostles listened and considered the needs of the congregation, and enabled the people to choose their own leaders and ministers (Peterson 2009, 229).

In both of these examples the apostles listened before they acted. They heard the cry of the crowd at Pentecost and discerned the need of the widows. The simple act of listening informed their decision making process. Biblical leaders listened primarily to God but also to His people. The Old Testament pattern was based on God’s prophet declaring God’s message to Israel, telling them of blessings for obedience or of impending doom and judgment for disobedience. Jesus turned the tables on people by asking questions and genuinely listening to their response. Many times Jesus led through the questions He asked of others rather than listening to the public to form His message. The apostles in Acts 6 illustrate listening to the people prior to making decisions. In the
modern church, a wise pastor will listen to others as he leads the congregation as an undershepherd of Christ.

**Summary**

A consistent leadership motif found throughout Scripture is God’s role as the shepherd of His people. Through the exodus from Egypt and wilderness wanderings, God demonstrates effective leadership. Through the pillar of fire and cloud, God’s presence and guidance is evident to the people of Israel. God protects His people from the oncoming Egyptian army as they prepare to cross the Red Sea (Exod 14:23-25).

When provisions are needed, God works through Moses to shepherd His flock by providing water, manna, and quail to feed the Hebrews (Exod 16).

This same theme is evident throughout King David’s life as he learns leadership principles from God, first while working as a shepherd boy and then as king (1 Sam 16:11-13). David’s training as a shepherd provides an understanding of what is required to care for God’s flock. Shepherds are responsible for providing for and protecting their flock regardless of the weather or prey threatening harm to the sheep.

Throughout Jesus’ ministry, He illustrates the character of a shepherding God as He cares, guides, and protects His flock, made up of both Jews and Gentiles. His ultimate expression of shepherding is to give His life for His sheep. Early in Jesus’ ministry, John the Baptist announces Jesus is the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world (John 1:29; Carson 1991, 148-49). Matthew 28:20 captures Jesus assuring His disciples of His continued presence with them as a faithful expression of a caring shepherd.

The leader who demonstrates concern as he guides, protects, and nourishes his
followers characterizes God’s leadership style as a shepherd. Shepherd leaders are those who are more concerned about their team members than themselves, who assist others to grow in their careers, and who provide opportunities for advancement beyond themselves. Pastors should lead their churches as shepherds of God serving God’s flock (1 Pet 5:2-4). They should embody the godly characteristics of an effective shepherd including presence with their followers, provision for their followers, and protection of their followers (1 Tim 2:3-4).

Shepherd leadership is a biblical model based on accounts of leaders in the Old and New Testaments, and demonstrated first by God, then by Moses, David, Jesus, and early church leadership. This biblical model is similar to leadership models found even in the current secular current literature. Leadership is a universal phenomenon and leadership occurs in all peoples (Bass 2008, 3).

**Theoretical Foundations of Leadership**

As one examines leadership, it should be done on the basis of a common definition and understanding of terms. There are many definitions of leadership. Leadership is about influence, and influence demands effective communication. Effective communication is necessary for effective leadership because leadership is “a reciprocal process between those who aspire to lead and those who choose to follow” (Kouzes and Posner 1995, 23). In later research, Kouzes and Posner elaborate with five leadership practices most common to successful leaders: challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart. (Kouzes and Posner 2002, 13).

Based on the a foundation of Kouzes and Posner’s leadership practices, it can
be argued that leaders are willing to take risks and challenge existing processes, red tape, and policies (Kouzes and Posner 2002, 17). Expressing a mutually shared vision, leaders communicate clearly and positively to meet the needs of subordinates. An inspiring vision reflects the undertones and themes heard through sharing and listening with coworkers and subordinates. Successful leaders understand that success is never attributable to the leader alone, but is a result of enabling and empowering others to act. This enabling action entails both speaking and listening to enlist support of others for projects to succeed. Leaders understand that by listening and respecting the opinions of others, they model good communication and leadership. Zenger and Folkman state that competency in leaders is assumed but respect for leaders must be earned (Zenger and Folkman 2002, 93).

Meeting the emotional needs of co-workers and subordinates is the fifth common leadership practice of effective leaders. Encouraging others to continue in a difficult task or listening sympathetically to the concerns of others builds leadership credibility. Expressions of encouragement such as these lend credibility and gain followship from co-workers. Listening and giving communication feedback provide encouragement in most cases (Zenger and Folkman 2002, 93).

Hersey defined leadership as “any attempt to influence the behavior of another individual or group” (Hersey 1984, 16). Bass suggests that attempted leadership is “an effort to influence others” (Bass 2008, 19). Leadership is successful when the influence results in actual change. Assumed in these leadership definitions is the concept that leaders exert influence within a relationship with those they lead. “Leadership is a relationship, founded on trust and confidence. Without trust and confidence, people do
not take risks. Without risks, there is no change. Without changing, organizations and movements die” (Kouzes and Posner 1995, 12). Supporting Kouzes and Posner’s five successful leadership practices, Weick states that “leaders have to listen to see if the message is understood” and Albright indicates that “leadership is an inherently interpersonal phenomenon: an individual cannot be a leader in isolation” (Weick 1978, 37-61; Albright 1995, 1296-77).

Attempting to identify a relationship between organizational leadership and success, Heskett and Schlesinger discovered information they did not expect (Heskett and Schlesinger 1995, 111-19). They noted that leaders of the best-performing profit and service companies defined their jobs in terms of identifying and constantly communicating commonly held values, shaping [these] values to enhance performance. “These leaders were ensuring the capability of people around them, living the commonly held values, listening a great deal of time, and literally speaking a different language than their traditional [non-performing] counterparts” (Heskett and Schlesinger 1995, 112).

**Leadership Characteristics**

In 1945, a three-year study was conducted at Ohio State University to research leadership characteristics. The study’s emphases were to catalogue leader traits and predict the impact of those traits on productivity. The study isolated two factors that described leaders: initiating structure and consideration (Eisenberg and Goodall, 1993). Leaders scoring high in initiating structure were active in planning, communicating, scheduling, and organizing. Leaders who scored high on the consideration scale showed a high level of concern for subordinate’s feelings, promoted mutual trust, and encouraged two-way communication. The study’s major finding was the fact that traditionally
defined management skills such as initiating structure, were equally as important as the skills promoting productivity through interpersonal skills. As a result of the Ohio State studies led by Eisenberg and Goodall, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was developed to discriminate between two general leadership behaviors: initiating structure and consideration (Bass 2008, 539).

The University of Michigan conducted similar studies on types of leadership behavior exploring the impact of leader behavior on small group performance (Katz and Kahn 1951; Cartwright and Zander 1960; Likert 1961, 1967). These studies identified employee orientation and production orientation as two types of leader behavior. Employee orientation stressed strong human relations skills with concern shown for personal needs, individuality, and saw employees as human beings (Bowers and Seashore 1966). Production orientation emphasized a more technical and production centered approach, which saw employees as the means to accomplish the job (Bowers and Seashore 1966). Later studies conducted in the mid-1990’s at the University of Michigan revealed similar findings to those at Ohio State University (Bowers and Seashore 1966). The influence of this research is seen as leaders in the twenty-first century are categorized as people-oriented or task-oriented. A change in leadership research began in the early 1980s with a renewed emphasis on the role of followers and the publication of James MacGregor Burns Leadership.

**Full Range of Leadership Model**

Bass developed a Full Range of Leadership Model (FRLM), which blended transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership styles into a coherent model. Using the FRLM, Bass and Avolio combine the three leadership styles into a
behavioral continuum suggesting leaders do not maintain a single style but use each of the styles when appropriate (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Leadership continuum from passive/avoidant to transformational leadership

Northouse also understands the use of leadership styles as a continuum, since they are not mutually exclusive (Northouse 2007, 180). Northouse suggests that leaders move on this continuum as leadership situations change and the transformational leader shifts into a more transactional mode to ensure that specific tasks or responsibilities are done (Northouse 2007, 180-81)

The FLRM incorporates each of the seven factors of transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership styles grouped into one of the three leadership styles as shown below (see Table 1). These three leadership style groups, when placed in a matrix, indicate the level of leadership activity and passivity along the horizontal axis and effectiveness on the vertical axis. As leadership styles cross the scale from transformational toward passive/avoidant, the behaviors become less active and more passive. As each leadership style descends from top to bottom, the style becomes less effective. These leadership styles are understood as a continuum of leader behaviors and leaders are not purely one leadership style. Business circumstances suggest that each leadership style is appropriate in some situations.
A leader responding and leading in a transformational style is rated as effective and active, whereas leaders responding with passive/avoidant behavior are more ineffective and inactive. Leaders are assessed on each of the individualized factors listed in Table 1, and the individual factors are scored. Leaders scoring high in factors one through four are considered transformational leaders, and transactional leaders typically score higher on factors five and six. Those leaders responding in a Laissez-Faire leadership style should have a high score in factor seven. The FRLM provides leaders with a detailed understanding of the individual leadership factors and their followers’ perception of how they lead. Feedback from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) can assist leaders to improve their leadership to become more successful and effective. The feedback should move leaders toward more desirable behaviors by creating a new awareness of the broad range of leadership options (Bass and Riggio 2006, 152-53). Ideally, a leader moves from Management-by-Exception leadership

---

**Table 1. Leadership factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Passive/avoidant Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active</strong></td>
<td>Factor 1 Idealized Influence Charisma</td>
<td>Factor 5 Contingent Reward Constructive Transactions</td>
<td>Factor 7 Laissez-Faire Non-transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive</strong></td>
<td>Factor 2 Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>Factor 6 Management-by-Exception Active and Passive Corrective Transactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ineffective</strong></td>
<td>Factor 3 Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 4 Individualized Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
toward more transformational leadership behavior.

**Transformational Leadership**

Transformational leadership was first identified by James MacGregor Burns in his Pulitzer winning *Leadership* (Burns 1978). Moving beyond the leadership theories based on great men, skills, and contingency theory, Burns brought a refined concept of transformational leadership to business. Burns and other theorists recognized that leadership was based on more than pure power, and building from Webber’s work on charismatic leadership, he moved beyond contingent reward in defining leadership (Bass and Riggio 2006, 3-4). He observed, “Leadership over human beings is exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers” (Burns 1978, 18).

Categorizing leaders into three styles, Burns identified them as transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leaders. In differentiating between transformational and transactional leaders, Bass noted that transformational leaders go beyond transactional leaders who lead by social exchange (Bass and Riggio 2006, 3). Charismatic and transformational leaders have much in common but charisma is only one aspect of transformational leadership.

With a strong sense of mission and an ability to attract committed and loyal followers, transformational leaders are able to motivate people through individualized attention to followers, a charismatic personality, an inspirational vision, and by expressing complex ideas in simple and easily understood language (Barge 1996, 301-342). Transformational leaders empower groups to accomplish goals through mutual
trust and proactive communication. Transformational leaders are also interested in improving the performance and development of their followers to the fullest (Avolio 1999; Bass and Avolio 1990). Transformational leaders inspire and stimulate followers to develop their own leadership skills and accomplish tasks followers thought unattainable without their leader expressing confidence in them (Bass and Riggio 2006, 3).

Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio, building off Burns’ work, began to operationalize the factors Burns identified so they could be described more fully and measured. Those five factors of transformational leadership are:

1. Idealized Influence (Attributed)(IA) Instills pride in others, goes beyond self-interests for the good of the group, acts in ways that build others’ respect, displays a sense of power and confidence.

2. Idealized Influence (Behaviors)(IB) Talks about most important values and beliefs, specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose, considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions, emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission.

3. Inspirational Motivation (IM) Talks optimistically about the future, talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished, articulates a compelling vision of the future, expresses confidence that goals will be achieved.

4. Intellectual Stimulation (IS) Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate, seeks differing perspectives when solving problems, gets others to look at problems from many different angles, suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments.

5. Individual Consideration (IC) Spends time teaching and coaching, treats others as individuals rather than just as a member of the group, considers each individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others, helps others to develop their strengths. (Bass and Avolio 2004, 3).

Although transformational leaders can respond in a transactional manner when needed, transactional leadership often leads to lower levels of performance or non-significant change (Bass and Avolio, 2004, 21).
**Transactional Leadership**

Bass and Riggio define transactional leadership as leaders who lead through social exchange (Bass and Riggio 2006, 3). Burns characterizes transactional leaders as those who exchange one thing for another, such as a politician would exchange jobs for votes or subsidies for campaign contributions (Burns 1978, 4). Transactional leaders are interested in achieving results by ensuring policy and procedures are maintained and followed (Durbrin 2004, 199). Transactional leaders do not individualize the needs of followers or focus on their personal development like transformational leaders (Northouse 2007, 185). Transactional leaders exert influence and power because followers know it is in their best interest to do as the transactional leader orders (Kuhnert and Lewis 1987, 648-57).

Transactional leaders lead through constructive and corrective actions (Avolio and Bass 2004, 97). When actions are seen as constructive, they are called Contingent Reward (CR) and corrective actions are labeled Management-by-Exception: Active (MBEA) (Northouse 2007, 185). Compliance is gained through offering rewards, threatening punishment, appealing to a sense of altruism, or appealing to rationality and judgment (Barge 1994, 52).

**Contingent Reward**

Van Eton and Burke demonstrated that differences in managers’ personality preferences and leadership orientations may result in very specific communication patterns with subordinates (Van Eton and Blake 1992, 149-67). An illustration of this finding is a leader communicating with one subordinate in one manner, due to personality style, and then altering the communication pattern or style when speaking to another
subordinate with a different personality to be more effective in each situation.

Concentrating on examples of interaction, transactional theory refers to leaders who are task-oriented and direct their groups in specific and focused structures to accomplish finite goals. The exchange between a transactional leader and followers is based on trading the followers’ effort for specific rewards. The leader attempts to convince the follower to agree on what must be done and in exchange, the follower will get a reward (Northouse 227, 185). One example of contingent reward is when a parent negotiates with their child on their bedtime based on how much homework they do. This is a contingent reward transaction.

Contingent reward-based leaders who were more “personable, that is, who talked and listened to those around them” were perceived as better communicators and leaders even though they still functioned based on contingent rewards (Church and Waclawski 1998, 99-126). Transactional leaders clearly state goals and expectations and give recognition or praise when goals are accomplished. Leading through contingent rewards means providing help to others in exchange for a “good” job, discussing responsibility for specific performance goals, clearly stating expectation of rewards when goals are met, and expressing satisfaction when expectations are met (Avolio and Bass 2004, 97).

**Management-by-Exception: Active**

Transactional leaders leading through manage-by-exception: active (MBEA) employ a more corrective approach. The leader defines the standards and sets performance reviews to determine ineffective performance. Followers are punished for not meeting performance goals and standards (Avolio and Bass 2004, 97). An example
of this leadership style is a sales manager who sets and monitors daily sales quotas and looks for an opportunity to catch salesmen doing something wrong (Northouse 2007, 185). The sales manager takes every opportunity to “teach and correct” salesmen not achieving the manager’s standards.

This type of management-by-exception: actively focuses on mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from set norms and concentrates on dealing with failures, mistakes, and complaints (Avolio and Bass 2004, 97). Leaders exhibiting this style keep track of mistakes and errors waiting for an opportunity to launch corrective action.

**Passive/Avoidant Leadership**

The leadership style of passive/avoidant behavior can be described through the use of two terms: Management-by Exception: Passive (MBEP) and Laissez-Faire (LF). This leadership style is often not considered leadership at all, thus, research minimizes this style. This leadership style is the least potent or effective style (Avolio and Bass 2004, 4). The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) assesses this particular leadership style because it is found in many organizations.

The MLQ describes passive/avoidant leaders as reactive as they do not assume a proactive stance in leadership. Passive/avoidant leaders “avoid specifying agreements, clarifying expectations, and providing goals and standards to be achieved by followers” (Avolio and Bass, 2004, 98). Passive/avoidant leaders generate “negative effects on desired outcomes” and are regarded as exhibiting “no leadership” by followers (Avolio and Bass 2004, 98). Individuals leading with this passive/avoidant style are not making positive contributions to the organization and their passivity and inactivity hinder growth and development of those working with them.
Management-by-Exception: Passive

The first type of Passive/avoidant leader is the one who leads by “Management-by-Exception: Passive” (MBEP). These leaders fail to intervene until the problems are serious, take action only after things have gone wrong, continue in the “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it” mentality, and only act when chronic problems arise (Avolio and Bass 2004, 98). The passive expression of this style is watching poor performance but neglecting to speak to the follower to correct it until a performance review. The passive nature of this leadership style contributes to ongoing problems. Employees experience frustration working with MBEP managers as their conversations with their supervisor only occurs when something goes awry.

Laissez-Faire

The second type of passive/avoidant leaders practice what is called “Laissez-Faire” leadership. This leader is characterized by avoiding involvement in important issues, delaying responses to critical questions, being absent when needed, and exhibiting indecisiveness when making decisions (Avolio and Bass 2004, 98). Both of these passive/avoidant leadership styles are counterproductive and lead to morale problems, as workers’ needs for decisions and action are not met. This type of leader does more harm than good in an organization as he abdicates action for inaction and prefers indecisiveness over against a firm, clear decision.

Listening is a critical component of leadership as it is through the communication process that leadership can occur. Listening informs leadership of issues, problems, and opportunities that arise from conversation. As such, leadership and listening are critically linked in the communication process. The perceived effectiveness
of a leader is influenced by his perceived communication skills (Bass 2008, 340).

**Listening and Leadership**

Listening is a requirement for leadership as identified by listening researchers and scholars (Brownell 1990; Cooper and Husband 1993; Wolvin 1999). Proficiency in listening skills is recognized as a major component of communication by business leaders and consultants (Drucker 1995, 6-7; O’Toole 1996, 29-31; Rosen 1996; Marriott and Brown 1997). The essential nature of listening as a primary aspect of leadership is often acknowledged (Witherspoon 1977; DiSalvo 1980, 283-90; Heskett and Schlesinger 1995, 111-19; Kouzes and Posner 2002, 43). Hanna further reinforces this finding in his three-point paradigm evaluating the importance of frequency, difficulty, and quality of listening (Hanna 1978, 163-72).

Very little research exists on listening and leadership in organizational settings outside of colleges with research conducted with university students. Most listening research relating to leadership is based on studies using college students as a population or is a meta-analysis of other listening studies deriving its information from samples other than business organizations and educational institutions (Johnson 1995; Gilchrist and Van Hoeven 1994; Swanson 1997; Johnson 1998). Swanson states that listening is an essential act of leadership and contends that listening can be taught, studied, and learned, resulting in effective listening. “For leaders, listening is essential. Three reasons for listening stand out, all extending from the leaders’ need 1) to know, 2) to build and maintain relationships, and 3) to create a basis for persuasion” (Swanson 1997, 6). Skills in listening effectiveness are also important to both leaders and small group members. Brownell’s earlier study suggests listening is perceived as more critical in managerial
effectiveness as leaders move into more senior positions (Brownell 1994, 31).

Johnson reported findings from an exploratory study considering listening effectiveness and leadership in small groups. Johnson wondered if there was a relationship between perceptions of leadership and listening effectiveness in task-oriented groups (Johnson 1995, 80). The study, comprised of 130 college students, examined the perceptions of members of twenty-three task-oriented classroom small groups with the variables of listening and leadership (Johnson 1995, 77-81). The total sample was divided into two large groups with one group completing a leadership assessment survey and the other completing a listening assessment survey. Correlations were computed and analyzed using Spearman rho statistical formula on the data. Johnson found a significant positive correlation of 0.497 ($p = 0.01$) between member rankings of leadership behavior and member rankings of listening effectiveness (Johnson 1995, 82). Therefore, Johnson suggests that listening influences leadership emergence in small groups (Johnson 1995, 77-85).

Johnson conducted another study with fifty-one undergraduate students in ten leaderless classroom groups. The groups met for twelve weeks prior to the study. Groups were videotaped in a decision-making discussion, and participants later completed a recall instrument, a listening-perceptions instrument, and a leadership-perceptions instrument. To avoid bias, three sets of coders viewed the videotaped discussion and coded listening effectiveness, leadership behavior, and recall instruments. Johnson found a strong, positive relationship of 0.636 ($p < 0.001$) among all variables except recall (Johnson 1998, 465). This indicates that emergent leadership normally displays more effective listening skills than other participants in the same small group.
Participants who were perceived as poor listeners did not emerge as leaders.

**Summary**

Bennis restates the central aspect of leadership as engaging others to create a shared meaning, speaking with a distinctive voice, possessing the capacity to adjust, and having integrity (Bennis 2003, xxi-xxii). Bennis comes back to the stance enunciated by Burns that leadership matters because it impacts people. Bass and Avolio reinforce the impact of leadership style on followers through the Full Range of Leadership Model through identifying specific behaviors and characteristics of each style. To lead people effectively, clear communication is as necessary as an effective leadership style.

The very nature of leadership implies communication as leaders share their vision, goals, and heart with those they lead. The communication process is complex but is used by small children to express their desires and wants. As individuals mature, so do their communication styles. Speech becomes more nuanced and indirect meanings and inferences are made without being expressed directly. Listening becomes a critical factor in the exchange of ideas as individuals think faster than they can talk. The ability to think faster than one speaks creates a challenge for all listeners.

**Critique of the Full Range Leadership Model**

Theories of leadership should be evaluated by the principles and practices found in Scripture. Additionally, these principles should be clear and easy to implement. The shepherd motif provides a leadership model for the church based on the principles of guiding, providing, and protecting individuals being led. There are similarities between
shepherd leadership and the leadership model suggested by Burns and Bass. When implemented effectively, each model serves to motivate, encourage, and provide effective leadership for followers.

The shepherd leadership motif is a progressive model of growth in that as the shepherd leader grows in his capabilities and length of service with a particular flock, his skills of shepherding should improve. His ability to understand members’ needs for nourishment and rest increases his capability to care for his flock. The shepherd’s relationship to the flock and, more importantly, to individual sheep is the determining factor of his leadership. The higher the commitment to the flock, the more effectively he is able to lead and nourish it.

The FRLM also suggests a model of leadership that grows as the leader develops and expresses transformational leadership. When transformational leadership is exercised, it resembles shepherd leadership in building relationships between the leader and followers that are developmental in nature and seek the best for the follower. These two styles diverge at the point of sacrifice. The shepherd leader willingly sacrifices for his followers but there is no indication transformational leader’s sacrifice for their followers. These leaders motivate, stimulate, encourage, and cast vision for team members; however, this does not necessitate sacrifice.

Sosik and Jung acknowledge the need for transactional leadership as a part of leading (Sosik and Jung 2010, 13). Transactional and passive/avoidant leadership styles are not developmental or growth models of leadership. These two styles are drastically different from the shepherd leader motif and are more closely aligned with the hired hands (John 10:11-13). Under purely transactional leadership the sheep might not
survive as they would be seen as providing for the shepherd’s needs by supplying wool and meat. Under passive/avoidant style, the sheep may not survive due to neglect. These styles would be more closely related to the false shepherd in Ezekiel 34 who used the sheep for his own personal gain.

Transformational leadership and the shepherd leadership motif are both based on an accurate, effective, and continual communication process whereby the leader listens and speaks to his followers whether they are sheep or people. The communication skill set of the leader listening to his followers establishes the foundation for effective leadership. The shepherd listens to the sounds his sheep make which indicate their needs just as the transformational leader listens to his staff to discover both personal and professional needs.

**Communication**

This section provides a biblical and theological analysis of communication and, more specifically, listening concepts in Scripture. This analysis is followed by a description and evaluation of the precedent literature on the issue of listening. The section will conclude with implications of these reviews for this research.

**Biblical and Theological Analysis**

By His very nature, God is transcendent which means He is distinct from and outside the created order. “God is far ‘above’ the creation in the sense that he is greater than the creation and he is independent of it” (Grudem 1997, 267). God’s transcendence sets Him apart from creation because He made and rules over it. Through His word God rules over all creation emphasizing the distinction between creation and God.
God, as Creator, needs nothing outside Himself and yet chooses to have a relationship with His creation (Goldsworthy 1991, 91-92). Man and the created world are brought into existence through the spoken word of God (John 1:3; Col 1:16). The God who has spoken commits Himself to humanity, and humanity is under obligation to God to serve Him and His world (Goldingay 2006, 517).

The immanence of God refers to creation’s dependence on God’s involvement with the created world. All creation depends on God for its existence and functioning, and Scripture is the history of God’s involvement with His creation and man. Paul affirms God’s transcendence and immanence in his sermon on the Areogapus by saying “The God who made the world and everything in it is the Lord of heaven and earth and does not live in temples built by hands. And he is not served by human hands, as if he needed anything, because he himself gives all men life and breath and everything else” (Acts 17:24-25). Finally, creation is distinct from God and yet always dependent on Him. He is distinct from and yet intimately involved with His creation (Grudem 1994, 267).

God’s transcendence and immanence is such that He initiates communication with man making Himself known through revelation (Gen 1; Ps 19). God has revealed Himself through nature, His word, and His Son in the incarnation (Rom 1:19-20; Gen 19; John 1:14, 17-18). Natural and special revelation demonstrates God’s desire to communicate with man.

**God as Communicator**

The discussion which follows provides a theological basis for the communication process in general and, specifically, listening in specific as found in the
Old and New Testaments. This foundation supports the rationale for this study as evidenced in Scripture

**Communication Patterns in the Old Testament**

The book of Genesis begins with God speaking “Let there be light” (Gen 1:3). God initiates communication with Adam in the Garden, thus reflecting His desire to know and be known. The focus of communication in the Pentateuch is illustrated through God’s relationships with Adam, Abraham, and Moses. Hoekema suggests that in creation, man becomes capable of answering and responding to God, fellowshipping with God, and loving God (Hoekema 1986, 76). This capacity is evidenced in Exodus 19:16-25 as God speaks and listens to His people (Childs 1974, 369). The patterns of communication between God and these men provide glimpses into His communication patterns throughout the rest of the Bible.

An aspect of *imago Dei* is man’s ability to communicate, make decisions, establish goals, and initiate action to accomplish his determined goals (Hoekema 1986, 5). Evident in the story of the Tower of Babel, man’s ability to communicate is one characteristic of God that was not lost in the Fall (Gen 11:1). Man, as a communicator, speaks and listens to God, others, and nature (Hoekema 1986, 75-78). As with Adam and Eve, God continues to speak to Abraham, calling and blessing him, and to Moses, leading and guiding the Israelites. God and man continue to communicate throughout the times of the patriarchs.

The first voice Adam heard was the voice of God (Gen 2:15-16). Waltke, referring to Genesis, suggests, “God gives humanity language to subdue the earth” (Waltke 2001, 91). Adam was capable of listening and capable of understanding what
God had said. Waltke further asserts that this pattern of God walking in the garden and conversing with Adam and Eve indicates that normal communication patterns existed in the Garden (Gen 2:16-19; 3:9-23). Since man was capable of conversing with God, he was also responsible for obeying God’s instruction. Zwemer states, “For hearing is not receptivity only – it is an act of volition” (Zwemer 1940, 15).

A clear illustration of God as communicator is found in Genesis 12:1-4 as God calls Abram to leave his homeland and journey to an unknown location. Westermann contends that in the patriarchs’ lifestyle and their relationship with God, it was not unusual for God to issue a command linked with a promise that the patriarchs obeyed (Westermann 1981, 147). Waltke states “The Lord had not spoken to His saints since His covenant with Noah, now suddenly His creative word is to bless the tribes and nations through Abraham” (Waltke 2001, 202).

Johnson states God speaking to Abram “reveals the most basic truth of the Hebrew and Christian scriptures: God speaks to men and women and they recognize God’s voice and respond” (Johnson 2004, 6). Johnson also suggests, “Divine communication was . . . personal and purposive but also persistent” (Johnson 2004, 9). The Scriptures are clear that God spoke to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Abraham heard and understood God’s voice, and he began acting on what he heard and understood. Abraham continued until his death to listen to the voice of God and respond (Gen 12:1-3, 7; 13:14; 25:1-9, 13-16, 18-21; 17:1-22; 20:6-7; 22:1-2, 15-18). Abraham is not the only one who experienced hearing God’s voice. Moses has a unique role in biblical history as he talked with God as a “man speaks with his friend” (Exod 33:11).
Moses

God listened to His people as they cried out to Him in Egypt (Exod 2:23-25). Childs suggests that God continues to listen as leaders and people express their hopes, dreams, and hardships to Him (Exod 16:12; Deut 5:26; Childs 1964, 288). Ryken states, “To further emphasize God’s awareness of His people’s hardship, the Bible uses four active verbs: God hears, remembers, sees, and knows” (Exod 2:23-25; Ryken 2004, 75). God reveals Himself to Moses in Exodus 3:4 and calls him by name. The conversation between God and Moses clearly indicates the fundamental aspects of communication – speaking and listening with understanding (Rhodes, Watson, and Barker 1990, 65). The ensuing extended conversation between God and Moses established Moses’ purpose and God’s name (Propp 1998, 202, 205).

In Exodus 19:3-7 God leads Moses and the Israelites to Mount Horeb to receive the Ten Commandments. Upon receiving a summons from God in Exodus 19:3, Moses began to ascend when God began speaking (Propp 2006, 155). With spectacular signs and wonders, God proved to the Israelites that it was God who spoke to them (Exod 19:16, Ryken 2005, 515; Propp 2006, 166). In Exodus 20-31, God gives Moses very specific and detailed instructions on a variety of topics: idols (Exod 20), Hebrew servants and personal injuries (Exod 21), regulations regarding property and social responsibility (Exod 22), and laws regarding justice and mercy, the Sabbath, and annual festivals (Exod 23; Childs 1964, 460). These instructions addressed the construction of the tabernacle and serving articles, the priestly garments, and confirmation of the covenant. These passages provided clear evidence of the communication process between God and man.
Samuel

After Israel settled in the Promised Land, Samuel began to hear God’s voice as a young boy living in the home of Eli, the priest (1 Sam 1:22; 3:2-15). McCarter suggests the word of the Lord was precious because direct divine communication had become infrequent (McCarter 1980, 97). God spoke to Samuel, who learned to listen and obey the voice of God (1 Sam 3:19-20). Samuel, addressed directly by God, became God’s spokesman for his generation, and God used him to proclaim blessing, to pass judgment, and to anoint Israel’s kings (1 Sam 7:3-6, 15; 8:7-9; 9:16-18; 12:18-20; 15:10-11; 16:1-3, 12). This role as prophet necessitated clear and unhindered communication with God so the prophet could speak to the people for God. Throughout Samuel’s life as prophet, he listened to God and spoke for God to Israel. McCarter states his contemporaries recognize Samuel as a prophet of God and a vehicle through which God would address His people (McCarter 1980, 100). Samuel was a great judge and was able to anoint two kings, Saul and David. David’s ability to communicate with God and others as a leader is evidenced by his calming presence with Saul and his motivational abilities to gather a group of “mighty men” around him and develop them into a battle hardened group (1 Sam 16:23, 18:10; 23:8-9).

David

David is remembered as a man after God’s own heart (Acts 13:22). This intimacy of communication with God is evident in David’s life as he fled from Saul (1 Sam 23:10-12). Rather than depending on human wisdom, David turned to God. David repeated this pattern of speaking to God and listening for His response and guidance (1 Sam 24:3-6; 26:23-25; 30:7-8). In 2 Samuel 22, David expressed his deep level of
communication with God in a song of praise, and as this song ends, David shifted into prophetic language. Birch states, “The vocabulary is that of a prophetic utterance” in 2 Samuel 23:2-3, “The Spirit of the LORD spoke through me; His word was on my tongue. The God of Israel spoke, the Rock of Israel said to me: When one rules over men in righteousness, when he rules in the fear of God” (2 Sam 23:2-3; Birch 1998, 1370-71).

King David’s expression of prayer and listening for God’s voice is seen in the Psalms. The book of Psalms demonstrates man speaking to God in prayer and his heart’s desire to hear God speak (Pss 4:1; 6:1-6; 17:6; 18:6; 54:2; 61:5; 66:18-20; 77:11-12; 78:59; 140:6). Beginning with the cry for mercy from a life-threatening illness, Psalm 6 expresses the desire to hear from God as God listens to the prayer and provides His steadfast love and healing. The expectation of answered prayer drives the speaker to ask how long one must wait to receive an answer from Him (Waltner 2006, 55-56). David, in Psalm 61, expresses confidence and trust in God, and this psalm assumes there is a need to call on God through prayer (Goldingay 2007, 236). Psalm 140:6 expresses the heart of prayer in an appeal for God to hear the supplicant’s heart cry. “This statement appeals to the personal relationship between the supplicant and Yahweh” (Goldingay 2008, 646). Additionally, many Psalms illustrate God’s communication pattern of speaking to man (Pss 16:7; 18:8-15; 25:14; 29:3-9; 50). As indicated in Psalm 139, “God is interested in us as human beings and can know everything about us, our activity, our thoughts, our words, and our whereabouts; there is nowhere beyond God’s reach” (Ps 139:1-12; Goldingay 2006, 517).

A survey of communication in the Old Testament reveals the expectation of man hearing God and obeying His voice. As such, Moses, David, and the prophets spoke
with the words they heard from God and reflected their concerns and troubles in prayer. God is a relational God as evidenced by the Trinity, so communication from God and with God is part of His nature. Man was created to have fellowship with God, and this includes active, participative communication. Throughout the Old Testament, God instructs His people, Israel, about Himself by speaking to individuals and giving visions and dreams (Gen 12:1-10, Isa 6:1-9; Jer 1:2-4). At times, God often speaks through angels, but He does speak to individuals who have ears to hear His voice, comprehend what He says and respond (Exod 3:2, 6:12; Judg 13:3; Matt 1:20, 2:13, Acts 12:7 Heb 1:1). Grudem speaks about God being personal in that “He interacts with us as a person and we can relate to him as persons . . . he can speak to us, rejoice over us, and love us” (Grudem 1994, 167). Angels and theophanies are used as a means of communicating between God and man as in Joshua 5:13-15. In this passage, Joshua saw a man standing in front of him with a sword identifying himself as “commander of the army of the Lord” (Lewis and Demarest 1996, 102).

In the Old Testament, God speaks to men as evidenced by His conversations with Adam, Abraham, and Moses. The text clearly indicates that these conversations are clear, understandable, meaningful, and participatory (Johnson 2004, 6). Johnson further contends, “God speaking to humans and humans responding to God provide the matrix for life, for meaning, and vocation” (Johnson 2004, 7). God clearly speaks, and man understands. God not only speaks, He also listens to His people. He hears man’s prayers and petitions. The Exodus experience illustrates that God hears the cries of His people and responds (Exod 2:24.)

God has continually communicated with His people in ways that are difficult
to explain and yet His people understand that it is God speaking and they listen. Repeatedly in the Old Testament God initiates conversation with man to reveal aspects of His character and plan. After 460 years of silence during the intertestamental period, God began to speak again to specific individuals about what He is about to do (Luke 1:11-21).

**Communication Patterns in the New Testament**

Communication between God and man continues in the New Testament and reaches its clearest form in the person of Jesus Christ. Jesus is the exact representation of God and speaks with the authority of God (Col 1:15; Heb 1:1-4). His words have shaped and molded human history. The words spoken by Jesus, and later through the apostles are God’s word to all believers regardless of their proximity to the time the words were spoken. John 21:25 states, “Jesus did many other things as well. If every one of them were written down, I suppose that ever the whole world would not have room for the books that would be written.”

**Jesus**

The communication between God and man is reflected most clearly in the Gospels through the words of Jesus Christ. The truth, which is presented in the New Testament, is that Jesus is God’s Son and, therefore, when Jesus speaks, it is God Himself who is speaking (Matt 27:54; Mark 3:11; Luke 8:28). Jesus emphasized to His disciples that He does and says exactly as the Father instructs Him, reflecting the perfect unity between the Father and Son (John 10:30). Twice in the Gospels, the writers note God speaking from heaven: at Jesus’ baptism and on the Mount of Transfiguration (Matt
3:17; Luke 9:35). In both instances, God affirms Jesus as His Son and, Luke adds, instructs people to “listen to Him” (Luke 9:35). Jesus speaks with authority exceeding that of Moses, thus the disciples are told to listen (Danker 1988, 201). Jesus is the master communicator as He speaks to all people: men and women, crowds and individuals, and the religious and non-religious. The scope of His communication includes the sick and poor, wealthy, and even outsiders (Matt 8:15-7; Mark 6: 30-31; Luke 4:40; Mark 12: 41-43; Matt 19:16-22; Mark 7:24-30).

Jesus was the master of asking questions that caused individuals to stop and critically think about the issue. Zuck states “Jesus asked 225 different questions” (Zuck 1995, 237). Jesus knew how to ask the right question that stimulated His listeners to think (Zuck 1995, 236). With the Pharisees, Jesus asked questions and used these opportunities to teach as well as correct misunderstandings (Zuck 1995, 143). Provoked by the question regarding healing on the Sabbath in Luke 14:3-4, 6, the Pharisees chose to remain silent (Zuck 1995, 142). Throughout His ministry, people exclaim that no one taught with authority like Jesus; even at the age of twelve, He astounded the priests with His teaching (Mark 1:21-22; Matt 7:28-29; Luke 2:46-48). Jesus asked questions of his followers.

**His Audience and Methods**

When Jesus spoke to different audiences, His speaking or teaching style changed from parables to stories, formal teaching to informal discussions as He traveled. When one considers the communication style of Jesus, it is important to differentiate between the various groups Jesus addressed. The Gospels highlight several different audiences such as individuals, the disciples, crowds, and Pharisees and Sadducees (Matt
Jesus responded differently to each of these groups both in tone and in content of His message. Additionally, Jesus varied His teaching methodology as He spoke to different groups (Matt 13:10-17, 34-36). Parables hid spiritual meaning from those not spiritually attuned and placed the responsibility for learning and seeking truth on the individual (Allison 2004, 212-13). “Jesus did not speak in parables to outsiders until hostility raised its ugly head” (Allison 2004, 213).

When Jesus spoke to individuals who were sick, poor, or needy, He sought to first meet their expressed need (John 4:46-50; Matt 8:1-4; 9:18-26 Mark 7:24-30). Jesus often asked questions of those who wanted healing to reveal the person’s heart and motivations. When Christ encountered people with faith, they received their request (Matt 8:2-10; Mark 5:21-43). John 4:46-53 illustrates the response the nobleman received from Jesus, when he asked Jesus to “come down” and heal his son. Jesus rebukes the Galileans for desiring only miracles when He encounters a man with a dire need (Carson 1991, 238). The English text indicates Jesus uttered seven words that elicited a faith response from the child’s father (Tenney 1989, 97-98). Jesus’ seemingly short answer forced the nobleman to make a decision based on faith. The official took Jesus at His word and left (John 4:51).

Those closest to Jesus were His disciples and they observed their Master teach using stories, parables, questions, and longer discourses (Matt 16:13-20; Mark 9:14-29; John 13:1-17:26). When the disciples had questions over a parable or difficulty understanding what Jesus meant, they had the opportunity to ask and receive clarification (Matt 13:1-52; 15:10-20). Of the twelve disciples, Peter, James, and John received a
more intimate style of communication from Jesus. These men were a part of the inner circle who joined Jesus on the Mount of Transfiguration and followed Him deeper into Gethsemane thereby demonstrating a closer, more trusted relationship and deeper level of communication (Matt 17:1-8; Mark 14:33-42; Matt 26:36-45). This inner circle was leaders who were singled out and called on in special occasions (Brooks 1991, 234-35). The apostle Paul recognized the special relationship between Peter, James, and John (Gal 2:9).

Ever the master teacher, Jesus taught using several different instructional methodologies closely linked with communication. In teaching and sharing with His disciples, He often used a combination of parables, questions, and discussions. The Last Supper discourse is an example of the level of intimacy Jesus felt with His disciples (John 13:1-17:26). In this upper room experience, Jesus calls the disciples “friends,” indicating a level of closeness and intimacy. Köstenberger states, “Friends is a status more elevated than even disciples” (Köstenberger 2004, 459).

The Emmaus Road experience for two disciples is another example of communication with God as Jesus interprets the Pentateuch and the prophets (Luke 24:27). Jesus chooses passages related to the Messiah from the Old Testament, emphasizing passage portions foretelling the suffering Messiah and the glory of His resurrection (Blight 2007, 557). Jesus’ communication style and intensity left these two disciples with a burning feeling in their hearts (Luke 24:13-27). Jesus’ gradual revelation allows the two men an opportunity to learn how to trust God’s promises, and this seven mile walk enables the men to remember and experience the emotional power of God’s word (Bock 1994, 383).
Parables

The crowds loved Jesus because He taught them using stories and parables such as the story of the vineyard owner or the parable of the persistent widow (Matt 5-7, 20:1-16; Luke 18:1-8). Using common illustrations from their lives, Jesus connected to the common people and the crowds were eager to listen to Jesus as He traveled with His disciples in Judea and Galilee. When teaching through parables, Jesus repeatedly tells the crowds, “He who has ears to hear, let him hear,” inferring that God not only speaks to the ears but also listens with the heart, but when He was with the disciples, He explained the parables’ meaning (Matt 11:15, 13:9, 13:48; Mark 4:9; Luke 8:8, 14:35). Jesus’ teaching and communication style led the listener to new ideas and insights about their relationship with God and to the Law (Matt 5-7).

Questions

When asked a question by the Pharisees and Sadducees, Jesus often responded with a question and used the opportunity to reveal the intent of the question (Matt 20:23-27; 22:41-45). In Matthew 19:3-9, the Pharisees asked Jesus a question regarding the lawfulness of divorce. Jesus’ response reveals both their lack of understanding of the Law and the hardness of their hearts (Matt 21:15-22; 23-24). On several occasions, Jesus listens and discerns the true motives behind a question or comment. Using parables, He reveals the motivation behind some of the Pharisees’ questions (Mark 3:22-24). His listening ability enhances His communication with His followers (John 3:2-4; Mark 10:16-18). Jesus had compassion on little children and believed they could learn about the kingdom of God. The word translated little children refers an age range from infancy to twelve years old (Brooks 1991, 159). The Pharisees, Sadducees, and the common
Israelites comprehended what Jesus taught and He healed with an authority not seen in Israel. It was this understanding of Jesus’ authority in His speech that ultimately drove Israel’s religious leaders to seek to kill Him (Luke 4:31-32; 19:47-48).

The most scathing criticism and pointed parables were directed to the Pharisees and Sadducees when Jesus confronted them with their hypocrisy and legalism. Matthew 23-24 records clear indictments against the religious legalism that bound the common people. These discussions in Matthew 22 set Jesus in opposition to the Pharisees and the Herodians (22:15-22), Sadducees (22:23-33), a Pharisaic lawyer (22:34-40), and against the Pharisees (22:41-46). In each of these clashes, Jesus’ communication style was clear and unmistakable as He pronounced judgments called the “Seven Woes” against the religious leaders (Matt 23:1-39).

**Summary**

Throughout the Scriptures, God communicates with man in ways that man can both understand and respond (Gen 12:1-3, 15:1-3; 32:24-30; Exod 3; Isa 6:11-13; Ezek 34; Matt 3:16-17; John 14:6-11; Acts 9:3-16). Through the voice of Moses, the Israelites heard and understood God. In the prophetic messages of promise and condemnation through the prophets, the Israelites heard and understood the voice of God. David’s expressions of confidence, joy, sorrow, and repentance recorded in the Psalms offer hope and comfort to others based on his speaking and listening to God.

Through the words and actions of Jesus, the religious leaders, crowds and individuals heard the voice of both John the Baptist and Jesus calling them to repentance and to enter the Kingdom of God (Mark 1:4-5; Luke 5:31-32). The disciples understood that God spoke to them and they must obey God rather than men (Acts 5:28-30).
Hebrews 1:1-3 indicates that God’s final revelation with man is through the person of Jesus Christ.

An integral part of leadership is communication as is presented below. Leaders use their voice and action to communicate what they believe is a proper direction for organizations and individuals to follow. Listening is an important aspect of the communication process as speaking without listening will not result in effective leadership.

**Theoretical Foundations of Communication**

Communication is the basis for human relationships and, as such, it is an essential aspect of everyday life. By its nature, communication is composed of several components: speaking, expression, listening, and reception (Brownell 1996; Wolvin and Coakley 1996). Communication competence is defined as a general and basic skill necessary for survival in society (Rubin 1982, 19-30; Rubin 1990, 94-129). Spitzberg and Cupach, among others observed, “Competence is an issue both perennial and fundamental to the study of communication” (Spitzberg and Cupach, 1985, 11). Communicative competence refers to the use of language in a social context (Savignon 1991, 264). The term “communication competence” first appeared in research journals in 1974 (Rubin, 1990, 94-129). Rubin suggests “the ability to use language to communicate within a specific situation” is the essence of communicative competence (Rubin, 1990, 19). One who is competent in communication is characterized as having a set of communication skills that are used in a variety of situations. This includes getting messages across as well as the ability to actively listen to the speaker, understand the speaker’s intent, and respond in an appropriate manner (Littlejohn 1989, 64).
Communication competence is reflected in three components: motivation, knowledge, and skill (Spitzberg 1991, 22-29). Spitzberg defines motivation in terms of communication involvement that can best be described as a willingness to listen and respond to the speaker (Spitzberg 1991, 22-29). Fisher and O’Leary suggest that rhetoric, which was utilized in ancient Greek classical education, plays a role in communication competence. (Fisher and O’Leary 1996, 248). Purdy reports a recent shift in the movement of rhetoric from a speaker-oriented, expressive emphasis to “rhetoric of expression” (Purdy 1991, 54). This movement changed rhetoric from an emphasis on the person speaking to more focus on the content of the speech.

O’Hair delineates between communication competence, communication competencies, and communication skills which provide a basis for understanding the differences in terms (O’Hair et al. 1997, 20). Communicative competence is “the ability of two or more people to jointly create and maintain a mutually satisfying relationship constructing appropriate and effective messages” (O’Hair et al. 1997, 20). O’Hair further described communication competence as producing optimal distribution of control, expressing affiliation, and focusing on the present goal and task. This competence is process-oriented and usually effective and appropriate for the relationship (O’Hair et al. 1997, 21). Based on social relationships and understandings, communication skills are behavioral skills used by persons to achieve their own goals. Behaviors indicating communicative competence are seen during conversations through paraphrasing for clarity, providing feedback for understanding, and attentive body language. Other behaviors found in good listeners are making eye contact, nodding one’s head, and making sounds to encourage the other person to talk and show one is listening. Restating
the key point in the conversation also communicates listening (Mindtools, Active listening.pdf).

**Communication and Listening**

McCrosky and Richmond supported Spitzberg’s suggestion that a willingness to listen is a part of interpersonal communication, and competent communicators display supportive listening behaviors. This means listening is an important aspect of communication competence (McCrosky and Richmond 1985, 187). The motivation for listening indicates the value and importance of the relationship to the communicator. Knowledge is the second component of communication competence and is defined as the process of “self-talk” or self-monitoring in which the communicators either “listen” or “talk” to themselves. The final component, attentiveness, is based on the cognitive skills of the persons involved in the conversation (Rubin 1982, 19-30).

Roberts and Vinson studied the relationship between willingness to listen and communication skills. Their research evaluated ninety-four individuals enrolled at a southern university on the Willingness-To-Listen (WTL) scale and other communication assessments (Roberts and Vinson 1998, 40-56). The WTL scale is a reliable self-report survey consisting of thirty-six questions describing situations in which a person may or may not choose to listen. The Crombach alpha level on the WTL was 0.88. The respondent answers by writing the percentage of time he would be likely to listen in each suggested situation. Pearson product moment analysis was conducted for each research question and simple correlation results for the five other surveys (BCLCT, WBLT, KCLT, WTC, WTL) support the findings that willingness to listen is positively related to communication skills (Roberts and Vinson 1998, 53). This study supports and provides a
theoretical construct that listening is related to communication skills, and listening effectively in a variety of situations is a component of being a competent communicator. Though the generalizability of this study is limited, it is helpful to this research in that it establishes the Willingness To Listen construct. This construct would also suggest a predisposition of individuals to listening to their leadership (Roberts and Vinson 1998, 40-536).

Bentley suggests that the speaker, listener, a third party observing a conversation, or a standardized listening test can assess effective listening. Bentley’s research recognizes that the speaker makes judgments, deciding if he perceives the listener to be listening as evidenced through effective listening indicators (Bentley 1997, 52). The listener also determines “how important the speaker is, how important the message is, how important the relationship is, and then decides how effective of a listener to be” (Bentley 1997, 52). A third party working as a mediator may assess both the speaker and the listener to determine listening effectiveness. Bentley includes standardized listening tests to assess effective listening behaviors. The communication process is not complete until listening and understanding have occurred (Bentley 1997, 51-68).

**Listening**

The International Listening Association (ILA) defines listening as “the process of receiving, constructing meaning from, and responding to spoken and/or nonverbal messages” (Emmert 1996, 2). Listening, in business circles, is categorized as the most lacking skill in communication competence, most frequently reported deficiency among new employees, and the second most critical need among supervisors requiring additional
communication training (Carsten 1982; Meister and Reinsch 1978, 235-44; Harris and Thomlison 1983).

The 1947 work of Ralph Nichols is considered seminal in listening research, and listening became an aspect of communication theory as a result of Nichols’ work (Nichols 1947; Nichols and Lewis 1954; Nichols and Stevens 1957). Nichols stated that most attention is given to oral communication and little emphasis is placed on listening. In 1957 Nichols and Lewis published a book exclusively devoted to listening, and identified the factors of listening comprehension. *Are You Listening?* is the first publication focused solely on listening. In recognition of the critical nature of clear communication between employees and employers, both scholars and the business community have accepted Nichols’ work. Additional research built upon Nichols’ studies has continued as interest has increased in assessing listening behaviors, understanding effective listening, and developing dimensions of the listening process.

*Listening Competency*

Wolvin and Coakley’s essay suggests that listening competency is composed of primarily two aspects: knowing about listening and displaying appropriate listening behavior while engaged in listening. Listening competency must “include the attitudinal component or the willingness to engage as a communicating listener” (Wolvin and Coakley 1994, 151). Other examples given by these researchers include “listening to a client during a business meeting” and “listening to a complaint from a dispute between neighbors” (Wolvin and Coakley 1994, 151). Willingness to engage in communication is an essential aspect of all successful listening opportunities.

In 1983, Snavely and Walters explored the importance of communication
competence within an organization and determined “the first function of the executive is to develop and maintain a system of communication,” and “communication and leadership are essential components of the management process” (Snavely and Walters 1983, 120). A survey of 323 co-workers in public school administration examined the relationship between communication competence and social style. The results indicated administrators with highly responsive styles (amiable and expressive) were perceived as more competent than those with less responsive styles (analytical and driven). The scales measured versatility, social anxiety, self-disclosure, empathy, and listening. This research examined social style, or leadership, as a fundamental indicator of organizational communication behaviors, including listening. Snavely and Walters supported the inclusion of listening skills within communication competence but did not directly study the listening practices of leaders (Snavely and Walters 1983).

The Other-Perceived Competency Survey employed by Snavely and Walters is composed of twenty-eight questions measuring four dimensions of communication competency: social anxiety, self-disclosure, empathy, and listening. Of the twenty-eight questions, only six dealt with an aspect of listening (Snavely and Walters 1983). Snavely and Walter’s research does not adequately address the listening practices of leaders but examines the general communication competence of public school administrators’ social styles.

Jablin, Cude, House, Lee, and Roth reviewed literature on communication competence-related studies reported from 1975 to 1990, in which the role of communication competence was examined across multiple levels within organizations (Jablin, Cude, House, Lee, and Roth 1994, 114-40). Their meta-analysis found that
people considered to be good listeners by their peers throughout the organization were also considered to be competent communicators. In this representative review of literature of communication competence or competence-related studies, various levels of leadership (staff, supervisor, and administrator) were represented. Although listening is an aspect of communication competency, not all studies of communication competence included a strong emphasis on listening. Other studies in business communication underscore the value of listening in organizations (Warner 1995, 51-56; Weinrauch and Swanda 1975, 25-32). Listening is a core aspect of communication competency but has not been a specialized area of research until the last thirty years.

**Listening Dimensions**

Listening dimensions are defined as general components of listening used to conceptualize and clarify the listening process (Halone, Conconan, Coakley, and Wolvin 1998, 14). Following Nichols’ research and building on his writings, other researchers have tried to examine listening dimensions (Barker 1971; Bostrom and Waldhart 1980; Brown and Carlsen 1955; Weaver 1972; Fitch-Hauser and Hughes 1987). In the 1950s and 1960s, the focus of listening research was limited to situations in which oral presentations were recalled. Similar to reading comprehension tests, paper-and-pencil measures were used to test the listener’s ability to recall and reproduce what was heard.

Brown and Carlson developed the Brown-Carlson Listening Comprehension Test (BCLCT) designed to test and measure five components of listening: immediate recall, following directions, recognizing transitions, recognition of word meanings, and lecture comprehension. The BCLCT reportedly evaluates the “aural assimilation of symbols in a face-to-face speaker-audience situation, both oral and visual cues present”
Following refinement through the years, Brown-Carlson tests continue in limited use for assessing listening comprehension among school-aged children. A second listening test developed in 1957 was Sequential Test of Education Progress. It was also designed to test school-aged children (Haberland 1959, 299-302).

Barker contended in 1971 that both the content and the listening situation impact listening and need to be considered in the communication process (Barker 1971). Barker believes that willingness to listen is impacted by the content of the message; therefore, if the content is interesting to the listener he is more likely to be able to listen. Conversely, if the content does not interest the listener, it is less likely he will listen to what is said. Barker suggests that situational noise impacts the ability to listen. For example, loud music or talking may make listening more difficult than an environment with little or no noise.

Watson and Barker also investigated five dimensions of listening with the Watson-Barker Listening Test (WBLT). They examined the dimensions of evaluating message content, understanding meaning in communication, understanding and remembering information in lectures, evaluating emotional meanings in messages, and following instructions and directions (Watson and Barker 1984, 178-97). This test, designed for high school students, focused on comprehension and recall.

**Research on Listening Dimensions**

Bostrom and Waldhart noted that “little is known about the listening process, and disagreement exists concerning its measurement” (Bostrom and Waldhart 1980, 221). Bostrom and Waldhart’s research identified a sixth dimension of listening, short-term memory. Fitch-Hauser and Hughes conducted a factor analysis of four listening tests:
Brown-Carlson Listening Comprehension Test, STEP II Listening Test, Kentucky Comprehensive Listening Test (KCLT), and Watson-Barker Listening Test (WBLT). Fitch-Hauser’s analysis “shed no light on the definition of the concept of listening”.

Fitch-Hauser and Hughes state “At this point in time all we can say is listening is a multidimensional experience” (Fitch-Hauser and Hughes 1987, 143). In a meta-analysis, Weaver endeavored to identify listening dimensions as sub-skills of listening behavior and supported the need to identify listening dimensions (Weaver 1972). Studies such as Weaver’s have attempted to conceptualize and clarify the listening process and have stimulated more research on the conceptualization of listening.

A more recent study by Halone et al. determined that the listening process can be conceptualized primarily with five dimensions: cognitive, affective, behavioral/verbal, behavioral/nonverbal, and behavioral/interactive (Halone et al. 1998, 12-28). Building on previous studies, Halone et al. surveyed 131 individuals on a self-report, five-point Likert-type scale composed of 105 questions that characterized and reflected cognitive, affective, behavioral/verbal, behavioral/nonverbal, and behavioral/interactive dimensions of listening. The results of this quantitative study found positive support for each respective dimension, confirming the multidimensionality of the listening process and providing initial framework for further research on listening dimensions (Halone et al. 1998, 12-28).

**Listening Models**

In the early 1980s to mid-1990s, listening scholars addressed the findings regarding listening dimensions and components resulting in four major listening models. These models provided clarity and a foundation for listening theories.
Steil, Barker, and Watson developed the SIER Model, presenting listening as a four-stage process involving sensing, interpreting, evaluating, and responding as interconnected activities (Steil, Barker, and Watson 1983). Emphasizing the diagnostic nature of their model, they contend that the SIER Model is a more effective method for greater understanding of the listening process. Barker and Watson developed a new model entitled PIER (Perceiving, Interpreting, Evaluating, and Responding), which conceived listening as a “progressive four-level process” (Barker and Watson 2000, 157). The primary difference between these two models is the identification of perceiving as a greater aspect than sensing in listening. Barker and Watson defined perceiving as including all senses such as sight, smell, and touch that they deemed requisite for effective listening.

Wolvin and Coakley developed the Wolvin-Coakley Sequential Model (WCSM) for listening, defining listening as an interpersonal activity of “the process of receiving, attending to, and assigning meaning to aural and oral stimuli” (Wolvin and Coakley 1996, 74). Wolff and Marsnik developed the Wolff-Marsnik Model of Receptive-Transactional Listening (MRTL) in 1993 (Wolff and Marsnik 1993). Their model views speaking and listening as distinct roles in a circular, transactional process of oral-aural communication, and suggests listening is conceptualized in three sequential stages: hearing and attending, interpreting and recreating, and retaining and responding.

Developed in response to employees’ perceived need for greater supervisory listening effectiveness, Brownell developed the HURIER Model of listening. Interested in employee stability, growth, and development, organizational leaders asked employees to describe the problems they experienced while working. Repeatedly, employees and
staff indicated that their supervisors and managers were not effective listeners (Brownell 1990, 401-16). Through conducting several studies, Brownell’s research identified six separate, interrelated listening skill areas. She recognized these six areas in the HURIER model as hear, understand, remember, interpret, evaluate, and respond.

Glenn analyzed 50 different definitions of listening suggested by scholars and researchers (Glenn 1989, 21-31). She assessed the similarities and differences between the various approaches and determined that seven independent dimensions were either present or absent. Those independent dimensions are attention, perception, interpretation, memory, response, spoken sounds, and visual cues. These listening dimensions established the basis for further research. As models for measuring listening appeared, researchers wondered how they would measure and operationalize listening.

**Listening Assessment**

With previous research providing a theoretical framework for listening, researchers have operationalized the concept of listening through various listening-assessment instruments (Norton and Pettegrew 1979; Emmert 1986; Rhodes 1987; Husband et al. 1988; Brandt et al. 1992; Cooper and Husband 1993; Lobdell, Sonoda, and Arnold 1993; Watson, Barker, and Weaver 1995). The Listening Practices Feedback Report-360 (LPFR) was developed using participants from a wide range of organizations and in a variety of positions within the business community (Emmert 1986; Brandt et al. 1992). This 28 question ten-point Likert-type survey is divided into six subscales of attention, empathy, memory, open mind, respect, and response. The associate sister survey contains the same 28 questions but stated as an observer of the participant’s listening behavior. Currently this listening assessment is widely used in listening training.
assessments and listening workshops within the business community (Miller 2008, 27).

The Managerial Listening Survey (MLS), designed by Cooper and Husband, measures listening competency (Cooper and Husband 1993, 6-34). The MLS is composed of 35 questions using a seven-point Likert scale with the 35 questions divided into six subscales measuring listening competency. These subscales are separated into attending, clarifying, affiliating, accommodating, discriminating, and recalling behaviors. The MLS has a companion survey containing questions for subordinates based on their perception of their supervisor’s listening skills.

Lobdell, Sonoda, and Arnold developed a 69 question five-point Likert-type questionnaire to assess organizational listening. The questionnaire studied four areas: communication in the organization, supervisory relationship, feelings about the organization, and self-report of listening skills. Used within the business community and specific workplace environments, this questionnaire examines the relationship between the supervisors’ listening and how employees value the organization, employees’ relationship with the supervisors, employees’ relationship to the organization, and employees’ listening behaviors as related to their supervisors (Lobdell, Sonoda, and Arnold 1993, 92-123).

Listening Perception

Norton and Pettigrew developed a survey asking individuals to assess and report on their perceptions of their own listening skills (Norton and Pettigrew 1979, 13-26). This survey was discontinued due to difficulty of administration. The Listening Styles Profile (LSP) developed by Watson, Barker, and Weaver is a 16 question survey designed to identify individual preferences in receiving information: people-oriented,
action-oriented, content-oriented, or time-oriented. The LSP measures listening preferences and is used with young adults in research and clinical settings (Watson, Barker, and Weaver 1995, 1-21). Barker and Watson updated the LSP, adding 4 more questions, and renamed it as the Listener Preference Profile (LPP) (Barker and Watson 2000). The 2011 revised version of the LPP will be published in May 2011.

Fitch-Hauser and Hughes conclude that insufficient attention has been given to the development of a consensus regarding the conceptualization and measuring of listening (Fitch-Hauser and Hughes 1992, 6-22). Their research examined several popular listening assessments and used the Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis to determine whether the test items hypothesized to represent each construct are homogeneous with other listening constructs. The Fitch-Hauser and Hughes research reflected the difficulty of identifying common variables. The only element on which there was agreement was memory. Three of the four instruments include a test of some type or types of memory. Fitch-Hauser and Hughes concluded that, on the surface, there is some consensus that listening is a multidimensional activity, and memory is one of those dimensions (Fitch-Hauser and Hughes 1992, 6-22).

Despite that consensus, there is considerable lack of commonality among the various conceptualizations of listening. Running the scores gathered from listening tests conducted on students in freshman psychology classes, Fitch-Hauser and Hughes found various amounts of discrepancy among the listening components that each assessment claimed to measure. The researchers attributed the discrepancies to the varied environments in which the tests were conducted. They indicated some level of consensus that listening is a multidimensional activity and agreed the only identifiable element of
listening is memory (Fitch-Hauser and Hughes 1992, 6-24).

With general consensus lacking on the dimensions of listening within the research community, choosing a listening assessment instrument for use in research is a difficult task. A review of literature reveals there are a number of listening assessment instruments available for research; however, there is no consensus on the best assessment tool. Each instrument was designed to meet a specific criteria or purpose such as willingness to listen or the ability to remember what was said. Research and the listening community support the concept of listening dimensions but each of these dimensions are defined and categorized slightly differently.

No widely accepted standard for developing listening assessment instruments currently exists (Bodie 2011, 1-9). The choice of a listening assessment instrument depends on the purpose and development of the survey as well as the research intention and survey environment in which the instrument will be used. Listening is a multi-dimensional experience and, due to the lack of instruments designed for leaders to assess their own listening skills, the Listening Practices Feedback Report-360 (LPFR) provides more consistent feedback from a broader range of individuals impacted by leadership.

The LPFR measures leader behavior as perceived by supervisors and direct reports. Developed and tested in the business community, this instrument is used in a wide variety of settings including the non-profit sector. Listening in a church or business context can challenge listeners as most organizations often use a wide variety of jargon as communication short hand. Unfamiliar acronyms can impede listening.

**Organizational Listening**

Substantiating organizational listening can be accomplished in several ways.
According to Hanna, a skill’s importance may be determined by considering its “frequency,” or the extent to which a skill is actually used; “difficulty,” or the degree to which lack of a particular skill presents a problem; and “quality,” or the degree to which the skill is believed to be critical to effective functioning” (Hanna 1978, 171). This clearly indicates the importance of listening to organizational and leadership success.

Peters and Austin, noted organizational authors, summarized the critical role of listening in organizations by defining excellence as being “built …on a bedrock of listening…listening and thus adapting…turning every employee into an outward-focused, adaptive sensor” (Peters and Austin 1985, 5-6). A few years later, Peters viewed effective listening as critical to organizational survival. “Listening…turns out to be anything but simple. Since it must be practiced if we are to survive, it will become a mindset and a way of life for everyone – or else” (Peters 1987, 145).

Organizational listening may take many forms. Listening skills are linked to breaking down resistance to change within companies. Listening to customers is used in direction setting, strengthening organizational processes, and increasing the responsibility of staff to adapt to market challenges. By promoting listening, a climate of consideration is created and this develops mature leaders (O’Toole 1996, 46; Heifertz and Laurie 1998, 56; Heifertz and Laurie 1998, 51; Kotter and Schlesinger 1999, 29-49; Charan, Drotter, and Noel 2001, 73; Abrashoff 2002, 43-51). Additionally, listening is linked to development of effective marketing strategies, establishing credibility between leaders and co-workers, and on-going learning (Cooper 1991; Kouzes and Posner 1993, 1-26; Marriott and Brown 1997, 50-60; Wolvin 1999). In relating to customers and other constituents, Kouzes and Posner suggest “periodically suspend your regular activity and
spend time listening to others” (Kouzes and Posner 2002, 187). Kotter identifies a new trend that “enterprises actually are listening more to their frontline personnel” (Kotter 2008, 70). Southard and Wolvin suggest that a leader must be connected to the people, and listening is necessary for successful interpersonal relationships (Southard and Wolvin 2009, 145).

**Listening in Context**

In the 1980s, DiSalvo identified twenty-five studies focused on isolating communication skills in organizational contexts (DiSalvo 1980, 283-290). Using meta-analysis, DiSalvo suggests the specific communication skills required of college students as they enter various business work settings. From this research, a common set of communication skills emerged, with listening skills being the most frequently mentioned.

Hunt and Cusella conducted a national research study using random sampling of perceived listening skills of 106 training managers employed by Fortune 500 companies. The design of this exploratory study was to assess the extent to which listening ability, or the lack thereof, was perceived as a major communication problem in modern organizations (Hunt and Cusella 1983, 393-401). The sample of training managers perceived inadequacies in listening skills and the listening training of typical employees, and that poor listening was “one of the most important problems” (Hunt and Cusella 1983, 399).

Another study examined the underlying factors related to supervisors’ perceptions of their own listening behaviors (Husband, Cooper, and Monsour 1988, 97-112). This research was conducted with 122 supervisors and managers from a large utility company. Participants were asked to describe their own listening behaviors on a
sixty-item Likert-type scale which was self-assessed. Preceding the research, listening dimensions were developed around listening as a generalized skill used in a variety of situations, but did not involve other people in the environmental stimuli. Seven factors were identified as underlying these perceptions: attending, clarifying, responding, discriminating and evaluating, recalling, affiliating, and accommodating. Additionally, two second-order factors were found undergirding the seven-factor structure: listening to gain information accurately and listening to create a supportive interpersonal environment. The research results suggest that supervisors’ perceptions of their own listening behavior can be differentiated according to the seven-factor structure and these seven factors generally correspond to the listening components most often discussed in the literature (Husband, Cooper, and Monsour 1988, 97-112).

The Husband, Cooper, and Monsour study noted the supervisory/subordinate dyadic relationship as a context for listening supporting the multidimensional nature of the listening process. Also noted in this study is the value of listening in an organizational environment. This research did not include participants’ demographic information so further assertions regarding age, or gender cannot be generalized beyond this utility company situation. The impact of this study on organizational listening provided a basis for further research (Husband, Cooper, and Monsour 1988, 97-112).

**Impact of Listening in Organizations**

Listening skills impact how leaders lead and influence the people with whom they interact. Listening is considered an important skill for a leader to possess because listening influences organizational commitment, effectiveness, production, and absenteeism (Kouzes and Posner 2002, 249-50). McNeese-Smith found the five
leadership behaviors identified by Kouzes and Posner were correlated and predictive of employee productivity, satisfaction, and organizational commitment (McNeese-Smith 1996, 160-75). Listening skills used by organizational leaders enhance the leaders’ ability to influence their staff.

Lobdell, Sonoda, and Arnold examined the relationship between employees’ perception of their supervisors’ listening behaviors and organizational commitment (Lobdell, Sonoda, and Arnold 1993, 92-110). The participants were surveyed using a sixty-nine item Likert-type five point scale on an organizational listening instrument. The instrument was given to 278 occupational and managerial employees of a large southwestern utility company. The instrument was divided into four sections: communication in the organization, supervisory relationship, feeling about the organization, and self-reports of listening skills. A factor analysis was used to group the four sections into seven subscales: supervisor responsiveness, openness, empowerment, poor listener, good listener, negative comment, and positive comment. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed between the variables generated from the factor analysis.

As further analysis of the relationship between the variables of supervisors’ listening, openness, and employee influence on commitment, two regressions were computed using a stepwise regression procedure. The findings of Lobdell, Sonoda, and Arnold’s study indicated a strong relationship between employees’ perceptions of their supervisors’ listening behavior and organizational commitment. One limitation of this study is it did not examine the listening behaviors in any other company or environment outside of this utility company therefore, it is possible that a replication study may not
yield the same results in a different type of organization (Lobdell, Sonoda, and Arnold 1993, 92-110).

Cooper and Hubbard used the Managerial Listening Survey with 182 workers of a large petroleum corporation receiving training in managerial communication (Cooper and Hubbard 1993, 6-34). The participants were surveyed during a five-year period to determine if the Managerial Listening Survey was made up of a reliable and valid set of items that relate to others’ impressions of competency in organizational interactions. The researchers revealed a two-factor (accuracy and support) model of listening competency and found employees, their supervisors, colleagues, and subordinates perceive listening competency to be highly correlated with general impressions of effectiveness and individual satisfaction with the working relationship. This longitudinal study supports the need for further research in listening in organizational settings but does not examine the listening practices or skills of leaders within this corporation (Cooper and Hubbard 1993, 6-34).

**Management Listening Studies**

Stine, Thompson, and Cusella conducted a further study surveying eighty-nine people from all departments, representing hourly employees to management in a tool manufacturing company (Stine, Thompson, and Cusella 1995, 84-105). Researchers examined the impact of supervisory listening indicators on subordinates’ perception of support, trust, and built-in motivation on subordinates’ performance (productivity and absenteeism). The hypothesis and research questions were examined using Pearson correlations, partial correlations, and multiple regression analyses. The results showed supportive listening indicators were positively related to production and negatively
related to absenteeism. Leaders, at all organizational levels, who were perceived as 
listening, saw an increase in supportiveness, trust, and intrinsic motivation of workers. 
This research suggests that subordinates viewed their supervisors as good listeners also 
considered as being supportive. Organizational leaders who listen effectively are able to 
adapt to changing economic challenges and solve problems (Stine, Thompson, and 
Cusella 1995, 100-01). Due to research limitations, these findings are interesting but 
only applicable to one organization.

Based on a review of literature, Brownell developed a survey to address 
managers’ communication patterns and an examination of topics most often found in 
fourteen management communication textbooks (Brownell 1994, 31-49). Additionally, 
Brownell conducted qualitative research with five focus groups. Trained research 
assistants analyzed the transcribed content using content analysis to determine recurrent 
themes for these focus groups. Information gathered from the review of literature, 
examination of textbooks, and transcripts of the focus groups were restructured into eight 
communication items: writing business memos, writing reports, giving oral 
presentations, managing interpersonal conflict, listening, leading groups, persuading in 
interpersonal contexts, and giving feedback. From these categories, an instrument was 
developed requesting information regarding the frequency managers found themselves 
engaged in these communication tasks (Brownell 1994, 31-49).

Brownell surveyed 91 general managers and 153 middle managers working in 
full service domestic properties in the hospitality industry such as hotels, clubs, and 
resorts (Brownell 1990, 401-16). The means were calculated for the eight activities 
central to effectiveness for middle management and general management, with
comparisons made between the two groups on these communication activities. This research indicated that listening is perceived as more important to managerial effectiveness as individuals are promoted into senior level positions. Thus, Brownell’s research indicated that listening, as perceived by general managers, is the most-essential communication skill for career development. Additionally, general managers in the study rated listening as the one activity that consumed most of their time (Brownell 1990, 401-16).

Gilchrist and Van Hoeven explored listening as an organizational construct. They gathered data from fifty participants working in forty-one organizations with employees ranging from three to three thousand. Their research indicated that organizations and staff regard listening as an organizational construct (Gilchrist and Van Hoeven 1994, 6-24). Although studies have generally defined listening as a skill possessed by an individual, the Gilchrist and Van Hoeven study indicates listening also occurs in an organizational context. It points to the significant role of leaders in developing and encouraging listening.

**Critique of Listening Theory**

It is the common assumption that all people are “good enough” at listening because people listen most of their day (Janusik and Wolvin 2009, 143). The unfortunate reality is poor listening is the cause of many of society’s problems such as divorce, bankruptcy, and a myriad of other problems. The annual cost to business over miscommunication is incalculable.

Listening theory attempts to define, measure, and operationalize the phenomena of hearing sound, understanding meaning in the words, interpreting the
meaning of those words, remembering the ideas, and responding to what was spoken. This tremendously complex process requires the listener to be attentive, empathetic, understanding, and limit the distractions in the environment. The challenges of researching listening are significant with many instruments attempting to measure it.

Research related to listening theory is still relatively in its early stages of research and, thus, the development of listening theory is not mature. Therefore, comparisons against a well-developed theory of listening are not possible.

**Implications for Study**

Beginning in an embryonic stage in the 1940s, listening research has evolved into a valid field of study within communication. Starting with the work of Ralph Nichols and continuing with Wolvin, Coakley, Fitch-Hauser, and Brownell, listening is now recognized as an important aspect of communication research. Recent research has attempted to identify and define the dimensions of listening behaviors. Current research suggests further study is needed with a larger sample size and a 360-degree feedback model (Orick 2002; Ellis 2003; Miller 2008).

Leadership depends on accurate, timely, and effective communication. Good communication is an essential functional necessity for all who lead. Listening is the communication process that brings leadership and communication together. Without effective listening, leaders and followers will always feel that their ideas, thoughts, and feelings are not fully understood.

Communication is integral to the leadership process. Research indicates that effective leaders are also good communicators, and listening is a significant aspect of communication. Listening informs leadership of the hopes, dreams, and wishes of
followers so that the leader can connect with those desires and build upon them. These studies suggest that listening is an essential act of leadership and is worthy of a more definitive study (Gilchrist and Van Hoeven 1994, 6-24; Brownell 1994, 31-49; Lobdell, Sonoda, and Arnold 1993, 92-110; Brownell 1990, 401-16). Therefore, this research seeks to determine if a relationship exists between leadership style and listening practices of leaders. How do leadership styles and listening practices impact each other? How are transactional, transformational, or passive/avoidant leaders perceived as listeners by their followers? This is an unexplored area within leadership style and communication.

Kouzes and Posner identify the crucial importance of leadership as providing clear direction and vision for their organizations (Kouzes and Posner 2002, 34). These leaders must combine direction and visioning skills with effective communications, thus making the connection between their goals and individual workers. This can only be accomplished through the use of strong listening skills. Stressing the communication skills needed by today’s leaders, Kouzes and Posner emphasize that effective listening is a critical component of leadership (Kouzes and Posner 2002, 247-50). Jim Collins discovered that good-to-great leaders asked questions and then listened (Collins 2001, 74-75). Previous studies identified the influence of good leadership on employee satisfaction and higher levels of productivity occurred when employees felt their supervisors listened and communicated with them (McNeese-Smith 1996; Kahn and Katz 2000; Kim 2002).

Several previous dissertations identified areas for further research (Orick, 2002; Ellis 2003; Williams 2006; Miller 2008). Orick, Ellis, and Williams recognized their studies were limited by a small sample size and suggested that similar studies include a larger sample. Additionally, Ellis and Miller recommended that a more diverse
sample from a different population be used to replicate their studies (Ellis 2003, 104; Miller 2008, 98-99). Ellis recommended correlating leadership and listening behaviors as a needed area for further study (Ellis 2003, 105). Williams noted the need for a 360-degree feedback instrument to provide a more balanced view of listening (Williams 2006, 177). This study extended the knowledge base in areas identified by other researchers as needing further study.

This study fills a void in non-profit organizations that are organizationally structured into teams. More than business and financial concerns, IMB team leaders strive to motivate and encourage their team members to be more effective in their mission. This study assists team leaders in understanding the transformational role they play with their team and others. Christian calling demands the best of both team leaders and team members because both are under a spiritual obligation to “be all things to all men so some might be won” (1 Cor 9:22). A team leader who exercises transformational leadership will inspire and encourage his team to be more effective in reaching the lost while both the team and the leader pursue the high calling of Christ.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN

This chapter describes the methodological design used to conduct this study. It outlines the design overview, identifies the research population, defines the population sample, and lists the delimitations. Additional sections identify the limits of generalization, discuss instruments, and conclude with procedures used to conduct the study.

Research Questions

The following five questions were addressed in this study.

1. What, if any, is the relationship between transformational leadership style and listening practices?

2. What, if any, is the relationship between transactional leadership style and listening practices?

3. What, if any, is the relationship between passive/avoidant leadership style and listening practices?

4. Which of the three leadership styles produces the highest total listening practice score?

5. Which leadership style(s) correlate with the highest individual dimensions of listening practices?

Design Overview

This correlational research sought to determine whether a relationship exists
between IMB team leaders’ leadership style as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and listening practices as determined by the Listening Practice Feedback Report. A list of team leaders was obtained from the Office of Global Personnel for all IMB field personnel. Team leaders were sorted by an assigned team code.

Following the collection of respondent data through these two instruments, scores were calculated for leadership style and each of the dimensions of listening. These scores were analyzed using a variety of statistical measures appropriate for determining whether a relationship exists, and the strength of relationship between leadership styles and listening practices of team leaders.

**Population**

The population for this study consisted of missionaries serving overseas with the IMB as a team leader for a minimum of six months and had a minimum of four team members serving under their leadership. There were 391 persons serving as team leaders during this research period. Based on the population and a confidence level of 95% with a confidence interval of .0648, the sample population consisted of 145 team leaders. The 360-degree team leader survey included input from cluster leaders, team members, and Great Commission Christian partners. Because of changes in personnel and job assignments, the actual population and sample size was calculated one month before the initiation of the research phase.

**Sample and Delimitations**

The current study used a census sampling methodology based on the homogeneity of the population. In census sampling approach each member of the
population was surveyed and included in the sample. In order to achieve a 95 percent confidence level and a confidence interval of .05, a sample of 183 team leaders was necessary. This study was delimited to overseas team leaders serving with the IMB. The role of team leader is defined in the Team Strategy Leader job description found in Appendix 5 and team leaders in other overseas offices as identified by the IMB.

**Limitations of Generalizations**

The findings from this study will generalize to all IMB team leaders and may be transferable to other Christian mission organizations which operate in similar team based organizational structures. Where appropriate, insights and findings from this study can provide a deeper understanding of listening practices as perceived by followers.

**Instrumentation**

The current study utilized two established instruments to determine leadership style and listening practices. These two instruments were administered together in one combined survey, maintaining the integrity of each instrument. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X Short Form or MLQ was used to determine team leaders’ leadership style. A second instrument, the Listening Practices Feedback Report-360 or LPFR, was used to determine the listening practices of leaders as measured by six dimensions. Both instruments are 360-degree instruments gathering perceptions of the leader from a supervisor, self, and peers or subordinates. GCC partners are considered subordinates for this study.

Multi-rater instruments or 360-degree surveys gather input from the team leader’s supervisor, peers, and subordinates. For the purposes of this study, GCC
partners were considered as respondents as the team leader exercises leadership and influence in their relationship. Research indicates that multi-rater instruments “provide an in-depth summary of how often leaders are perceived to exhibit specific behaviors” (Bass and Avolio 2004, 2). Bass and Avolio generally recommend that all persons working above, below and directly at the same organizational level as the leader rate the leader (Avolio, Bass, and Yammarino 1988).

**Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire**

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X-Short (MLQ) is the instrument for measuring leadership style within organizations and is distributed by Mind Garden (Sharp 2006, 68). The MLQ has been used for over twenty-five years to reliably differentiate “highly effective from ineffective leaders” from a wide variety of businesses, military, non-profit, and volunteer organizations (Avolio and Bass 2004, 13). The MLQ is based on the Full Range Leadership Model (FRLM) and this theoretical design was constructed using a behavioral model to assess leadership style. The MLQ uses a five-point Likert scaled model with 45 questions measuring 9 leadership factors and includes 3 effectiveness variables to measure leadership style within the FRLM.

**Reliability and Validity**

Since 1985, MLQ has been used in over thirty countries and translated into twenty-seven languages (Avolio and Bass 2004, 14). Bass and Avolio developed this instrument to measure leadership style and it has consistently yielded both reliable and valid results in military, business, government, church, social service organizations, and the non-profit sector (Avolio and Bass 2004, 79). Avolio and Bass state this instrument
has “a tremendous amount of consistency across raters, regions, and cultures in terms of support for the nine factor full range model” (Avolio and Bass 2004, 79). In testing 9 samples (n=2,154), reliabilities for the total items and for each factor scale ranged from 0.74 to 0.94 (Bass and Avolio 2004, 13-14). Cronbach alpha scores for MLQ in this study were 0.799. The MLQ is a reliable and valid instrument for discriminating between transactional, transformational, and passive/avoidant leadership styles (Gaspar 1997; Lowe and Gardner 2001; Fuller, Patterson, Hester, and Stringer 1996).

**Listening Practices Feedback Report**

The Listening Practices Feedback Report-360 or LPFR is a 28 item questionnaire employing a ten-point Likert scale to measure perceptions of a leader’s listening practices. This 360-degree instrument allows both the leader and others such as supervisors, peers, and subordinates to provide input on the leader’s listening practices. For the purposes of this study, supervisors, cluster leaders, and team members are defined as respondents. In this research, supervisors are defined as cluster leaders, leaders as team leaders, and subordinates or associates as team members. All of these individuals are considered respondents. As noted by Jones, Bearly, and McLean, 360-degree feedback instruments have advantages beyond self-assessment and allow multiple raters to confirm or negate data gathered from a single individual as well as provide parallel measures on various aspects of performance (Jones and Bearly, 1996; McLean, 1997).

Introduced in 1992, the LPFR is used to study listening and identify effective or ineffective listening practices (Brandt et al. 1992). Used in over 100 organizational and business training settings, the survey quantifies the frequency with which individuals are perceived to engage in specific 28 listening behaviors grouped into 6 dimensions of
listening. Each dimension is composed of 3 to 5 questions based on the developer’s assessment and subject to factor analysis results of the behaviors indicated in the questions (Brandt et al. 1992). The dimensions of listening are, attention, empathy, memory, open mind, respect, and response. Scores are derived by averaging the numerical responses for each statement in each of the listening dimensions.

**Reliability and Validity**

Reliability measures the consistency with which an instrument returns the same values (Gall, Gall, and Borg 2005, 140). Tested for both reliability and validity, the LPFR, developed by Brandt and Emmert, measures listening practices of leaders as perceived by the leader and others. Cronbach alpha calculates a reliability coefficient and is the standard measurement of reliability (Gall, Gall, and Borg 2005, 140). The LPFR has a Cronbach alpha of 0.84 for the leader’s survey and internal consistency suggests the associate’s LPFR a Cronbach alpha of 0.94 that gives the LPFR a high reliability rating (Emmert et al. 1992). Cronbach alpha for this study was higher for team leaders at 0.869 and lower at 0.901 for respondents.

Leedy and Ormrod state criterion validity is the “correlation with another instrument measuring the same measure” (Leedy and Ormrod 2005, 92). As both instruments are copyrighted, permission was obtained to use the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) from Mind Garden, Inc. The researcher contacted Janice D. who gave permission for the Listening Practices Feedback Report (LPFR) to be used in this research. Both of these instruments were administered through a single web-based survey format that maintained the integrity of both instruments.

The content/face validity for the LPFR has been determined by administering
the LPFR to over 1,500 people successfully (Emmert, Emmert, and Brandt 1994, 4). The LPFR self-report and associate ratings positively correlate with the Listening Preference Profile (LPP), which also measures listener preferences for receiving information and giving attention to information, indicating a moderate construct validity ($r = .3140$, $p < 0.01$ (Barker and Watson, 2000; Orick 2002). A demographic section was used to gather information such as age, gender, position, time on the field, and if the respondent had served with the team leader for more than six months. Respondents were also asked to indicate their desire to receive an electronic copy of the research findings when completed.

**Field-Testing of the Instruments**

Upon approval of the survey instruments by the dissertation committee chairman, the researcher field-tested the web-based survey instruments to ascertain if any procedural issues might arise. A select group of overseas missionaries participated to test the clarity of survey instructions and the process necessary to use the web-based survey. This field test group was given seven days to complete the survey and the researcher conducted phone interviews with four participants to determine if any adjustments were needed to conduct the survey. Reminder emails were sent to the field test group to complete the survey and provide feedback on the process. The dissertation committee chairman approved adjustments made throughout this process. Following the field test and before conducting the actual survey, the researcher received approval from the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary Ethics Committee to use MLQ and LPFR and conduct this study.
Procedures

The first step was to obtain permission from the IMB to conduct research with IMB field personnel. The researcher contacted the Executive Vice President, Vice President of the Office of Global Personnel, Vice President of the Office of Global Strategies, and the Associate Vice President for Leadership Development for permission to conduct this study and obtain field personnel contact information. The Associate Vice President for Global Strategies endorsed this study and encouraged field personnel to fully participate and support this research study. To obtain stronger organizational support, the Director of Global Research sent an email to the nine Affinity Group Strategists and asked them to support this research project. The email asked the Affinity Group Strategists to contact cluster leaders, team leaders, and team members informing and requesting their personnel to participate in the research project.

Next, an alphabetized list of possible team leaders’ and team members’ names and email addresses was obtained from the Office of Global Personnel, IMB. All team leaders on the list were contacted for participation in this research. Each team member, the appropriate cluster leader, and GCC partners were considered respondents. All respondents are included in this survey.

An email was sent to all the team leaders asking for their voluntary participation in this research (see Appendix 1). The first email introduced the study, summarized its purpose, and provided the data collection timeline. Team leaders were asked to indicate their willingness to participate in this research by replying to the email and recommend ten individuals with email addresses for inclusion in this survey. When a team leader volunteered to participate in this study, it indicated a willingness for his
cluster leader and team members to be surveyed with the combined MLQ and LPFR instrumentation. When a team leader consented to be surveyed, he provided the contact information for ten respondents including his team members and GCC partners. Team members and cluster leaders rated their perception of the team leader’s leadership style and listening practices. The cluster leader was asked to rate each team leader in his cluster. All respondents were given ten days to respond to this request before a reminder was sent.

Creating incentives and multiple contacts with respondents increases the response rates on web-based surveys (Sheehan and McMillan 1999, 48). Therefore, this study included several incentives for the participants. Incentives gradually decreased over a three-week period. In week 1, cluster leaders who completed their questionnaires within 7 days were eligible for a drawing of a $75.00 gift card from Amazon Books. Team leaders completing the survey within 7 days were eligible to receive one of two $50.00 gift cards from Amazon Books. Likewise, team members completing the instrument within 7 days were eligible to receive one of three $25 gift cards from Amazon Books.

Beginning week 2, the same process was followed with cluster and team leaders’ gift cards dropped to $25.00 each, but team members’ remaining the same dollar amount. On the final week, the number of gift cards increased by one for each group and the dollar amount decreased to $15.00 per gift card. A drawing was held each week to select those receiving gift cards and the winners informed through a follow up email. At the conclusion of this research study, all team leaders who completed the questionnaire received a personalized report describing their leadership style with suggestions on how
to become a more effective leader. Respondents wishing to receive an executive summary of the findings from of this study were promised an electronic copy.

Team leaders who agreed to participate in this study were sent an email with a hyperlink to the survey instrument and asked to provide the contact information for ten respondents including his team members and GCC partners. Each team leader was asked to contact those he recommended and request the survey be completed promptly. All respondents were given 10 days to complete the questionnaire. An initial reminder was emailed to each respondent who had not completed the survey instrument by the tenth day following the initial email. When the researcher received questions from respondents about the researcher or research project, the researcher responded within 24 hours. A second reminder was sent to those who had not responded on the eleventh day following the initial email. The third reminder notice was sent after 21 days. Acknowledging the sensitive security situation for individuals residing overseas, the researcher used a secure email system to communicate with all respondents. Follow up emails were sent at 10-day intervals, thanking responders for their response or encouraging them to complete their assessments. Once the research began, an 8-week timeline for administering the survey was followed. A master Excel workbook with separate worksheets tracked participants, dates emails were sent, and response dates. Team leaders with a minimum of five responses were included in this study.

All respondents submitted by team leaders were contacted by email and asked to participate in this survey. Respondents were sent an email confirming their email address, introducing the researcher, and summarizing the purpose of the survey. Respondents who chose to participate in rating their team leaders received a web
hyperlink and a request to complete their assessment within 7 days.

The data was gathered using the SurveyMonkey.com website, which administered the survey and tracked team codes for both team leaders and respondents. Following the incentive drawing and at the conclusion of this research, a final thank-you email was sent to each team leader who received a personalized leadership style report with descriptions of each leadership style, their scores on the MLQ leadership model, and suggestions to improve their leadership style. Respondents whose names were drawn for Amazon gift cards were notified in the final thank you email. The data was analyzed with appropriate statistical methods to address the research questions.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

This chapter presents the analysis of findings to determine if a relationship exists between leadership style and listening practices of IMB team leaders. The analysis of findings is presented in sections delineating the collection protocol used for compiling and encoding the data, findings and analysis, and an evaluation of the research design. The first section identifies the compilation protocol used to gather and analyze the data from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and Listening Practices Feedback Report (LPFR). Section two identifies and analyzes demographic information collected through the data gathering process. The following sections present the data and analysis related to the five research questions and other analyses conducted. The final section in this chapter is an evaluation of the research design, identifying both strengths and weaknesses found in this study.

Collection Protocol

For this study, data was gathered using MLQ and LPFR surveys administered through SurveyMonkey.com. Both instruments were combined into one survey for ease of use by respondents and to ensure both instruments were completed at the same time. The single survey approach streamlined the data collection process and allowed respondents to complete the surveys in less than fifteen minutes. Demographic information such as age, gender, years of overseas service, and team role were complete
by respondents.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), a forty-five item questionnaire, measured five components of transformational leadership, two elements of transactional leadership, and two aspects laissez-faire leadership. Additionally, the MLQ assessed respondents’ perception of their leaders’ ability to generate extra effort, lead efficiently, and generate satisfaction in their followers. The Listening Practices Feedback Report (LPFR), composed of 28 questions, measured six components of listening: attention, empathy, memory, open mind, respect, and response. The combined survey consisted of 5 demographic questions, 45 leadership questions from MLQ, and 28 questions from the LPFR totaling 78 questions. The MLQ is administered by Mind Garden Incorporated and the LPFR is produced by Skill Set Partners. Both instruments are copyrighted and permission was obtained to use these surveys as indicated in Appendix 7.

A letter of introduction explaining the purpose of the research and inviting participation in the MLQ-LPFR survey was emailed on September 1, 2010, to individuals listed as team leaders in the IMB’s database as of August 15th, 2010. These individuals were contacted through a secure email system to protect their confidentiality and ministry security. Team leaders provided the names and email addresses of up to ten team members and/or GCC partners who had worked with them for six months or longer. The names of these respondents included individuals who served with the team leader as a team member but may currently be in another ministry role.

The Executive Vice President of the IMB and the Associate Vice President of Global Strategy responsible for supervising IMB field team leaders gave permission to
conduct research with the team leaders. Generally, the IMB does not grant permission for their personnel to be surveyed for research purposes; however, access to this population was given provided participation was voluntary.

Compilation Protocol

In this correlational study, all respondent data was gathered at one point in time using a single stage process with simultaneous data collection (Gall, Gall, and Borg 1999, 175). The survey data was gathered using a web-based survey distributed via secure email to team leaders and respondents composed of cluster leaders, team members, and GCC partners. On August 15, 2010, individuals identified as possible team leaders totaled 685 individuals. These possible team leaders were contacted and asked to participate in this research project. Each of the nine IMB affinity groups were represented.

Of the 685 individuals listed as possible team leaders on August 15, 2010, after excluding individuals for various reasons as described in Table 2, the team leader population sample was reduced to 391 persons. Of the 685 possible team leaders, 233 team leaders opted out stating concerns relating to revealing the names of their team members or significant GCC partners. Of the 208 responses from team leaders, twenty-six individuals did not meet the minimum requirement of serving as a team leader for more than six months. Participation in the 360-degree feedback model required a minimum of five responses for inclusion. Thirty-five team leaders fell short of this 5 response threshold. A total of 145 team leaders met all the inclusion criteria and had sufficient team members, cluster leader, or GCC responses and were included in this analysis. Of the 391 possible team leaders, 145 individuals met the inclusion criteria
representing a response rate of 39.9%. Given the security concerns and personal ministry considerations for this population, the sample size of 145 yielded a confidence level of 95% with a confidence interval of 6.45. The data related to the population sample is displayed in Table 2.

Table 2. Overview of sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Population</th>
<th>Exclusions</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possible team leaders – August 15, 2010</td>
<td>n=685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team leaders opting out due to security concerns</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team leaders excluded – time as a team leader</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team leaders excluded – insufficient response</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total excluded</td>
<td>-294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample frame</td>
<td>391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete and valid responses</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although both LPFR and MLQ suggest an optimum number of feedback respondents is ten per leader, LPFR indicated that feedback from at least three respondents or “associates” is sufficient to provide valid feedback for this instrument (Brandt Management Group 1999, 4). In email correspondence with this researcher, the publisher of MLQ indicated “a couple of raters” were necessary for feedback to be considered as valid. In this study, the number of responses needed for inclusion was determined to be five responses. A minimum of five responses allowed more respondents to be included and provided a level of anonymity for those responding so that their surveys would not be distinguishable from other respondents. In this study, feedback on the 145 team leaders exceeded the minimum requirements for both instruments with 77.83% of team leaders receiving between seven and nine responses, as illustrated in Table 3. Eight percent of team leaders received more than 10 responses and
this comprised 11.3% of total respondents. Only nine team leaders had the minimum of five responses which is 40% more than required by either instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Team Leaders</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.039%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8.618%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>26.391%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>29.443%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>20.197%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7.181%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.975%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.154%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>100.000%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aligning the Data**

Five digit alpha-numeric team codes were assigned to identify and link team leaders and respondents to a specific team. This identification code was used to group team leaders and respondents together to ensure alignment of responses with the appropriate team leader. The raw data was downloaded into Microsoft Excel and screened for completeness of data, sufficient response, and alignment between team leader and respondent. The data was summarized and grouped by team leader in Excel and transferred into Minitab version 16 to conduct statistical analysis.

Demographic data was compiled including age, gender, respondent team role, and time on the field. The demographic data was entered as ordinal data and grouped in categories. Gender data was entered as nominal data. The variables listed on the MLQ and LPFR were entered, scored, and assessed as continuous scale data.
Findings and Displays

Using Minitab 16, various statistical analyses were used to evaluate the data from respondents and answer the research questions in data tables. Significant correlations are displayed using appropriate tables to communicate both the direction and strength of the correlation. Table 4 summarizes the statistical methods used to analyze the data gathered through the survey.

Table 4. Overview of statistical analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Statistical Tools</th>
<th>Data Set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Sample</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>Demographics, MLQ, and LPFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 1, 2, 3, 5</td>
<td>Pearson r, and coefficient of determination ($R^2$)</td>
<td>MLQ and LPFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 4</td>
<td>Frequency distribution</td>
<td>MLQ and LPFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Findings</td>
<td>Pearson r, coefficient of determination ($R^2$), and ANOVA</td>
<td>MLQ and LPFR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the datum was coded and entered in Excel, it was transferred to Minitab for analysis. Demographic data was analyzed using general descriptive statistics to measure central tendencies. Mean, median, and mode were calculated for age, years of service, and team role. Based on the individual MLQ scores of team leaders, their leadership style was calculated and grouped according to the leadership styles. The three leadership styles defined by MLQ are transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership. Each leadership style is composed of several factors and forms a leadership continuum.

Team leader scores from the LPFR were calculated for each listening dimension and for a total listening score. The analyses of the relationship between three
leadership styles and listening dimensions were calculated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearson $r$) which is used to determine the degree of relationship between continuous scaled data (Gall, Gall, and Borg 1999, 214). The coefficient of determination ($R^2$) was also calculated.

The following five research questions were addressed in this study.

1. What, if any, is the relationship between transformational leadership style and listening practices?

2. What, if any, is the relationship between transactional leadership style and listening practices?

3. What, if any, is the relationship between passive/avoidant leadership style and listening practices?

4. Which of the three leadership styles produces the highest total listening practice score?

5. Which leadership style(s) correlate with the highest individual dimensions of listening practices?

**Statistical Methodology**

General descriptive statistics were used for the demographic data to provide a basic understanding of the characteristics of the sample. The measures of central tendency such as mean, mode, median, standard deviation for age, and length of time on the field were calculated. The mean is the sum of the values divided by the number of values (Salkind 2010, 42). The mode is the most commonly occurring score and the median is a point where 50% of the scores fall below it (Howell 2004, 60-61). A statistical deviation is the square root of the variance and is the average amount of variability within a dataset (Donnelly 2007, 67; Salkind 2010, 68).

The second statistical measure used to determine the relationship or correlation
between two means was Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. This correlation coefficient, commonly known as Pearson \( r \), provides a measure of the strength and direction of relationship between the independent and dependent variables (Donnelly 2007, 312). The coefficient of determination (\( R^2 \)) was used to determine the percentage of variation between leadership styles and listening practices for the sample. Positive or negative correlations with values between 0.0 and 0.2 indicated a weak or no relationship, positive or negative correlations which fall between 0.2 and 0.4 indicated a weak relationship. Correlations with positive or negative values between 0.4 and 0.6 are considered moderately related. A strong relationship was indicated when the correlation is related, positively or negatively between 0.6 and 0.8, whereas a very strong relationship reflected a correlation between 0.8 and 1.0 (Salkind 2010, 129). Table 5 displays the criteria to interpret Pearson \( r \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson ( r ) Value</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0 to ±0.2</td>
<td>Weak or no relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±0.2 to ±0.4</td>
<td>Weak relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±0.4 to ±0.6</td>
<td>Moderate relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±0.6 to ±0.8</td>
<td>Strong relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±0.8 to ±1.0</td>
<td>Very strong relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to measures of central tendency and Pearson \( r \), a linear regression model was calculated to determine the coefficient of determination (\( R^2 \)) between leadership styles and listening dimension. To test the variance between the independent (leadership style) and dependent variables (listening dimensions), a coefficient of determination (\( R^2 \)) was calculated and shown as a percentage of variance in one variable.
which was accounted for by another variable (Salkind 2010, 130). Linear regressions allowed the researcher to determine how well the data fit along a line. Rumsey indicated a coefficient of determination less than 30% does not provide sufficient fit to make predictions based on the $R^2$ (Rumsey 2009, 76).

For research questions 1, 2, 3, and 5, the statistical analysis was completed by calculating Pearson $r$ for the three leadership styles on MLQ and listening dimensions on LPFR. The three leadership styles are transformational (TF), transactional (TA), and passive/avoidant (PA). The LPFR identified and measured six dimensions of listening: accepting, empathy, memory, open mind, respect, and response. A summary of research question findings is shown in Table 13. The table displays correlation values as well as the statistically significant values for each research question. Significant correlations are highlighted with an asterisk in tabular form.

**Demographic and Sample Data**

Demographic data was collected on the first page of the survey instrument and team leaders were unable to progress through the instrument until all demographic data was entered. Age, gender, team role, and time on the field were collected for each team leader; however 8 respondents did not enter age and 28 did not give time on the field as it was not a required field for respondents. If the team leader had not served with this team for more than six months, they were redirected to a “Thank you” page and did not have the opportunity to complete the survey instruments. Twenty-six individuals had not served as team leader for six months and thereby were excluded from the sample (see Table 2).
Age

The distribution of respondents by age, gender, team role, and time on the field is provided using various tables. The age of respondents was collected as interval data. The measures of central tendency for age distributions were calculated and summarized in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TL Age</td>
<td>46.264</td>
<td>9.488</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Age</td>
<td>44.930</td>
<td>11.740</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this sample, the mean age of the team leader was 46.26 years with the youngest team leader being 28 and the oldest 72 years old. The standard deviation of the mean places the team leaders’ age range from 36.81 to 55.71 years of age. The mode and median age for team leaders was 47 years of age. The mean age for respondents was 44.92 years with the youngest being 19 and the oldest 81 years old. The standard deviation was 11.74 years, making the age range between 33.18 and 56.66 years of age. The mode for respondents was 47 years of age with a median of 46 years. The span of ages between the minimum and maximum for team leaders is 44 years, whereas the same age spread for respondents is 62 years.

Table 7 displays the age range distribution and percentage of response for both team leaders and respondents. Of those responding, 8 respondents did not choose to share their ages. Age was required for team leaders, but was not for respondents. The
table below shows that all team leaders were over 26 years of age, as compared with respondents with 73 individuals less than 26. The age distribution of this sample indicated that 31.72% of team leaders were between 37 and 46 years of age. The next largest age range for team leaders was between 47-51 years of age or 23.45%. Team leaders between the ages of 52 to 61 comprised 23.44% of this sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Team Leader Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
<th>Respondent Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.413%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7.121%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.207%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10.423%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.345%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8.699%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.552%</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>11.765%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.172%</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>15.686%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23.448%</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>14.138%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.724%</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>13.622%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.724%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8.669%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.138%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.986%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 or older</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.690%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.683%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.836%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When team leaders were compared to the respondent population in the same age ranges (37-46), team leaders were 31.03% and those responding composed 27.45% of this age group. In the 47 to 51 age grouping were 14.14%. Respondents in the age ranges over age 57, both team leaders and respondents had equal percentages (17.00% vs. 17.34%). One team leader was over 67 years of age and likewise, 26 respondents were in this same age group.
Gender

Table 8 reflects the distribution of respondents by gender. The distribution of team leaders by gender was not reflective of the gender ratio in overseas personnel within the IMB. In 2009, the male to female ratio was 46% male to 54% female, which has remained fairly constant over the past 5 years (IMB 2009 Personnel.pdf). The overwhelming majority of team leaders surveyed were male. Men accounted for 140 of the 145 respondents or 96.55%. Women comprised a much smaller number of team leaders with 3.45% or five individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Team Leader Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
<th>Respondent Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>96.55%</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>74.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.448%</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>25.800%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, men were the most frequent responders to this survey with 719 men responding, or 74.20% of the total response. Women respondents comprised 25.80% or 250 individuals of the total respondents.

Role

The purpose of a 360-degree instrument is to gather information through a multi-rater system. This research gathered insight on team leaders’ leadership styles and listening practices through surveying cluster leaders, team leaders, team members, and GCC partners. The respondents identified their role as it related to the team leader. As shown in Table 9, the highest percentage of respondents were team members comprising
52.06% of total respondents while individuals serving as cluster leaders, and in many cases also serve as the team leaders’ direct supervisor, comprised the second largest group with 23.88% of the total response.

Table 9. Frequency distribution by role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>13.016%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Leader</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>23.878%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Member</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>52.065%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCC Partner</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>11.041%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The larger number of cluster leaders responding to this survey may reflect personal relationships they have with field personnel. Since team leaders submitted names of those to complete the survey, cluster leaders who were familiar with the team leader but not their supervisor could have been asked to complete a questionnaire. GCC partners who worked alongside these team leaders comprised the smallest group of respondents at 11.44%. GCC partners often serve on IMB teams in an important adjunct role.

Time on the Field

The demographic indicator of “time on the field” brought the dimension of longevity into this analysis, as displayed in Table 10. Time on the field data was gathered using year ranges as defined categories which limited the researcher’s ability to calculate measures of central tendency (see Appendix 1). Year ranges were used to standardize the responses from participants. The total number of respondents to this survey was 1,114, composed of 145 team leaders and 969 respondents. Team leaders
serving less than 5 years were the largest group of responses with 21.38% or 31 team leaders. Respondents in this age grouping were also the largest number of responses with 38.49% or 373 respondents. Team leaders serving between 6 and 11 years made up 31.09% of team leaders (45) in this survey but only 21.47% of respondents (208). The majority of team leaders (52.41%) served for less than 12 years. In comparison, the majority of respondents (52.01%) served on the field for less than 9 years. Team leaders with from 17 to 25 years on the field composed 10.35% or 15 individuals. Survey respondents with the same time on the field composed 13.83% or 134 persons.

Respondents were not required to enter time on the field data and 25 individuals or 2.58% of the sample chose not enter their time on the field data.

### Table 10. Time on the field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time on the field</th>
<th>Team Leader Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
<th>Respondent Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.759%</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>20.124%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18.621%</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>18.369%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.241%</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>13.519%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.793%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7.946%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.552%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>8.359%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-16 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.793%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7.534%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-19 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.069%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.573%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.517%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.541%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-25 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.759%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.715%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.897%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.740%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.580%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leadership Styles**

Following the demographics section, respondents were asked to continue and complete the MLQ questionnaire measuring TF, TA, and PA leadership styles through
the use of nine subscales. These subscales were combined as shown in Table 11 to produce a TF, TA, and PA leadership score. MLQ structures leadership styles as a continuum from passive/avoidant leadership to transformational styles. Transition points between leadership styles were based on national norms identifying movement on the leadership continuum (Avolio and Bass, 2004, 99). Leadership styles were measured as percentages of individual subscales listed below. As subscales scores increased, the greater the indication the leader was behaving in ways which indicated a specific leadership behavior. For example, as transactional leadership scores increased, the leader became more transformation in his approach and leadership style.

As shown in Table 11, IMB team leaders scored above the MLQ mean on six of nine subscales (IA, IB, IC, IM, CR, MBEA) and below the mean on three subscales (IS, MBEA, PA). IMB team leaders were assessed as a total group without differentiating between transformational and transactional leaders. This group of leaders is broken out by leadership style in the additional findings section. Scores above the MLQ mean indicated these leadership behaviors were more prevalent in IMB team leaders than in the general population used to construct the MLQ norm; likewise, when subscale scores fell below the MLQ norm, the specific behaviors were less characteristic of IMB team leaders as compared to the MLQ norm. When subscale scores dropped below the MLQ mean, it meant the specific leadership behaviors were less characteristic of IMB leaders than of individuals in the general population. The total listening score was grouped on TF and TA leadership styles. Team leaders with a TF score equaling 3.0 or greater were assigned to the TF group and team leaders with a TF score below 3.0 were assigned to the TA group (Avolio and Bass 2004, 99). No team leader scored below
2.0 on the TF scale so PA leadership was excluded. Table 11 provides a summary of the nine leadership scales for this sample as compared with national norms (Avolio and Bass 2004, 99).

Table 11. MLQ descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MLQ Subscales</th>
<th>Mean (n=145)</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>MLQ Mean (n=27,285)</th>
<th>MLQ Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>3.073**</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>3.095</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>3.251**</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>3.300</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>3.135**</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>3.138</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>2.741</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>2.753</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>3.012**</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>3.031</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF Score</td>
<td>3.042**</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>3.037</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>2.906**</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>2.933</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>1.229</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA Score</td>
<td>2.088</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>2.097</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive/Avoidant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEP</td>
<td>1.040**</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA Score</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>2.866**</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>2.875</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>3.205**</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>3.246</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>3.221**</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>3.222</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** Above MLQ mean; IA=Idealized Influence-Attributed; IB=Idealized Influence–Behavior; IM=Inspirational Motivation; IS=Intellectual Stimulation; IC=Individual Consideration; TF Score=Total Transformational Score; CR=Contingent Reward; MBEA=Management-by-Exception (Active); TA Score=Total Transactional Score; MBEP=Management-by-Exception (Passive); PA=Laissez-faire Leadership; PA= Total Passive/avoidant Score EE=Extra Effort; EF=Effectiveness; SAT=Satisfaction (Avolio and Bass 2004, 73); MLQ data is limited to two decimal places.

Leadership outcomes were measured in MLQ and focused on the respondents’ perception of the leader effectiveness, efficiency, and respondents’ satisfaction with the
leader. On each of these scales, IMB leaders, as a group, scored above the mean but within the standard deviation of the population norm. This would indicate that IMB team leaders were perceived as more effective, efficient, and possessed a higher level of respondent satisfaction than the MLQ norms.

**Listening Practices**

The third section of the survey consisted of the LPFR measured perceptions of the leaders’ listening abilities as defined by six listening dimensions. The LPFR rated listeners on a ten-point Likert scale on the 28 listening questions. The highest possible listening score for any given question is 10 with the highest possible total LPFR score of 280. According to LPFR, leaders scoring between (280-225) are in the 80\textsuperscript{th} percentile and considered highly effective listeners. Leaders in the 70th percentile (224-196) on these subscales were seen as effective listeners. Listening scores below 196 fell below the 70th percentile and were considered average listeners (Brant Management 1999).

Table 12 presents the mean, standard deviation, and median for each dimension of listening as identified by the LPFR. Means above 7.0 indicated effectiveness on the subscale. Likewise, means greater than 8.0 indicated highly effective listening for that particular subscale. There are no nationally published norms for LPFR to compare with the current sample. Other researchers who have studied listening practices used LPFR with a combined total of 322 leaders in hotel management, U. S. Coast Guard, and two non-profit organizations (Orick 2002; Ellis 2003; Williams 2006; Miller 2008). Previous research served as a guide but did not contain the data necessary to establish a norm for the LPFR. The current sample is the largest using the LPFR as an instrument for dissertational research. Table 12 lists the LPFR descriptive
statistics.

Table 12. LFPR descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LPFR Subscales</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATTN</td>
<td>7.094</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>7.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>8.137</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>8.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>8.228</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>8.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>5.853</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>5.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>7.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESP</td>
<td>8.228</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>8.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPFR Score</td>
<td>7.471</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>7.486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ATTN=Attention; EMP=Empathy; MEM=Memory; OM=Open Mind; REST=Respect; RESP=Response; LPFR=Total Listening Practices Feedback Report Score

Research Questions

In order to determine if a relationship existed between leadership styles and listening practices as found in RQ 1, 2, 3, and 5, Pearson product-moment correlation (r), linear regressions, and the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) were calculated on data gathered through the MLQ and LPFR. These calculations were used to identify statistically significant correlations between the three leadership styles as identified by MLQ and listening dimensions as measured by the LPFR. Correlations identified by Pearson $r$ were interpreted according to guidelines proposed by Salkind and are presented in Table 5, and a p value of less than 0.05 was set to determine statistical significant of the correlation (Salkind 2010, 129).

Table 13 summarizes the analysis for the correlational research questions, and a discussion of the specific finding for each research question is located in the following sections. Research question 1, 2, and 3 found statistically significant relationships
between leadership styles and listening practices. Research question 4 found that transformational leadership scored highest total listening score and research question 5 also found statistically significant relationships with listening dimensions.

Table 13. Summary of findings for RQ 1-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ 1 – TF and LPFR</td>
<td>0.550*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>Moderate Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 2 – TA and LPFR</td>
<td>0.433*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>Moderate Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 3 – PA and LPFR</td>
<td>-0.539*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>Moderate Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 4 – Highest Listening Score</td>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 5 – ATTN and TF</td>
<td>0.315*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>Weak Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 5 – EMP and TF</td>
<td>0.513*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>Moderate Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 5 – MEM and PA</td>
<td>-0.598*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>Moderate Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 5 – REST and TF</td>
<td>0.370*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>Weak Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 5 – RESP and PA</td>
<td>-0.591*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>Moderate Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Correlation = p<0.05 indicates a statistical significance. TA=Transactional; TF=Transformational; PA=Passive\Avoidant; MLQ=Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire ATTN= Attention; EMP=Empathy; MEM= Memory; OM= Open Mind; REST = Respect; RESP= Response.

Research question 4 ranked leadership styles and returned the highest total listening score. Therefore, a frequency distribution was calculated to determine which of the three leadership styles had the highest listening score. Research question 5 identified the leadership style with the strongest correlation for listening dimensions.

**Findings Related to Research Question 1**

The first research question examined whether a relationship existed between transformational leaders and listening practices. The research question asks, “What, if any, is the relationship between transformational leadership style and listening
practices?" Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient or, Pearson $r$, was used to determine if a relationship existed between transformational leadership style and listening practices. The calculation returned a correlation of 0.550 (Table 14). The $p$ value for the correlation was 0.000 which indicated a statistically significant finding ($r=0.550$, $p=0.000$).

Table 14. Correlation coefficients for TF and LFPR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LPFR</th>
<th>ATTN</th>
<th>EMP</th>
<th>MEM</th>
<th>OM</th>
<th>REST</th>
<th>RESP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>0.550*</td>
<td>0.315*</td>
<td>0.513*</td>
<td>0.472*</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.370*</td>
<td>0.528*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p=0.00$</td>
<td>$p=0.00$</td>
<td>$p=0.00$</td>
<td>$p=0.00$</td>
<td>$p=0.00$</td>
<td>$p=0.00$</td>
<td>$p=0.00$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *$= p<0.05$ indicates a statistical significance. TF=Transformational leadership; LPFR = Listening Practices Feedback Report ATTN= Attention; EMP=Empathy; MEM= Memory; OM= Open Mind; REST = Respect; RESP= Response

As shown in Table 5, a correlation between 0.4 and 0.6 indicated a moderately positive relationship. Based on the correlation in Table 14, a statistically significant, moderately positive relationship does exist between transformational leadership styles and listening practices as measured by the LPFR. This finding would suggest the higher the transformational score, the more positively respondents perceived the leader’s listening behavior. Conversely, as a leader’s transformational leadership score decreased, the less likely the team leader was perceived as one who listened to his team.

The table above displays significant correlations between transformational leadership and each of the dimensions of listening. Transformational leadership has a moderately positively correlation with LPFR ($r=0.550$, $p=0.000$). This correlation indicates that when LPFR listening practices increased, TF leadership tended to increase.
The LPFR subscales of attention, empathy, memory, open mind, respect, and response have statistically significant, positive correlations with transformational leadership as shown in Table 5 and Table 14 above. Hence, transformational leaders were perceived by their followers and peers as being attentive and empathic leaders who remembered previous conversations. These leaders were perceived as open minded, respectful, and were responsive to those they lead.

In order to measure the strength of the relationship between transactional leadership style and listening practices and to determine if a linear model could be used to predict listening behavior from leadership style, a linear regression was calculated using Minitab. Table 15 provides the results of this regression. During the calculation of linear regression, the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) was determined.

### Table 15. Linear regression for TF and LFPR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.252</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFPR</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The coefficient of determination ($R^2$) measures the strength of a relationship by representing the percentage of variation in listening practices ($y$) that can be explained by the relationship with leadership style ($x$) (Donnelley 2007, 324). As shown in Table 15, the linear regression model projected the relationship between transformational leadership style and listening practices with a coefficient of determination of 30.3%. The remaining 69.7% of the variance was unaccounted for in this linear regression model. Rumsey states that predictions based on a coefficient of determination ($R^2$) of less than
30% do not fit well and could not be used for prediction. Although in this case, R² is 0.3% above the 30% threshold set by Rumsey, predictions based on such a slight percentage would not be strong enough to be predictive. Therefore, even though a statistically significant, moderately positive relationship does exist between transactional leadership style and listening practices, the linear regression model does not indicate these two variables have significant enough fit to predict listening practices.

**Findings Related to Research Question 2**

The first research question examined whether a relationship existed between transformational leaders and listening practices. Research question 2 asks, “What, if any, is the relationship between transactional leadership style and listening practices?” Pearson r was used to determine if a relationship existed between transactional leadership style and listening practices. Table 16 displays the results of this correlation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LPFR</th>
<th>ATTN</th>
<th>EMP</th>
<th>MEM</th>
<th>OM</th>
<th>REST</th>
<th>RESP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>0.433*</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.412*</td>
<td>0.443*</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.452*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=0.00</td>
<td>P=0.08</td>
<td>p=0.00</td>
<td>p=0.00</td>
<td>p=0.10</td>
<td>p=0.20</td>
<td>p=0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = p<0.05 indicates a statistical significance. TA=Transactional leadership; LPFR = Listening Practices Feedback Report ATTN= Attention; EMP=Empathy; MEM=Memory; OM= Open Mind; REST = Respect; RESP= Response

The calculation returned a correlation of 0.443. The p value for the correlation was 0.000 which indicated a statistically significant finding (r=0.443, p=0.000). A statistically significant, moderately positive relationship does exist between transformational leadership style and listening practices as measured by the LPFR. This finding suggests
the higher the transactional score, the more positively respondents perceived the leader’s listening behavior. Conversely, as a leader’s transactional leadership score decreased, it was less likely the team leader was perceived as one who listened to his team.

The LPFR subscales of empathy (r=0.412, p=0.000), memory (r=0.443, p=0.000), and response (r=0.452, p=0.000) indicated statistically significant, moderately positive correlations do exist between these dimensions of listening practices and transactional leaders as displayed in based on Table 5 and Table 16. A statistically significant relationship did not exist between transactional leadership on LPFR subscales of attention (r=0.144, p=0.084), open mind (r=0.135, p=0.105), and respect (r=0.107, p=0.200) as the p value was above <0.05.

In order to measure the strength of the relationship between transactional leadership style and listening practices and to determine if a linear model can be used to predict listening behavior from leadership style, a linear regression was calculated using Minitab. Table 17 provides the results of this regression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.537</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFPR</td>
<td>0.3517</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, the coefficient of determination (R²) was also calculated during the linear regression. The coefficient of determination (R²) measures the strength of a relationship by representing the percentage of variation in listening practices (y) that can be explained by the relationship with leadership style (x) (Donnelley 2007, 324). As
shown in Table 17, the linear regression model calculated the variance between transactional leadership style and listening practices with a coefficient of determination of 18.7%. Only 18.7% of the variance between transactional leadership and listening practices of team leaders was accounted for by the variance of transactional leadership. The remaining 81.3% of variability was unaccounted for in this regression model. Therefore, even though a statistically significant, moderately positive relationship did exist between transactional leadership style and listening practices, the linear regression model did not indicate listening practices could be predicted from transactional leadership style. Rumsey indicates a coefficient of determination less than 30% did not fit well and could not be used for prediction as the $R^2$ was less than 30% (Rumsey 2009, 76).

**Findings Related to Research Question 3**

The second research question examined whether a relationship existed between transactional leadership style and listening practices. Research question 3 asks, “What, if any, is the relationship between passive/avoidant leadership style and listening practices?” According to Avolio and Bass, this leadership style is considered non-leadership style, however MLQ still considers passive/avoidant (PA) leadership prevalent enough to continue to assesses this style (Avolio and Bass 2004, 3). Pearson $r$ was used to determine if a relationship existed between passive/avoidant leadership and listening practices. The calculation returned a correlation of -0.539 (Table 18). The p value for the correlation was 0.000 which indicated a statistically significant finding ($r=-0.539$, $p=0.000$). According to Table 5, a correlation between a negative 0.4 and 0.6 indicates a moderate negative or inverse relationship, therefore concluding that a statistically
significant, moderately negative relationship did exist between passive/avoidant leadership and listening practices as measured by the MLQ and LPFR. This finding suggests the higher the passive/avoidant leadership score, the more negatively respondents considered the leader’s listening behavior. Conversely, as a leader’s passive/avoidant leadership score decreased, the greater likelihood the team leader is perceived was listening to his team.

Table 18. Correlation coefficients for PA and LFPR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LPFR</th>
<th>ATTN</th>
<th>EMP</th>
<th>MEM</th>
<th>OM</th>
<th>REST</th>
<th>RESP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>-0.539*</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td>-0.486*</td>
<td>-0.598*</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>-0.328*</td>
<td>-0.591*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=0.000</td>
<td>p=0.060</td>
<td>p=0.000</td>
<td>p=0.000</td>
<td>p=0.310</td>
<td>p=0.000</td>
<td>p=0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = <0.05 indicating a statistical significance. PA=Passive/avoidant leadership LPFR = Listening Practices Feedback Report ATTN= Attention; EMP=Empathy; MEM= Memory; OM= Open Mind; REST = Respect; RESP= Response

Overall, this leadership style had an inverse correlation as compared to the previous two styles. Of the six listening dimensions, only the open mind dimension had a positive correlation and it was statistically insignificant and weakly correlated (Table 5). The remaining five aspects of listening practices had a negative correlation. The subscales of empathy (r=-0.486, p=0.000), memory (r=-0.598, p=0.000), and respect (r=-0.596, p=0.000) had a statistically significant, moderately inverse relationship according to Table 4. The combined LPFR score (r=-0.539, p=0.000) was also a statistically significant, moderately negative relationship. This indicated that the more a team leader used a passive/avoidant leadership style, the less likely the leader was perceived as a listener.
In order to measure the strength of the relationship between passive/avoidant leadership style and listening practices and to determine if a linear model could be used to predict listening behavior from leadership style, a linear regression was calculated using Minitab. Table 19 provides the results of this regression.

Table 19. Linear regression for PA and LFPR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.363</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFPR</td>
<td>-0.479</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>-7.66</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression Equation: PA=4.363 + -0.479 LPFR

Additionally, the coefficient of determination (R²) was also calculated during the linear regression. The coefficient of determination (R²) measures the strength of a relationship by representing the percentage of variation in listening practices (y) that could be explained by the relationship with leadership style (x) (Donnelley 2007, 324). As shown in Table 19, the linear regression model projected the relationship between passive/avoidant leadership style and listening practices with a coefficient of determination of 29.1%, which means 29.1% of the variance between PA leadership style and LPFR practices were due to these two variables. The remaining 70.9% of the variance was unaccounted for in this model. Therefore, even though a statistically significant, moderately negative relationship did exist between passive/avoidant leadership and listening practices, the linear regression model did not indicate these two variables influenced the other variable to predict listening practices from PA leadership. Rumsey indicates a coefficient of determination less than 30% did not provide sufficient fit for prediction (Rumsey 2009, 76).
Findings Related to Research Question 4

The fourth research question examined the three leadership styles to determine which one produced the highest total listening practice score. This research question asks, “Which of the three leadership styles produces the highest total listening practice score?” The total listening practice score was calculated by summing top possible scores on each of the six dimensions of listening practices. The maximum score possible on the LPFR is 280. According to Brandt Management Group, the higher the total listening scores the more effective the leader’s listening practices (Brandt Management Group 1998, 24; Williams 2006, 104).

The LPFR listening responses from all respondents were summed for each team leader and divided by the number of respondents, resulting in a mean total listening score. The sample was grouped by primary leadership style, and measures of central tendency were calculated for both groups. The total listening score was grouped on TF and TA leadership styles. Team leaders with a TF score equaling 3.0 or greater were assigned to the TF group and team leaders with a TF score below 3.0 were assigned to the TA group (Avolio and Bass 2004, 99). No team leader scored below 2.0 on the TF scale so PA leadership was excluded. For this analysis, the scores on this research question were categorized by percentages to indicate a range of effective listening. A LPFR composite score over 196 indicated an effective listener and scores over 224 indicated a highly effective listener. Both transformational and transactional leaders scored on the upper end of the high listening range (196-224). The difference in the means suggested that leaders who were perceived as transformational leaders were seen as having better listening practices than transactional leaders. Leaders in the TF group had a higher LPFR
mean score (213.668) than leaders in the TA group (202.857). A comparison of leadership styles and listening practices are displayed in Table 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>MLQ Mean</th>
<th>MLQ Std Dev</th>
<th>MLQ Median</th>
<th>N=145</th>
<th>LPFR Mean</th>
<th>LPFR Std Dev</th>
<th>LPFR Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-TF</td>
<td>3.218</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>3.203</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>213.688</td>
<td>7.021</td>
<td>212.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-TA</td>
<td>1.966</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>1.963</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>202.857</td>
<td>8.776</td>
<td>202.881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transformational leaders scored higher than transactional leaders by more than one standard deviation. \( (TA \bar{m} (202.857)) + (TA \bar{sd} (8.776)) = 211.63 \). Even though the difference between these two leadership styles was a standard deviation, both styles scored as effective listeners. Shamir contends that transactional leaders have developed listening skills as part of their transactional process. He suggests that consistently honoring transactional agreements builds trust, dependability, and a perception of consistency between TA leaders and followers (Shamir 1995, 19-47). This would suggest that respondents perceived TF leaders as using listening practices more frequently than TA leaders. Team leaders grouped as transactional were perceived as having a high level of listening practice but not to the level of transformational leaders.

**Findings Related to Research Question 5**

The final research question examined the relationship of leadership styles to individual listening dimensions. This research question sought to determine “Which leadership style(s) correlate with the highest individual dimensions of listening practices?” Pearson \( r \) was used to determine if a relationship existed between the MLQ leadership styles and LPFR individual listening dimensions. Northouse also understands
the use of leadership styles as a continuum, since they are not mutually exclusive (Northouse 2007, 180). MLQ provides scores for each leadership styles and, therefore, a leader whose primary leadership behavior is TF also has a TA and PA score, hence a comparison is possible. This ability to drill down on MLQ leadership style allows an indepth look at a leader’s style. As the FRLM model spans the three leadership styles, scores on all styles are available. Therefore, even though none of the team leaders scored low enough to be a passive/avoidant leader, each individual still had a passive/avoidant score. The calculation returned the following correlations, found in Table 21. The p value for these correlations was 0.000 which indicated a statistically significant finding (p=<0.05). Five of the six dimensions had a statistically significant relationship with a p-value of <0.05. The listening dimension of open mind did not reflect a statistically significant score due to a p-value in excess of 0.05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>PA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attention</strong></td>
<td>0.315* P=0.000</td>
<td>0.144 P=0.084</td>
<td>-0.152 P=0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empathy</strong></td>
<td>0.513* P=0.000</td>
<td>0.412* P=0.000</td>
<td>-0.486* P=0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memory</strong></td>
<td>0.472* P=0.000</td>
<td>0.443* P=0.000</td>
<td>-0.598* P=0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open mind</strong></td>
<td>0.088 P=0.293</td>
<td>0.135 P=0.105</td>
<td>0.083 P=0.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respect</strong></td>
<td>0.370* P=0.000</td>
<td>0.107 P=0.200</td>
<td>-0.328* P=0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>0.528* P=0.000</td>
<td>0.452* P=0.000</td>
<td>-0.591* P=0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = p<0.05 indicates a statistical significance. TF=Transformational, TA=Transactional, PA=Passive/Avoidant
Note: All correlations are statistically significant except – TF – Open Mind; TA – Attention, Open Mind, Respect; PA – Attention, Open Mind.

Figure 2. Listening dimensions and leadership style

Table 21 shows a Pearson $r$ for each dimension of listening and leadership style. The remaining dimensions had correlations which were statistically significant. Statistically significant correlations were found on empathy, memory, and response dimension across all three leadership styles. Figure 2 displays the contrast the correlations between transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership styles and listening preferences.

Attention was the first dimension and had the strongest correlation with
transformational leadership \((r=0.315, p=0.000)\) and indicated a moderately positive relationship between these variables (Table 5). Attention did not have a statistically significant relationship with either transactional or passive/avoidant leadership styles as the \(p\) value exceeded 0.05.

The second dimension of empathy correlated significantly with transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership styles. Of the three styles, strongest relationship was with transformational leadership with a moderate positive correlation. \((r=0.513, p=0.000)\). Passive/avoidant leadership style’s correlation with empathy was moderately negative \((r=-0.486, p=0.000)\).

Memory was the third dimension analyzed and was also statistically significant as it correlated across all three leadership styles. The strongest correlation was with passive/avoidant leadership \((r=-0.598, p=0.000)\) and is a moderately negative correlation. Transformational leadership’s correlation \((r=0.472, p=0.000)\) moved in the opposite direction as a moderately positive correlation.

Respect was the fourth dimension and had statistically significant correlations with transformational and passive/avoidant leadership styles. This dimension had a moderately positive correlation \((r=0.370, p=0.000)\) with transformational leadership and a moderately negative correlation \((r=-0.328, p=0.000)\) with passive/avoidant leadership.

Response was the final dimension of listening in this analysis and had a statistically significant correlation with all three leadership styles. The strongest relationship was between response and passive/avoidant leadership \((r=-0.591, p=0.000)\) which was a moderately negative correlation. Transformational leadership \((r=0.528), p=0.000)\) had a moderately positive correlation with the response dimension. Table 22
shows the calculations of the coefficient of determination, $R^2$, for leadership styles and
listening practices.

Table 22. Linear regression of listening dimensions and leadership styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Err</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6.027</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>22.37</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression Equation: $ATTN=6.027 + 0.350 TF$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Err</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.821</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression Equation: $EMP=4.821+1.090 TF$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Err</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>9.159</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>81.89</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>-1.191</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>-8.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression Equation: $MEM=9.159 - 1.191 PA$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Err</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.956</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>21.22</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.0918</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression Equation: $REST=5.956 + 0.437 TF$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Err</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>9.093</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>85.97</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>-1.105</td>
<td>0.1264</td>
<td>-8.75</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression Equation: $RESP=9.093 - 1.105 PA$

Note: *$= p<0.05$ indicates a statistical significance. TF=Transformational, TA=Transactional, PA=Passive/Avoidant

A coefficient of determination ($R^2$) was calculated for each subscale in Table 22. The coefficient of determination ($R^2$) measures the strength of a relationship by representing the percentage of variation in listening practices ($y$) that can be explained by the relationship with leadership style ($x$) (Donnelley 2007, 324). In Table 22, the listening dimension of attention has a $R^2$ of 9.9% indicating that 9.9% of the variance
between transformational leadership and attention was related and 89.1% of the variance was unaccounted. Empathy had a coefficient of determination, $R^2$, of 26.3%, which indicated that 26.3% of the variance of empathy was accounted for by transformational leadership. The remaining 73.7% of the variance was unaccounted for in this model. The listening dimension of memory had a coefficient of determination of 35.7% indicating that 35.7% of the variance of memory was accounted for by passive/avoidant leadership and the remaining 64.3% of this variance was unaccounted for by this model. On the listening subscale of respect, the coefficient of determination, $R^2$, was 13.7% indicating that 13.7% of the variance of response was accounted for by transformational leadership and the remaining 86.3% of the variance was unaccounted for as projected by this model. The subscale of response had a coefficient of determination, $R^2$, of 34.9% which indicated that 34.9% of the variance of response was accounted for by passive/avoidant leadership. The remaining 65.1% of the variance was unaccounted for by the linear regression model. Rumsey indicated a coefficient of determination less than 30% did not provide sufficient fit for prediction, therefore only the regression models for memory and response are predictive (Rumsey 2009, 76).

**Additional Findings**

Two additional analyses were conducted on the sample data to determine if other factors such as age of team leaders, gender, or outcomes of leadership might extend this research beyond the stated research questions. The first was an ANOVA for age and leadership style and the second ANOVA was calculated on gender and leadership style. The final ANOVA was conducted on the outcomes of leadership. The analysis of variance or ANOVA is a statistical test to determine the variance between the means of
more two groups on one factor or dimension (Salkind 2010, 255). An ANOVA allows researchers to analyze two or more independent variables to understand the effects of each variable separately and the interactions between variables (Howell 2004, 356).

**Age**

The ANOVA, with the significance level set to 0.05, was calculated on the sample data to determine if age of the respondent had a significant effect on leadership style. The result of the ANOVA calculation, found in Table 23, indicated that since the p values were greater than 0.05, age had no effect on determining leadership styles of transformational and transactional team leaders.

Table 23. ANOVA for age and TF and TA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. P</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transformational (TF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transactional (TA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.6307</td>
<td>0.0907</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.8313</td>
<td>0.0610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.4621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: TF = Transformational leadership; TA = Transactional leadership

**Gender**

The ANOVA, with the significance level set to 0.05, was calculated on the sample data to determine if the gender of the respondent had a significant effect on leadership style. The result of the ANOVA calculation is found in Table 24. The ANOVA indicated that since the p value were greater than 0.05, gender had no effect on determining leadership styles
of transformational or transactional team leaders. The ratio of men to women team leaders was 140 to 5 so it is not unexpected that gender was not a factor in measuring leadership style. A female sample size of 5 is too small to make valid comparisons between their leadership styles. The $R^2$ value for gender and transformational leadership was 1.11% and 0.52% for transactional leadership.

Table 24. ANOVA for gender and TF and TA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. P</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational (TF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0252</td>
<td>0.0252</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.2408</td>
<td>0.0270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2.2660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional (TA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0232</td>
<td>0.0232</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10.5958</td>
<td>0.0741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10.7673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: TF = Transformational leadership; TA = Transactional leadership

**Outcomes of Leadership**

Beyond measuring leadership style, respondents were asked to assess team leaders in three other areas: extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction with leadership. MLQ identifies these as outcomes of leadership. These outcomes are not directly related to leadership but provide additional information in understanding the team leader’s influence. Bass and Riggio suggest these outcomes of leadership have a strong positive correlation with transformational leadership (Bass and Riggio 2006, 26).

Extra effort (EE) measured the leader’s ability to motivate and encourage respondents to do more than they expected and go the second mile (Avolio and Bass 2004, 98). This outcome measured the respondents’ desire to succeed and willingness to
try harder because of the leader’s influence. The second category measured how effective (EF) the leader was perceived to be in meeting job related needs, representing the group to upline leadership, meeting organizational requirements, and leading an effective group (Avolio and Bass 2004, 98). The final leadership outcome asked the respondent how satisfied (SAT) he was with his team leader’s leadership and the way that leadership was exercised (Avolio and Bass 2004, 99). These subjective attitudinal measures provided another glimpse into the sphere of leadership and influence.

When asked about outcomes of leadership, respondents gave their perception of their team leaders in these areas. Whereas for other analyses a total sample score was used, in this analysis of outcomes of leadership, team leaders were grouped by their TF scores. As a whole, IMB team leaders scored above the MLQ means as noted in Table 11. Team leaders with a TF score of 3.0 or greater were grouped into the TF group. Team leaders with a TF score of less than 3.0 were in the TA group. The MLQ norms for TF were set at 80% and transactional leader at 50% of the total item score.

Table 25. TF leaders and outcomes of leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TF Leaders n=85</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>MLQ Norm n=27285</th>
<th>Below MLQ norm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>3.102*</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>3.361*</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>3.358</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>3.407*</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>3.416</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Leaders n=60</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>MLQ Norm n=27285</th>
<th>Below MLQ norm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>2.533*</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>2.554</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>2.983*</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>2.992</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>2.957*</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>3.005</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = below mean of the norm; TF = Transformational leadership; TA = Transactional leadership, MLQ norms are limited to two decimals.
As illustrated in Table 25, both TF and TA leaders scored below the norm established by MLQ. Both transformational and transactional leaders’ mean scores were below the MLQ norms for extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction. IMB team leaders who were rated as transformational leaders had a mean score of 3.102 on extra effort, 3.361 for perceived effectiveness, and 3.407 on satisfaction. Transactional leaders’ scores on extra effort were 2.533, effectiveness 2.983, and 2.957 on satisfaction. The difference from the norm was greater with transformational leaders than those who were transactional.

*Alpha Coefficients for Research Scales*

To confirm the internal reliability for MLQ and LPFR, Cronbach alpha coefficients were calculated for these instruments. Table 26 summarizes the results of these calculations with a comparison to MLQ and other sources for LPFR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ</td>
<td>0.80-0.90*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPFR - ATTN</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPFR - EMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPFR - MEM</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPFR - OM</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPFR - REST</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPFR - RESP</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Orick, 2002 n=122, r=607; Miller, 2008 n= 68, r=119; McCord 2011 n=145, r=1,114; MLQ=Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire; ATTN=Attention; EMP=Empathy; MEM=Memory; OM=Open Mind; REST=Respect; RESP=Response; *=Avolio and Bass 2004, 99.
Evaluation of the Research Design

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the relationship between leadership style and listening practices of team leaders. This research was conducted on a 360-degree feedback model, assessed team leaders rated by superiors (cluster leaders) and subordinates (team members or GCC partners). The strengths and weaknesses of the research design are addressed below. The methodology used in this research achieved the research purpose and answered the research questions.

**Strengths**

The selection of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) as a basis to study leadership style is well researched and validated through many studies (Bass and Avolio, 1993a, Bass and Avolio 1999; 2004). Approaching the measurement of leadership style through a valid, well known, and reliable instrument strengthened this study. The 360-degree multi-rater feedback model combined the team leader’s perception of their own leadership and listening practices along with feedback from superiors and subordinates. This multi-rater feedback model provided a greater range of evaluation and more stability in the assessment process.

**Team Leaders**

The research design was dependent upon accessing team leaders serving on a team for more than six months. This sample provided a front line understanding of the leadership styles used in a cross-cultural ministry situation. The relationship between leadership style and listening practices of team leaders provided insight through the eyes of others as to how the team leaders’ functional leadership was viewed.
The IMB’s team leaders were diverse in age, experience, and ministry locations from all around the world were represented in this sample. This ensured a broader understanding of the factors at play in leadership. There are few organizations that can provide such a variety of leaders and respondents for a study such of this type and yet still have a level of homogeneity in its organizational scope and purpose.

**Survey Instruments**

A strength of the study’s research design was the use of two well proven and reliable instruments to measure leadership style and listening practices. The MLQ is an extremely well developed instrument designed to measure leadership style through the eyes of the leader, his supervisor, and subordinates. Considered the premier leadership style instrument, the use of MLQ added a level of rigor and precision to this study (Northouse 2007, 175).

Although not as well-known nor as extensively used as the MLQ, the LPFR provided a stable basis to measure listening practices of team leaders. With a 10 point Likert scale, LPFR was easy to use and understand. Combined, these instruments averaged about 15 minutes to complete.

**Survey Distribution and Administration**

The distribution of this survey was done through SurveyMonkey, a web-based company, which hosted this research. The distribution and administration of the combined survey was greatly assisted though the use of web-based technology as it allowed for names and email addresses to be uploaded to the hosting company’s server. This capability ensured that team leaders and respondents received the same
communication which lessened confusion regarding the research. The survey company also provided a tracking system to monitor the number of responses received, who responded, emails addresses which bounced, and completed responses. This increased functionality allowed the researcher to concentrate on responding to team leaders and respondents within 24 hours when specific questions arose.

**Leadership Style and Listening Practice**

Other researchers called for listening and leadership to be combined and researched to a further degree (Orick 2002, 99; Ellis 2003, 105). There are a variety of perspectives when assessing and measuring listening. Some instruments designed to measure listening perspectives include listening comprehension, retention of content, barriers to effective listening, and observations of listening behaviors (Fitch-Hauser and Hughes 1992, 6-24). Effective leaders are skilled communicators and those who are most effective tend to spend a majority of their time listening (Kouzes and Posner 1995, 60; Janusik and Wolvin 2009, 104-19). Although listening involves external behaviors, much of the listening process is internal to the listener as he processes information mentally (Watson and Barker 1984, 180-197).

There are benefits to studying listening practices of leaders. Listening behavior is an external indicator of internal mental processes and state of mind, thus how the team member perceives a leader impacts the level of commitment, and influence given to the leader. This study was based on the leadership style and listening practices of team leaders as perceived by their followers, peers, GCC partners, and supervisors.

This study expanded the research literature base significantly in two ways: (1) through the use of a global sample allowing for conclusions to be drawn and
generalized for a wide range of leadership experience and (2) by establishing a baseline foundation of research on leadership styles and listening. Since organizations use team structures, a more complete understanding of the relationship between leadership style and listening can build a foundation for improved team leader training.

**Weaknesses**

Once undertaken, all research reveals weaknesses that the researcher would avoid in the next study. One weakness is that the researcher is an employee of the IMB and this may have negatively influenced respondents’ sense of confidence in the level of confidentiality when completing the research instruments. All email correspondence with the respondents came from a secure email account established for in house email. The researcher was relatively well known within the IMB, and some cluster and team leaders knew the researcher personally. Although all communication from the researcher to IMB field personnel regarding this study assured respondents of the confidential nature of their responses and any feedback from respondents would be reported in a composite score, a higher level of participation might have occurred if the researcher was an organizational outsider.

**Organizational change**

A second weakness in the design was the confounding variable of organizational change. Immediately prior to conducting this research, the IMB reorganized its administrative and field structures which directly impacted team leaders, team members, and their supervisors. The new organizational model was met with resistance from field personnel as previously well-defined relationships and
organizational patterns changed and some personnel were redeployed into new assignments. With the initiation of this new organizational design, a new secure email system was introduced and this change further impacted this research as individuals were required to use the newly established system to participate in the research. Several individuals contacted the researcher after the survey closed indicating they had not setup nor checked their new email account thereby missing the opportunity to participate in this research.

**Demographic data**

A third weakness was found in the lack of demographic data required from respondents. Respondents provided their age, role, gender, and time on the field as demographic information. Asking respondents the primary mode of communication with their team leaders would have given insight to the supervisory relationship. If the primary mode of communication with respondents was via email, then listening scores might not reflect the written nature of listening. The demographic variable – years on the field – should be collected as interval data rather than in predefined categories so a more complete and detailed statistical analysis could be performed.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

Following the collection and analysis of the data, the researcher suggested appropriate findings as dictated by the data. These findings addressed the research purpose and questions as listed below. The relationship between leadership style and listening practices was determined and the strength of that relationship assessed. The purpose of the study, implications, applications, and recommendations for further research are presented in this final chapter.

Research Purpose

The purpose of this correlational research study was to determine if a relationship exists between team leaders’ leadership style and listening practices as perceived by the cluster leader, team leader, and team members.

Research Questions

1. What, if any, is the relationship between transformational leadership style and listening practices?

2. What, if any, is the relationship between transactional leadership style and listening practices?

3. What, if any, is the relationship between passive/avoidant leadership style and listening practices?

4. Which leadership style produces the highest total listening practice score?
5. Which leadership style(s) correlate with the highest individual dimensions of listening practices?

Research Implications

What are the implications for IMB team leaders and other leaders as they express their leadership style and gain a greater understanding of listening practices?

With a careful assessment of the data from this study and a review of precedent literature, the following implications are summarized below:

1. Transformational leadership style and listening practices have a statistically significant relationship across five of six dimensions of listening.

2. Transactional leadership and listening practices have a statistically significant relationship to the listening dimensions of response, memory, and empathy.

3. Passive/avoidant leadership style and listening practices have a statistically significant inverse relationship with the listening dimensions of empathy, memory, respect, and response.

4. Of the three leadership styles, transformational leadership ranked the highest in listening practices.

5. Five listening dimensions had statistically significant relationships with transformational and passive/avoidant leadership styles.

6. Most IMB team leaders are transformational leaders and scored at a high level of listening practices.

7. The scores of IMB transactional leaders were higher than the MLQ norms.

8. IMB team leaders were rated below the MLQ norms on the outcomes of leadership.

9. Listening is an integral aspect of communication and leadership.

Transformational Leaders and Listening

Transformational leadership style and listening practices have a statistically significant relationship across five of six dimensions of listening.
The transformational leader is perceived as listening to others. Bass and Avolio allude to the probability of leadership listening to others as being an aspect of transformational leadership. In describing the transformational leader, Bass characterizes this leader as behaving “in ways that motivate and inspire those around them by providing meaning and challenge” (Bass and Riggio, 2006, 6). Transformational leadership, as defined by Bass, is also admired, trusted, and respected (Bass and Riggio, 2006, 6). Kouzes and Posner state “the best say to overcome obstacles is to meet, watch, listen, and discuss” (Kouzes and Posner 202, 374). Transformational leaders in this study appeared to follow this advice.

The moderately positive statistically significant correlation (r=0.550) between transformational leadership and listening practices confirmed what had been thought in the literature but had not yet been proven. It is significant that each of the six listening dimensions were positively correlated with transformational leadership (see Table 14). The listening dimensions, as identified and measured in the LPFR, aligned and correlated with transformational leadership theory.

One aspect of motivation and inspiration is listening to the needs, hopes, and desires of others, and responding. Transformational leaders provide meaning and challenge to those they lead as they both respond to and respect the individual and his contribution. The listening dimension most strongly correlated with transformational leadership in this study was response (r=0.528, p=0.000). Among the other subscales, empathy (r=0.513) and memory (r=0.472) had the strongest correlations. These leaders were perceived as paying attention to respondents (r=0.315, p=0.000) as they interacted with them.
Transformational leaders are transformational partly due to their ability to connect with the hopes, dreams, and aspirations of people. Southard and Wolvin suggest that a leader must be connected to the people, and listening is necessary for successful interpersonal relationships (Southard and Wolvin 2009, 145). Listening provides the avenue for this leadership to occur.

**Transactional Leaders and Listening**

*Transactional leadership and listening practices have a statistically significant relationship to the listening dimensions of response, memory, and empathy.*

Transactional leadership is used throughout organizations on a daily basis. The transactional leader trades rewards for results and monitors performance against set goals to find errors, defects, or under performance (Bass 1985, 11). Managers are considered transactional leaders and emphasize process rather than substance (Bass 1985, 13). Further, Burns suggested a transactional leader motivates followers by giving rewards for services provided (Burns 1978, 19). Leaders and managers have organizational demands placed on them which are transactional in nature; however, leaders have a choice in how those demands are communicated and implemented with their team.

The moderately positive and statistically significant correlation ($r=0.443$) existed between transactional leadership and listening practices. This relationship was seen in the correlation between response ($r=0.452$), memory ($r=0.443$), and empathy ($r=0.412$). It is significant that the three listening dimensions were positively correlated with transactional leadership and were also correlated with transformational leadership (see Table 14 and 16). The listening dimensions of response, memory, and empathy, as
identified and measured in the LPFR, supported transactional leadership theory.

Transactional leadership theory suggests these leaders are interested in achieving goals, meeting defined standards, and have less concern for either personal or developmental needs of their subordinates. Bass emphasizes that transactional leaders are skilled at compromise and control (Bass 1985, 13). The listening dimensions of response and memory operate as the transactional leader remembers and responds to errors, mistakes, or under performance. Shamir suggests by honoring transactional agreements and consistently following through, transactional leaders build trust and dependability with followers (Shamir 1995, 19-47). Empathy is shown when this leader is negotiating with the subordinate to achieve the leader’s goals. Depending on the personality of the leader, transactional leaders may also respond as benevolent dictators or tyrants (Bass and Riggio 2006, 62).

**Passive/Avoidant Leaders and Listening**

*Passive/avoidant leadership style and listening practices have a statistically significant inverse relationship with the listening dimensions of empathy, memory, respect, and response.*

Bass and Riggio describe passive/avoidant leadership as avoidance of leadership and is mostly inactive as well as ineffective (Bass and Riggio 2006, 8). This leadership style is non-transactional as decisions are not made and the leader’s authority is not used (Bass and Riggio 2006, 9). Listening in this environment or under this type of leadership does not positively impact the subordinate.

The moderately negative statistically significant correlation ($r=-0.539$) between passive/avoidant leadership and listening practices confirms what has been thought in the literature but had not yet been proven (see Table 13). It is significant that five of the six
listening dimensions had statistically significant negative correlation with passive/avoidant leadership (see Table 18). The listening dimensions, as identified and measured in the LPFR, supported passive/avoidant leadership theory.

The four listening dimensions with negative correlations are: memory (r=\(-0.598\)), response (r=\(-0.596\)), empathy (r=\(-0.486\)), and respect (r=\(-0.328\)). The implication for this leadership style for subordinates is conversations are “heard” but no actions are taken nor are decisions made. This passive/avoidant style does not express empathy or respect for subordinates. In fact, the more this style is used, the less communication and listening occur. When compared to MLQ norms, none of the IMB team leaders had a passive/avoidant leadership style.

With an inverse correlation, this leadership style diminishes the impact of good listening practices seen in transactional and transformational leadership. Subordinates who have passive/avoidant leaders suffer due to their leadership style. As passive/avoidant behaviors occur, it affects subordinates in a negative manner because listening practices decrease as this leadership is exercised. For example, the less active and more passive the passive/avoidant leader becomes the less his subordinates desire to communicate with him. His listening style of non-response and not remembering conversations tend to decrease any influence this leader might have had otherwise.

**Leadership Styles Ranked by Listening Score**

*Of the three leadership styles, transformational leadership ranked the highest in listening practices.*

Each of the leadership styles was ranked according to a total listening score. None of the IMB team leaders scored below the transactional leadership level, therefore
passive/avoidant leadership style was not included. Transformational leaders scored high as listeners with a mean score of 213.688. Transactional leaders scored 202.857, which was 10.83 points lower than transformational leaders but still in the high range on listening scores. Southard and Wolvin suggest that leaders who are connected to people in successful interpersonal relationships use listening as the “glue” for those relationships (Southard and Wolvin 2009, 145). Therefore, team leaders who practice high quality listening would tend to have a higher listening score.

Teams who function most effectively tend to be led by transformational leaders with well-developed listening practices. Although a correlational study cannot state a cause and effect relationship between leadership style and listening practices, one would tend to believe that as transformational leadership increases so will the perceived listening skills of the team leader. Various studies indicate that by promoting listening, the ethos of the organization begins to change and leaders mature into a more transformational leadership style (O’Toole 1996, 46; Heifertz and Laurie 1998, 56; Heifertz and Laurie 1998, 51; Kotter and Schlesinger 1999, 29-49; Charan, Drotter, and Noel 2001, 73; Abrashoff 2002, 43-51). As team members “feel” heard, they are more likely to respond positively to the vision, direction, and encouragement provided by the team leader. Johnson states that emergent leaders normally display more effective listening skills (Johnson 1998, 452-81).

**Listening Dimensions and Leadership Styles**

*Four listening dimensions had statistically significant relationships with transformational and passive/avoidant leadership styles.*

Viewing leadership from the perspective of listening dimensions enabled the
researcher to investigate how each leadership style rated to specific listening subscales. The dimension of open mind was excluded as it did not return a p value less than 0.05. Attention, empathy, and respect were positively and significantly correlated with transformational leaders. Passive/avoidant leadership style recorded the strongest correlations on listening dimensions in this study. These inverse correlations, memory (-0.598, p=0.000) and response (-0.591, p=0.000), were moderately strong correlations (Table 5).

Intuitively, a transformational leader would be perceived as attentive, empathetic, and respectful of the listener. The correlations of these dimensions bear this out. Since this leader’s strengths come from connecting with people, he would naturally tap into their dreams and hopes as he listens to them. The stimulation and inspiration received from a transformational leader would be perceived by team members as empathetic. Listening, paying attention to what is said, and relating with empathy certainly communicate respect when the team member speaks.

Passive/avoidant leaders’ listening practices were negatively correlated with memory and response. This type of leader only intervenes with a situation when it becomes critical. Although staff and subordinates may suggest recommendations and ask for decisions, the passive/avoidant leader does not respond or possibly remember the conversation. Therefore, team members are left with the impression that this ineffective leader did not remember what was said. In the same respect, when the passive/avoidant leader does not provide timely responses to questions, reports, or other communication, he is perceived as lacking in response.
**Transformational Team Leaders**

*Most IMB team leaders are transformational leaders and scored at a high level on listening practices.*

IMB team leaders are recruited from individuals who are already successful. In most cases, team leaders were effective, innovative team members whose gifts and abilities were recognized and appreciated. Although the team leader’s job description includes both transformational and transactional elements, an emphasis is placed on vision casting, mobilizing others, and ensuring that team members are equipped for ministry (Appendix 6). With the organizational bias for transformational leadership, it is not surprising the majority (85 of 145) of team leaders scored as transformational leaders.

With transformational leaders, the organization may be challenged to adapt and grow as fast as their team leaders. The very nature of this leadership style suggests innovation, going beyond current procedures, and pushing the boundaries in pursuit of the vision. Organizational limitations on resources and personnel may squelch some of the transforming initiative of these leaders when they encounter transactional leaders in positions above them.

Through casting vision, transformational team leaders are more likely to retain team members and increase the effectiveness of individuals who have not performed to their potential. The transformational leader influences team members to continue to work and strive to do a better job because they feel supported, understood, and affirmed by their leader. When people feel good about their jobs and supervisors, they want to do their best and make significant contributions through their work. Transformational leaders’ score higher on respondent satisfaction scores than transactional leaders by 0.45 which means respondents were more satisfied with TA leaders.
A benefit of transformational leadership is a decrease in attrition caused by inadequate leadership. When teams are inadequately led and difficulties come, team members emotionally disengage from the team and, while still continuing to work, they lose a passion, energy, and vision for their work. A transformational leader decreases attrition because he is actively engaged with his team, modeling for them the ethos and passion required to get the job done. He shares his vision and challenges his team to reach the goals they have set through encouragement and by equipping them with the skills necessary to accomplish the task.

**Transactional Team Leaders**

_The scores of IMB transactional leaders were higher than the MLQ norms._

IMB team leaders scored higher than the MLQ national norms which would indicate that these leaders, although not transformational in style, were more transformational than the transactional norm. Because their mean score was higher, it is possible that these transactional leaders could be trained and equipped with more transformational skills and thereby improves their level of leadership skill (Church and Waclawski 1998, 99-126). Transactional team leaders are more attuned to ensuring policy and procedures are followed than enabling and developing team members to fulfill the vision and calling of their team (Durbrin 2004, 199).

A transactional leader may stifle and frustrate team members who possess a larger vision or have a strong drive to excel and succeed. Team members who are successful and competent in their job responsibilities may chafe and struggle to express themselves under a transactional leader. All organizations have policies and procedures which must be followed, but the transactional leader follows them with the intent of
catching someone doing something wrong and swoops down to correct the deficiency. This leader only engages a team member when standards are not met or is embarrassed by some action of the team (Sosik and Jung 2010, 11)

**Outcomes of Leadership**

*IMB team leaders rated below the MLQ norms on the outcomes of leadership.*

The implications of a team leader scoring high on getting extra effort from his team are important. Team leaders who scored high on this outcome have influenced and motivated their team to go beyond a forty hour week to accomplish team goals. These leaders developed and encouraged an ethos of “whatever it takes to get the job done” within team members. Extra effort is earned by the team leader and given to him by team members. Team members were motivated to go beyond normal working hours to achieve goals because they wanted to please their leader. The thought of not doing their best and the risk of disappointing him energized them to put forth maximum effort. Extra effort is an intangible quality given by team members to a leader they respect and admire rather than feeling a compulsion to spend the extra time and effort to avoid criticism.

The second outcome of leadership relates to the team leader’s ability to efficiently operate within the organizational structure through official channels. Churches, non-profits, and business organizations have standard operating procedures with deadlines that must be met. Whether it was getting a budget approved or goals written, team leaders who were able to function smoothly within the organizational structure on these tasks were perceived as effective. Leaders who moved through these processes and procedures with ease were able to obtain needed resources and are seen as assets. One aspect of efficiency is communicating to up-line management to secure the
resources and personnel needed for the team. In this study, both transformational and transactional leaders scored lower than the MLQ norm. The IMB is a non-profit organization and dependent on donations to support its operating costs. Budget reductions for the last two years may have impacted team members’ perception of their team leader’s ability to obtain needed team resources.

The last of the three outcomes of leadership, satisfaction, assesses how satisfied team members or respondents are with the team leader as a leader. This measure of satisfaction impacts the team long term as team members who are not satisfied might decide to change teams or leave prematurely. It is difficult to lead people who are not satisfied with their leadership. A leader receiving low satisfaction scores from team members may indicate the team members’ willingness to “stick it out” with the team leader until an opportunity to leave the team occurs. The lack of satisfaction with leadership may lessen the heart commitment toward achieving the team’s goals. Low satisfaction scores may also indicate unspoken morale problems with the organization or team leader.

Why would IMB team leaders score lower than the national norm on these outcomes of leadership? What are the implications for a Christian organization when their team leaders score lower than national norms on outcomes of leadership? Intuitively, one would think missionary team leaders would score highly in these areas of effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction. This researcher believes there may be other organizational factors at work which may have influenced these scores. In the year preceding this research, the IMB reorganized its field organization and structures. A significant level of organizational change was experienced by field teams where
decisions were communicated down from the home office for implementation by a team leader. With the organizational transitions, the autonomy previously experienced by team leaders became more limited. Decisions, once made at a local team level, were now made by individuals outside the team structure. Any leader who implements changes that the team disagrees with or disapproves of may suffer as a result. This may have been the case for some team leaders when rated on outcomes of leadership.

**Implications for Listening**

*Listening is an integral aspect of communications and leadership.* The correlation of listening practices of IMB team leaders with leadership found in this study supports previous studies (Kouzes and Posner 2002, 88-89). Communication is an essential aspect of the leadership process and this study provides additional support that effective listening enhances leadership skills. This study continues to build on existing listening theory and may impact how leaders are trained as communication skills such as listening become more central to their ongoing development and growth.

Listening is the essential first step to communicative competency. Wolvin suggests that only through listening can a communicator understand his own responses (Wolvin 2010, 179). As a communicator, each person engages both psychological and physical filters to understand what he hears, attends to, and how he responds. These filters present significant challenges to understanding the messages one hears.

As leaders, understanding one's psychological filters is of critical importance to effectively leading a team. Johannesen and Purdy suggest that leaders have an ethical responsibility to listen with both skepticism and empathy to others in order to judge the soundness of the argument while fully attempting to understand the speaker (Johannesen
2008, Purdy 1995). With greater understanding of listening, both transformational and transactional leaders will connect more effectively with those they lead.

**Summary of Implications**

There is a positive correlation between transformational and transactional leadership practices of IMB team leaders. Based on leadership styles and listening practices, transformational leaders are perceived as more effective and better listeners than transactional leaders. This is proven by the positive correlations between transformational leadership and five of six of the listening dimensions. Transformational leaders are shown to be more effective in achieving improved performance from their teams (Bass and Avolio 2004, 21). Age, gender, and time on the field are not statistically significant variables on leadership style or listening practice. The majority of IMB team leaders (85 individuals or 58.6%) were rated as transformational leaders and highly effective in their listening practices. The remaining leaders (60 individuals or 41.3%) scored as transactional leaders. Both transformational and transactional team leaders scored below the national norms on outcomes of leadership as measured by the MLQ.

**Research Applications**

The IMB and similar organizations are structuring their staff into functional teams as they implement their work globally. Teams need an effective leader capable of capturing the heart, mind, and soul of those who follow him. The literature points to the importance of leadership that allows individuals to express their own creativity and innovation in the workplace whether that is in an office or working cross-culturally (Zenger and Folkman 2002, 93; Weick 1978, 37-81; Heskett and Schlesinger 1995, 112).
Transformational leadership offers the greatest hope of engaging team members in the global task of evangelism and church planting. This research suggests a linkage between transformational leadership and listening practices. How does this relationship express itself in the life of a team?

A transformational leader realizes that his responsibility is to set a vision for the future that is inclusive of team members’ hopes, dreams, and desires. Through training in both leadership and listening practices, a transformational team leader is able to develop his team to go further and achieve their goals more than other leadership styles. Avolio and Bass’ research supports the idea that transactional leaders can become transformational (Northouse 2007, 180-81). Through the use of MLQ and other leadership inventories, organizational leaders have the opportunity to identify and develop leaders in leadership style to equip them for more effective and fulfilling service. Individuals identified as passive/avoidant leaders could receive training to develop their leadership style to become more transformational, or they might be redeployed to another assignment not involved in leading a team.

**Basic Leader Training**

An immediate application of this study could be implemented through a basic leadership course for front-line supervisors for training in leadership and listening. The course would teach these new leaders the principles of leadership style and provide hands-on practice in listening. Training would teach the principles of leadership style with a focus on transformational and transactional leadership. Passive/avoidant leadership behavior could be identified. Passive/avoidant leadership would be used to demonstrate the pitfalls of ineffective leadership. During basic leadership training, the
differences between transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership could be demonstrated through simulation, role plays and critical incidents. Trainers should identify and discuss the impact of the various styles on followers. This training should emphasize the importance and use of these leadership styles and listening practices. Basic listening training could be implemented using a pretest and post-test model to ensure listening competency. These principles of leadership are also applicable within the church and mission settings.

**Advanced Leader Training**

For experienced leaders, listening and communication training is more critical as their words and listening skills significantly impact team members in the workplace. The findings of this study emphasize the long term need for leaders to grow in leadership style. As more experienced leaders move toward transformational styles, they are modeling for their team the essential qualities for effective leadership. Advanced leader training could teach the Full Range of Leadership Model as proposed by Bass and Riggio (Bass and Riggio 2006, 9).

Advanced leadership training would help experienced leaders better mentor and guide younger leaders grow in leadership at the beginning of their career. Likewise, this type of mentorship enables senior pastors and ministers to continue to grow and develop their leadership as they lead younger men. Biblically, this model already exists as Christ is the Head of the Church and pastors are undershepherds.

**Church Member Orientation and Training**

Within every organization, there is a continual need for trained leaders. As
members relocate or decide to serve in another area of church life, new leaders are needed. As ministry expands into new outreach or the church decides to advocate for an unreached people group, new leaders are needed. When a church decides to reach new people and develop a multisite ministry, new leaders are needed. When individuals join a church, the church’s ethos and expectations for the new member are communicated. As part of the initial working training and church member orientation process, leadership styles and listening practices should be taught because they are foundational to the organization’s success. When this training is conducted, the MLQ and LPFR can provide an objective basis for a developmental growth process and readiness for future leadership positions. Most businesses and churches would welcome a cadre of equipped and trained leaders who are skilled at listening and relate to others in a transformational manner.

**Team Building**

The principles of listening and leadership style could assist teams in better understanding fellow team members and their leadership. As a part of an annual team building event, listening skills and leadership principles could become an integral part of ongoing team development. Trainers could lead team exercises and games which focus on listening and following directions, not as an individual but as a team activity. These listening skills, used in an outdoor, hands on exercise, would enable team members to assess their listening skills. Likewise, three leadership scenarios could illustrate the power of the three leadership styles, followed by a team debrief to assess the effectiveness of each style. Adding to group team building activities, the transformational leader would use this opportunity to deepen their relationship with their fellow team members. Learning the aspirations of team members would be included.
Diagnosing Team Problems

Leadership, listening, and problems are inevitably linked together. When leadership challenges occur, listening is one of the first casualties. As shown in this study, when leaders resort to passive/avoidant styles of leadership, team communication suffers. Listening can be used as a diagnostic tool for assisting leaders to “hear” what is being said and examine their response in light of MLQ leadership styles. When conflict occurs, a wise leader uses all of the dimensions of listening to really understand the source and depth of the issue. A transformational leader will be more effective and active in addressing team problems than a passive/avoidant leader who denies a problem exists or refuses to take decisive action.

Personnel Retention and Attrition

All organizations are confronted by the challenge of retaining productive staff and determining when someone should leave. Retention focuses on keeping individuals who are effective, productive, and have long term potential. Teaming under transformational leadership allows the individual to express his dreams, creativity, and innovation so that he grows as a result of good leadership. Considering the cost of recruiting, selecting, training, salary, and benefits, the total cost of hiring new professional staff can vary from 50 to 150 percent of the employee’s salary (Heber 2010, Haygroup-6-10-2010.pdf). The Hay Group, a global management consulting firm suggests a potential ‘brain drain’ during 2010 and employers must find effective methods to prevent a mass exodus of employee talent (Heber 2010, Haygroup-6-10-2010.pdf). Therefore, it behooves organizations to retain their most productive workers.

This study found that most respondents served overseas for less than eight
years. Reported anecdotally in general mission journals, the typical missionary serves approximately eight years and then returns to their home country (Taylor 1997, 49). The IMB’s personnel retention studies would support the REMAP studies conducted by Taylor (IMB personnel.pdf, 2010). Given the cost of replacing skilled professionals in the business world and the knowledge and ministry skills needed to work in an overseas environment, care should be taken to retain experienced people. Additional research should be conducted to determine the impact of leadership style on personnel retention.

What is the cost to the organization for individuals who leave prematurely due to lack of leadership, non-responsive leadership, or leadership that micro-manages the work?

Brownell indicated that workers do not quit a company; they quit because of their supervisor (Brownell 1990, 401-16). Passive/avoidant and transactional leaders may be the reason trained and qualified employees are choosing to retire early or change employers. This study suggests that as passive/avoidant leadership decreases, listening scores increase. Likewise, as transactional leadership scores become more transformational, listening scores improve. Correlational studies cannot draw a cause and effect relationship between leadership and listening but this type of study does demonstrate the relationship between these variables.

Continuous Improvement

Most successful organizations intend to grow in their scope and impact. Individuals want to improve and grow in their abilities and responsibilities. Equipping people to be effective leaders and listeners is an on-going process. The relationship between leadership and listening can assist both profit and non-profit organizations to make meaningful and measurable changes in leadership style and listening practices of
their employees. Equipping all team members to be more effective and better listeners makes teams more effective and productive and results in better customer service for clients or church members.

**Remedial Leadership Training**

Occasionally, a team leader possesses exceptional abilities or skills but is unable to effectively work with a team. Recognizing the individual’s knowledge of language, culture, or other talents, his supervisor recommends the team leader attend additional training to better equip him to function more effectively. In situations like this, remedial leadership training might be appropriate. One aspect of remedial training should be to conduct a leadership style and listening assessment.

Through the assessment and with a leadership coach, leaders would develop a more complete understanding of their communication patterns, leadership styles, and become more aware of their impact on a team. For leaders who relate with a tendency toward passive/avoidant leadership style, a more active transformational style would be taught. Active listening skills would be an essential aspect of this training.

**Multi-Disciplinary Teams**

The research findings could be applied with multi-disciplinary teams which are increasing in medicine and education (Wilson and Pirrie 2000, 1-4). Listening is a critical component of working together as a team. Some examples of teams which would benefit from training in listening practices and leadership styles are: police officers and other emergency service personnel, multi-disciplinary medical teams, and special educational teams who work with the parents of special needs children. Each of these
teams would perform more effectively if they understood the relationship between leadership style and listening practices.

**Research Limitations**

Leadership styles and listening practices are complex phenomena with many factors contributing to the relationships among these variables. One limitation of a correlational study is causation cannot be drawn. A correlation may exist but this study cannot prove a cause and effect relationship between leadership styles and listening practices.

**Further Research**

Further research regarding leadership style and listening practices are needed. These recommendations are derived from limitations of the research design, new research methodology, and reflection on the data. The researcher hopes to explore the phenomenon of listening, leadership, and followship based on the findings of this study.

**Methodology**

Additional research should be conducted using a mixed method approach to measure leadership and listening. A mixed method approach combines the statistical strength of correlations between groups and adds a context through qualitative research that a correlational study alone cannot provide. A mixed methods approach to leadership and listening would make a contribution to both disciplines. Using a mixed methods study, a qualitative study guide could be developed to lead respondents in describing the behaviors they perceive as transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant. This methodology would go beyond calculating statistical significance to explore the practical
impact of these leadership styles on followers. In the same manner, further research is needed to better define and measure listening. The literature review clearly suggests this is needed as listening is a complex skill, which needs further research (Bodie 1-9, 2011). A mixed methods approach could be used to measure listening using one of the existing instruments and continued with qualitative research to describe the listening process. This approach may result in a more precise instrument to measure and assess listening.

Orick, Ellis, and Miller recommended that qualitative research be used to explore the field of listening (Orick 2002, 85; Ellis 2003, 106; Miller 2008, 100).

**Instrumentation**

Further research is needed in developing the Listening Practices Feedback Report into a more robust and reliable instrument. Assessing listening through a 360-degree feedback model limits the bias found in self-reporting instruments and adds a richness of perspective needed to assess listening. The LPFR needs more rigorous testing through a pretest – post-test protocol to ensure that the six dimensions are unrelated to each other. The LPFR was validated with Listening Preference Profile as noted by Brant et al. and should be compared to the newly revised Watson Barker Listening Test (WBLT). National norms and means need to be developed so comparison can be made across groups (Orick 2002, 86). Orick and Ellis suggested further development of the LPFR to expand the number of questions for each of the subscales (Orick 2002, Ellis 2003). As noted both this and their research, the subscale of open-mind needs re-evaluation to determine if it is a distinct subscale of listening. The listening community could develop more precise instruments to measure and assess the dimensions of listening.
A re-examination of the dimensions of listening could be conducted for LPFR as both Orick and Ellis suggest in their dissertations (Orick 2002; Ellis 2003). The listening dimension of open mind was dropped from Orick’s research. This research would affirm Orick’s call to reassess LPFR’s dimensions and expand the number of questions for each listening dimension.

Cross Cultural Studies

Due to globalization and internationalization of business and non-profit agencies, the relationship between leadership and communication needs to be explored further. This study did not explore the challenges of communication and leadership in a cross-cultural setting. Although this sample was composed of respondents working cross-culturally, this study did not attempt to investigate the communication or leadership challenges experienced working in a multi-national company with staff from several different cultures and countries. MLQ provides a reliable foundation to test leadership style in this manner; however, are there communication instruments capable of meeting this challenge of measuring listening as perceived in another culture?

This research was based on team leaders working overseas with the IMB. Even though the IMB is a global organization, research conducted on a sample of team leaders is limited in scope. Additional research could be conducted with team leaders within churches, associations, or other non-profit agencies to gain a broader understanding of the three leadership styles and their relationship to leader listening practices. Pastors, church staffs, and congregations would benefit from replicating this study within their church to understand their leadership style. Replicating this study with a larger population and sample would be beneficial and add to the fields of both
leadership and listening.

Additionally, team leaders working in any non-profit organization would benefit from this type of study. The results of such a study would expand the understanding of the relationship between leadership styles and team communication. This study demonstrates that a relationship does exist between the three leadership styles as defined by Avolio and Bass with listening practices within non-profit organizations. Additional research should be conducted to determine if the relationship is also found in for-profit organizations and non-governmental agencies.

Listening and communication is part of family life. Improving the listening effectiveness of family members may enable the relationship between parents and teenagers to improve. How does family leadership style impact listening within a family? A study of leadership and communication within the home using the MLQ self-report instrument with each spouse, and asking children, extended family, and friends to provide feedback on listening practices with the LPFR. This research would be aimed at promoting healthy family life as all family members would learn from the research.

Finally, with the increased role of technology as a communication medium and the rise of virtual teams, further research needs to be done regarding the role of technology, leadership, and listening. How does the use of email enhance or detract from effective communication for virtual teams? How does distance impact the nature of leadership in virtual teams? As much of the business and team communication occurs over email, does email correspondence “count” as listening? What are the dynamics of leading a transformational team when the team is not co-located but are spread over several different cities or countries? These questions need further research as more and
more employees take advantage of “work from home” policies to avoid commuting costs.

**Conclusion**

Based on a sample of 145 team leaders from the IMB and with 969 respondents totaling 1,114 who provided feedback through a 360 feedback model, this study found a statistically significant relationship existed between leadership styles and listening practices as measured by MLQ and LPFR. All three of the leadership styles correlated with listening practices. Transformational leadership style is positively correlated with five of six dimensions of listening and transactional leadership style correlates positively with the listening dimensions of empathy, memory, and response. Passive/avoidant leadership has a moderately inverse or negative correlation with attention, empathy, memory, respect, and response. These findings suggest transformational leadership is the most effective listening leadership style.
APPENDIX 1

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

The first section of the survey, following demographics questions were asked.

What is your age: _____

I am:
[ ] Male
[ ] Female

I am a:
[ ] Cluster leader or supervisor
[ ] Team leader
[ ] Team member
[ ] GCC partner

I have been on the field for:
[ ] Less than 2 years
[ ] 3 – 5 years
[ ] 6 – 8 years
[ ] 9 – 11 years
[ ] 12 – 13 years
[ ] 14 – 16 years
[ ] 17 – 19 years
[ ] 20 – 22 years
[ ] 23 – 25 years
[ ] Over 25 years

I have served with this team for 6 months or more.
[ ] Yes
[ ] No

I would like an electronic copy of the findings when this research is complete.
[ ] Yes
[ ] No
APPENDIX 2
MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

This section contains information regarding the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, and Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio of Mind Garden Incorporated regulate the MLQ. Due to the restricted nature of this instrument and copyright concerns, Mind Garden only allows an example of their instrument to be included.

Example: This questionnaire describes the leadership style of the above-mentioned individual, as you perceive it. Please answer all items on this answer sheet. If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank. Please answer this questionnaire anonymously.

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits the person you are describing. Use the following rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not At All</td>
<td>Once in a While</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Fairly Often</td>
<td>Frequently, if not always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Talks optimistically about the future</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Spends time teaching and coaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Avoids making decisions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3

LISTENING PRACTICES QUESTIONNAIRE (LPQ-360)

TEAM LEADER

Name of listener:

DIRECTIONS:

There are no “right” or “wrong” answers to these questions. They describe behavioral criteria used in determining how people are perceived as listeners. The questions do not determine listening ability.

You will be asked to answer questions about how you perceive, how you feel about, your own listening habits.

Some questions are reversed for research validity. Please read each question carefully. Then determine from the rating scale (1-10) how frequently you typically use the behaviors described in most situations with most people. Do not confer with co-workers: your own perception is needed.

Choose one of the ten possible responses for each of the 28 listening practices.

1 = Almost Never
2 = Rarely
3 = Seldom
4 = Once in a While
5 = Occasionally
6 = Sometimes
7 = Fairly Often
8 = Usually
9 = Very Frequently
10 = Almost Always

Record your ratings by selecting the number that corresponds to your answer.

To what extent do you, the listener, use the following behaviors? Select the number that best applies to each practice on the scale below.
I, the listener:

1. Seem to be hurried or impatient during conversations or meetings.
2. Respect others’ ideas and words regardless of our business, social, or economic status.
3. Give full attention and am not preoccupied with other concerns.
4. Show appropriate non-verbal responses, such as nodding and facial expressions.
5. Talk more than listen.
6. Ask relevant questions for clarification of points that are technical or misunderstood.
7. Prepare or become informed when such preparation or knowledge is necessary.
8. Keep a confidence.
9. Take notes when notes are appropriate.
10. Change the topic before proper closure or agreement.
11. Accurately recall comments or positions at a later date.
12. Follow up with prompt actions.
13. Encourage others to give their views on subjects under discussion.
14. Appear to listen with an open mind free from personal biases.
15. Become defensive or emotional when encountering a difficult situation.
16. Sincerely listen without going-through-the-motions.
17. Smile or otherwise acknowledge humorous remarks.
18. Correctly anticipate where the conversation is going.
19. Accurately relate messages to a third party.
20. Maintain comfortable eye contact with speaker.
21. Allow others to finish without interrupting.
22. Hold outside calls and distractions to minimum during meetings and conversations.

23. Repeat, paraphrase, or summarize comments to ensure understanding.

24. Think about the subject under discussion before responding.

25. Place myself in others’ position and understand their concerns and feelings.

26. Avoid emotion-packed (trigger) words, phrases, or clichés.

27. Consider content and logic and am not critical of others’ delivery, appearance, grammar, vocabulary, etc.

28. Produce results consistent with agreed upon instructions or guidelines.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Copyright 1987 and revised 1998 by Brandt Management Inc., Richmond, VA.
APPENDIX 4

LISTENING PRACTICES QUESTIONNAIRE (LPQ-360)

CLUSTER LEADER, TEAM MEMBER, or GCC

Name of listener:

DIRECTIONS:

You have been asked to complete this questionnaire on your team leader with whom you frequently interact.

There are no “right” or “wrong” answers to these questions. They describe behavioral criteria used in determining how people are perceived as listeners. The questions do not determine listening ability.

You will be asked to answer questions about how you perceive, how you feel about, this person’s listening habits.

Some questions are reversed for research validity. Please read each question carefully. Then determine from the rating scale (1-10) how frequently he or she typically use the behaviors described in most situations with most people. Do not confer with co-workers: your own perception is needed.

Choose one of the ten possible responses for each of the 28 listening practices.

1 = Almost Never
2 = Rarely
3 = Seldom
4 = Once in a While
5 = Occasionally
6 = Sometimes
7 = Fairly Often
8 = Usually
9 = Very Frequently
10 = Almost Always

Record your ratings by selecting the number that corresponds to your answer. To what extent do you, the listener, use the following behaviors? Select the number that best applies to each practice on the scale below.
To what extent does the listener use the following behaviors:

1. Seem to be hurried or impatient during conversations or meetings.
2. Respect others’ ideas and words regardless of our business, social, or economic status.
3. Give full attention and am not preoccupied with other concerns.
4. Show appropriate non-verbal responses, such as nodding and facial expressions.
5. Talk more than listen.
6. Ask relevant questions for clarification of points that are technical or misunderstood.
7. Prepare or become informed when such preparation or knowledge is necessary.
8. Keep a confidence.
9. Take notes when notes are appropriate.
10. Change the topic before proper closure or agreement.
11. Accurately recall comments or positions at a later date.
12. Follow up with prompt actions.
13. Encourage others to give their views on subjects under discussion.
14. Appear to listen with an open mind free from personal biases.
15. Become defensive or emotional when encountering a difficult situation.
16. Sincerely listen without going-through-the-motions.
17. Smile or otherwise acknowledge humorous remarks.
18. Correctly anticipate where the conversation is going.
19. Accurately relate messages to a third party.
20. Maintain comfortable eye contact with speaker.
21. Allow others to finish without interrupting.
22. Hold outside calls and distractions to minimum during meetings and conversations.

23. Repeat, paraphrase, or summarize comments to ensure understanding.

24. Think about the subject under discussion before responding.

25. Place myself in others’ position and understand their concerns and feelings.

26. Avoid emotion-packed (trigger) words, phrases, or clichés.

27. Consider content and logic and am not critical of others’ delivery, appearance, grammar, vocabulary, etc.

28. Produce results consistent with agreed upon instructions or guidelines.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Copyright 1987 and revised 1998 by Brandt Management Inc., Richmond, VA

Thank you for your cooperation.

Copyright 1987 and revised 1998 by Brandt Management Inc., Richmond, VA.
APPENDIX 5

SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS AND CORRESPONDENCE

This appendix includes sequence of emails sent to team leaders and those who rated them along with web hyperlinks to the survey site. They are listed in the order they will be sent.
Email Contact No. 1 – Initial Contact – Team Leader

Date Sent:

Dear <insert team leader’s name>,

I need your participation. My name is Steve McCord and, like you, served as a missionary with the IMB for 26 years. I am in the dissertation stage of my Ph.D. at Southern Seminary, which is why I need your help. Research indicates that effective leaders are good listeners and listening and leadership are inseparable. The more effective we become as leaders, the better we become in reaching the lost for Christ. My dissertation focuses on the relationship between leadership style and listening practices of leaders.

This email has several purposes. The first one is to invite you to participate in a 360-degree Leadership Development Survey. This 360-degree feedback process allows input from your Cluster Leader, Team Members, and GCC Partners. Another purpose is to assist you in gaining a better understanding your leadership style to become a more effective leader. The last one is to ask for your participation in this study.

If you agree to participate in this study, you can expect the following from me.
1. You will receive an instructional email with a hyperlink to complete your survey via SurveyMonkey.com survey within 2 days.
2. The survey will take 15-20 minutes of your time.
3. Upon completing the survey, your name is entered to win one of two $50 Amazon gift cards.
4. By agreeing to participate in this study, you will receive an individualized leadership style report describing your leadership style with suggestions on how to become a better leader.

I need two things from you.

1. Your agreement to participate in the study. Reply to smccord.research@gmail.com with a YES or NO in the subject line to confirm your participation.
2. A commitment to respond to the survey instruments within 5 days of receipt. Please respond now.

Let me assure you of the absolute confidential nature of this study. I promise to protect you at all times and all survey information will remain completely anonymous. If you have any questions, please contact me via Skype at smccord2K or by email at smccord.research@gmail.com.

Thanks,
Steve McCord
Email No. 2 – Confirmation Email – Team Leader

<Insert team leader’s name>

Thank you again for your willingness to participate in this study by accepting this invitation. As I mentioned in the initial email, after this study is complete, you will receive an individualized leadership style report describing your leadership style with suggestions on how to increase your leadership capacity. Additionally, your name will be entered for one of two $50 Amazon Books gift cards. The drawing will take place at the end of the research phase in approximately 10 weeks.

**The Survey:**
The hyperlink below will take you to the survey hosted by Surveymonkey.com. To make it easier for you to complete, the two questionnaires are integrated into one survey.

**MLQ** - The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was developed to identify three types of leadership style - transactional, transformational, and passive/avoidant. It is a highly regarded instrument for assessing leadership behavior and style.

**LPFR** - The Listening Practices Feedback Report (LPFR) identifies listening behaviors and practices based on six dimensions such as: attention, empathy, memory, open mind, respect, and response.

Please click on the hyperlink below or paste the url into your browser to access the survey and complete the survey plus some demographic information.

Please complete the survey in the next 2 days.

[www.surveymonkey.com](http://www.surveymonkey.com)

It should take about 15-18 minutes to complete the survey.

**Research Purpose:**
The purpose of this research is to determine if a relationship exists leadership style and listening practices in team leaders.

Again, let me assure you of the absolute confidential nature of this study. I promise to protect you at all times and all survey information will remain completely anonymous.

If you would like any additional information on this research or have any questions, please contact me at smccord.research@gmail.com or Skype smccord2k.

Thank you
Steve McCord
Email Contact No. 3 – Initial Contact – Team Member

<insert team member’s name>

<Insert team leader’s name> is working to improve his/her leadership and listening skills. As a part of this leadership development process, he is taking a leadership development survey. The survey is a 360-degree instrument, which provides not only the leader’s self-assessment but also assessments from his supervisor, team members and GCC partners. As part of this team, your participation in this survey is critically important. Your involvement is critical to the success of this leadership assessment process.

However, let me assure you of the absolute confidential nature of this study. I promise to protect you at all times and all survey information will remain completely anonymous. Your team leader will receive an individualized leadership style report describing their leadership style with suggestions on how to become a better leader. But he will not receive individual results from your responses.

Please help your team leader become a better leader and listener by complete the action steps below within two days of receiving the email below:
1. You will receive an instructional email from Surveymonkey.com with a hyperlink to complete this survey.
2. The survey will take 15-18 minutes of your time.
3. Upon completing the survey, your name will be entered in a drawing, held in about six weeks, to win one of three $25 Amazon gift cards.

**The Survey:**
The hyperlink below will take you to the survey hosted by Surveymonkey.com. To make it easier for you to complete, the two questionnaire are integrated into one survey.

**MLQ** - The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was developed to identify three types of leadership style - transactional, transformational, and passive/avoidant. It is a highly regarded instrument for assessing leadership behavior and style.

**LPFR** - The Listening Practices Feedback Report (LPFR) identifies listening behaviors and practices based on six dimensions such as: attention, empathy, memory, open mind, respect, and response.

Please complete the survey plus some demographic information.

www.surveymonkey.com

Again, let me assure you of the absolute confidential nature of this study. I promise to protect you at all times and all survey information will remain completely anonymous. If you would like any additional information on this research or have any questions, please contact me at smccord.research@gmail.com or Skype smccord2k.

Thank you
Steve McCord
Dear Cluster Leader:

<insert team leader’s name> is working to improve his/her leadership and listening skills. As a part of this leadership development process, he is taking a leadership development survey. The survey is a 360-degree instrument, which provides not only the leader’s self-assessment but also assessments from you, his supervisor, and team members. Your participation, as his supervisor, is critically important. Your involvement is critical to the success of this leadership assessment process to develop more effective team leaders.

However, let me assure you of the absolute confidential nature of this study. I promise to protect you at all times and all survey information will remain completely anonymous. Team leaders will receive an individualized leadership style report describing their leadership style with suggestions on how to become a better leader.

Please help your team leader become a better leader and listener by complete the action steps below within two days of receiving the email below:

1. You will receive an instructional email from Surveymonkey.com with a hyperlink to complete this survey.
2. The survey will take 15-18 minutes of your time.
3. Upon completing the survey, your name is entered in a drawing, held in about six weeks, to win a $75 Amazon gift card.

The Survey:
The hyperlink below will take you to the survey hosted by Surveymonkey.com. To make it easier for you to complete, the two questionnaire are integrated into one survey.
MLQ - The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was developed to identify three types of leadership style - transactional, transformational, and passive/avoidant. It is a highly regarded instrument for assessing leadership behavior and style.
LPFR - The Listening Practices Feedback Report (LPFR) identifies listening behaviors and practices based on six dimensions such as: attention, empathy, memory, open mind, respect, and response.

Please complete the survey plus some demographic information.

www.surveymonkey.com

Again, let me assure you of the absolute confidential nature of this study. I promise to protect you at all times and all survey information will remain completely anonymous.

If you would like any additional information on this research or have any questions, please contact me at smccord.research@gmail.com or Skype smccord2k.

Thank you
Steve McCord
Email Contact No. 5 – Team Leader Survey Reminder 1

Dear <insert name>:

About ten days ago, you received an email from me asking you to participate in a leadership development survey built around a 360-degree feedback model to enhance your leadership and listening effectiveness. I was glad to hear that you responded with a positive YES to being included in this study.

However, as of today, the survey has not been completed on the website. Because I am using a small sample of leaders, it is extremely important that you be included in this study.

I am sure you may have been travelling or not had Internet access for the last few days but please complete the survey now by clicking on the hyperlink below.

www.surveymonkey.com

Would you check your spam filter to see if the email from surveymonkey.com was caught there?

Once the data is in and analyzed, you will receive a Leadership Style Report based on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire data to help you better understand your leadership style and continue to develop greater leadership skills.

Again, let me assure you of the absolute confidential nature of this study. I promise to protect you at all times and all survey information will remain completely anonymous.

If you would like any additional information on this research or have any questions, please contact me at smccord.research@gmail.com or Skype smccord2k.

Thank you

Steve McCord
Email Contact No. 6– Team Leader Survey Reminder 2

Dear <insert name>:

I was glad to hear that you responded with a positive YES to being included in this study. About ten days ago, you received an email from me asking you to participate in a leadership development survey built around a 360-degree feedback model to enhance your leadership and listening effectiveness.

However, as of today, the survey has not been completed on the website. Because I am using a small sample of leaders, it is extremely important that you be included in this study.

I am sure you may have been travelling or not had Internet access for the last few days but please completed the survey now by clicking on the hyperlink below.

www.surveymonkey.com

Would you check your spam filter to see if the email from surveymonkey.com was caught there?

Once the data is in and analyzed, you will receive a Leadership Style Report based on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire data to help you better understand your leadership style and continue to develop greater leadership skills.

Again, let me assure you of the absolute confidential nature of this study. I promise to protect you at all times and all survey information will remain completely anonymous.

If you would like any additional information on this research or have any questions, please contact me at smccord.research@gmail.com or Skype smccord2k.

Thank you

Steve McCord
Email Contact No. 7 – Cluster leader or Team member – Reminder 1

Dear <insert name>

I was glad to hear that your team leader responded with a positive YES to being included in this leadership study. About ten days ago, you received an email from me asking you to participate in a leadership development survey built around a 360-degree feedback model to enhance your leadership and listening effectiveness.

However, as of today, the survey has not been completed on the website. Because I am using a small sample of leaders, it is extremely important that you be included in this study.

I am sure you may have been travelling or not had Internet access for the last few days but please complete the survey now by clicking on the hyperlink below.

www.surveymonkey.com

Would you check your spam filter to see if the email from surveymonkey.com was caught there?

Once the data is in and analyzed, you will receive a Leadership Style Report based on, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire data to help you better understand your leadership style and continue to develop greater leadership skills.

Again, let me assure you of the absolute confidential nature of this study. I promise to protect you at all times and all survey information will remain completely anonymous.

If you would like any additional information on this research or have any questions, please contact me at smccord.research@gmail.com or Skype smccord2k.

Thank you

Steve McCord
Dear <insert name>

I was glad to hear that your team leader responded with a positive YES to being included in this leadership study. About ten days ago, you received an email from me asking you to participate in a leadership development survey built around a 360-degree feedback model to enhance your leadership and listening effectiveness.

However, as of today, the survey has not been completed on the website. Because I am using a small sample of leaders, it is extremely important that you be included in this study.

I am sure you may have been travelling or not had Internet access for the last few days but please complete the survey now by clicking on the hyperlink below.

www.surveymonkey.com

Would you check your spam filter to see if the email from surveymonkey.com was caught there?

Once the data is in and analyzed, you will receive a Leadership Style Report based on, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire data to help you better understand your leadership style and continue to develop greater leadership skills.

Again, let me assure you of the absolute confidential nature of this study. I promise to protect you at all times and all survey information will remain completely anonymous.

If you would like any additional information on this research or have any questions, please contact me at smccord.research@gmail.com or Skype smccord2k.

Thank you

Steve McCord
Email Contact No. 9 - Thank you – Cluster Leader or Team Member

<insert name>

You are awesome! Thank you so much for your active participation in helping us learn more about leadership style and listening practices among our team leaders! Your help is invaluable in discovering the relationship between these two factors.

At the end of week one, two, and three, a drawing is held to select the winner for that week’s Amazon gift card. If your name is drawn, you will receive an email from Amazon indicating you have a new gift card. Hopefully, your name will be drawn!

If you would like an executive summary of this study, please contact me at the address below.

If you would like any additional information on this research or have any questions, please contact me at smccord.research@gmail.com or Skype smccord2k.

Thank you

Steve McCord
# APPENDIX 6

## INTERNATIONAL JOB DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Job Title</strong></th>
<th>Team Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Office Global Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City/Country</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This Position Reports to:</strong> Cluster leader</td>
<td><strong>This Position Directly Supervises:</strong> (titles/number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Positions Indirectly Supervised</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prepared by:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Approved by:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status:</strong></td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Purpose:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Job Tasks and Responsibilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These are the primary responsibilities of the job; however, other duties may be assigned from time to time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casts vision for the engagement of the people group, urban center, or segment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensures the effective functioning of the team (e.g. IMB personnel, Baptist Partners, SBC churches, GCCs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works with team to develop and implement a comprehensive and effective strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensures that each team member is equipped to function effectively (i.e. language, culture, evangelism, church planting, discipleship, training, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enlists key Baptist partners, SBC churches, and other GCCs to achieve team objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop job descriptions and request additional personnel in alignment with cluster, affinity, and global priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Looks for strategic breakthroughs and shares with team and with the cluster leader, thus ensuring the sharing of these across the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviews and adjust team strategy budget to ensure alignment with team strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reports to the Cluster leader.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 7

PERMISSIONS

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Permission to use Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was obtained through the purchase of 250 licenses from Mind Garden, Inc. to use with team leaders. Mind Garden, Inc. 855 Oak Grove Avenue, Suite 215, Menlo Park, CA 94025.

Listener Practice Feedback Report

Permission to use the Listener Practice Feedback Report was received from Janice Brandt, Ph.D. to use this instrument. “Steve McCord has my permission to use the LPFR-360 (Listening Practices Feedback Report-360) for his research. Please give the author, Richard C. Brandt credit for its development.” Janice Deaver Brandt, Ph.D.
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ABSTRACT

LEADERSHIP STYLE AND LISTENING PRACTICES OF IMB TEAM LEADERS: A CORRELATIONAL STUDY

Stephen Kearney McCord, Ph.D.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2011
Chair: Michael S. Wilder

Listening is a critical skill for those who lead. Research indicates that leaders significantly influence followers through their listening practices; however the relationship between leadership styles and listening is assumed but not conclusively proven (Kouzes and Posner 2002). The purpose of this current study was to determine if a relationship exists between leadership style and listening practices of International Mission Board (IMB) overseas team leaders (Burns 1978, Bass 2004).

The population for this research was overseas team leaders of the IMB serving in this position for more than six months with a team of four or more team members. A total of 145 of 391 team leaders participated in this study with a response rate of 37%. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was used to measure transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership style and the Listening Practices Feedback Report-360 (LPFR) assessed listening practices of attention, empathy, memory, open mind, respect, and response.

A correlational analysis using Pearson r was conducted between leadership styles and listening practices. Further analysis was conducted to determine which
leadership style was most significantly correlated with each of the six listening practice subscales. The subscale of open mind was not significantly correlated with any leadership style.

The findings indicated that transformational leadership had a statistically significant and moderately positive correlation with the total LPFR score and on five of the six listening practices subscales. Transactional leaders also had a moderately positive correlation with total LPFR score and significant correlations on empathy, memory, and response subscales. Passive/avoidant leadership style had a significantly moderate negative correlation with LPFR and with empathy, memory, respect, and response subscales. Transformational leadership scored highest on the LPFR total listening score. Passive/avoidant leaders’ showed the lowest total listening scores and were rated ineffective listeners. This study shows that transformational and transactional leadership styles have a statistically significant and moderately positive relationship with listening dimension scores as measured by the LPFR and supports transformational leadership theory.

Keywords: leadership style, transformational, transactional, passive/avoidant, laissez-faire leadership, listening, communication, team leader, missionary, MLQ, LPFR, IMB.
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