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**THE FACILITATING LISTENING SCALE (FLS)**

ABSTRACT

Existing measures of listening behaviors are fraught with inconsistent factor analytic results and poor reliabilities. By considering both existing measures and theory, we built a pool of 138 items that were presented to 977 subordinates, who rated their supervisory listening behaviors and consequences. Exploratory factor analyses suggested nine interpretable factors, and the existence of a second order factor accounting for most variance in reports of supervisory listening behaviors. Scales built on the basis of the nine factors yielded acceptable reliabilities, often exceeding .90.

"Listen!" is what we were advised by our parents, teachers and supervisors, but many of us never learned how to listen effectively. Yet, the "listen" advice is beneficial as research has shown that effective listening influences the (a) quality of the narrative told by a speaker (for a review see [Bavelas, Coates, & Johnson, 2000](#_ENREF_1); [Pasupathi & Hoyt, 2009](#_ENREF_19)), (b) business’ bottom line ([Ramsey & Sohi, 1997](#_ENREF_22)) (c) parent-child relationship ([Ellis, 2002](#_ENREF_10)), (d) subordinates' well-being ([Mineyama, Tsutsumi, Takao, Nishiuchi, & Kawakami, 2007](#_ENREF_16)), and (e) quality of close friendships ([Deci, La Guardia, Moller, Scheiner, & Ryan, 2006](#_ENREF_7)), to name a few. Given the benefits of listening, a question arises of how to measure individual differences in listening effectiveness.

Before discussing listening measurement it is important to consider the theoretical construct of listening. Until the 1990's, the various theoretical definitions of listening were influenced by two untenable underlying assumptions: listening processes are (a) passive and (b) merely cognitive and less affective. First, the assumption of passivity was underlying an early communication model, according to which the receiver (listener) has no role; s/he is transparent; s/he is a potential speaker or “speaker-in-waiting” and remains a passive audience, as the conversation is being conducted by one person at a time ([Shanon and Weaver, 1949 in Bavelas et al., 2000](#_ENREF_1)). Similarly, speaking and listening were considered autonomous processes: speakers determine how to express themselves, and listeners try to understand them on their own ([for a review see Clark & Krych, 2004](#_ENREF_6)). Second, the assumption that listening is merely cognitive is seen in various listening definitions. For example, “Listening is a cognitive process of actively sensing, interpreting, evaluating and responding…” ([Castleberry, Shepherd, & Ridnour, 1999](#_ENREF_4); [Drollinger, Comer, & Warrington, 2006](#_ENREF_8); [Ramsey & Sohi, 1997](#_ENREF_22)). For a comprehensive review of the cognitive focus in listening research see Janusik ([2007](#_ENREF_13)).

However these assumptions were challenged both conceptually and empirically. Conceptually listening is now considered as (a) an active process (destructive or constructive) that (b) contains not only cognitive elements but also affective elements. First, the active nature of listening in a conversation was noted by various researchers ([Bavelas et al., 2000](#_ENREF_1); [Beukeboom, 2009](#_ENREF_2); [Drollinger et al., 2006](#_ENREF_8); [Pasupathi, 2001](#_ENREF_18); [Pasupathi & Hoyt, 2009](#_ENREF_19); [Pasupathi & Rich, 2005](#_ENREF_20); [Ramsey & Sohi, 1997](#_ENREF_22)) who argued that the listener not only comprehend the message but must also respond, as they try to keep speakers informed of their current state of understanding ([Clark & Krych, 2004](#_ENREF_6)). In parallel, speakers monitor not just their own actions (what they say), but those of their listeners (check for understanding or interest), taking both into account as they speak.

Yet, listening and speaking are not only a jointly coordinated activity; effective listeners are thought to actively shape the speakers' behavior. Carl Rogers suggested that certain types of listening could dramatically change the speaker: “people who have been listened to in this new way, become more emotionally mature, more open to their experience, less defensive, more democratic and less authoritarian” ([Rogers, 1951](#_ENREF_23)). This process of “changing the speaker” was later on labeled as co-constructive ([Pasupathi, 2001](#_ENREF_18)) and co-narration ([Bavelas et al., 2000](#_ENREF_1)). Co-constructive and co-narration refer to conversations in which both the listener and the speaker participate in the shaping of the content and style of the conversation ([Pasupathi, 2001](#_ENREF_18)). Moreover, listeners may not be equal co-narrators, but they are essential due to their own responses, that determine the content and the quality of the speaker’s story ([Bavelas et al., 2000](#_ENREF_1)). Thus, the current view of listening in a conversation (as oppose for example to listening to the radio) is now construed as an active process, where the listener has critical role in co-constructing the conversation.

Second, although a lot of communication researches focused on listening as cognitive process ([Janusik, 2007](#_ENREF_13); [Miller, deWinstanley, & Carey, 1996](#_ENREF_15)), some researches assumed that listening has both cognitive and affective components ([Drollinger et al., 2006](#_ENREF_8); [Rogers, 1951](#_ENREF_23)). The cognitive and affective components are defined by Rogers ([Rogers, 1975](#_ENREF_24)) as empathic listening: which is “the ability to perceive the internal frame of reference of another with accuracy and with the emotional components and meaning… as if one were the other person, but without ever losing the ‘as if’ condition”. Moreover, Rogers emphasizes the importance of ‘listening to the emotion’ component ([Rogers, 1975](#_ENREF_24)). The cognitive component consists of an intellectual understanding of another person’s situation, while the affective component consists of an internal emotional reaction that produces understanding of the other person’s feelings ([Duan & Hill, 1996](#_ENREF_9)). In sum, today listening is perceived as both cognitive and affective in nature. Next, we consider the empirical evidence for these ideas.

Empirically, listening was shown to be an active process containing affective components. For example, in one experiment speakers who talked to smiling listeners used more interpretive, abstract language than speakers who talked to frowning listeners; Talking to frowning listeners made speakers use more concrete language and describe facts ([Beukeboom, 2009](#_ENREF_2)). This experiment indicates that listener's affective components such as positive or negative nonverbal expressions have meaningful impact on the speaker. Correspondingly, Bavelas ([2000](#_ENREF_1)) and Pasupathi ([2005](#_ENREF_20)) examined the impact of two types of listening; attentive and distracted. The result has shown that; (a) people who tell stories to attentive listeners tell longer, more elaborative, more fluent and better-ended stories; and (b) people who tell stories to destructive listeners make fewer responses and produced stories with poorer quantity and quality ([Bavelas et al., 2000](#_ENREF_1); [Pasupathi & Rich, 2005](#_ENREF_20)). To summarize, the evidence is consistent with the emerging view of the listening constructs as active, bi-lateral, co-constructive and both cognitive and affective in nature ([Bavelas et al., 2000](#_ENREF_1); [Beukeboom, 2009](#_ENREF_2); [Pasupathi, 2001](#_ENREF_18); [Pasupathi & Hoyt, 2009](#_ENREF_19); [Pasupathi & Rich, 2005](#_ENREF_20)).

***Current Listening Scales***

To gauge how to measure co-constructive listening behavior, we searched for all existing measurement scales from a variety of fields, including sales, education, occupational health and training. We considered only scales that focus on listener behaviors that have a potential to impact the speaker during human interaction. We excluded scales that focus only on listener outcomes such as memory and retention of information by the listener ([e.g., Janusik, 2007](#_ENREF_13)). That is, we sought to measure the ability of the listener to influence the speaker, in line with the co-constructive view of listening ([Pasupathi & Rich, 2005](#_ENREF_20)).

The review of existing measures (see Appendix A) suggests three conclusions. First, existing measures largely assess behaviors presumed to be effective (e.g., "When I listen, I summarize for the speaker things the speaker told me"). Yet, the consequences of listening are rarely assessed (e.g., “When my current supervisor listens to me, most of the time, it makes me… enjoy being listened to" or "… better understand myself"). Second, the measures are based on different theoretical, or no theoretical, backgrounds. Last, the factor structures of listening scales are inconsistent across scales. Below, we elaborate on these conclusions.

First, whereas all reviewed scales view listening as (a) active; and (b) cognitive & affective ([Castro, 2010](#_ENREF_5); [Drollinger et al., 2006](#_ENREF_8); [Ellis, 2002](#_ENREF_10); [Kubota, Mishima, Ikemi, & Nagata, 1997](#_ENREF_14); [Mishima, Kubota, & Nagata, 2000](#_ENREF_17); [Ramsey & Sohi, 1997](#_ENREF_22)), none seek to measure the consequences of listening in co-constructing the conversation process with the speaker. Nevertheless, the process of co-constructing a conversation was studied in experimental lab research ([Bavelas et al., 2000](#_ENREF_1); [Pasupathi, 2001](#_ENREF_18); [Pasupathi & Hoyt, 2009](#_ENREF_19); [Pasupathi & Rich, 2005](#_ENREF_20)). These laboratory studies focused on situational variables by manipulating distracted versus attentive listening and assessed the impact of the manipulation on the quality of the narrative created. The existence experimental consequences of listening suggest that parallel variance will be found in chronic listening variables. Thus, one goal of this study is to extract conceptual variables from these laboratory studies and to transfer their constructs to a measure of chronic individual differences in co-constructive listening.

Second, the listening scales were designed according to several theories; Kubota ([1997](#_ENREF_14)) and Castro (2010) did not report any theory that guided items construction; Ramsey & Sohi ([1997](#_ENREF_22)) and Drollinger ([2006](#_ENREF_8)) based their scales on the theory that suggests three components of listening ([Steil et al., 1983 in Ramsey & Sohi, 1997](#_ENREF_22)): (a) “sensing” (receiving stimuli and attending to the message), (b) “evaluating” (assigning meaning to the message) and (c) “responding” (uni-lateral reaction to the message). Both scales ([Drollinger et al., 2006](#_ENREF_8); [Ramsey & Sohi, 1997](#_ENREF_22)) contain items that are congruent with their theory; Mishima et al. ([2000](#_ENREF_17)) developed the Active Listening Attitude Scale(ALAS) according Rogers's Person-Centered Attitude (PCA), which comprises three main elements: “empathic understanding”, “unconditional positive regard” and “congruence” ([Rogers, 1951](#_ENREF_23)). When aligning the ALAS items with the PCA, there is minor congruence between the theory and scales, since only four items out of 47 directly map to PCA; Ellis ([2002](#_ENREF_10)) developed the Parent Confirmation Behavior Indicators (PCBI) scale, based on the confirmation theory of Martin Buber ([Fishban, 1998](#_ENREF_12)). Some of the items in the PCBI scale are strongly connected to listening (“demonstrated that he or she was genuinely listening when I was speaking about issues important to me”), where other items are more closely connected to confirmation (“attended the sports event, music event, or other activities in which I participated”).

Third, the scales did not yield consistent factorial results; Kubota et al. ([1997](#_ENREF_14)) did not report any factor analysis results; Ramsey & Sohi’s ([1997](#_ENREF_22)) results showed very high loading of the three latent constructs (sensing = .92, evaluating = .99, and responding = .98) on a second order factor, which raise doubts regarding the independence of the factors; The AEL scale ([Drollinger et al., 2006](#_ENREF_8)) yielded the expected three factors, yet they were highly correlated such that inter-factor correlation was as high as .63 (exceeding the product of the respective reliabilities). This is congruent with Ramsey and Shoi that did not provide a convincing evidence for more than one factor. Mishima et al. (2000) reported three factors; ‘listening attitude’ – which appear to tap destructive listening (e.g., "I hurry him/her into talking faster"), ‘listening skills’ – which appears to tap constructive listening (e.g., "I pay attention to his/her unexpressed feelings") and ‘conversational opportunity’ – which may not be related to listening skill (e.g., "I’m willing to say something to others usually"). The PCBI scale had only one factor: confirmation-disconfirmation ([Ellis, 2002](#_ENREF_10)). The Listening Style Profile (LSP16), which is 16 item instrument putatively measuring people, action, content, and time presences, was tested with confirmatory factor analysis to test its putative structure ([Bodie & Worthington, 2010](#_ENREF_3)). Results suggested that three and four factor structure have similar fit the both head RMESEA higher than .05 and the reliabilities were unacceptable ranging from .52 to .67. Finally, the Listening Style Inventory had four factors in Study 1 (active, involve, passive and detached), and three factors in Study 2 (active, involve and passive). Combine factor analysis of both studies yielded three factors as found in Study 1 ([Pearce, Johnson, & Barker, 2003](#_ENREF_21)). In sum, most scales predicted several factors but produced either no evidence for more than one factor, or unstable factorial solutions. The only exception is Mishima et al. whose first two factors appear to indicate destructive and constructive listening style, respectively.

The inconsistent factor structures reported above could stem from several reasons. First, some measures tapped both constructive and destructive listening. For example, Misihima et al. ([2000](#_ENREF_17)) had 21 constructive items and 16 destructive items; Ellis ([2002](#_ENREF_10)) embedded the constructive and destructive listening items in non-listening (dis)confirmation behavior scale. In contrast, others scales either did not contain destructive items ([Castro, 2010](#_ENREF_5); [Drollinger et al., 2006](#_ENREF_8)) or only three destructive items out of 13 items ([Ramsey & Sohi, 1997](#_ENREF_22)). Second, some scales include items that measure the outcome of listening, that is, the impact of the listener on the speaker. For example, "People feel easy to talk to me" (Misihima et al., 2000); "I succeed in identifying new aspects in my own attitudes" (Castro, 2010). Others scales focus only on listening behavior ([e.g., "Asked for more details", Ramsey & Sohi, 1997](#_ENREF_22)). Third, some listening scales (LSP16) mix items tapping listening preference style (e.g., “I prefer to listen to technical information”) with behavioral aspect of listening (e.g., “I often jump ahead and/or finish thoughts of speakers”) ([Bodie & Worthington, 2010](#_ENREF_3)).

Given the co-constructive view of listening, it seems desirable to measure the perceived impact of the listener on the speaker, including constructive and destructive listening behaviors. Thus, in this work a comprehensive listening scale was developed to sample items from all of this conceptual space, while incorporating items from existing scales as to sample items from the entire listening universe.

*The development of a new scale*

The proposed Facilitating Listening Scale (FLS) sampled two domains; listening skills (constructive and destructive with 109 items) and listening consequences (co-construction and co-destruction with 29 items). Listening skills items were adopted from existing questionnaires. Listening consequences items were developed according to Pasupathi ([2001](#_ENREF_18); [Pasupathi & Hoyt, 2009](#_ENREF_19); [Pasupathi & Rich, 2005](#_ENREF_20)) and Bavelas ([2000](#_ENREF_1)) theories. In sum, the development of FLS relied on existing listening scales for the first listening dimension (listening skills) and additional new items for the second listening dimension (listening consequences).

*Measurement Techniques*

Listening scales have been measured with different perspectives (a) self-report of the listeners ([Kubota et al., 1997](#_ENREF_14); [Mineyama et al., 2007](#_ENREF_16); [Mishima et al., 2000](#_ENREF_17)) and/or (b) evaluation by the speakers ([Drollinger et al., 2006, Study 3](#_ENREF_8); [Ellis, 2002](#_ENREF_10); [Ramsey & Sohi, 1997](#_ENREF_22)). As a first step, the FLS will be developed to captures the speaker's perspective, both regarding the way the speaker experiences the listening and the perception of the consequences of this listening on the speaker. This choices was made because the speaker may be a better judge of the consequences of listening ([Ellis, 2002](#_ENREF_10)). Therefore, all existing items that measured listener's self-reports, were adapted for questions to be presented to the speaker.

*Hypotheses*

Hypothesis 1: FLS will yield four factors: constructive and destructive *listening behaviors* and co-constructive and co-destructive *listening* consequences (positive and negative outcomes).

Hypothesis 2: Constructive behaviors will be the best predictor of co-constructive consequences (positive outcomes), whereas destructive behaviors will be the best predictor of co-destructive consequences (negative outcomes).

METHOD

*Participants*

Subordinates in various organizations were recruited with various snowball sampling attempt to respond to volunteer to respond to an on-line survey. Out of a total of 1,030 volunteers that completed the survey, 977 responses were found valid. The respondents took either an English version of the FLS (N=173) or a Hebrew version (N = 804). The most frequent age category was 25-34 (39%), followed by 18-24 (22%) and 35-44 (17%). Fifty eights percent of the respondents were female, and 56% reported to a male supervisor. The most frequent occupations were educational services (17%), professional, scientific or technical services (13%), other services (except public administration) (13%), and health care or social assistance (12%). The most frequent tenure was 1-4 years on the job (36%), followed by less than one year (30%), and 5-9 years (14%). Most respondents resided in Israel (88%).

*Measures*

Existing items from the literature ([Bodie & Worthington, 2010](#_ENREF_3); [Castleberry et al., 1999](#_ENREF_4); [Castro, 2010](#_ENREF_5); [Drollinger et al., 2006 2006](#_ENREF_8); [Ellis, 2002](#_ENREF_10); [Fassaert, Van Dulmen, Schellevis, & Bensing, 2007](#_ENREF_11); [Kubota et al., 1997](#_ENREF_14); [Mishima et al., 2000](#_ENREF_17); [Pearce et al., 2003](#_ENREF_21); [Ramsey & Sohi, 1997](#_ENREF_22)) were searched for similarity and redundancy aiming to create a list of items that reflect all existing items with no redundancy. Next, all items that were originally written to capture listener's perspective on one's own listening behavior were re-written to measure the perspective of the speaker. For example, "I tend to deny his/her opinion" ([Mishima et al., 2000](#_ENREF_17)) was rewritten as follows "when listening to me, he/she tend to denies my opinion". Also, original items that had specific targets (e.g. listen seriously to your employee) were re-written to a general target (e.g., "he/she seriously listens to me"). Last, when the items across multiple measures appear identical, only one version was used. For example “I talk about what I want to say, even if I interrupt him/her” ([Mishima et al., 2000](#_ENREF_17)), or "Interrupts me during conversation" ([Ellis, 2002](#_ENREF_10)), or “You often interrupt workers talking without listen to the end of the story” ([Kubota et al., 1997](#_ENREF_14)) were rewritten into one item "When my current supervisor listens to me, most of the time, s/he often interrupts me while I am talking".

All 109 items assessing listening behaviors were presented with the following common stem: "When my current supervisor listens to me, most of the time, s/he...". All 29 items that were gleaned from the theoretical literature to assess listening consequences were presented with the following common stem: "When my current supervisor listens to me, most of the time, it makes me...". All items were presented on a 7-point scale ranging from (1) "Never" to (7) “Very frequently". The scale was presented with the following general introduction "This is an anonymous questionnaire about your experience of being listened to by your current supervisor. We kindly ask you to volunteer your time, estimated at 20-30 minutes, to help us better understand some listening behaviors you may have experienced". This was followed with informed consent request and general instructions on contacting the researchers and filling out the survey.

The scale was developed in English and distributed both to native English speakers’ and speakers of English as a second language. In parallel, we translated it to Hebrew and back translated it to English. Discrepancies between the versions were worked out with the help of a professional English-Hebrew editor. The complete English version can be found in the results below (the Hebrew version can be obtained from the authors).

*Procedures*

 Participants were invited to answer anonymously the FLS on a web-page application either as volunteers or as a part of participation in other studies that carried some course credit for working students (N = 273).

*Analysis*

All items were subjected to a principal component analysis with an oblique (promax) rotation. Also two additional analyses were carried out. First, we factor analyzed the Hebrew and the English version separately. Second, we factor analyzed the listening behavior items and the listening consequences items separately. Both analyses yielded results very similar to the analyses comprising all participants and all items. Therefore, only the latter is reported below. The first order factors were also be analyzed with a second order factor analysis. Next, we performed item analyses on the basis of the factor analysis to produce reliable scales with minimal amount of items that retain high Cronbach's alphas. Finally, we regressed all scales once on positive outcome (co-constructive effects) and once on negative outcomes (co-destructive effects) using stepwise regression with p value of .01 is a criterion for inclusion (as to avoid the presence of meaningless predictors that emerge with p of .05, because the sample size is large).

RESULTS

 The analysis yielded 19 principal components. However, a scree test suggested that only one factor should be retained. Specifically, the first component explained 38% of the variance, whereas the second component explained only 6% of the variance. This suggests that participants construe a general impression of their boss' listening behavior. However, the items with the 10 highest loading appear to capture both behavior and consequences. Therefore, we also explored the potential meaning of oblique rotation. The first four factors completely agreed with our hypothesis (H1). Moreover, five more factors were clearly interpretable (see Table 1).

--------------------------------------

Insert Table 1 about here

--------------------------------------

As can be seen in Table 1, the first factor (F1), with 34 items, largely taps constructive consequences of listening. Specifically, the highest loading 22 items are all items that were written to reflect constructive consequences. The three items with the highest loading on F1 were "… Enjoy being listened to"; "… Feel that s/he cares about me"; "…Feel that it is easy for me to open my heart". The remaining 12 items that loaded on F1 reflect constructive behaviors, but have low loadings, e.g. “…Listens to the complete message”

 F2 appears to tap destructive listening skills with 29 items such as “…humiliates me; …”makes statements that communicate that my ideas don't count”; “…talks offensively”; “…uses killer glances”; “…criticizes my feelings”. Two items were also loaded on different factors.

F3 comprised of 24 items that reflect constructive listening skills such as: “assures that s/he is listening to me by using verbal acknowledgments”; “tries hard to understand what I am saying”; “asks for more details”. Few items are loaded also on different factors. Six items were also loaded on different factors.

F4, F5, and F6 reflect various destructive behaviors. F4 reflects seven domineering behaviors of the listener, labeled Destructive Listening Skills: Domineering Listener, with items such as: “often interrupts me while I am talking”; “begins to talk before I finish talking”, etc. F5 reflects five passive behavior of the listener, labeled Destructive Listening Skills: Escape". For examples “stares at the computer screen while I'm talking to him/her”; “uses the telephone while I'm talking to him/her”. Finally, F6 reflects three behaviors indicating lack of time to listen, labeled items "Destructive Listening Skills: No time" such as: “begins a discussion by telling me how long s/he has for me”; “looks at his/her watch or clocks in the room when s/he has limited time to listen to me”; “hurries me and lets me know that s/he has a limited amount of time to listen”.

F7 has four items reflecting the speaker becoming concerned about him/her self were labeled Negative Consequences: “concerned about what s/he thinks of me”; “worry about myself”; “aware of my shortcomings (disadvantages)” and “try to impress him/her”.

F8 has three Destructive Listening Skills items indicating Changing the Subject with the items: “starts talking about unrelated issues”; “changes the subject too frequently”; and “makes irrelevant jokes all the time”. F8 seems to focus on the listener inability to connect to the conversation by changing the subject or by talking about unrelated topics.

F9 has four items reflecting Constructive listening Skills that focus specifically on reframing, with items such as: “gives me a brief summary of what I have said”; “completes my sentences to help me clarify what I am saying”; and “asks continuing questions like could you tell me more? “. Note that factors F4 through F9 do not have items that loaded on other factors.

Although the first nine factors were easily interpretable, they were all highly intercorrelated (See Table 2). Therefore, we ran several second order factor analyses: One with all 19 factors, one with the 9 factors identified above, and one more based on these explorations. A second factor analysis of all 19 first order factors yielded five factors, where a scree test again indicated the presence of only one large factor. A second order factor analysis of the first nine factors yielded two factors, with the first seven first order factors loading on the first factor. Thus, we tested whether the first seven factors belong to only one factor, and the results indicated the existence of only one second order factor accounting for the interecorrelations among the first seven factors. Perhaps the factors of changing the subject (F8) and reframing (F9) are behaviors that depending on context could be either constructive or destructive.

--------------------------------------

Insert Table 2 about here

--------------------------------------

Next, we sought to build operational scales to reflect the nine factors as economically as possible. To attain this goal, we sought to create scales that will be both as short as possible and as reliable as possible. Hence, we did an item analyses, and dropped from each scales items that their removal did the minimal damage to the reliability, or even improved it. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 3. As can be seen in Table 3, all scales have 10 items or less, with excellent (.95) to acceptable (.69) reliabilities.

--------------------------------------

Insert Table 3 about here

--------------------------------------

Finally, we regressed all scales once on positive outcomes and once of positive outcomes. As can be seen in Table 4, positive consequences are largely predicted by constructive listening behaviors (35% of the variance). Two other predictors explain between 2% to 1% of the variance (destructive behaviors, negatively; and reframing) and the remaining predictors explain less than 1% of the variance. Negative outcomes are almost entirely explained by escaping listening behaviors (%85).

DISCUSSION

The FLS presented here is based on the largest sample that was used in listening scale development and presented the largest pool of items to the respondents. The results differ from most existing scales and hint to similarities only to the ALAS ([Mishima et al., 2000](#_ENREF_17)). Specifically, in the presence of many items, the distinctions made in the literature between sensing, processing and responding, or between cognitive and emotional aspect of listening, or between various preferences for listening (technical versus personal information) are not supported by our data. However, consistent with ALAS, our results suggest that constructive and destructive listening behavior may belong to different factors. Furthermore, we also predicted separate factors for listening consequences and in total predicted four factors. Although we found nine factors, all predicted factors could be found and three of the predicted factors were the first observed three factors. The predicted factors showed strong negative correlations.

An additional evidence that positive and negative listening behavior could be found in the regression that suggest that constructive behaviors is the best predictor of positive listening outcomes, whereas escape behaviors is the best predictor of negative listening outcomes. Yet, the last results should be interpreted with caution because the scales are construed with few items and the high intrecorrelation between the predictor and the outcome cast doubt on the meaning of these measures.

The results suggest that listening behavior needs to be conceptualized with a general factor of listening that contains several sub-scales. The existence of separate constructive and destructive factors may indicate that some people may not be engaged in destructive listening behaviors, yet they do not have the skill to engage in constructive behaviors. In other words, some people may be both polite (and not destructive), but also fail in making the listener feel understood. This proposed structure should be tested on a new sample with the reduced number of items (Table 3) using confirmatory factor analyses.

Equipped with FLS, future research should validate the consequences of listening in various contexts. One obvious context is the work setting, where FLS could be used to predict stress, turnover, creativity, well-being, etc. Another question is whether this structure will be found in contexts different from the one used here (subordinates rating their superiors).
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**TABLE 1**

**Factor Loadings of FLS Items after Oblique Rotation Sorted by Loading Size**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 1. Q117 Enjoy being listened to
 | **.83** | -.18 | .23 | -.13 | -.05 | -.06 | -.02 | -.05 | .06 |
| 1. Q118 Feel that s/he cares about me
 | **.82** | -.24 | .25 | -.09 | -.09 | -.08 | -.04 | -.05 | -.01 |
| 1. Q126 Feel that it is easy for me to open my heart
 | **.81** | -.18 | .14 | -.13 | -.08 | -.03 | -.07 | -.02 | .00 |
| 1. Q122 Feel that I am a unique and valuable human being
 | **.80** | -.16 | .16 | -.06 | -.04 | -.06 | .04 | .04 | .07 |
| 1. Q123 Better understand myself
 | **.80** | -.13 | .09 | -.09 | -.05 | -.01 | .16 | .06 | .16 |
| 1. Q116 Feel that s/he is interested in me
 | **.79** | -.25 | .27 | -.07 | -.11 | -.09 | -.01 | -.06 | .01 |
| 1. Q111 Feel close to him/her
 | **.79** | -.21 | .21 | -.06 | -.11 | -.02 | -.09 | -.07 | -.01 |
| 1. Q125 Feel comfortable
 | **.78** | -.28 | .22 | -.15 | -.09 | -.06 | -.14 | -.05 | .02 |
| 1. Q119 Feel a sense of relief
 | **.78** | -.18 | .16 | -.08 | -.10 | -.05 | .01 | -.04 | .07 |
| 1. Q115 Better understand my thoughts
 | **.76** | -.19 | .19 | -.08 | -.02 | .00 | .10 | -.11 | .11 |
| 1. Q128 Feel that s/he accepts me for who I am
 | **.75** | -.25 | .21 | -.10 | -.07 | -.08 | -.07 | .02 | .04 |
| 1. Q114 Feel confident
 | **.74** | -.31 | .28 | -.13 | -.07 | -.04 | -.15 | -.12 | .00 |
| 1. Q124 Remember details of my stories
 | **.73** | -.12 | .11 | -.14 | -.03 | .01 | .17 | .02 | .16 |
| 1. Q113 Feel understood
 | **.73** | -.29 | .29 | -.13 | -.05 | -.03 | -.11 | -.17 | .01 |
| 1. Q121 Talk more
 | **.70** | -.16 | .16 | -.10 | -.07 | -.10 | .08 | .01 | .13 |
| 1. Q110 Feel that it is easy for me to talk to him/her
 | **.69** | -.32 | .28 | -.13 | -.10 | -.05 | -.16 | -.12 | .01 |
| 1. Q138 Feel free to talk to him/her whenever I need
 | **.67** | -.29 | .26 | -.07 | -.05 | -.04 | -.17 | -.06 | .01 |
| 1. Q120 Feel like s/he is listening to me in earnest
 | **.67** | -.34 | .32 | -.16 | -.10 | -.10 | -.05 | -.11 | .02 |
| 1. Q136 Feel that s/he notices changes in the way I am feeling
 | **.66** | -.08 | .24 | -.06 | -.10 | -.01 | .00 | -.06 | .05 |
| 1. Q137 Feel that s/he senses how I feel
 | **.66** | -.08 | .21 | -.09 | -.10 | -.03 | -.02 | -.05 | .07 |
| 1. Q135 Feel that s/he pays attention to my unexpressed feelings
 | **.64** | -.07 | .21 | -.10 | -.11 | -.02 | .00 | -.03 | .14 |
| 1. Q133 Feel that s/he puts him/herself in my shoes
 | **.55** | -.04 | .17 | -.09 | -.09 | .00 | .02 | -.01 | .23 |
| 1. Q64 Appears to enjoy listening to me
 | **.52** | -.30 | **.48** | -.16 | -.09 | -.10 | -.10 | -.01 | .06 |
| 1. Q73 Focuses his/her attention on my feelings
 | **.49** | -.14 | .34 | -.16 | -.21 | -.06 | -.03 | .02 | .10 |
| 1. Q103 Tries to find things we have in common
 | **.48** | -.15 | .22 | -.08 | -.05 | .03 | -.05 | .04 | .38 |
| 1. Q33 Gives me good advice
 | **.47** | -.37 | **.42** | -.06 | .00 | -.01 | .08 | -.09 | .06 |
| 1. Q3 Seems to understand my feelings
 | **.46** | -.33 | .38 | -.10 | -.05 | -.09 | -.06 | -.05 | -.06 |
| 1. Q112 Change my opinions
 | **.46** | -.07 | .03 | .10 | .03 | .04 | .21 | -.25 | .14 |
| 1. Q100 Listens to the complete message
 | **.46** | -.36 | **.44** | -.27 | -.11 | -.11 | -.02 | -.15 | .04 |
| 1. Q4 Seems to understand my thoughts
 | **.45** | -.28 | .37 | -.08 | -.02 | -.09 | -.04 | -.07 | -.08 |
| 1. Q104 Allows me to express negative feelings
 | **.45** | -.31 | .37 | -.11 | -.08 | -.09 | -.10 | .02 | .03 |
| 1. Q83 Smile
 | **.45** | -.39 | **.43** | -.14 | -.03 | .01 | .03 | .05 | .09 |
| 1. Q74 Quickly notices if I am pleased or disappointed
 | **.44** | -.15 | .38 | -.04 | -.08 | -.08 | -.05 | -.04 | -.01 |
| 1. Q34 Focuses only on me
 | **.40** | -.18 | .37 | -.19 | -.35 | -.14 | -.02 | .00 | .06 |
| 1. Q72 Likes the challenge of listening to complex information
 | .37 | -.12 | .35 | -.11 | .03 | .00 | -.01 | -.05 | .24 |
| 1. Q58 Humiliates me
 | -.22 | **.76** | -.14 | .00 | .06 | .07 | .06 | .06 | -.07 |
| 1. Q59 Makes statements that communicate that my ideas don't count
 | -.18 | **.75** | -.16 | .01 | .14 | .02 | .00 | .07 | -.04 |
| 1. Q30 Talks offensively
 | -.18 | **.73** | -.15 | .17 | .01 | .06 | .04 | .03 | -.09 |
| 1. Q50 Uses killer glances
 | -.26 | **.70** | -.14 | .11 | .11 | .00 | .11 | .02 | .00 |
| 1. Q51 Criticizes my feelings
 | -.25 | **.69** | -.16 | .08 | .07 | .07 | .09 | .00 | .03 |
| 1. Q78 Frowns (showing disapproving facial expressions)
 | -.29 | **.68** | -.13 | .22 | .07 | .11 | .08 | .07 | -.05 |
| 1. Q47 Discounts or explains away my feelings
 | -.28 | **.67** | -.23 | .18 | .04 | .08 | .11 | .08 | -.01 |
| 1. Q68 Is not willing to listen to me
 | -.28 | **.61** | -.33 | .07 | .18 | .09 | .06 | .23 | .02 |
| 1. Q69 Does not pay attention to things I say
 | -.29 | **.60** | -.33 | .11 | .19 | .10 | .07 | .21 | .01 |
| 1. Q10 Talks back to me aggressively
 | -.20 | **.60** | -.17 | .42 | .04 | .04 | .08 | -.11 | -.05 |
| 1. Q71 Argues with the details of stories I tell
 | -.25 | **.54** | -.06 | .24 | .19 | .10 | .05 | .07 | -.01 |
| 1. Q36 Reacts with resistance to what I am saying
 | -.22 | **.54** | -.25 | .22 | -.01 | .11 | .05 | .13 | .01 |
| 1. Q8 Becomes irritated
 | -.24 | **.53** | -.15 | .53 | .03 | .11 | .06 | -.06 | -.06 |
| 1. Q49 Fails to acknowledge anything I say
 | -.24 | **.53** | -.33 | .11 | .11 | .04 | .08 | .31 | -.09 |
| 1. Q79 Yawns
 | -.11 | **.53** | -.16 | .03 | .27 | .16 | -.02 | .24 | -.04 |
| 1. Q57 Ignores my attempts to express my feelings
 | -.31 | **.53** | -.25 | .13 | .15 | .08 | .04 | .13 | .01 |
| 1. Q17 Is impatient
 | -.28 | **.53** | -.23 | .49 | .15 | .09 | .03 | .04 | -.01 |
| 1. Q60 Focuses on any inconsistencies and/or errors in what I'm saying
 | -.14 | **.51** | -.06 | .15 | .19 | .13 | .14 | -.01 | -.05 |
| 1. Q9 Gets tense
 | -.25 | **.50** | -.15 | .47 | .04 | .12 | .05 | -.01 | -.02 |
| 1. Q20 Begins arguing with me
 | -.20 | **.50** | -.18 | .44 | .09 | .10 | -.04 | -.07 | -.05 |
| 1. Q84 Is polite
 | .31 | **-.49** | .33 | -.29 | -.17 | -.03 | .04 | .06 | .10 |
| 1. Q87 Is detached
 | -.30 | **.47** | -.26 | .06 | .30 | .11 | .11 | .26 | .00 |
| 1. Q24 Respects my opinion even if s/he thinks differently
 | .37 | **-.47** | .41 | -.25 | -.06 | -.03 | -.07 | .06 | .08 |
| 1. Q77 Completes my sentences impatiently
 | -.19 | **.46** | -.21 | .41 | .12 | .17 | .04 | .22 | .10 |
| 1. Q86 Makes restless movements with his/her head, arms, hands, or legs, clicks a pen, etc.
 | -.15 | **.45** | -.18 | .29 | .32 | .19 | .06 | .18 | -.01 |
| 1. Q23 Listens to me, even if s/he holds a different opinion
 | .32 | **-.44** | **.42** | -.28 | -.08 | -.03 | -.02 | .00 | .11 |
| 1. Q48 Engages in monologue
 | -.23 | **.42** | -.11 | **.40** | .08 | .10 | .03 | .33 | -.04 |
| 1. Q16 Twists my words
 | -.21 | **.40** | -.18 | .33 | .10 | .14 | .02 | .03 | .02 |
| 1. Q91 Shows frustration when I don't present my ideas in an orderly, efficient way
 | -.15 | **.40** | -.07 | .25 | .08 | .22 | .22 | .02 | .12 |
| 1. Q88 Avoids eye contact
 | -.26 | .38 | -.28 | .10 | .31 | .04 | .06 | .23 | -.07 |
| 1. Q62 Assures that s/he is listening to me by using verbal acknowledgments
 | .30 | -.26 | **.66** | -.14 | -.03 | -.11 | -.02 | -.13 | .05 |
| 1. Q43 Tries hard to understand what I am saying
 | .37 | -.29 | **.66** | -.11 | -.07 | -.02 | -.03 | -.11 | .12 |
| 1. Q42 Asks for more details
 | .28 | -.13 | **.65** | -.04 | -.01 | .03 | .04 | -.09 | .19 |
| 1. Q63 Asks questions that show his/her understanding of my opinions
 | .37 | -.31 | **.63** | -.13 | -.03 | -.07 | -.03 | -.10 | .09 |
| 1. Q44 Uses full sentences instead of saying just yes or no
 | .21 | -.10 | **.59** | -.05 | -.10 | -.05 | .05 | .00 | .11 |
| 1. Q56 Keeps track of the various points I make
 | .31 | -.21 | **.58** | -.16 | -.16 | -.06 | -.03 | -.06 | .04 |
| 1. Q45 Offers relevant information in response to questions I ask
 | .32 | -.29 | **.56** | -.05 | -.02 | -.03 | .07 | -.13 | .07 |
| 1. Q76 Asks me to tell my account (story)
 | .32 | -.14 | **.54** | -.11 | -.17 | -.07 | -.06 | -.02 | .14 |
| 1. Q95 Encourages me to clarify a problem
 | .37 | -.29 | **.53** | -.11 | -.11 | -.03 | .01 | -.08 | .12 |
| 1. Q82 Expresses interest in my stories
 | **.49** | -.34 | **.52** | -.15 | -.15 | -.05 | -.04 | -.04 | .01 |
| 1. Q15 Responds to me personally
 | .32 | -.21 | **.52** | -.05 | -.09 | .02 | -.04 | -.08 | -.04 |
| 1. Q55 Gives me an indication that s/he will remember what I say
 | .38 | -.18 | **.51** | -.09 | -.17 | -.07 | -.01 | .02 | .14 |
| 1. Q41 Makes nonverbal gestures that indicate that s/he is listening to me
 | .26 | -.12 | **.49** | -.02 | -.07 | -.04 | -.09 | .09 | .10 |
| 1. Q11 Listens to me attentively
 | .38 | -.36 | **.49** | -.24 | -.19 | -.01 | .00 | -.12 | .02 |
| 1. Q13 Pays close attention to what I say
 | .41 | -.34 | **.48** | -.22 | -.20 | .00 | -.06 | -.10 | .00 |
| 1. Q96 Gives me time and space to talk
 | .39 | -.35 | **.47** | -.29 | -.17 | -.14 | -.07 | -.11 | .04 |
| 1. Q32 Listens to my problems
 | .39 | -.38 | **.47** | -.07 | -.11 | -.07 | -.01 | -.12 | -.04 |
| 1. Q65 Gives me his/her undivided attention
 | .41 | -.26 | **.47** | -.18 | **-.44** | -.13 | -.08 | -.08 | .02 |
| 1. Q85 Responds to my questions
 | .29 | **-.44** | **.46** | -.12 | -.07 | .02 | .03 | -.04 | -.01 |
| 1. Q14 Creates a positive atmosphere for me to talk
 | **.44** | -.40 | **.45** | -.22 | -.16 | .05 | -.08 | -.01 | .05 |
| 1. Q97 Allows me to fully express my self
 | .39 | **-.41** | **.45** | -.25 | -.15 | -.15 | -.08 | -.16 | .03 |
| 1. Q2 Gives me indications that s/he seriously consider my opinion
 | .36 | **-.42** | **.43** | -.16 | -.04 | -.07 | -.02 | -.03 | .01 |
| 1. Q98 Expresses understanding non-verbally
 | .37 | -.23 | **.40** | -.07 | -.05 | -.06 | -.06 | -.10 | .13 |
| 1. Q31 Doesn't get tired of listening to me
 | .38 | -.24 | **.40** | -.25 | -.10 | -.10 | -.09 | .00 | -.01 |
| 1. Q52 Shows eagerness in his/her responses
 | .26 | .04 | .38 | .05 | -.02 | .04 | -.09 | .03 | .16 |
| 1. Q6 Often interrupts me while I am talking
 | -.12 | .23 | -.16 | **.69** | .21 | .09 | .07 | .07 | -.03 |
| 1. Q19 Begins to talk before I finish talking
 | -.13 | .31 | -.16 | **.64** | .19 | .11 | .01 | .16 | -.07 |
| 1. Q5 Can hardly bear to have silence in conversations with me
 | -.09 | .09 | -.07 | **.60** | .04 | .07 | .15 | .10 | .02 |
| 1. Q18 Talks more than me
 | -.15 | .24 | -.08 | **.57** | .12 | .00 | .08 | .16 | .01 |
| 1. Q7 Imposes his/her own views
 | -.25 | .41 | -.17 | **.53** | .12 | .05 | .15 | .00 | -.03 |
| 1. Q21 Listens to me calmly
 | .30 | **-.40** | .33 | **-.40** | -.16 | -.04 | .00 | .00 | .08 |
| 1. Q28 Hurries me into talking faster
 | -.10 | .39 | -.22 | **.40** | .23 | .28 | .07 | .07 | .05 |
| 1. Q25 Lets me talk, when we begin to talk at the same time
 | .27 | -.23 | .30 | -.31 | -.23 | .02 | .02 | .01 | .11 |
| 1. Q81 Stares at the computer screen while I'm talking to him/her
 | -.09 | .25 | -.10 | .13 | **.74** | .17 | .04 | .05 | -.01 |
| 1. Q80 Uses the telephone while I'm talking to him/her
 | -.02 | .23 | -.07 | .14 | **.73** | .22 | .05 | .11 | -.02 |
| 1. Q70 Is distracted while I'm talking
 | -.20 | .27 | -.10 | .21 | **.65** | .17 | .08 | .17 | -.03 |
| 1. Q66 Protects our conversation from interruptions
 | .31 | -.13 | .30 | -.21 | **-.58** | -.08 | -.03 | -.06 | .08 |
| 1. Q35 Keeps firm eye contact
 | .31 | -.13 | .37 | -.15 | **-.44** | .03 | .02 | -.02 | .07 |
| 1. Q108 Begins a discussion by telling me how long s/he has for me
 | -.06 | .22 | -.06 | .11 | .16 | **.79** | .11 | .07 | .06 |
| 1. Q109 Looks at his/her watch or clocks in the room when s/he has limited time to listen to me
 | -.15 | .21 | -.05 | .14 | .28 | **.74** | .09 | .10 | .05 |
| 1. Q107 Hurries me and lets me know that s/he has a limited amount of time to listen
 | -.20 | .27 | -.14 | .21 | .21 | **.68** | .09 | .06 | .01 |
| 1. Q129 Concerned about what s/he thinks of me
 | -.08 | .10 | -.04 | .10 | .02 | .07 | **.74** | .02 | .02 |
| 1. Q130 Worry about myself
 | -.16 | .28 | -.07 | .07 | .00 | .08 | **.71** | .03 | -.04 |
| 1. Q131 Aware of my shortcomings (disadvantages)
 | .02 | .18 | .03 | .07 | .06 | .08 | **.67** | -.03 | .02 |
| 1. Q127 Try to impress him/her
 | .34 | -.05 | .01 | .13 | .13 | .04 | **.53** | .00 | .08 |
| 1. Q39 Starts talking about unrelated issues
 | -.06 | .28 | -.15 | .23 | .21 | .12 | .00 | **.65** | -.04 |
| 1. Q38 Changes the subject too frequently
 | -.09 | .29 | -.20 | .28 | .17 | .14 | -.02 | **.59** | .01 |
| 1. Q89 Makes irrelevant jokes all the time
 | -.02 | .34 | -.08 | .15 | .16 | .10 | -.01 | **.41** | .05 |
| 1. Q37 Seems bored
 | -.25 | .36 | -.33 | .11 | .25 | .05 | .13 | .39 | .00 |
| 1. Q102 Restates what I say
 | .19 | -.01 | .17 | .01 | .00 | .08 | .06 | -.02 | **.77** |
| 1. Q22 gives me a brief summary of what I have said
 | .29 | -.01 | .19 | -.10 | -.11 | .06 | .02 | -.05 | **.66** |
| 1. Q75 Completes my sentences to help me clarify what I am saying
 | .26 | -.05 | .20 | .25 | .01 | -.03 | .01 | .10 | **.45** |
| 1. Q101 Asks continuing questions like Could you tell me more?
 | .29 | -.18 | **.41** | -.23 | -.06 | -.02 | -.05 | -.06 | **.41** |
| 1. Q54 Listens to more than just spoken words
 | **.43** | -.13 | **.43** | -.13 | -.13 | -.04 | -.06 | -.03 | .16 |
| 1. Q53 Is sensitive to what I am not saying
 | .39 | -.10 | .36 | -.13 | -.09 | .04 | -.10 | -.01 | .12 |
| 1. Q99 Can guess my intention or purpose without being told
 | **.41** | -.06 | .27 | -.04 | -.03 | -.10 | -.04 | -.10 | .14 |
| 1. Q26 Insists on saying things in his/her own words
 | -.16 | .17 | .00 | .29 | .19 | .02 | -.01 | .13 | .08 |
| 1. Q27 Criticizes me
 | -.18 | **.48** | -.13 | .23 | .09 | .10 | .03 | -.07 | .01 |
| 1. Q29 Sticks to his/her opinions
 | -.25 | .34 | -.08 | .28 | .09 | -.01 | .10 | .12 | -.08 |
| 1. Q1 Waits for me to begin talking when I am hesitating
 | .23 | -.09 | .19 | -.21 | -.05 | -.08 | -.01 | .00 | .10 |
| 1. Q12 Listens to me carefully
 | .22 | -.20 | .36 | -.12 | -.11 | .02 | .06 | -.06 | .06 |
| 1. Q93 Adjusts his/her language when talking to me
 | .26 | -.10 | .21 | -.02 | -.10 | .06 | .07 | -.01 | .07 |
| 1. Q92 Is comfortable and confident
 | .27 | -.18 | .30 | -.03 | -.02 | -.05 | .01 | -.10 | .05 |
| 1. Q94 Uses (comfortable) silences in the conversation
 | .29 | -.17 | .26 | -.30 | -.11 | -.06 | -.02 | -.08 | .07 |
| 1. Q40 Gives ambiguous responses
 | -.13 | .30 | -.09 | .10 | .16 | .07 | .08 | .26 | -.01 |
| 1. Q46 Sends double messages, where verbal and nonverbal messages differ
 | -.21 | **.41** | -.21 | .20 | .10 | .05 | .11 | .21 | .01 |
| 1. Q132 Feel that s/he pretends to understand me even when s/he does not
 | -.21 | .35 | -.27 | .16 | .13 | .12 | .28 | .09 | .04 |
| 1. Q134 Feel that s/he keeps listening to me, even if s/he is not interested
 | .32 | .00 | .14 | -.02 | -.02 | .03 | .09 | .04 | .08 |
| 1. Q67 Prefers to hear facts and evidence
 | .00 | .10 | .10 | .07 | -.06 | .14 | .04 | -.02 | -.02 |
| 1. Q61 Prefers to listen to technical information
 | -.20 | **.41** | -.14 | .22 | .14 | .01 | .04 | .11 | .01 |
| 1. Q106 Points out inaccuracies in my account (story)
 | -.05 | .25 | .02 | .14 | .10 | .27 | .13 | .10 | .14 |
| 1. Q105 Ensures that when I tell my stories, I do not skip important details
 | .35 | -.10 | .34 | -.08 | -.08 | .01 | .02 | .03 | .30 |
| 1. Q90 Uses professional language or jargon that I don't understand
 | -.05 | .28 | -.09 | .05 | .03 | .07 | .10 | .13 | .16 |

Note. Loadings equal or higher than |.40| are **boldfaced**.

**TABLE 2**

**Factor Intercorrelations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Component | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 2 | -.68 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | .70 | -.77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | -.46 | .67 | -.57 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | .69 | -.63 | .73 | -.48 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | -.47 | .56 | -.57 | .54 | -.48 |  |  |  |
| 7 | -.38 | .52 | -.45 | .29 | -.35 | .48 |  |  |
| 8 | -.24 | .38 | -.26 | .34 | -.18 | .36 | .31 |  |
| 9 | -.27 | .39 | -.35 | .28 | -.22 | .28 | .26 | .34 |

**TABLE 3**

**FLS scales**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Scale name | Items (see Table 1) | α |
| 1. Positive Consequences
 | Q117 Q118 Q126 Q122 Q116 Q111 Q125 Q119 Q128 Q114 | .96 |
| 1. Destructive listening behavior
 | Q30 Q51 Q78 Q47 Q68 Q69 Q10 Q8 Q17 Q9 | .93 |
| 1. Constructive listening behavior
 | Q43 Q63 Q95 Q82 Q11 Q13 Q96 Q65 Q14 Q97 | .95 |
| 1. Destructive listening behavior: domineering listener
 | Q6 Q19 Q18 Q7 Q21 Q28  | .86 |
| 1. Destructive listening behavior: escape; phone computer etc
 | Q81 Q80 Q70 | .83 |
| 1. Destructive listening behavior: no time
 | Q108 Q109 Q107 | .84 |
| 1. Negative Consequences; Makes me concerned
 | Q129 Q130 Q131  | .72 |
| 1. Destructive listening behavior; change the subject
 | Q39 Q38 | .82 |
| 1. Constructive listening behavior; reframing
 | Q102 Q22 Q75 Q101 | .69 |

**TABLE 4**

**Stepwise Regressions Predicting Listening Outcomes**

1. Positive Consequences

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
| Listening Behavior | β | t | p < |
| Constructive listening skills | .59 | 15.97 | .000 |
| Constructive listening skills; reframing | .11 | 4.64 | .000 |
| Destructive listening skills | -.16 | -4.57 | .000 |
| Destructive listening skills; change the subject | .09 | 3.66 | .000 |
| Destructive listening skills: no time | -.07 | -2.70 | .007 |

1. Negative Consequences; Makes me concerned

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
| Listening Behavior | β | t | p < |
| Destructive listening skills: escape; phone computer etc. | .92 | 78.12 | .000 |
| Destructive listening skills: no time | .05 | 3.84 | .000 |
| Constructive listening skills; reframing | .03 | 2.78 | .006 |

**Appendix A**

**Listening Scales Table Mapping**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale’s name** | **Theoretical Construct** | **Item development** | **Sample** | **Factors Found** | **Comments** |
| Active listening([Kubota et al., 1997](#_ENREF_14))  | None | 27 items – development not reported | 60 employees (administrative) trained in active listening 2 days workshops. After a month they went through another 2 days workshop | Factor Analysis not reported (α = .78) | Context: trainingSelf-report |
| Salesperson listening ([Ramsey & Sohi, 1997](#_ENREF_22)) | Practitioners' theory in Marketing:*Sensing*: verbal and non-verbal messages such as words, tone of voice, gestures, etc. *Evaluation*: determine what meaning the message actually convey (by paraphrasing and asking for more details)*Responding*: The salesperson responded with information indicating that s/he was listening ([Ramsey & Sohi, 1997](#_ENREF_22))  | 80 students were asked to think back tothe last time they purchased something from a salespersonand indicate the behaviors by which they knew the salespersonwas listening to them. The items that appeared at least twice were included in the initial scale. In the final scale, the *sensing* component of listening was measured by four items (α = .80). *evaluating* was measured by five items (α = .64) and *responding* was measured by four items (α = .91) | N=173 respondents to a mail survey, which was mail to 500 new car buyers, who had bought a car within the past 6 months. | Using Structural Equation Modeling, loadings of each latent construct were reported on a second order factor of Salesperson's listening: Sensing = .92, evaluating = .99, and responding = .98 | Context: Sales Self-report of customers The high loading raise doubt regarding the independence of the three factors (the lowest =.92) |
| **ALAS** active listening attitude scale([Mishima et al., 2000](#_ENREF_17)) | Person Centered Attitude ([Rogers, 1951](#_ENREF_23))1. empathic understanding
2. unconditional positive regard
3. congruence
 | Active Listening (AL) teachers wrote 47 items based on PCA and AL | N= 536 production workers 426 male and 95Female at two manufacturing companies  | 1. Listening Attitude (α = .84)
2. Listening Skill (α = .78)
3. Conversation Opportunity (α = .74)

No correlation among scales reported. | Context: Occupational Health No congruence between theory and obtained factorsSelf-report Correlation between factors not reported  |
| **PCBI** parent confirmation behavior indicators ([Ellis, 2002](#_ENREF_10)) | Martin Buber (1957)**Confirmation**: 1. Recognition
2. Acknowledgment
3. Endorsement

**Disconfirmation**: 1. indifferences
2. imperviousness
3. disqualification
 | 28 items. Half of the Qs focus on parental responses and half on parent-initiated communication. It was tested on 29 young adults.  | N= 244 young adult (26% males, 73.8% female)  | One factor: Confirmation-disconfirmation  | Young adult-Parent relationshipPerceived Confirmation Scale - **PCS** (Sieburg 1973, 1975)Cissna and Sieburg (1981)  |
| Listening Style Inventory (LSI) ([Pearce et al., 2003](#_ENREF_21)) | Categorized four types of listening style:Active (focus on what is being said), Involve (focus on the speaker’s words and intention), Passive (seldom expend any noticeable energy in receiving the message), Detached (inattentive, disinterested, restless, bored or easily distracted). | Self-assessment tool for managers comprised of 10-items. Based on five-point scale ranging from (1) “almost never” to (5) “almost always”. | **Study 1** N=349 supervisors, nurse managers, educational administrators and audit managers.**Study 2** N= 478  | **Study 1**Four factors were found (α =.75): active, involve, passive and detached. **Study 2**Three factors were found (α =.70): active, involve and passive. The forth listening style “detached” was not found as a factor.Combine factor analysis of both studies yielded three factors as found in study 1 |  |
| **AEL (**active empathetic listening) ([Drollinger et al., 2006](#_ENREF_8)) | Sensing, ProcessingAnd Responding (Steil et. Al 1983 in Ramesy & Sohi, 1997) | Interviews with nine key informants (sales managers, sales supervisors and sale people) that wrote 98 items. The items were given to judges in order to sort the items according to the three construct definition (sensing, processing and responding). Based on this feedback the list was reduced to 47 items.  | **Study 1** N=164 47 itemsThe customer evaluate the salesperson**Study 2** N=15145 itemsSelf-evaluation of salespeople **Study 3**N=175 11 itemsSelf-evaluation of salespeople | The AEL scale yielded the expected three factors, yet they were highly correlated such that inter-factor correlation was as high as .63 (exceeding the product of the respective reliabilities). | Context: Sales through E-mail Didn’t evaluate the dyadic relationship**Empathy** - Davis empathy scale(M. H. Davis, 1980; 1983) |
| ALOS-Global (active listening observational scale) ([Fassaert et al., 2007](#_ENREF_11)) | Patient-center interview skill through active listening in the context of consultationsfor minor ailments in general practice | 7-item observational instrument measuring active listening, based on five-point observing scale ranging from (Never) to (Always) | N=524 general practice (GP) consultations were videotaped | Factor analysis revealed one homogeneous dimension | Female GPs received higher active listening scores |
| Castro (2010) | None | 24 items on 1 to 7 Likert scale. 12 items that focus on the listener and 12 items that focus on the one that is listened to (speaker)  | N=90 undergraduate student at the Hebrew University Jerusalem (Israel) | Three factors were found for the Listener:Empathic listening (α =.761); Attitude and "talent" for listening (α =.668); Focus on the listener self (α =.536)Three factors were found for the speaker:Empathic feelings (α =.831); Cognitive aspects/ listening in conflicts ideas (α =. 551);Openness (α =.538) | Self-assessment |
| LSP-16 (Listening Style Profile)([Bodie & Worthington, 2010](#_ENREF_3)) | People have four primary listening styles: people (concentrate on the relational content of the message); action (focus on the inconsistency and errors in a speaker’s message); content (listen fully to a speaker’s message); and time (focus on interaction between time and message reception).(Watson et al. 1995) | 16-item scale design to measure people-action-content & time-oriented approach to listening and receiving information. Self-assessment based on five-point scale ranging from (0) “never” to (4) “always”. | N=661 Volunteers were enrolled in introductory communication courses at Auburn University and were rewarded with extra credit for their participation. | Low internal consistency was found for the four listening style (People, α =.65; Action, α =.53; Content, α =.52; Time, α =.67) | Self-assessmentRecommend to differentiate between cognitive (what the person prefers) & behavioral (how the person behave) items.  |