

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

The Teaching of Listening as an Integral Part of an Oral Activity:

An Examination of Public-Speaking Texts

From www.wca-refracted.com

W. Clifton Adams

SAda Enterprises

and

E. Sam Cox

University of Central Missouri

- Copyright 2009 & 2011 W. Clifton Adams.

A latter version of this paper is copyrighted 2010 by Taylor and Francis Group, LLC; the company published the paper in *The International Journal of Listening*, 24, 69-88

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

Abstract

This paper presents the results of a content analysis of ten current public-speaking textbooks to determine the nature and extent to which they teach listening in an integrated approach with public speaking as an oral activity. Lewis & Nichols (1965) predicted that listening would increasingly be taught especially in an integrated approach with speaking. Beyond the prediction, they established a template for the pedagogy that emphasized the oral modality. Their prediction has not proved accurate. Ample research illustrates the lack of listening instruction. The current study sought both to replicate these findings and to examine the emphasis on the oral modality as reflected in public-speaking texts. Six research questions asked about listening inclusion and concentration, differences in written and oral modalities, delivery, development via writing, discussion of the oral modality and pedagogy. The results of this analysis confirmed that these texts do contain treatments of listening, but, with one exception, only to a slight degree. Listening was seldom integrated with the teaching of speech within these texts. Secondly, with two exceptions, the texts seldom developed instruction with an emphasis on speech as an oral activity. Overall, the texts failed to reflect the pedagogy for teaching the oral modality essential to listening instruction. The results are discussed in terms of the extent to which the texts advance the teaching of listening and speaking as an interdependent oral activity. The conclusions indicate that the pedagogy advanced through these texts focus too greatly on writing to appropriately advance an understanding of the oral aspects essential to listening education.

Key words: Listening, oral modality, public speaking, idea focus

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

Ralph Nichols in writing with Thomas R. Lewis (1965) believed that effective listening was linked to effective speaking. They stated, “Effective listening and effective speaking are so closely woven together as to be inseparable” (p. 7). They suggested integrating speaking and listening in the basic speech course that differed from instruction in writing and reading.

They were optimistic that their pioneering work in listening would be advanced through an integrated approach. In Lewis and Nichols (1965), they said, “It appears the time is at hand when speech and listening training is to be considered an important area of study throughout the education system” (p. 5). They proposed that “the best approach to classroom training in listening appears to be through a coordination of listening and speech instruction” (p. 7). They proposed an integrated approach and provided a model with their book.

Lewis and Nichols (1965) asked, given the importance of listening to all aspects of life, “why is it that speech as a course subject has occupied such a minimal place in the curriculum hierarchy?” (p. 3). Given current research by Emanuel, Adams, Baker, Daufin, Ellington, Fitts, Himsel, Holladay and Okeowo (2008), the impacts of technology have not reduced the importance of listening. Given Berko, Wolvin & Wolvin (2001), Janusik (2001), the centrality of listening in the curriculum has not made sufficient advances as to void Lewis and Nichols’ (1965) question. Yet, today, the same question is justified. Indeed, Johnson and Long (2007) illustrated the ineffectiveness of current approaches of including listening instruction within the public speaking course. Steil (2008) noted the lack of progress, saying, “Everything that has been said could be said again.”

Central to the integrated approach in Lewis and Nichols (1965) were both a combined treatment of speech and listening within each chapter and an emphasis on the spoken modality. This latter emphasis is important since listening only occurs within the context of utterances. In explaining the basis of language use, Clark (1992) gave as the first of his three tenets, “In language use, utterances are more basic than sentences” (p. xiii). One implication of this tenet is that listening is dynamic; sentences which are linear, then, cannot be the building blocks in

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

teaching listening. Clark (1992) later used this tenet in discussing the speech act (Searle, 1969) as expanded by Schiffer (1972) and, in so doing, showed why listening is not reading.

Understanding speakers depends on recognizing their attitudes. To interpret the spoken word as intended, listeners must understand these attitudes by processing the words within the context of the act of speaking (p. 73). Understanding and teaching listening depends on understanding the fundamental, yet complex, nature of utterances. In terms of listening, these cannot be simplified to sentences. The research in nonverbal communication underpins this position (for example, Ekman & Friesen, 1969, Mehrabian, 1971 & Bateson, 1972).

Listening can *not* be taught through the teaching of reading or through the teaching of writing (see for example, Rankin, 1952, Nichols & Stevens, 1957, Floyd, 1985 & Rubin 1993).

For the instruction in speech to advance the concomitant skills in listening, the instruction needs to be anchored in speech behavior. Further support for this position is found in studies of the learning of a language (see for example, Luria, 1976, Luria, 1982; Siegal 1996; & Piper, 2003) and in studies that identify the centrality of speech in learning reading and writing (see for example Frith, 1980 & Piper, 2003). Listening is the companion of speaking, not writing. To the extent that speaking is taught using basically the same as used in teaching writing, it is impossible to integrate valid instruction in listening. It seems justified to ask whether the answer to “why does listening instruction remains generally absent, and, where present, fundamentally ineffective?” is found in the inappropriate pedagogy borrowed from the teaching of writing.

While the oral tradition is anchored in the classics, much of its character was distorted before the emergence of modern Departments of Speech (Macke, 1991). As described by Smith (1954), less than 100 years ago, speech instruction was included within English departments. There, the primary focus was on written expression. There was resistance to this emphasis by a few individuals such as Winans (1915) who discussed the dynamic nature of speech and who said, “A speech is not an essay standing on its hind legs” (Wilson & Arnold, 1968, p. 292). The

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

question is whether the speech instruction envisioned by Winans (1915) and by Lewis and Nichols (1965) has been able to overcome the emphasis on writing within the teaching of public speaking as reflected in leading textbooks. To the extent that they have not, it is impossible to integrate listening into that instruction.

Clearly, the critical factors that make speaking different than writing are all found within the fact that speech is presented orally at one moment in time for an audience of viewer-listeners. For example, even listening to a recording of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I have a Dream Speech" is not the same thing as being part of the original audience to whom it was delivered. As Clark (2008) explained in his keynote address at the Communication, Language and Cognition Conference, anything except first-time presentations of a speech, i.e., all subsequent presentations or recordings, must be viewed as quotation.

Critical factors defining the dynamic of a spoken presentation should impact all aspects of speech preparation. The speaker should approach the creative aspects of invention with an understanding that she/he will need to focus on ideas so as to present them to listeners. The speaker should organize the ideas in a clear and easily-comprehended fashion limiting multileveled substructure to help the audience to avoid focusing on details, a primary listening problem (Nichols, 1957, Nichols & Stevens, 1957); leaving details for print material more suited to that purpose. The speaker should limit the total number of ideas presented to permit the necessary redundancy. In like manner, the speaker should search for a variety of types of supporting material for each of the most-subordinate ideas presented (see, for example, O'Hair et al., p.176). The variety of supporting material also provides the depth to reinforce the richness of each idea and help the audience appreciate its significance. Of course, the speaker needs to refine supporting material with the listener's capabilities foremost in mind and give due consideration to the presentation of the ideas.

Scholars have done much research relevant to Lewis and Nichols' (1965) suggestions and predictions. The most relevant was Janusik and Wolvin (2002). They analyzed the 17 most

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

popular basic-speech texts. They reported that across the texts, the average space devoted to listening was a little more than 4% and that only two of the texts devoted as much as 7% to listening. How much of the instruction incorporated an emphasis on speech as an oral activity was not considered directly. They did report on “Approaches to Teaching Listening.” In this section they reported a stress on differentiating listening from hearing, but did not report a concern for its multidimensional character in making this distinction.

Perkins (1994) surveyed the types of listening most frequently taught in the basic course. Johnson and Long (2007) found that during the basic-course there was no overall gain in listening performance; the only exception was in interpreting emotional meaning. Neither study spoke directly to the dynamics necessitated by an oral interchange. Bodie, Worthington, Imhof and Cooper (2008) did note that the prevailing definition of listening derived from information processing is linear, not dynamic. This view of listening is consistent with the processes of reading.

Given the Janusik and Wolvin (2002) findings, it seemed fitting to extend their analysis to current public-speaking texts to determine the extent to which the texts treated listening within an integrated approach that focuses on an oral modality. Thus, the following questions were advanced:

Area one: Coverage of Listening

(RQ1) Do current public-speaking textbooks include instruction in listening? If so, to what extent do they?

(RQ2) Is the listening instruction primarily concentrated in one chapter? If not, to what extent is the listening instruction integrated with that of public speaking?

Area two: Oral-Modality Orientation

(RQ3) Does the text highlight the differences between the oral and the written modalities of communication? If so, is the focus primarily on language and is there a section discussing the differences?

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

(RQ4) How often is delivery (it's execution and impact) discussed beyond a chapter(s) on delivery?

(RQ5) Are there direct statements that support the desirability of developing speech via writing? and,

(RQ6) To what extent does the text reflect an oral-modality perspective in instructions for both speaker and listener?

Method

A sample of 10 public-speaking texts was selected for analysis from the ones available when we began the analysis in May, 2008. Given the focus of previous studies on textual material, the present analysis also only involved the physical texts. Texts, at the time, were the primary source of instruction outside the classroom; auxiliaries served as supplements. The texts were judged as providing the foundation for the prevailing pedagogy.

The selection of texts was made to provide diversity in the popularity, depth and variation in treatment. We were also sensitive to claims that the text included listening instruction. The texts were (1) Beebe and Beebe (2006), (2) Ferguson (2008), (3) Griffin (2003), (4) Lucas (2007), (5) Makay, Butland, and Mason (2008), (6) Nelson, Titsworth and Pearson (2008), (7) O'Hair, Stewart and Rubenstein (2007), (8) Osborn, Osborn and Osborn (2008), (9) Verderber and Verderber (2003), (10) Wolvin, Berko & Wolvin (1999).

A rubric was used to guide the analysis (see Appendix A). Items for the rubric were generated to answer specifically the research questions. The items were then refined by independently reviewing two texts not in the present sample. In the pilot there was 98% agreement between the two reviewers, but each felt the need for more sensitivity in the items. This final adjustment yielded the rubric.

The authors, then, independently analyzed all ten texts. They agreed in advance to be liberal in including questionable references to listening; for example, a suggestion that the students simply reflect on a previous listening experience was counted as listening instruction.

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

However, both coders agreed that, where “listener(s)” was/were used as a synonym for “audience,” it would not count as listening instruction since the focus in those cases was on generating a message. Guided by the rubric, the table of contents and the index, they studied each book, including all the chapters and all the application exercises. The coders agreed 93% of the time. Disagreements were minor and easily resolved. The resulting ratings were used to answer the research questions

Results

Area one: Coverage of Listening RQ1& RQ2

In RQ1 we asked: Do current public-speaking textbooks include instruction in listening? If so, to what extent do they?

As shown in Table 1, every text had a major section/chapter on listening. However, listening was cordoned off in the textbooks. In terms of the total text, the percentage devoted to listening was small, ranging from 2% to 6% for all texts except the Wolvin et al.(1999) text which addressed listening seventeen percent of the time. When the texts actually made suggestions to improve listening, as opposed to talking about listening, the percentage dropped from one to three percent for all but the Wolvin et al.(1999) text which dropped to 7%.

Table 1

Coverage of Listening

	Considers listening	# of pages covering listening	% of text covering listening	# of pages focused on improving listening	% focused on improving listening
Beebe & Beebe	YES	29 pp	6%	10 pp	2%
Ferguson	YES	24 pp	5%	2 pp	1%
Griffin	YES	31 pp	6%	10 pp	2%
Lucas	YES	19 pp	4%	9 pp	2%
Makay, Button & Mason	YES	17 pp	5%	7 pp	2%
Nelson, Titsworth & Pearson	YES	10 pp	3%	5 pp	2%

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

O'Hair, Stewart & Rubenstein	YES	11 pp	2%	7 pp	1%
Osborn, Osborn & Osborn	YES	7 pp	2%	4 pp	1%
Verderber, & Verderer	YES	13 pp	4%	9 pp	3%
Wolvin, Berko & Wolvin	YES	52 pp	17%	23 pp	7%

In addition, in RQ2 we asked: Is the listening instruction primarily concentrated in one chapter? If not, to what extent is the listening instruction integrated with that of public speaking?

As shown in Table 2, with the exception of the Wolvin et al.(1999) text, the books seldom sought to integrate listening into instruction in other areas. This absence of integration was noticeably absent in two areas that lend themselves to highlighting the importance of listening. The first of these areas was audience analysis. The texts went to great lengths to discuss surveys and even interviews with key members of the audience with, at best, a token recognition that listening could be involved in the interviews. Even Wolvin et al.(1999) failed to note that listening to group members in day-to-day interactions is a valuable source of information about the audience. The general idea found in all the texts was that the audience was a group of people distant from the speaker as opposed to the more typical situation where the speaker has some routine involvement with the audience, even as found in the classroom situation.

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

Table 2

Integration of Coverage

	Integration beyond one chapter	If yes, frequency	Integration in "activities/discussion questions"	If yes, frequency
Beebe & Beebe	YES	Seldom	YES	Seldom
Ferguson	NO		YES	Seldom
Griffin	YES	Seldom	YES	Seldom
Lucas	YES	Seldom	YES	Seldom
Makay, Button & Mason	YES	Seldom	YES	Seldom
Nelson, Titsworth & Pearson	YES	Seldom	YES	Seldom
O'Hair, Stewart & Rubenstein	YES	Seldom	NO	
Osborn, Osborn & Osborn	YES	Seldom	YES	Seldom
Verderber, & Verderber	YES	Seldom	YES	Seldom
Wolvin, Berko & Wolvin	YES	In every chapter	YES	Frequently

The other relevant place for linking listening to public speaking was in interviews to gain information. As a rule, the texts devoted a page or more to discussing the setup and execution of the interview. Where listening was mentioned, the phrase generally referred back to the listening chapter. Where listening was discussed in this context, the focus was on quoting the individual accurately not in any regard to recognizing attitudes/purposes of the context in which the words were expressed. The typical advice was to take an audio tape recorder, the implication of which was clearly that it was primarily the words and facts with which the student should be concerned.

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

One typical example: “The major advantage of recording an interview is that it gives you an exact record of the interview that you can check later for direct quotes and important facts”

(Lucas 2007, p. 160).

Table 3

Distinction of Speaking from Writing

	Highlights differences between speaking and writing	Distinction limited primarily to language/style	Has a section on the differences
Beebe & Beebe	Seldom	YES	YES
Ferguson	Seldom	YES	YES
Griffin	Seldom	NO	YES
Lucas	Seldom	NO	NO
Makay, Button & Mason	Seldom	YES	YES
Nelson, Titsworth & Pearson	Seldom	NO	YES
O’Hair, Stewart & Rubenstein	Seldom	YES	YES
Osborn, Osborn & Osborn	Seldom	NO	YES
Verderber, & Verderber	Seldom	NO	NO
Wolvin, Berko & Wolvin	Frequently	NO	YES

Area two: Oral-Modality Orientation—RQ3-RQ6

Analysis of the third research question, “Does the text highlight the differences between the oral and the written modalities of communication? If so, is the focus primarily on language and is there a section discussing the differences?” gave a very similar answer to the second one. Wolvin et al.(1999) more often placed its instruction within the domain of speaking (see Table 3).

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

Eight out of 10 books had sections emphasizing that there is a difference between spoken and written communication and 6 out of 10 texts did expand in some way the differences beyond that of style, although differences in style received much of the small attention devoted to this issue. However, only Wolvin et al.(1999) saw fit frequently to capitalize on this opportunity (see Table 4).

The fourth question was, “How often is delivery (its execution and impact) discussed beyond a chapter(s) on delivery?” It provided another opportunity for the texts to distinguish public speaking from written presentations. Again, only Wolvin et al. (1999) and Makay et al. (2008) saw fit frequently to capitalize on this opportunity (see Table 4). One part of the instruction that almost demands a strong focus on delivery is in the discussion of introductions; three of the four purposes of an introduction are typically accomplished via delivery. While most texts focused on writing and, even, memorizing the introduction, Makay et al. (2008) stressed establishing rapport in capturing attention and provided an example illustrating the importance of delivery to set the appropriate tone and mood (p. 181). This discussion was in contrast to examples in the other texts which were most generally presented as sections of manuscripts with perhaps a passing reference to some small part of the delivery.

Table 4

Treatment as Oral Activity

	The impact/application of delivery discussed beyond a delivery chapter	Instruction stresses developing speech through writing	Discussion helped speaker manage multi-channel nature of speech	Discussion helped listener manage multi-channel nature of speech
Beebe & Beebe	Seldom	YES	Seldom	Only in listening section
Ferguson	Seldom	YES	Seldom	Only in listening section
Griffin	Seldom	YES	Seldom	Seldom

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

Lucas	Seldom	YES	Seldom	Only in listening section
Makay, Button & Mason	Frequently	Almost Never	Frequently	Only in listening section
Nelson, Titsworth & Pearson	Seldom	YES	Seldom	Only in listening section
O’Hair, Stewart & Rubenstein	Seldom	YES	Seldom	Only in listening section
Osborn, Osborn & Osborn	Seldom	YES	Seldom	Only in listening section
Verderber, & Verderber	Seldom	YES	Seldom	Seldom
Wolvin, Berko & Wolvin	Frequently	YES	Frequently	Frequently

In terms of RQ5, “Are there direct statements that support the desirability of developing speech via writing?” every text encouraged students to use writing as a chief, if not the only, means of developing the speech. Most common was an encouragement for the students to write very detailed preparation outlines, with multiple-leveled structure in full-sentence form. They followed the principle set forth by Lucas (2007), “Writing a preparation outline means actually putting your speech together” (p. 254).

Students were told, as by Verderber & Verderber (2003), “begin framing the structure of the speech by writing a thesis statement” (p. 117). All ten of the texts provided directions in writing thesis or central-idea sentence.

The clear tendency was to encourage in-depth outlines. These texts avoided teaching a more listener-friendly perspective of developing a point through repetition with alternative supporting materials. Most did identify the need to limit the number of ideas, but in turn, contradicted this principle by applying it only to *main* points and then encourage pupils to write multi-leveled outlines containing large numbers of ideas.

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

Nelson et al. (2009), for example, encouraged students to limit their points. This advice was based, appropriately, on listeners' inability to "remember much" (p. 13). Few points with redundancy through a variety of different types of supporting material are needed for oral presentations. Yet, Nelson et al. (2009) encouraged students to write full-sentence outlines and provided a model outline that had nine sub-ideas (p.133), negating the possibility to develop each in the way they recommended. Theirs was among the most streamlined examples.

Similarly, Lucas (2007), in discussing "Rehearsing the Speech," correctly advised students, "Concentrate on gaining control of ideas rather than on trying to learn the speech word for word" (p. 79). However, this advice came after the "speech" was constructed, not as a guide in preparing the speech. As typical of the texts in the collection, he instructed students to write a preparation outline, providing a sample that reflected a manuscript structured in hierarchical form (pp. 260-263).

The focus on the importance of developing a speech through writing was also clear in the guidelines/principles for the outlines. Writing and ordering sentences for a visual effect was at a premium. Within this stress, there was some discussion of substance. Griffin (2003) gave marginal definitions of coordination (p. 253) and subordination (p. 257) beside her example outlines. A few others, while maintaining a stress on the visual goal, gave brief discussions of key concepts necessary to structuring ideas in an outline. For example, Nelson et al. (2009) opened the section, "The principle of subordination allows you to *indicate which material is more important and which is less important through indentation and symbols*" [their emphasis] (p. 138).

Discussions made it clear that the "preparation outline" could be edited to improve the stylistic qualities of the wording. Perhaps the most explicit in this area was Beebe & Beebe (2006) who *showed* how this editing should be done under "Editing Your Speech" (pp. 240-242).

Some texts would require the writing of introductions. For example, Osborn et al. (2008) said, "Your introduction is one part of the speech you should write out in full and commit

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

to memory” (p. 153). Ferguson’s (2008) third step in speech preparation was “writing the introduction” (p.100). She also provided guidelines for lengths of both introductions and conclusions in terms of page lengths (p. 101).

While Makay et al. (2008) was judged to be focused frequently on the oral modality, they did recommend constructing a multileveled, detailed planning outline (pp. 164). Even Wolvin et al. (1999), who were most consistent with listener-friendly advice, showed outlines that would require, from an oral perspective, the development of 8-15 ideas for classroom speeches (pp. 171-177).

The standard method was for students to abstract the polished “preparation outline” (also known as “speech”) to a “speaking outline,” with which they would practice their performances until they felt comfortable. At this stage, they were encouraged to stop rehearsing before the words in the recital became frozen.

In examining the books to answer RQ6, “To what extent does the text reflect an oral-modality perspective in instructions for both speaker and listener?” it was difficult to recognize that speech is a multi-channel activity, again, with the exception of the Wolvin et al. (1999) text (see Table 4). Only within the delivery chapter, and a spattering of consideration within the treatment of visual aids and use of redundancy, was attention given to managing material for the benefit of listeners within the dynamics of a spoken presentation.

RQ6 asked the extent to which, throughout the text, the authors were concerned with helping listeners adapt to the dynamic nature of speech. In so asking, it focused the earlier question of integration of listening instruction within the context of an oral activity. The results (see Table 4), reflected the same lack of integration as RQ2.

Similarly, only Makay et al. (2008) and Wolvin et al. (1999) frequently guided students to manage the simultaneous multi-channel nature of speech. Furthermore, 7 of 10 texts only addressed how listeners could manage the simultaneous multi-channel nature of speech in their

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

listening sections. Only Wolvin et al. (1999) frequently discussed how a listener could better participate during a speech.

In summary, while it was clear from the context, the nouns of address, the listening chapters and chapters on delivery that these textbooks were written to teach public speaking, other indicators were that they could be texts on writing. This lack of clarity was best reflected in the discussions of constructing the message where the predominant emphasis was on the written word. Most texts did state that speakers should limit the number of ideas developed because of listeners' abilities; however, model outlines embedded multiple levels of ideas as would be appropriate for an essay. The predominant examples were of the verbal part of the message. Phrases such as "write the sentences," "write your speech," "read your speech," "draft your speech," "rewrite the paragraph" and "edit your speech" were not uncommon. Some texts encouraged the word-for-word writing of introductions and/or conclusions, while the others showed the total wording of them in the model outlines.

Discussion

Our results are restricted to the instruction provided in the texts themselves. Obviously, the addition of computer assisted instruction is a key innovation to the pedagogical process. With the use of DVD's and internet connection, a student has access to examples involving the dynamics of the spoken message. We can hope that with the addition of electronic and online materials, students will be able and encouraged to listen to sample speeches. However, given the predominant emphasis on constructing speeches via writing within the text, it seems unlikely that a shift to a more listener-friendly approach will emerge without a shift in pedagogy.

At with previous studies, we found listening cordoned off in the textbooks and under-addressed where it did appear. The discussion of audience could just as easily apply to readers as listeners in many cases. Finally, we discovered that discussions of speech preparation are writing-centric in their instruction.

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

The view that speeches are written in the form of preparation outlines similar to ones for essay was clearly presented. The instruction most resembled writing texts in discussing thesis statements. Thesis statements are central to term or theme papers in writing classes (see, for example, Williams, 2004). The goal of theme papers is for students to develop unity across the entire work. Unified treatment is reflective of academic values but is often trumped in actual communication, especially spoken communication, by flexibility. The requirement for unity is better left, in teaching public speaking, for the discussion of subordination within sections of the presentation.

Discussions of the differences between writing and speaking predominately centered on differences in style, again emphasizing language use. While Winans' (1915) views and even famous quote, "A speech is not an essay standing on its hind legs," (Wilson & Arnold, 1968, p. 292), are to be found within the pages of current texts, the overriding value remains on the verbal component, to the general neglect, outside chapters on delivery, of (1) most of what the nonverbal contributes, (2) the impacts of nonverbal communication, (3) the difficulties produced by the addition of nonverbal elements, and (4) the degree to which the message has a different character when listened to than when read. Based on instruction in these texts it can be concluded that, "Speech is a well-polished preparation outline standing on its hind legs."

As best reflected in the discussions of audience analysis as involving a distant audience and with the emphasis on writing and refining key parts of the speech, current texts seem more oriented to training speech writers than teaching individuals how to prepare and present speeches within the context of their everyday business and social schedules. This orientation neglects too much of the dynamic in giving a speech to effectively incorporate instruction in listening.

Clearly, major changes are needed in public-speaking texts for them to best integrate listening instruction. An important shift would be away from specifics, managed in sub-sub-points, to a greater emphasis on creating/determining ideas and deciding how to support each one in a number of different ways, and thinking of the support in terms of illustrations that provide

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

needed redundancy, clarification etc., not in providing more specific ideas.

To help listeners, these ideas, at the most subordinate level, must be supported with a variety of supporting materials. The variety not only helps the listener understand the idea but also helps the speaker because she/he isn't focusing on covering material but upon getting the audience to understand the idea. This shift might be expedited if teachers considered a block of supporting material that is spoken (not a paragraph or a sub-point) as the building block of a presentation. Then, they could help students understand that each block of supporting material is modular and may be shifted or even omitted since each, in a section, is making the same point. When successful, the student recognizes that presenting ideas in a speech is congruous with their natural interaction patterns.

Texts could help by presenting an "Idea: supporting material, supporting material, supporting material" model (I:sm³ for short) to replace the "Main idea: Sub-idea: Sub-sub-idea: etc." one. In short class-room length speeches, the I:sm³ would apply at the main-idea level for three main points with no subdivision or at the sub-idea level for speeches with two main points with one subdivision each. This *idea-focus* approach discourages students from writing, and encourages each to listen and develop her/his inner-voice. Still, teachers do require students to submit their plans including the *type* of introduction, the ideas with *types* of support for each and the *type* of conclusion to be used. The purpose of this assignment is to help guide students in their thinking and to keep the focus on the communication and reinforcement/clarification of a few ideas during the speech.

The more difficult major change, but the one that is more fundamentally needed, is better teaching of principles of outlining. In the texts that made any attempt to discuss the substantive aspects of coordination and subordination, the key variable was *importance* (Griffin (2003), pp. 253 & 257, O'Hair et al. (2007) p. 179, Nelson et al. (2008) p. 138, and Osborn et al. (2008) p. 146). Perhaps Nelson et al. (2008) made the most valiant effort: "More important materials usually consist of generalizations, arguments, or conclusions. Less important materials consist of

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

the supporting evidence for your generalizations, argument or conclusions” (p. 138). They also illustrated the problem with the word *importance* in this context with their next sentence, “By less important, we of course do not mean that your supporting evidence is not vital to your presentation” (p. 138). They do clarify that *less important* actually means more specific in this explanation. With the exception of their including *argument*, which has both general and specific elements, in their clarification, they were able to capture Hayakawa’s (1949) view on structuring thought. It would be better for the teaching of listening within the context of public speaking if the books began the discussion of outlining with some of Hayakawa’s (1949) activities (p. 180).

In light of the entrenched view that we build speeches from preparation outlines, major change may be unrealistic. However, some small changes might help to emphasize the oral context in which speaking and listening occur. We present the following substitutions in wording as a start in helping students think of speech as a presentation, not as a text:

- *section* **for** *paragraph*
- *prepare speech* **for** *write speech*
- *re-think* **for** *rewrite*
- *as you plan your speech* **for** *as you draft your speech*
- *adjust your thinking* **for** *edit*
- and, depending on context: *idea* or *statement* or *utterance* **for** *sentence*.

Overall, Wolvin et al. (1999) stood out in the degree to which they integrated listening. They placed listening within the context of components of the process and distinguish speaking from writing. Makay et al.(2008) did the best in maintaining a focus on orality in preparing and presenting the speech. Still, much work remains to be done in writing public-speaking texts. Their emphasis negates Lewis and Nichols’ prediction (1965): “It appears the time is at hand when speech and listening training is to be considered an important area of study throughout the education system” (p. 5). Many schools require a basic speech course but our pedagogy does not

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

match our professed goals for speech education. These results definitely indicate that it is the study of style (in its traditional sense) and writing and not speaking and listening that dominate the pedagogy in courses explicitly in public speaking.

References

- Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind*. New York: Ballantine.
- Beebe, S. A. & S. J. Beebe, S. J. (2006). *Public Speaking: An Audience-Centered Approach* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Berko, R. M., Wolvin, A. D., & Wolvin, D. R. (2001). *Communicating: A social and career focus/approach*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bodie, G. D., Worthington, D., Imhof, M., & Cooper, L. O. (2008). What would a unified field of listening look like? A proposal linking past perspectives and future endeavors. *International Journal of Listening*, 22, 103-122.
- Clark, H. H. (1992). *Arenas of Language Use*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Clark, H. H. (2008, 4-7 August). "Depiction in Communication," Keynote Address at Plenary Session at the Communication, Language, and Cognition Conference, Brighton, UK.
- Ekman, P. & Friesen, W. V. (1969). The repertoire of nonverbal behavior: Categories, origins, usage, and coding. *Semiotica* 1, 49-98.
- Emanuel, R., Adams, J., Baker, K., Daufin, E. K., Ellington, C., Fitts, E., Himsel, J., Holladay, L., & Okeowo, D. (2008). How college students spend their time communicating. *The International Journal of Listening*. 22 (1), 13-28.
- Ferguson, S. D. (2008). *Public Speaking: Building Competence in Stages*. NY: Oxford.
- Floyd, J. J. (1985). *Listening: A Practical Approach*. Glenview, IL: National Textbook.
- Frith, U. (1980). *Cognitive Processes in Spelling*. London, Academic Press.
- Griffin, C. L. (2003). *Invitation to Public Speaking*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson.
- Hayakawa, S. I. (1949). *Language in thought and action*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

Johnson, D. I. & Long, K. M. (2007). Student listening gains in the basic communication course:

A comparison of self-report and performance-based competence measures. *The International Journal of Listening*, 2, 92-101.

Janusik, L. A. (2001). Teaching listening: What should we do? What should we do? *The International Journal of Listening*, 16, 5-39.

Lewis, T. R. & Nichols, R. G. (1965). *Speaking and Listening: A Guide to Effective Oral—Aural Communication*. Dubuque, IA: W.C. Brown.

Lucas, S. E. (2007). *The Art of Public Speaking*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Luria, (1976). A. R. *Cognitive Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press.

Luria, A. R. (1982). *Language and Cognition*. Washington, D. C: V. H. Winston & Sons.

Makay, J. J., Butland, M. J., & Mason, G. E. (2008). *Public Speaking: Choices for Effective Results*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Macke, F. J. (1991). Communication left speechless: A critical examination of the evolution of Speech Communication. *Communication Education*. 40, 125-143.

Mehrabian, A. (1971). *Silent messages*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Nelson, P. E., Titsworth, S. & Pearson, J. C. (2008). *iSpeak: Public Speaking for Contemporary Life*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Nichols, R. G. (1957). Listening is a 10 Part Skill. In *Nation's Business*. Retrieved from

http://www.listen.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=51&Itemid=89.

Nichols, R. G. & Stevens, L. A. (1957). *Are You Listening?* New York: McGraw-Hill.

O'Hair, D., R. Stewart, & Rubenstein, H. (2007). *A Speaker's Guidebook: Text and Reference*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Osborn, S., Osborn, M., & Osborn, R. (2008). *Public Speaking*. Boston: Pearson.

Piper, T. (2003). *Language and Learning*. Columbus, OH: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

- Rankin, P. T. (1952). *The measurement of the ability to understand spoken language*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1926). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52, 847.
- Rubin, D. L. (1993). Listenability = oral-based discourse + considerateness. In A. D. Wolvin & C. G. Coakley (Eds.), *Perspectives on Listening* (pp. 216-268). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Schiffer, S. (1972). *Meaning*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Siegal, M. (1996). Conversation and cognition. In R. Gelman & T. K-F Au (Eds), *Perceptual and Cognitive Development* (pp.244-273). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Smith, D. K. (1954). Origins and development of Departments of Speech. In K. R. Wallace (Ed.), *History of Speech Education in America* (pp. 447-470). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Steil, L. K. (2008). "Listening Guarantees the Training and Development Lighthouse Foundation," keynote address, International Listening Association 29th Annual Convention, Portland, ME, March 26, 2008.
- Verderber, R. F. & Verderber, K. S. (2003). *Effective Speaking*. (12th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.
- Williams, D. R. (2004). *Sin Boldly! Dr. Dave's guide to writing the college paper*. New York: Basic Books.
- Wilson, J. F. & Arnold, C. C. (1968). *Public Speaking as a Liberal Art* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Winans, J. A. (1915). *Public Speaking*. New York: The Century Co.
- Wolvin, A. D., Berko, R. M., & Wolvin, D. R. (1999). *The Public Speaker/The Public Listener* (2nd ed.). LA: Roxbury.

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

Appendix A

Text-Review Form: ILA Journal article: "Listening in P/S Texts"

Text Reviewed: _____

A: Coverage of listening

Does the text provide direct instruction in listening? Y N

If yes:

Page numbers of the discussion _____

of pages providing skill instruction _____

Is listening instruction integrated with speech instruction within the text itself beyond a chapter on listening?

- _____ In every chapter
 _____ Frequently
 _____ Seldom
 _____ Not at all

Is the integration found in "discussion questions/activities?"

- _____ In every chapter
 _____ Frequently
 _____ Seldom
 _____ Not at all

B: Speech-act orientation

How often does the text highlight the differences between speaking and writing?

- _____ In every chapter
 _____ Frequently
 _____ Seldom
 _____ Not at all

.Is the distinction primarily one of language/style? Y N

Does the text have a section distinguishing the differences between the written and spoken modality? Y N

How often is the impact/application of delivery discussed beyond a delivery chapter? (how often are such words as "in speaking"/"listener", not the equivalent of "in writing"/"reader?")

- _____ In every chapter
 _____ Frequently
 _____ Seldom
 _____ Not at all

Overall, are there direct statements that support the desirability of developing speech via writing? If so, in which of the following:

- _____ using the term "writing the speech..."
 _____ stressing complete sentence outlines
 _____ stressing well-developed written speaking outline
 _____ suggesting that introductions/conclusion be written
 _____ valuing speech writing and manuscript speaking
 _____ using written manuscripts as models
 _____ others

To what extent does the text reflect a speech-act perspective (i.e.: the discussion does not better relate to reading):

Teaching Listening as an Oral Activity

In helping the speaker best adapt given the presentation is both verbal and nonverbal?

- In every chapter
- Frequently
- Seldom
- Not at all

In helping the listener with such matters as attention control, rate of presentation, mannerism/accent, external distractions and multidimensionality of spoken messages?

- Frequently
- Seldom
- Only in the section on listening
- Not at all