

A CENTURY OF COMMUNICATION STUDIES

THE UNFINISHED CONVERSATION

Edited by

PAT J. GEHRKE

AND

WILLIAM M. KEITH

First published 2015
by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2015 Taylor & Francis

The right of Pat J. Gehrke and William M. Keith to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

A century of communication studies: the unfinished conversation/edited by Pat J. Gehrke and William M. Keith.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Communication—Study and teaching—United States—History.
2. Communication—Research—United States—History.
3. National Communication Association (U.S.) I. Gehrke, Pat J., 1970– editor. II. Keith, William M., 1959– editor.

P91.5.U5C47 2014

302.207'073—dc23

2014022495

ISBN: 978-0-415-82037-0 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-415-82036-3 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-0-203-36691-2 (ebk)

Typeset in Minion Pro

by Florence Production Ltd, Stoodleigh, Devon, UK

9.

LISTENING RESEARCH IN THE COMMUNICATION DISCIPLINE

David Beard and Graham Bodie

Claims abound that listening research started in the mid-twentieth century with a handful of scholars employed in the Department of Rhetoric at the University of Minnesota. In a hagiographic gesture that honors the founder of the Association, the public relations materials for the International Listening Association (ILA) claim that (emphasis added):

Any history of listening would be remiss if it didn't *start* with "The Father of Listening," Dr. Ralph G. Nichols. *All* listening roads *led* to the University of Minnesota for over 25 years prior to the formation of the International Listening Association. Dr. Nichols *pioneered*, popularized and parlayed the missing "L" back into learning the world over.¹

Pooley and Park would call this "a kind of social science *bildungsroman*,"² which imposes a novel-like story, with all the satisfactions that a good story brings, on what would be a richer, if less satisfying, account of history without that artificial narrative structure.

While there are good reasons, within an organizational culture, to salute its founder, this history is partial and incomplete. While not taking anything away from Dr. Nichols as a key figure in listening research, as Keith suggests, "Any honest history will be messy, and not just at the edges."³ It is our goal to muddle the convergence implied by the ILA's metaphor; to thoroughly understand the history of listening research (at least as it is understood within the Communication Studies discipline), we must recognize that all "roads" sprawl endlessly, usually dead end just short of intersection, and often collide in traffic circles that serve to both smooth and to snarl the work of communication scholars.

It is the work of this chapter to trace some of that roadmap: to recognize that research in listening is as old as the discipline and its oldest professional association, the National Communication Association (NCA), and to recognize that research in listening is a thread in the tapestry of every dimension of work in the Association (from the basic course to media theory; from interpersonal communication to public address). We will map their intersections and trace their developments toward new frontiers, and in so doing, shed a little light on the road ahead in the twenty-first century.

Listening as a Conceptual Problem, Listening as a Historiographical Problem

In writing a chapter for this volume about the history of listening research, we faced both a conceptual problem and a historiographical problem, reflecting larger areas of contention in the Communication Studies discipline. We tackle, albeit briefly, both of these problems separately below.

Concepts

Defining any field or subfield raises problems of definition and questions of emphasis. The definitional problem has been addressed (for example) by the ILA, an affiliate organization of the NCA, which stipulates that listening is “the process of receiving, constructing meaning from, and responding to spoken and/or nonverbal messages.”⁴ Such a definition is designed to move us from the audiologist’s or speech pathologist’s attention on *hearing* toward a communication scholar’s attention to *listening* (because we can hear an array of sounds which are not *messages*).⁵ Indeed, a popular distinction made in textbooks and scholarly writing alike is between hearing and listening with the latter imbued with more conscious awareness and manipulation on the part of an active message recipient.⁶ The ILA’s definition of listening as a process involving *messages* also moves us away from the musicologist’s focus on understanding and appreciating various musical styles, although there are moments when music constitutes at least one dimension or one channel of meaning within the listening process.⁷ Conceptually, then, communication scholars have needed to define listening by either excluding particular activities of the ear or, more commonly, by adding certain critical activities that other disciplines ignore.

In some ways, conceptual work in listening research is always pragmatic: each piece of listening research begins with some variation of the claim, “for the ends I intend, I stipulate the following definition of listening . . .”⁸ Over time, these definitions are synthesized and analyzed,⁹ but the stipulative work of conceptual definition was as ongoing in listening research as it has been in other areas of communication research (for example, in rhetoric, where definitions of the central term proliferate). Interestingly, most definitions, thus far, move us toward understanding listening as a behavior—as intentional a communication behavior as writing, reading, and speech.¹⁰ We share those basic assumptions, though at some points in this chapter we will discuss scholars who further trouble them.

Historiography

Listening has been the subject of intense, focused scrutiny (especially, we shall see, in the post-war period of American communication scholarship). At the same time, it has been a phenomenon visible only indirectly, by its effects on other areas of communication research. We can see this split, for example, in mass communication research. Most mass communication research focuses on the message: on critical interpretation of the message,

on the effects of certain types of messages, and on locating the message within larger cultural and economic systems.¹¹ The role and activities of the listener are only sometimes under direct scrutiny. Most of the time, the role of the listener is a presupposition of the research—a background element, unquestioned and unexamined.¹² Indeed, the listener is often conceptualized as a mere receptor of information, someone acted upon versus an active participant in the meaning-making process.

To attempt to draft a history of listening research that attended only to the scholarship addressing the phenomenon directly would thus be to generate a history already more significant for its absences and lacunae than for its contribution. We have greater ambitions than that. At the same time, we have no intentions to see scholars with no explicit interest in listening as an area of research, as Pooley and Park call it, “retroactively dragooned” as listening scholars.¹³ In much the way a conservation biologist must sometimes study the fish and sometimes study the lake, we must move back and forth between (1) analysis of research that directly addresses listening and (2) analysis of research that directly addresses some other dimension of human communication but offers insight into disciplinary presumptions about the nature of listening. By doing so, we will be able to make claims about both the study of listening and the contributions of the study of listening to the larger project of the National Communication Association in its first hundred years.

Toward the goal of writing a history of listening research, this chapter is arranged by intellectual problem set. Some of these problem sets are nearly as old as the NCA—being articulated in the early, most polemical years of the Association’s history. Others are recent research trajectories.

- (1) First, we will address the early tensions in accounts of listening. Scholarship in the journals prior to World War II (a period usually presumed to be barren of research on listening) focused on the speech teacher as (a) the master listener, (b) diagnostician for speech defects, and (c) expert judge of quality. Audiences were presumed passive recipients of speech; the master speech teachers strove to teach students to listen as they listened.
- (2) Second, we will address the turn, at mid-century, to study listening as a behavior. Empirical research in student listening practices was the core of this research (and the core of claims that this period marks the beginning of listening research—claims we here revise). The research here drew attention to best practices for listening, stemming from the larger communications movement in the wartime and post-war period.
- (3) Third, we will address listening research that attempts to study listeners. This thread of research asks scholars to account for the actual behaviors of listeners. While scholars in Communication Studies presume that empirical study of listeners and “participatory culture” in media is a recent development, in fact, this research is among the oldest strands in communication scholarship.
- (4) Finally, we examine the current intersections between listening and cultural studies research as communication scholars come to participate in larger discussions of the

auditory environment. At the start of the twenty-first century, listening research is just one of the many sites where Communication Studies is making a contribution to interdisciplinary research across the humanities and social sciences.

In the end, we will draw some attention to the evolution of the map of programs for listening research in Communication Studies and the directions that might evolve in the second century of the NCA.

The Mastery of “Speech Teachers” and the Passivity of Audiences

Given the history of the NCA and the prominent focus of early work on “speech” pedagogy,¹⁴ it is no surprise that the earliest conceptualizations of listening are based in this framework. In the early decades of the discipline, however, little explicit attention was paid to listening;¹⁵ indeed “the audience” was itself not a major focus of the earliest work.

The lack of attention was not because the early scholars in the field did not recognize the importance of listening. In 1915, an exhortation to conduct “an observational study of the behavior of audiences” was included in the *Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking* (later renamed the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*) in a report from the research committee.¹⁶ Similarly, preparation for research in public speaking depended upon learning a complex of biological, sociological, and psychological dimensions of the communication process. This list included, among many other factors:

- The processes involved in good English *when it is being heard* (emphasis added).
- To what extent . . . postures, gestures, and vocal modulation influence one’s experience.
- What relations exist between the work of the vital organs (heart, lungs, glands, etc.) and the different kinds of experiences.
- The structure, functions, and development of collective auditors, or audiences, including such topics as:
 - (1) The crowd, the mob, the society, and the army.
 - (2) The audience.
 - (3) Fashion and custom.
 - (4) Methods of social intercourse.
 - (a) Suggestion (mass and individual), suggestibility.
 - (b) Sympathy and contagion.
 - (c) Imitation and tradition.¹⁷

To the contemporary communication scholar, this looks like a scattershot list of the topics that would come to shape research in listening and in audience research more broadly. But in the resulting exchanges between Everett Hunt and Charles Woolbert about the future of research in the discipline (fundamentally, a disagreement about

humanistic and social scientific research trajectories), both of these scholars continued to emphasize the *production* of speeches, not the *reception* of speeches in the audience, as the primary site for scholarship.¹⁸ When mentioned in the early journals, audience was generally discussed in terms of how a speaker can make “himself [*sic*] agreeable to an audience.”¹⁹ Perhaps unsurprisingly, considerations of *audience* and *listening* that were active in the early years of the discipline primarily included consideration of (1) the speech teacher as the master listener, a diagnostician of speech impediments who taught students to listen as he or she does; and (2) the relatively impoverished model for listening outside the classroom, one which emphasized the audience as acted upon by the speaker and the mass media, instead of acting to create their own meaning.

Early Views of Audience as Passive

The view of the unilateral or unidirectional impact of speakers on audience members is well captured in the literature with the use of terms like “audience reaction.”²⁰ Language such as “the effect of the speech on the hearers”²¹ was much more common than language indicative of listeners’ active construal of information. The audience as passive receptor was also the implicit model of listening in early work on attitude change, and most of the early work was in the spirit of how speakers can more effectively move audiences. The assumption that listeners are “influenced” by how speakers structure their messages was fully entrenched in the vernacular of those writing articles for the *Quarterly Journal of Speech (QJS)*,²² and this same view was also evident in the experimental studies published mostly in *Speech Monographs* that were concerned with speaker effectiveness. To describe the processes by which speakers influenced audiences, a variety of variables were investigated, with intelligibility²³ and articulation²⁴ mentioned frequently. Research in mass communication focused on similar variables, replicating concerns addressed by traditional speech researchers. For instance, F.H. Lumley investigated “Rates of speech in radio speaking,”²⁵ while others voiced concerns over how the radio will “change speech”²⁶—generally speaking, even in mass communication, emphasis resided in the act of production.

As reviewed by Howard Gilkinson, there were “four distinguishable kinds of criterion-indexes . . . employed to record, or measure, the influence of a speaker upon an audience.”²⁷ These included attitude scales, opinion polls, retention tests, and ratings (or judgments about the speech). Interestingly, the third of these (retention tests) was deemed the measure of listening, a trend that lasted well into the 1990s and was influential in efforts to improve student comprehension of lecture material.²⁸ The focus on how people comprehend messages was also aided by work made necessary by the war effort, in particular reported problems of pilots in “listening accurately and in reporting back accurately what is heard.”²⁹ Whether the population of interest was students or pilots, however, the focus of listening instruction was about “the degree of accuracy with which the theme and main ideas of the speaker are communicated to the listener.”³⁰ Although the listener was recognized, the primary model of the audience (and thus listening) was simple and linear, much like early models of communication more generally.³¹

Speech Teacher as Therapist

Prior to 1930, a primary discussion of listening was as diagnostic, as instructors in voice, speech pathology, and speech clinics needed to attune their ears for purposes of identifying various speech problems to be corrected. Although some were concerned with students “listening” to their own voices in an effort to help with pitch, rate, and so forth,³² most attention was paid to constituting the speech teacher as an expert interpreter not only of what was said by a student or clinic patient, but of what blocks (psychological and physical) were an impediment to effective speech.³³ Smiley Blanton is the obvious case in support of this focus. Blanton argued that the voice, divided into motor, vibrator, and resonator, is impacted by emotion, and that one could discern the impact that emotion has on each of the components of the voice.³⁴

In the public speaking classroom at the University of Minnesota, Bryng Bryngelson continued this line of thinking, arguing that students with difficulties in public speaking had internalized emotional difficulties and social disorders that were complicating their speech. A good speech teacher could listen to diagnose these difficulties and develop treatment. Bryngelson would force the students to speak before a mirror (and so learn to internalize the image that their audiences had of them, rather than their faulty self-image). In addition, he would enlist other students to serve as both audience and makeshift analyst, participating in the diagnosis: Bryngelson writes about “the members of the class all participat[ing] in the discussion, calling attention to the difference as well as remarking about the more normal parts of their persons.”³⁵ This was the work of the public speaking teacher (in the works of Blanton, Bryngelson, and others): to listen attentively, to diagnose, and to treat, in the clinic and in the classroom.

In outlining the public speaking class at Cornell and seeking the ideal speaking situation for classroom exercises, James Winans writes, “We wish to make the conditions as normal as possible, with the audience listening to what the speaker has to say and the speaker rising to communicate his ideas.” In this model, audience response or criticism is suppressed until after the class is over when speakers seeking audience feedback could meet with the teacher. Feedback from students was not valuable in the classroom dynamic; students as listeners were no more valuable than the passive audiences discussed above.³⁶ At best, a handful of scholars were interested in teaching students to listen as the teacher listens—as a therapist. In “Standardization of Grades in Public Speaking,” J.R. Pelsma argues that students should attend academic speaking competitions and measure their sense of “the winner” in the competition against those of the judges—learning to listen like the master speech teachers do.³⁷ In “Some Statistical Investigations in the Field of Speech,” Robert West and Helen Larsen argue that a public speaking class can be taught to assess each other with a high degree of reliability to the ways that the teacher assesses the students: in other words, that students can be taught to listen like the teacher listens.³⁸ Effective listening defines the master Speech Teacher, who teaches students to listen like him or her, and the master Speech Teacher defines the discipline of Communication Studies until the Great Depression.

Listening and the Communications Movement: Training Listeners

No history of communication study and instruction can deny that the world wars were important engines that drove speech research and pedagogy. In this section, we trace a history from wartime communication pedagogy (which was inherently multimodal, written and verbal) through the Communications movement (catalyzed by the influx of students funded by the GI Bill) which picked up that multimodal approach to communication. This is the backdrop against which the earliest formal research in listening is engaged—the work of the “father of listening,” Ralph Nichols, and his colleagues at the University of Minnesota. In contextualizing the work of Nichols, we hope to reinterpret somewhat hagiographic histories of listening research, enhancing them with an acute awareness of the developing fullness of the Communication Studies discipline which leads to including listening as a formal area of study in the post-war period.

The War Redefines Communication Pedagogy in Military Training

In the wartime period, it was not unusual to see submissions to *QJS* from teachers and scholars whose institutional identification was not with colleges or universities, but with a military rank and branch of service. For example, Harold Kent’s “The Army and its Needs in Speech” outlines, specifically, the skills the military values in oral communication in the midst of World War II (e.g., effective use of microphones).³⁹ Held and Held reiterate the emphasis on message production, writing that:

the Army has no pressing need for great orators, nor has it any need whatever for spellbinders and rabble-rousers. But it has a great need for officers who have knowledge, logical conclusions based upon it, and ability to impart it to others.⁴⁰

But the army was also interested in effective listening techniques—Forest Whan tells us that the airplane pilot must be trained in “ear-memory” so that he can retain and process complex, compressed messages from air traffic control towers.⁴¹ And perhaps more significantly, the military was interested in integrated communication. There is no point to the differentiation of speaking, writing, reading, and listening in the military context; disciplinary boundaries that divide curricula in the university have minimal significance in the context of war (or perhaps any “applied context” for that matter). As reported in an unsigned article of 1943 in *QJS*, the “Objectives” of military training in communication are:

to develop an officer candidate who will (1) be a clear thinker; (2) possess the skill of orderly, concise, and appropriate communication, both oral and written, including the ability to observe and report accurately; (3) possess the ability to listen and to read understandingly.⁴²

In a very practical form, this integration of reading, writing, speaking, and listening into a single curriculum prefigures the work engaged by the Communications movement of the post-war period; Jean Malmstrom argued as much, claiming that the curricular innovations developed to better train officers should serve as the backbone of university curricula after the war.⁴³

The Communications Movement Redefines Communication Pedagogy within the University

A new wave of systematic exploration of listening seems to happen within the context of the Communications movement in World War II–era United States. The rise in students after the war (enabled by the GI Bill) and the interest in practical communications that these students brought to university life led to the development of “communications courses.” These were core courses (liberal education or general education courses) which combined speech and composition, reading and listening, sometimes inflected with the works of Alfred Korzybski and S.I. Hayakawa in General Semantics. According to David Russell:

the movement was launched in 1947 when the NCTE [National Council of Teachers of English] and SAA [Speech Association of America, later renamed the NCA] sponsored a joint conference on freshman programs (which led the NCTE to found the Conference on College Composition and Communication the next year). The movement amounted to a crash program for initiating into academia a host of GIs from radically different social backgrounds.⁴⁴

Against the backdrop of an integrated curriculum, uniting writing and speaking, reading and listening, a more formal research and pedagogical agenda would develop.

Harlen Adams was one of the first to argue strongly that listening is absent from pedagogy, writing that most teachers would claim that:

speaking and listening cannot be separated. Probably all teachers would agree on this point, but they then focus their attention upon the teaching of speech and apparently assume that skill in listening will somehow be acquired.⁴⁵

Unfortunately, textbooks prior to World War II were closer to pop psychology than grounded in genuine listening research. By the end of World War II, there would be a hunger in the Speech community for textbooks and pedagogies grounded in theory and research. Robert T. Oliver shares the best of his advice, which again stems from pop psychology: “to be a good listener . . . attention must be so eager and intent as to inspire the best that the speaker of the moment is capable of giving.”⁴⁶

It is not unfair to the discipline to note that, prior to the war, energy was focused on the speaker. These pressures are aggravated when faculty are called upon to teach four dimensions of the communication process; if faculty trained in speech barely addressed listening, faculty trained primarily in the teaching of writing might not address it at all in the context of a communications program. After and as a result of the war and the GI Bill, listening could move from the periphery to the center.

Reframing and Refocusing “The Father of Listening”

To understand how the Communications movement reframed pedagogy at the university, and to reframe the origin of listening research as commonly identified in disciplinary histories to this point, we can examine a specific program at the University of Minnesota.

In 1944, the University of Minnesota's Department of Rhetoric in the College of Agriculture converted the first-year composition course into the first-year "communication" course. The university required undergraduate majors to take nine credits (three courses on the quarter system, or one full year) of "Communication I-II-III," a course sequence symptomatic of the Communications movement insofar as it integrated assignments in reading, listening, and speaking as well as writing. Here, the curriculum follows Adams's 1938 claim that "listening is one of the four major aspects of the teaching of English, perhaps the most neglected,"⁴⁷ and so the curriculum was redesigned to address all four areas.

To ground their pedagogy in addressing listening, faculty members in the Rhetoric program (like Ralph Nichols and James I. Brown) engaged in social scientific research in processes of listening. Nichols and others, in a series of articles in *QJS* and *Speech Monographs*, outline a model for listening that would define a subfield (including a scholarly association) for some time.⁴⁸ Listening should be taught, not presumed in the communication process, Nichols argued, and there were specific skills and habits that were best taught. These were not the folk theories that typified popular (and sometimes scholarly) communication texts but specific skills discerned through systematic study.

To give you a taste of the energy of this period, we can look to Nichols's inaugural address to the first meeting of the International Listening Association (ILA), in which he celebrates the work of his contemporaries at this exciting time:

Paul Bagwell . . . was put in charge of the biggest communication program in the nation, at Michigan State University. Their stated objective was to improve the reading, writing, speaking, and listening of their thousands of under-classmen. He declared that if listening improvement was one of their stated goals, they should spend a fourth of their energy on it . . .

James I. Brown at the University of Minnesota . . . felt that to prove to people that listening comprehension can be improved, we ought to have a standardized test of effective listening . . . and he went ahead and produced his Brown-Carlson Test of Listening Comprehension . . .

Grant Fairbanks . . . was a chopper and splicer. He would take a tape recording of a previously recorded speech, cut it all up in little pieces, and then paste the residues together. Through this technique he could speed up the presentation time to any degree desired, and determine the consequent effect upon listener comprehension . . . [I]t is possible for people to listen to human speech at twice the rate, perhaps three times the rate, that they normally hear it without any significant loss of comprehension of it.⁴⁹

One can feel a general sense of an open horizon here, one that invited many approaches.

The rise of social scientific research methods and the presentation of formal research as the basis for instruction in listening follow from the general blossoming of social science approaches in the post-war period. It is no accident that Ralph Nichols was an agitator for the formation of both the International Listening Association and the National Society for the Study of Communication (NSSC, formed in 1950, renamed the International Communication Association in 1969). The NSSC was the alternative organization to the Speech Association of America (NCA) that privileged empirical and data-driven research. These early figures in listening were also committed to the development of empirical methods.

Nichols's own contribution was to systematize listening as a skill set: to identify behaviors that hurt one's ability to listen and to identify behaviors that made one a better listener. He was also skilled at arguing the value of listening and listening research. So, for example, he noted in various places that focusing on emotional trigger words could interfere with good listening, as does focusing overmuch on evaluating delivery or attempting to take notes on all of the details in a speech (losing sight of the forest for the trees). That last bit should make clear that Nichols was focused on listening among undergraduate students. On the positive side, Nichols recommended that listeners make mental summaries and anticipate next points as they listen—engaging in a kind of meta-cognition that would improve listening practice. Again, this work was grounded in empirical studies of the listening practices of students, though Nichols believed in great generalizability.

At the level of the hortatory, Nichols argued that effective listening was central to efforts to develop our basic human nature:

- The most basic of all human needs is to understand and to be understood.
- It is almost impossible to hate a person whom we fully understand.
- The best way to understand people is to listen to them.⁵⁰

It is clear, within the ILA, that some scholars believe that Nichols (and Brown and others) had a formative and powerful effect on the Communication Studies discipline. Whether Nichols is a force for transforming the discipline or symptomatic of changes already under way (including the larger systematization of social science methods) is an open question; what is clear is that listening was being recognized by a larger body of teacher-scholars. By the 1960s, L. LeRoy Cowperthwaite's 1964 review essay on "Fundamentals and Public Speaking Texts" surveyed a variety of texts that brought listening to the fore for the basic course, manifesting the promise of integrating speaking and listening in the communication curriculum.⁵¹

By the 1980s, the Communications movement had thoroughly waned,⁵² but interest in listening continued to flower. "Communications" courses, teaching a complex interplay of reading, writing, and speaking, were being eliminated by administrators who succumbed to arguments about expertise: speech teachers should teach speech, writing teachers should teach writing, and expertise in both is not possible. As communications courses began to evaporate, freestanding courses in listening began to appear. Listening developed as an area of inquiry all its own, with studies emerging on listening in health communication, workplace communication, interpersonal communication, intercultural communication, and so on.⁵³ The subfield became open to ethnographic, qualitative, quantitative, and occasionally even critical and rhetorical methods.⁵⁴

In the last decades of the twentieth century, listening research and pedagogy became at once more thoroughly institutionalized, but fell victim to a catch-22 of communication pedagogy. Listening increasingly becomes viewed as important enough an area of inquiry to establish a course in the undergraduate curriculum. Yet, by establishing a course in listening, it became unnecessary to address listening in other courses. In 2014, it is very nearly impossible to imagine a textbook in the basic course in communication without

a chapter on listening. At the same time, the presence of that chapter erases the need to address listening as the textbook addresses other elements of the communication process. As Adams and Cox note, communication textbooks retain a production focus, one that centers on the speaker (and often on the parts of the speaking process that most resemble writing or speech-writing), without a real exploration of the listening process threaded through the text.⁵⁵ At the level of research, listening becomes more sharply defined as a subfield—autonomous within the larger field of Communication Studies. Its increasing richness and independence is simultaneous to its segregation from the larger NCA community.⁵⁶

The International Listening Association is the group most caught in that bind. Founded at a “State-of-the-Art of Listening” symposium held on the University of Minnesota campus (where Nichols taught with Brown, Lyman Steil, and others) in 1979, the ILA has grown from a small community holding annual meetings with a newsletter (*Listening Post*) to an organization with an international convention, often held abroad, and three scholarly publications: *International Journal of Listening*, *The Listening Professional*, and *Listening Education*.⁵⁷ The ILA still sponsors or co-sponsors panel and poster sessions at the NCA convention, but these presences are reflections of the joint identification of some ILA members with both the ILA and a larger disciplinary association, rather than a sign that listening research descending from the work of Nichols is thoroughly embedded in NCA disciplinary conversations.⁵⁸

Without a doubt, the received history of the scholars engaged in listening research and pedagogy (identifiable with the International Listening Association) reinforces the tension between autonomy and isolation. By focusing on Nichols’s role in the foundation of the ILA (and so at least underplaying his role in the foundation of the ICA), the uniqueness and autonomy of listening research comes to the fore. We want to trouble that narrative. We would argue, instead, that listening research is of a piece with the turn away from speaker-centered rhetorical approaches favored (in the post-war period) by the SAA/SCA community toward the social scientific approaches of the ICA. We lose the idea that Nichols was a single great man, but we may regain a sense that listening research is of a piece with the historical developments of Communication Studies as a field. Additionally, by focusing on the individual genius of Nichols’s research program in the study of listening, we may lose sight of the broader disciplinary movements that funded the integrated pedagogies for listening, speaking, writing, and reading that defined the Communications movement. (The post-war period in communication research and pedagogy, the period in which the Communications movement found root, is entirely undertheorized, if not forgotten, by scholars in the history of communication, with rare exception,⁵⁹ and so we want to crack open the door here to beginning that kind of re-investigation.)

Recontextualized in the way that we have tried to engage here, we find ways to appreciate both the increasing specialization of methods and the unique scholarly traditions inherent in the community of listening researchers. At the same time, we hope we have demonstrated that the tradition of listening research and pedagogy is embedded in and inseparable from the larger movements in the Communication Studies discipline.

From Studying *Listening* to Studying *Listeners*

The study of listening as Nichols and his contemporaries engaged it was the study of practices and behaviors. While rooted in classroom-based research, this work was generalized to other contexts—the skills for good listening in the classroom were generalized to business, to relationships, to public discourse. But for Nichols, Brown, and others, the study of the actual practices of real listeners in these other contexts was not yet on the horizon. The move from studying listening as a practice in the university setting to studying the diverse actual practices of real listeners in other settings comes slowly to Communication Studies (and some would argue is still not to an adequate level⁶⁰).

We can trace the growing importance of studying the actual practices of people listening across the decades in the twentieth century. While at first just a whisper manifested around the advent of radio, by the end of the century full-scale ethnographic study of real listeners would become one of the defining dimensions of communication study. We will trace those earliest efforts in sources like Cantril and Allport's work in radio listening. But quickly, we will see this impulse to study real people, listening, will spread to researchers interested in business communication, in K–12 education, and more—scholars will bring the study of listening into real listening contexts and so start to make the listener the genuine object of study.

In the 1930s, Cantril and Allport, in *The Psychology of Radio* (reprinted in the 1970s), begin their work with a sketch of “The Mental Setting of Radio,” a comprehensive picture of the social-psychological setting in which radio operates, thrown into relief by detailed comparison with the economic and political background of radio broadcasting in other countries.⁶¹ This section of the book considers the effects of the radio upon the listening public and the preferences and habits of the radio audience as inferred from questionnaire data, fan mail, and field studies. For example, the *Survey of Radio Listeners in Louisiana* by Edgar A. Schuler covered nearly every geographical section of the state and outlined listeners' typical daily listening patterns, activities while listening, reasons for not listening, non-available programs desired, types of programs preferred, methods of learning about new programs, reasons for writing to radio stations, station preferences, conditions of radio sets, and extent of shortwave listening. Breakdowns are afforded on many of these items on a basis of sex, age, educational background, race, family income, geography, and location in cities-villages-farms.⁶²

With the advent of research on radio listening, then, the Communication Studies discipline is no longer solely about public speaking or speech, but about a broader understanding of communication, including mediated communication. Notably, by studying audiences as much or more than speakers, in the mediated communication environment created by radio, the discipline of Speech Communication comes to widen and grow out of the speaker-centered model for communication research and toward the study of real listeners.

This movement comes to real fruition in the 1970s. In Communication Studies, we see the ascension of the idea that listeners play an “active role in determining both the nature and the outcome of the communicative encounter,”⁶³ coupled with the recognition

that listening will vary across contexts (civic, professional, educational, and relationship). The most popular distinction made to identify listening as a unique phenomenon worthy of study was put forth in texts such as *Listening Behavior* by Larry Barker.⁶⁴ In this and other texts one finds the now infamous dichotomy between hearing (a passive form of listening in which “the potential receiver of the message is minimally, if at all, concerned about the listening process”) and listening (an active form of listening in which the receiver is involved or has a purpose for information reception). This basic separation is still prominent in textbooks designed for the basic course as well as interpersonal communication. Others added to the notion of active listening abilities not only to be involved but also to adequately judge a speaker’s message.⁶⁵ This sort of active involvement or engagement as an informed citizen was present in early conceptualizations of the basic course⁶⁶ and is still evident in the way many programs still conceptualize this course. Thus the goal of speech education is more than producing adequate elocutionists, or skillful note-takers (in Nichols’s case) and information processors (in Brown’s case); it is fundamentally about producing engaged citizens, an idea as old as rhetorical studies itself.

Listening research conformed to a trend in the SCA journal space (in particular in *The Speech Teacher*) to publish articles that highlighted the importance of various skills for the workplace and life in general. Within this larger literature can be found several assessment instruments (typically self-report) that attempt to map communicative and listening competence.⁶⁷ A focus explicitly on what constitutes listening competence was led by Andrew Wolvin and his colleagues at the University of Maryland, and many of the findings from this research program are obvious within the NCA’s list of critical communication skills.⁶⁸ In addition, there were, for obvious reasons, complementary efforts targeted toward K–12 education as opposed to the academy⁶⁹ with a concern on national standards,⁷⁰ or what is now referred to as the Common Core.

Apart from an explicit focus on listening as a distinct set of competencies, others implied the importance of listening as part of a larger communicative construct.⁷¹ Most, though not all, of this research was concerned with how listening (or related competencies) is influenced by certain trait-like predispositions. Some investigations treat listening only tangentially, for example Charles Wigley’s study of verbal aggressiveness (VA) in which jurors’ listening to testimony is thought to be clouded by traits like VA,⁷² while others treat listening directly, for example, William Villaume’s work on age-related hearing loss.⁷³ Again, we are moving more and more deeply into the study of the practices of real listeners in real contexts.

The *International Journal of Listening* has been a center for the study of real listeners—from medical students to nursing professionals, from police to hospitality workers.⁷⁴ The annual meeting of the ILA maintains a business communication track that specifically works on researching and training for listening in the corporate context.⁷⁵

In addition to the importance of listening skills for student retention of aurally presented (and largely lecture-based) information, others have made a career out of stressing the importance of training listening skills for various classes of workers like healthcare providers.⁷⁶ Finally, there is also an emphasis in communication research that utilizes semi-structured interviewing techniques that listening is a skilled method for

data collection.⁷⁷ Thus, it appears that our field in part works within a vision of listening as a skilled behavior—one that can be trained and honed and one that is crucial for personal and professional success and well-being.⁷⁸ Further research in new contexts of listening will only enhance our understanding of the complexities of the communication process.

Listening and the Mediation of Technology: From Radio to iTunes

The end of the twentieth century and the first decades of the twenty-first have been the time of the rediscovery of the ear by communities beyond Communication Studies. Historians of technology, cultural studies scholars, literary theorists, and others in the humanities have rediscovered sound, noise, music, and voice as complementary areas of critical exploration. Taken together, these studies have constituted a new scholarly area of research, “auditory culture,” and significant scholars in Communication Studies are shaping this scholarly dialogue.

Auditory culture is composed of a range of sound phenomena, analyzed from diverse critical and methodological perspectives. Perhaps appropriately, given his dominant position in the interdisciplinary humanities, Michel Foucault is among the scholars who cracked open listening as a phenomenon worthy of critical reflection. He begins by addressing listening in the classical world:

When you have heard someone say something important, do not start quibbling straightaway but try to collect yourself and spend some moments in silence, the better to imprint what you have heard, and undertake a quick self-examination when leaving the lesson you have listened to, or the conversation you have had, take a quick look at yourself in order to see where you are, whether you have heard and learned something new with regard to the equipment (the *paraskeue*) you already have at hand, and thus see to what extent and how far you have been able to improve yourself.⁷⁹

Listening was, as Foucault described the Pythagoreans, a process engaged with the whole body; listening also requires a “precise physical posture . . . the body must stay absolutely calm.”⁸⁰ Understanding is to be indicated “by a smile and a slight movement of the head”;⁸¹ the body’s stillness is essential. In this context, the immobility of the body is “a guarantee of morality.”⁸² Listening, as a practice, becomes the key to reflection, meditation, and salvation.

The 1986 publication of Jacques Attali’s *Noise*⁸³ and the rise of Cultural Studies scholarship generally in the late 1980s and 1990s opened the door to cultural studies of sound and the socio-cultural processes of listening, broadly conceived. We provide the following three areas of study as examples of the emerging trends in such research.

Music Studies

Theodor Adorno diagnosed the twentieth century as an age of “regressive listening.” Mass reproduction and broadcast of music meant that the average person understood less and less about the process of performing music. The experience of music becomes

increasingly passive. Botstein tells us that “the cause of the ‘impoverishment’ of musical culture . . . was that music was no longer practiced in the home.”⁸⁴ Denied the music literacy to produce songs on instruments of their own, listeners grow ever more passive in their appreciation for music. Adorno aggressively advocated for a rediscovery and revaluation of the processes of attentive listening, an advocacy picked up by others in communication and cultural studies. Contemporary musicologists continue work in this vein.⁸⁵

Critical Technology Studies

Technologies for listening tend to interfere with genuine human interaction. Jonathan Sterne discusses “mediated auscultation” as one of the major phenomena of the twentieth century.⁸⁶ Sterne’s example of such mediated listening that actually narrows or winnows the range of human interaction is the stethoscope: the stethoscope brings certain sounds into clarity for the doctor, but as it does, it closes out or even suppresses a range of other sounds. The doctor learns to listen *only* through the stethoscope.

Relatedly, technology changes the sociality of listening. Radios, in a crowded room, can push people into solitude. When the sports bar turns on the giant screen television, the room ceases to be a *group* of basketball fans and becomes a *collection of individual fans*, entranced by the screen. As Michael Bull puts it, “users no longer commune with those next to them but with the ‘distant’ voices” of the media.⁸⁷ The technology yields an experience of “accompanied solitude” in lieu of genuine interaction with the people around us. Bull and Sterne see critical reflection on listening technologies as a key to rethinking the processes of listening.

Soundscape Studies

The environmental movement leads to a rediscovery of “acoustic ecology.” Murray Schafer identifies a “soundscape” or an “acoustic environment” that can be documented via “soundwalks,” or walks in which the ambient noises of an environment are recorded electronically; the recordings are logged onto a map of the space.⁸⁸ The noises include those sounds that exist regardless of the visitor’s presence, like ambient bird noises and water or wind, and those caused by the visitor’s presence, like the sound of footfalls on the walking surfaces.

Barbara Lorenzowski (in *Sounds of Ethnicity*) argues persuasively for soundscape as productive of cultural identities. Among German immigrants in North America, “the act of speaking (or singing) the German mother tongue anchored fellow migrants reassuringly in a soundscape of German ethnicity.” This process is not simply akin to an immersion program in your local middle school for learning a foreign language. Rather, among some immigrant communities, arguments were made for an “audible homeland—a space liberated from place and translated into sound.” Sound, above and beyond physical or political geography, was constitutive of identity for these immigrant families.⁸⁹

Barry Blesser, Linda Ruth Salter, and Alain Corbin have explored the role of nonmusical sound in identity formation. Blesser and Salter, in *Spaces Speak: Are You Listening? Experiencing Aural Architecture*, define “soundmarks”—something like the landmark, but constituted in sound.⁹⁰ Soundmarks define an acoustic geography of a space (like the sound of a waterfall or a chiming bell). Corbin analyzes the use of nineteenth-century church and village bells to define a “territorial identity.”⁹¹ The Church decreed that cathedrals held five to seven bells while local parishes could hold at most three. Monastery bells could not reach louder or further than the local parish bell, and the cathedral bells should always be rung before local bells within their area. It was bells, not landforms or geographical barriers, which served to define membership in a community: a citizen belonged to the group of people who could hear a specific bell. The soundscape centered on the bell, and local identity developed around the soundscape. Architects have engaged the dialogue on space and sound as well, both as practitioners and as critical scholars.⁹²

Taken together, these areas of research into sound are at once richly complex, exploring dimensions of our lived experience that have been unconsidered before. But, to return to our ecological metaphor, these scholars (trained in musicology, technology, and cultural studies) are highly trained limnologists. Their attention to the soundscape, to ambient sounds and the cultural impact of these ambient sounds, is akin to the freshwater scientist who carefully studies the chemical, bacterial, and other makeup of the lake.⁹³

We argue that scholars in Communication Studies struggled to locate the study of listening within the larger domain of communication for most of the twentieth century. In the twenty-first, we need to locate the study of listening both in the Communication Studies discipline and within the larger, interdisciplinary exploration of sound. Communication scholars are poised to make these connections. Whether in connecting the speech tradition to media ecology,⁹⁴ to performance studies,⁹⁵ or to technology studies, scholars rooted in the powerful tradition of Communication Studies have much to offer the contemporary, interdisciplinary turn in sound studies.

For example, Bull’s notion of “accompanied solitude” has been extended, in the cultural studies tradition, to account for other sound experiences (e.g., the Walkman).⁹⁶ This extension of Bull’s concept invites us to explore whether Bull has found a resonant experience in modern life, but it does not push the borders of his theoretical work.⁹⁷ Communication scholars Joshua Gunn and co-author Mirko Hall push harder, taking the experience of the iPod and articulating the politics behind it:

The mirror-work of iPod discourse is an attempt to represent the sonorous envelope, an advertising campaign that appeals to an unconscious desire to return to a prediscursive state of harmonious omnipotence, maintaining the presumed autonomy and independence of the ideal consumer.⁹⁸

To make these claims, Gunn and Hall assess both the experience of the iPod and the discourses around the iPod. Moving a step beyond Bull or Sterne or Schafer, Hall and Gunn do not end with the examination of the auditory environment of the iPod

(the “sonorous envelope”), but account, as well, for the media landscape that sends us messages about the iPod. Advertising tells us how to listen to the iPod in ways for which Bull never accounts, but that communication scholars recognize easily. We are attuned to the complexity of the media environment.

There is no time in human history better suited to a research program in the complexities of listening. But these rediscoveries are fragmented; they are puzzle pieces that require integration. The decades of experience in Communication Studies in defining, theorizing, analyzing, and teaching about listening as part of human communication positions us well to shape the future of this interdisciplinary research.

Toward the Twenty-First Century: Reassembly of the Senses

The twenty-first century, then, offers us the possibility of achieving what Marshall McLuhan called the “orchestration” of our senses. McLuhan picks up the concept of the “*sensus communis*” from the classical tradition, the “reassembly” of the senses for an integrated relationship with the world, to explicate a “five sense sensorium.”⁹⁹ We must be able to bring the eye and the ear and all the senses together to attend to the complexities of our world and the complexities of human communication.

To fulfill this project for a twenty-first century *sensus communis*, we must begin to draw upon the best research in listening in the last century—this is a unique strength of the Communication Studies discipline, honed over decades of research and teaching. In developing an integrated relationship to the world, we must understand listening as integrated, inextricable from other aspects of the communication process (speaking, reading, writing). We must understand listening to the spoken word as integrated, inextricable from the broader auditory environment. And perhaps, we must appreciate that our understanding of listening is an essential part of our understanding of what it means to be human.

Notes

- 1 International Listening Association, “History,” International Listening Association, January 16, 2014, www.listen.org/history.
- 2 Jefferson D. Pooley and David W. Park, “Communication Research,” in *The Handbook of Communication History (ICA Handbook Series)*, ed. Peter Simonson, Janice Peck, and Robert T. Craig (New York: Routledge, 2013): 76.
- 3 William Keith, *Democracy as Discussion: The American Forum Movement and Civic Education* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield/Lexington Books): 345.
- 4 International Listening Association, “An ILA Definition of Listening,” *Listening Post* 53, no. 1 (April 1995): 4–5. Interestingly, this definition was itself a contested issue within the organization for years before its codification and in years since.
- 5 Margarete Imhof, “The Cognitive Psychology of Listening,” in *Listening and Human Communication in the 21st Century*, ed. Andrew D. Wolvin (Boston: Blackwell, 2010): 97–126.
- 6 Graham D. Bodie and Nathan Crick, “Listening, Hearing, Sensing: Three Modes of Being and the Phenomenology of Charles Sanders Peirce,” *Communication Theory* (in press).
- 7 David Beard, “A Broader Understanding of the Ethics of Listening: Philosophy, Cultural Studies, Media Studies and the Ethical Listening Subject,” *International Journal of Listening* 23 (2009): 7–20.

- 8 Graham D. Bodie, "Listening as Positive Communication," in *The Positive Side of Interpersonal Communication*, ed. T. Socha and M. Pitts (New York: Peter Lang, 2012): 109–125.
- 9 Ethel C. Glenn, "A Content Analysis of Fifty Definitions of Listening," *Journal of the International Listening Association* 3 (1989): 21–31; Andrew D. Wolvin and Carolyn Gwynn Coakley, "A Listening Taxonomy," in *Perspectives on Listening*, ed. Andrew D. Wolvin and Carolyn Gwynn Coakley (Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1993): 15–22.
- 10 Graham D. Bodie, Debra L. Worthington, Magrete Imhof, and Lynn Cooper, "What Would a Unified Field of Listening Look Like? A Proposal Linking Past Perspectives and Future Endeavors," *International Journal of Listening* 22 (2008): 103–122.
- 11 Annie Lang, "Discipline in Crisis? The Shifting Paradigm of Mass Communication Research," *Communication Theory* 23 (2013): 10–24.
- 12 Graham D. Bodie, "Treating Listening Ethically," *International Journal of Listening* 24 (2010): 185–188. Graham D. Bodie, "The Understudied Nature of Listening in Interpersonal Communication: Introduction to a Special Issue," *International Journal of Listening* 25 (2011): 1–9.
- 13 Jefferson D. Pooley and David W. Park, "Communication Research," in *The Handbook of Communication History (ICA Handbook Series)*, ed. Peter Simonson, Janice Peck, and Robert T. Craig (New York: Routledge, 2013): 84.
- 14 Gerry Philipson, "The Early Career Rise of 'Speech' in Some Disciplinary Discourse, 1914–1946," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 93 (2007): 352–354; and William M. Keith, "We Are the Speech Teachers," *Review of Communication* 11, no. 2 (2011): 83–92.
- 15 For early discussions of the role of listening in communication studies, see Harlen Adams, "Listening," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 24, no. 2 (1938): 209–211; Harold A. Dressel, "Debating for the Audience," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 16, no. 2 (1930): 227–231; Winifred H. Littell, "Before and After Taking," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 23, no. 4 (1937): 616–619; Ralph G. Nichols, "Listening: Questions and Problems," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 33, no. 1 (1947): 83–86; Robert West, "Speech and Hearing," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 21, no. 2 (1935): 178–188; Wesley Wiksell, "The Problem of Listening," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 32, no. 4 (1946): 505–508.
- 16 The Research Committee, "Research in Public Speaking," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 1, no. 1 (1915): 24–32.
- 17 The Research Committee, "Research."
- 18 Charles H. Woolbert, "The Organization of Departments of Speech Science in Universities," *Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking* 2, no. 1 (1916): 64–77; Everett Lee Hunt, "The Scientific Spirit in Public Speaking," *Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking* 1, no. 2 (1915): 185–193.
- 19 H.B. Gislason, "The Relation of the Speaker to his Audience," *Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking* 2, no. 1 (1916): 45.
- 20 William A.D. Millson, "A Review of Research in Audience Reaction," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 24, no. 3 (1938): 464–483; William A.D. Millson, "A Review of Research in Audience Reaction," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 24, no. 4 (1938): 655–672.
- 21 Ernest H. Henrikson, "An Analysis of the Characteristics of Some 'Good' and 'Poor' Speakers," *Speech Monographs* 11, no. 1 (1944): 124.
- 22 L.B. Tyson, "The Radio Influences Speech," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 19, no. 2 (1933): 219–224.
- 23 C. Hess Haagen, "Intelligibility Measurement," *Speech Monographs* 13, no. 2 (1946): 4–7.
- 24 Gayland L. Draeger, "Intelligibility Related to Articulation," *Speech Monographs* 13, no. 2 (1946): 50–53.
- 25 F.H. Lumley, "Rates of Speech in Radio Speaking," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 19, no. 3 (1933): 393–403.
- 26 Tyson, "The Radio Influences Speech."
- 27 Howard Gilkinson, "Experimental and Statistical Research in General Speech: II. Speakers, Speeches, and Audiences," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 30, no. 2 (1944): 180.
- 28 Larry L. Barker, Robert J. Kibler, and Francis J. Kelly, "Effect of Perceived Mispronunciation on Speech Effectiveness Ratings and Retention," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 54, no. 1 (1968): 47–58; Larry L. Barker and Robert J. Kibler, "An Experimental Study to Assess the Effects of Three Levels of Mispronunciation on Comprehension for Three Different Populations," *Speech Monographs* 35,

- no. 1 (1968): 26–38; Ralph G. Nichols, “Factors in Listening Comprehension,” *Speech Monographs* 15, no. 2 (1948): 154–163.
- 29 Forest L. Whan, “Training in Listening and in Voice and Diction for the Airplane Pilot,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 30, no. 3 (1944): 263.
- 30 William H. Ewing, “Finding a Speaking–Listening Index,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 31, no. 3 (1945): 368–370.
- 31 David K. Berlo, *The Process of Communication: An Introduction to Theory and Practice* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960). The model of the audience as passive would remain a force for decades. The Constructivist model advanced by Jesse Delia and his colleagues at the University of Illinois operated with a thin veneer of attention to audience, but eventually collapsed into this oversimplified reflection of the linear model. Constructivism focused on how individual social cognitive ability is associated with abilities to produce listener-adapted communication (which later was renamed person-centered speech; see Graham D. Bodie and S.M. Jones, “Constructivism,” in *International Encyclopedia of Interpersonal Communication*, edited by C.R. Berger and M.E. Roloff (New York: Wiley-Blackwell, in press)). Thus, Constructivism, which served as a predominant paradigm for the study of interpersonal communication for nearly two decades, was not unlike the early emphasis on adapting speeches to audiences. As written by Lyon, “For present purposes I shall limit the subject to a brief treatment of the *speaker’s consciousness* of his audience. I am thinking of audience consciousness on the part of the speaker as the possession of a proper degree and kind of audience awareness” (C.E. Lyon, “Audience Consciousness,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 17, no. 3 (1931): 376). Of course, being aware of the presence of an audience and the need to adapt messages to that audience is different from viewing the audience (and the listener) as not only a participant in the communicative transaction (for example, Kristin M. Langellier, “A Phenomenological Approach to Audience,” *Literature and Performance* 3, no. 2 (1983): 34–39) but also a “co-narrator” of dialogue (Pamela Cook Miller, “Listen to the Ancients,” *Literature and Performance* 5, no. 1 (1984): 29–39; see also Janet B. Bavelas and Jennifer Gerwing, “The Listener as Addressee in Face-to-Face Dialogue,” *International Journal of Listening* 25, no. 3 (2011): 178–198).
- 32 For a review, see Howard Gilkinson, “Experimental and Statistical Research.”
- 33 One reason that listening instruction emphasized effective diagnosis in the early journals of the field may stem from the hybrid relationship with speech pathology at the time. The founding of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) was marked during the 1925 meeting of the National Association of Teachers of Speech in Iowa City, IA. In December of that year, the Academy of Speech Correction (the first of five names for what is now ASHA) was officially chartered and specialized journals followed soon thereafter. Indeed, this separation aligns well with the fact that by the mid-1920s all but lost in the NCA journal space was an interest in hearing and auditory disorders, something that was integrated with more mainstream scholarship in the beginning (for example, Swift, “Psychological Parallelisms between Speech Disorder and Oral English,” *Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking* 3 (1917): 224–228).
- 34 Smiley Blanton, “The Voice and the Emotions,” *Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking* 1, no. 2 (1915): 154–172.
- 35 Bryng Bryngelson, “The Re-education of Speech Failures,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 19, no. 2 (1933): 231. Thanks to Joshua Gunn for bringing Bryngelson to our attention.
- 36 J.A. Winans, “Public Speaking 1 at Cornell University,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 3, no. 2 (1917): 157.
- 37 J.R. Pelsma, “Standardization of Grades in Public Speaking,” *Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking* 1, no. 3 (1915): 266–271.
- 38 Robert West and Helen Larsen, “Some Statistical Investigations in the Field of Speech,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education* 7, no. 4 (1921): 375–382.
- 39 Harold Kent, “The Army and its Needs in Speech,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 30, no. 2 (1944): 147–150.
- 40 McDonald W. Held and Colbert C. Held, “Public Speaking in the Army Training Program,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 29, no. 2 (1943): 143–146; see also William West, “Speech and the

- Signal Corps," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 30, no. 2 (1944): 151–154, for a take on communication in the signal corps, for example.
- 41 Whan, "Training in Listening."
- 42 "Speaking Instruction in College Military Units," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 29, no. 4 (1943): 399–400.
- 43 Jean Malmstrom, "The Communications Course," *College Composition and Communication* 7 (1956): 21–24; this argument has been elaborated by David Russell in "Writing across the Curriculum in Historical Perspective: Toward a Social Interpretation," *College English* 52, no. 1 (January, 1990): 52–73.
- 44 Russell, "Writing across the Curriculum in Historical Perspective," 61.
- 45 Adams, "Listening," 210.
- 46 Robert T. Oliver, "Conservation in the Speech Curriculum," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 18, no. 1 (1932): 108–111.
- 47 Adams, "Listening," 211.
- 48 Nichols, "Listening"; Nichols, "Factors in Listening Comprehension"; Wiksell, "The Problem of Listening."
- 49 Ralph G. Nichols, "The Struggle to be Human," from the International Listening Association website, www.listen.org/Resources/Documents/14.pdf.
- 50 Nichols, "The Struggle to be Human."
- 51 L. LeRoy Cowperthwaite, "Fundamentals and Public Speaking Texts," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 50, no. 4 (1964): 448–452.
- 52 For discussions of the waning of the Communications movement, see Russell, "Writing across the Curriculum in Historical Perspective." At the University of Minnesota, the freestanding Communications Program (which was designed by faculty in the Department of Communication in opposition to the "Communication 1–2–3" sequence in the Department of Rhetoric) was dismantled in the 1980s, largely as the Department of English made greater claims to the professionalization of the teaching of writing (see David Beard, "More than 100 Years of Rhetoric at the University of Minnesota," *Composition Forum* 18 (Summer 2008). Online at <http://compositionforum.com/issue/18/uminnnesota-duluth.php>).
- 53 Graham D. Bodie and Margaret Fitch-Hauser, "Quantitative Research in Listening: Explication and Overview," in *Listening and Human Communication in the 21st Century*, ed. Andrew D. Wolvin (Oxford: Blackwell, 2010): 46–93.
- 54 Michael W. Purdy, "Listening, Culture, and Structures of Consciousness: Ways of Studying Listening," *International Journal of Listening* 14 (2000): 47–68; Michael W. Purdy, "Qualitative Research: Critical for Understanding Listening," in *Listening and Human Communication in the 21st Century*, ed. Andrew D. Wolvin (Oxford: Blackwell, 2010): 33–45.
- 55 W. Clifton Adams and E. Sam Cox, "The Teaching of Listening as an Integral Part of an Oral Activity: An Examination of Public-Speaking Texts," *International Journal of Listening* 24, no. 2 (2010): 89–105.
- 56 Interestingly, several members of the ILA were instrumental in the establishment of the Commission on Intrapersonal Communication Processes within the NCA, a group that was officially recognized in 1986. The name of the Commission was changed to the Communication & Social Cognition Division in 2000, and "listening" remains a focal area of research inquiry for its members. Although detailed records are dispersed across various file cabinets (and others likely lost forever), we garnered this information from the bylaws of the CSC Division of the NCA, found here: www.ou.edu/csc/Communication_and_Social_Cognition/Bylaws_files/CSCBylaws.pdf.
- 57 For more information about the history of the ILA see here: www.listen.org/history.
- 58 Indeed, in past years the number of NCA convention panel slots allotted to the ILA has varied as a function of those in charge of convention planning. There have been several conversations between leaders of the ILA and leaders of the NCA with respect to the affiliate status of the former to the latter. Of course, these conversations are not part of the "official" history of either organization, but are worth mentioning here as evidence of the tension that exists between these two organizations.

- 59 For an example of the excavation of the post-war period, see Darrin Hicks, "The New Citizen," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 93, no. 3 (2007): 358–360.
- 60 Graham D. Bodie, Kellie St. Cyr, Michelle Pence, Michael Rold, and James M. Honeycutt, "Listening Competence in Initial Interactions I: Distinguishing between What Listening Is and What Listeners Do," *International Journal of Listening* 26, no. 1 (2012): 1–28; Graham D. Bodie, "Issues in the Measurement of Listening," *Communication Research Reports* 30, no. 1 (2013): 76–84.
- 61 Cantril and Allport's work stretches into mass communication research, but certainly remained significant across subfields of the communication discipline for decades. Hadley Cantril and Gordon W. Allport, *The Psychology of Radio* (New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1935).
- 62 Edgar A. Schuler, *Survey of Radio Listeners in Louisiana* (Baton Rouge: General Extension Division, Louisiana State University, 1943).
- 63 Theodore Clevenger, *Audience Analysis* (Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966).
- 64 Larry L. Barker, *Listening Behavior* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971).
- 65 William Norwood Brigrance, *Speech: Its Techniques and Disciplines in a Free Society* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961): 9.
- 66 B. Paul Wilson, Frederick Sorensen, and Murray Elwood, "A Functional Core for the Basic Communications Course." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 32, no. 2 (1946): 232–244.
- 67 John M. Wiemann, "Assessing Communication Literacy," *Communication Education* 27, no. 4 (1978): 310–315; Rebecca Rubin, "Assessing Speaking and Listening Competence at the College Level: The Communication Competency Assessment Instrument," *Communication Education* 31, no. 1 (1982): 19–32.
- 68 For information on the National Communication Association's "Speaking and Listening Competencies for College Students," see www.natcom.org/uploadedFiles/Teaching_and_Learning/Assessment_Resources/PDF-Speaking_and_Listening_Competencies_for_College_Students.pdf.
- 69 Donald L. Rubin, John Daly, James C. McCroskey, and Nancy A. Mead, "A Review and Critique of Procedures for Assessing Speaking and Listening Skills among Preschool through Grade Twelve Students," *Communication Education* 31, no. 4 (1982): 285–303.
- 70 Donald L. Rubin and Sally Hampton, "National Performance Standards for Oral Communication K–12: New Standards and Speaking/Listening/Viewing," *Communication Education* 47 no. 2 (1998): 183–193.
- 71 Work by Rod Hart and Don Burks on rhetorical sensitivity (Roderick P. Hart and Don M. Burks, "Rhetorical Sensitivity and Social Interaction," *Speech Monographs* 3, no. 2 (1972): 75–91) is just one example of this type of work.
- 72 Charles J. Wigley, "Verbal Aggressiveness and Communicator Style Characteristics of Summoned Jurors as Predictors of Actual Jury Selection," *Communication Monographs* 66, no. 3 (1999): 266–275.
- 73 William A. Villaume and Tami Reid, "An Initial Investigation of Aging, Aligning Actions and Presbycusis," *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 18, no. 1 (1990): 8–31.
- 74 Kittie W. Watson, Cathy J. Lazarus, and Todd Thomas, "First-Year Medical Students' Listener Preferences: A Longitudinal Study," *International Journal of Listening* 13, no. 1 (1999): 1–11; Brenda Comeaux Trahana and Patricia Rockwell, "The Effects of Listening Training on Nursing Home Assistants: Residents' Satisfaction with and Perceptions of Assistants' Listening Behavior," *International Journal of Listening* 13, no. 1 (1999): 62–74; Connie Fletcher, "Listening to Narratives: The Dynamics of Capturing Police Experience," *International Journal of Listening* 13, no. 1 (1999): 46–61; Judi Brownell, "Managerial Listening and Career Development in the Hospitality Industry," *International Journal of Listening* 8, no. 1 (1994): 31–49.
- 75 Jan Flynn, Tuula-Riitta Valikoski, and Jennie Grau, "Listening in the Business Context: Reviewing the State of Research," *International Journal of Listening* 22, no. 2 (2008): 141–151.
- 76 Ben W. Morse and Richard N. Piland, "An Assessment of Communication Competencies Needed by Intermediate-Level Health Care Providers: A Study of Nurse-Patient, Nurse-Doctor, Nurse-Nurse Communication Relationships," *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 9, no. 1 (1981): 30–41.
- 77 Timothy G. Plax, Patricia Kearney, Ted J. Ross, and J. Christopher Jolly, "Assessing the Link Between Environmental Concerns and Consumers' Decisions to Use Clean-Air Vehicles," *Communication*

- Education* 57, no. 4 (2008): 417–422; Karen Slattery and Ana C. Garner, “Mothers of Soldiers in Wartime: A National News Narrative,” *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 24, no. 5 (2007): 429–445.
- 78 Judi Brownell, “Listening Leaders: The Skills of Listening-Centered Communication,” in *Listening and Human Communication in the 21st Century*, ed. Andrew D. Wolvin (Oxford: Blackwell, 2010): 141–157.
- 79 Michel Foucault, *The Hermeneutics of the Subject: Lectures at the College de France, 1981–1982* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001): 350.
- 80 Foucault, *Hermeneutics*, 343.
- 81 Foucault, *Hermeneutics*, 345.
- 82 Foucault, *Hermeneutics*, 344.
- 83 Jacques Attali, *Noise: The Political Economy of Music* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985).
- 84 Theodor W. Adorno, “On the Fetish Character in Music and Regressive Listening,” in *The Culture Industry* (New York: Routledge, 2001): 143.
- 85 L. Botstein, “Listening through Reading: Musical Literacy and the Concert Audience,” *19th-Century Music* (Special Issue on Music in Its Social Contexts) 16, no. 2 (1992): 129–145; C. Hirschkind, “Hearing Modernity: Egypt, Islam, and the Pious Ear,” in *Hearing Cultures: Essays on Sound, Listening and Modernity*, ed. Veit Erlmann (New York: Berg Publishing, 2004): 131–151; D. Wong, “Finding an Asian American Audience: The Problem of Listening,” *American Music* (Special Issue on Asian American Music) 19, no. 4 (2001): 365–384.
- 86 Jonathan Sterne, *The Audible Past: The Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006): 99.
- 87 Michael Bull, “Sound, Proximity, and Distance in Western Experience: The Case of Odysseus’s Walkman,” in *Hearing Cultures: Essays on Sound, Listening and Modernity*, ed. Veit Erlmann (New York: Berg Publishing, 2004): 134.
- 88 Murray Schafer, *The Soundscape: Our Sonic Environment and the Tuning of the World* (Rochester, VT: Destiny Books, 1994): 212.
- 89 Barbara Lorenszowski, *Sounds of Ethnicity: Listening to German North America* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2010): 10.
- 90 Barry Blesser and Linda Ruth Salter, *Spaces Speak: Are You Listening? Experiencing Aural Architecture* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007): 29.
- 91 Alain Corbin, “The Auditory Markers of the Village,” in *The Auditory Culture Reader*, ed. M. Bull and L. Back (New York: Berg, 2003): 117.
- 92 Michael Fowler, “Sound, Aurality and Critical Listening: Disruptions at the Boundaries of Architecture,” *Architecture and Culture* 1, no. 1–2 (2013): 162–181.
- 93 In rhetorical studies, itself becoming an increasingly interdisciplinary field, there is continuing attention to the cultural work of listening. Scholars in rhetoric and composition in English departments have turned to listening to drive theory-building; Krista Ratcliffe, in writing about “Rhetorical Listening,” calls for listening with intellectual roots in Heidegger and in Fiumara’s philosophical work on listening. Similar roots are at the core of calls by Wayne Booth and Lisbeth Lipari for listening in rhetoric; by rethinking rhetoric not from the position of the speaker/author, but from the listener, these scholars open us up to new ways to think through the central problems of communication studies; while these scholars are not in communication studies, their work has resonance. See Krista Ratcliffe, *Rhetorical Listening: Identification, Gender, Whiteness* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2005); see also Wayne C Booth, *The Rhetoric of Rhetoric: The Quest for Effective Communication* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004); Lisbeth Lipari, “Rhetoric’s Other: Levinas, Listening and the Ethical Response,” *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 45 (2012): 227–245.
- 94 Joshua Gunn, “Speech Is Dead; Long Live Speech,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 94, no. 3 (2008): 343–364; see also Edward Schiappa and Emmanuelle Wessels, “Listening to Audiences: A Brief Rationale and History of Audience Research in Popular Media Studies,” *International Journal of Listening* 21 (2007): 14–23.

- 95 Joshua Gunn, "On Recording Performance; or, Speech, the Cry, and the Anxiety of the Fix," *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies* 7, no. 3 (2011), online at <http://liminalities.net/7-3/>.
- 96 Michael Bull, "No Dead Air! The iPod and the Culture of Mobile Listening," *Leisure Studies* 24 (2005): 343–355.
- 97 Bull, "No Dead Air!"
- 98 Joshua Gunn and Mirko M. Hall, "Stick it in Your Ear: The Psychodynamics of iPod Enjoyment," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 5, no. 2 (2008): 135–157.
- 99 These issues are excavated in Norm Friesen, "Education as a Training of the Senses: McLuhan's Pedagogical Enterprise," *Enculturation*: <http://enculturation.net/education-as-a-training> (November 7, 2011).

References

- Adams, Harlen. "Listening." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 24, no. 2 (1938): 209–211.
- Adams, W. Clifton and E. Sam Cox. "The Teaching of Listening as an Integral Part of an Oral Activity: An Examination of Public-Speaking Texts." *International Journal of Listening* 24, no. 2 (2010): 89–105.
- Adorno, Theodor W. "On the Fetish Character in Music and Regressive Listening." In *The Culture Industry*, 29–60. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Attali, Jacques. *Noise: The Political Economy of Music*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985.
- Barker, Larry L. *Listening Behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- Barker, Larry L. and Robert J. Kibler, "An Experimental Study to Assess the Effects of Three Levels of Mispronunciation on Comprehension for Three Different Populations." *Speech Monographs* 35, no. 1 (1968): 26–38.
- Barker, Larry L., Robert J. Kibler, and Francis J. Kelly, "Effect of Perceived Mispronunciation on Speech Effectiveness Ratings and Retention." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 54, no. 1 (1968): 47–58.
- Bavelas, Janet B. and Jennifer Gerwing. "The Listener as Addressee in Face-to-Face Dialogue." *International Journal of Listening* 25, no. 3 (2011): 178–198.
- Beard, David. "A Broader Understanding of the Ethics of Listening: Philosophy, Cultural Studies, Media Studies and the Ethical Listening Subject." *International Journal of Listening* 23 (2009): 7–20.
- . "More than 100 Years of Rhetoric at the University of Minnesota." *Composition Forum* 18 (Summer 2008). Online at <http://compositionforum.com/issue/18/uminnesota-duluth.php>.
- Berlo, David K. *The Process of Communication: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.
- Blanton, Smiley. "The Voice and the Emotions." *Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking* 1, no. 2 (1915): 154–172.
- Blesser, Barry and Linda Ruth Salter. *Spaces Speak: Are You Listening? Experiencing Aural Architecture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007.
- Bodie, Graham D. "Issues in the Measurement of Listening." *Communication Research Reports* 30, no. 1 (2013): 76–84.
- . "Listening as Positive Communication." In *The Positive Side of Interpersonal Communication*, edited by T. Socha and M. Pitts, 109–126. New York: Peter Lang, 2012.
- . "Treating Listening Ethically." *International Journal of Listening* 24, no. 3 (2010): 185–188.
- . "The Understudied Nature of Listening in Interpersonal Communication: Introduction to a Special Issue." *International Journal of Listening* 25, no. 1–2 (2011): 1–9.
- Bodie, Graham D. and Nathan Crick. "Listening, Hearing, Sensing: Three Modes of Being and the Phenomenology of Charles Sanders Peirce." *Communication Theory* (in press).
- Bodie, Graham D. and Margaret Fitch-Hauser. "Quantitative Research in Listening: Explication and Overview." In *Listening and Human Communication in the 21st Century*, edited by Andrew D. Wolvin, 46–94. Oxford: Blackwell, 2010.
- Bodie, Graham D. and S.M. Jones. "Constructivism." In *International Encyclopedia of Interpersonal Communication*, edited by C.R. Berger and M.E. Roloff. New York: Wiley-Blackwell, in press.

- Bodie, Graham D., Debra L. Worthington, Magrete Imhof, and Lynn Cooper. "What Would a Unified Field of Listening Look Like? A Proposal Linking Past Perspectives and Future Endeavors." *International Journal of Listening* 22, no. 2 (2008): 103–122.
- Bodie, Graham D., Kellie St. Cyr, Michelle Pence, Michael Rold, and James M. Honeycutt, "Listening Competence in Initial Interactions I: Distinguishing between What Listening Is and What Listeners Do." *International Journal of Listening* 26, no. 1 (2012): 1–28.
- Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Rhetoric: The Quest for Effective Communication*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004.
- Botstein, L. "Listening through Reading: Musical Literacy and the Concert Audience." *19th-Century Music* (Special Issue on Music in Its Social Contexts) 16, no. 2 (1992): 129–145.
- Brigance, William Norwood. *Speech: Its Techniques and Disciplines in a Free Society*. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.
- Brownell, Judi. "Listening Leaders: The Skills of Listening-Centered Communication." In *Listening and Human Communication in the 21st Century*, edited by Andrew D. Wolvin, 141–156. Oxford: Blackwell, 2010.
- . "Managerial Listening and Career Development in the Hospitality Industry." *International Journal of Listening* 8, no. 1 (1994): 31–49.
- Bryngelson, Bryng. "The Re-education of Speech Failures." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 19, no. 2 (1933): 227–232.
- Bull, Michael. "No Dead Air! The iPod and the Culture of Mobile Listening." *Leisure Studies* 24, no. 4 (2005): 343–355.
- . "Thinking about Sound, Proximity, and Distance in Western Experience: The Case of Odysseus's Walkman." In *Hearing Cultures: Essays on Sound, Listening and Modernity*, edited by Veit Erlmann, 173–190. New York: Berg Publishing, 2004.
- Cantril, Hadley and Gordon W. Allport. *The Psychology of Radio*. New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1935.
- Clevenger, Theodore. *Audience Analysis*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.
- Corbin, Alain. "The Auditory Markers of the Village." In *The Auditory Culture Reader*, edited by M. Bull and L. Back. New York: Berg, 2003.
- Cowperthwaite, L. LeRoy. "Fundamentals and Public Speaking Texts." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 50, no. 4 (1964): 448–452.
- Draeger, Gayland L. "Intelligibility Related to Articulation." *Speech Monographs* 13, no. 2 (1946): 50–53.
- Dressel, Harold A. "Debating for the Audience." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 16, no. 2 (1930): 227–231.
- Ewing, William H. "Finding a Speaking-Listening Index." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 31, no. 3 (1945): 368–370.
- Fletcher, Connie. "Listening to Narratives: The Dynamics of Capturing Police Experience." *International Journal of Listening* 13, no. 1 (1999): 46–61.
- Flynn, Jan, Tuula-Riitta Valikoski, and Jennie Grau. "Listening in the Business Context: Reviewing the State of Research." *International Journal of Listening* 22, no. 2 (2008): 141–151.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Hermeneutics of the Subject: Lectures at the College de France, 1981–1982*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.
- Fowler, Michael. "Sound, Aurality and Critical Listening: Disruptions at the Boundaries of Architecture." *Architecture and Culture* 1, no. 1–2 (2013): 162–181.
- Friesen, Norm. "Education as a Training of the Senses: McLuhan's Pedagogical Enterprise," Enculturation: <http://enculturation.net/education-as-a-training> (November 7, 2011).
- Gilkinson, Howard. "Experimental and Statistical Research in General Speech: II. Speakers, Speeches, and Audiences." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 30, no. 2 (1944): 180–186.
- Gislasen, H.B. "The Relation of the Speaker to his Audience." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 2, no. 1 (1916): 39–45.
- Glenn, Ethel C. "A Content Analysis of Fifty Definitions of Listening." *Journal of the International Listening Association* 3, no. 1 (1989): 21–31.
- Gunn, Joshua. "On Recording Performance; or, Speech, the Cry, and the Anxiety of the Fix." *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies* 7, no. 3 (2011), online at <http://liminalities.net/7-3/>.

- . "Speech Is Dead; Long Live Speech." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 94, no. 3 (2008): 343–364.
- Gunn, Joshua and Mirko M. Hall. "Stick it in Your Ear: The Psychodynamics of iPod Enjoyment." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 5, no. 2 (2008): 135–157.
- Haagen, C. Hess. "Intelligibility Measurement." *Speech Monographs* 13, no. 2 (1946): 4–7.
- Hart, Roderick P. and Don M. Burks. "Rhetorical Sensitivity and Social Interaction." *Speech Monographs* 3, no. 2 (1972): 75–91.
- Held, McDonald W. and Colbert C. Held. "Public Speaking in the Army Training Program." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 29, no. 2 (1943): 143–146.
- Henrikson, Ernest H. "An Analysis of the Characteristics of Some 'Good' and 'Poor' Speakers." *Speech Monographs* 11, no. 1 (1944): 120–124.
- Hicks, Darrin. "The New Citizen." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 93, no. 3 (2007): 358–360.
- Hirschkind, C. "Hearing Modernity: Egypt, Islam, and the Pious Ear." In *Hearing Cultures: Essays on Sound, Listening and Modernity*, edited by Veit Erlmann, 131–151. New York: Berg, 2004.
- Hunt, Everett Lee. "The Scientific Spirit in Public Speaking." *Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking* 1, no. 2 (1915): 185–193.
- Imhof, Margarete. "The Cognitive Psychology of Listening." In *Listening and Human Communication in the 21st Century*, edited by Andrew D. Wolvin, 97–126. Boston: Blackwell, 2010.
- International Listening Association. "An ILA Definition of Listening." *Listening Post* 53, no. 1 (April 1995): 4–5.
- . "History," International Listening Association, January 16, 2014, www.listen.org/history.
- Keith, William. *Democracy as Discussion: The American Forum Movement and Civic Education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield/Lexington Books, 2007.
- . "We Are the Speech Teachers." *Review of Communication* 11, no. 2 (2011): 83–92.
- Kent, Harold. "The Army and its Needs in Speech." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 30, no. 2 (1944): 147–150.
- Lang, Annie. "Discipline in Crisis? The Shifting Paradigm of Mass Communication Research." *Communication Theory* 23, no. 1 (2013): 10–24.
- Langellier, Kristin M. "A Phenomenological Approach to Audience." *Literature and Performance*, 3 no. 2 (1983): 34–39.
- Lipari, Lisbeth. "Rhetoric's Other: Levinas, Listening and the Ethical Response." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 45, no. 3 (2012): 227–245.
- Littell, Winifred H. "Before and After Taking." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 23, no. 4 (1937): 616–619.
- Lorenzkowski, Barbara. *Sounds of Ethnicity: Listening to German North America*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2010.
- Lumley, F.H. "Rates of Speech in Radio Speaking." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 19, no. 3 (1933): 393–403.
- Lyon, C.E. "Audience Consciousness." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 17, no. 3 (1931): 375–385.
- Malmstrom, Jean. "The Communications Course." *College Composition and Communication* 7, no. 1 (1956): 21–24.
- Miller, Pamela Cook. "Listen to the Ancients." *Literature and Performance* 5, no. 1 (1984): 29–39.
- Millson, William A.D. "A Review of Research in Audience Reaction." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 24, no. 3 (1938): 464–483.
- . "A Review of Research in Audience Reaction." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 24, no. 4 (1938): 655–672.
- Morse, Ben W. and Richard N. Piland. "An Assessment of Communication Competencies Needed by Intermediate-Level Health Care Providers: A Study of Nurse-Patient, Nurse-Doctor, Nurse-Nurse Communication Relationships." *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 9, no. 1 (1981): 30–41.
- National Communication Association. "Communication and Social Cognition Bylaws." www.ou.edu/csc/Communication_and_Social_Cognition/Bylaws_files/CSCBylaws.pdf.
- . "Speaking and Listening Competencies for College Students." www.natcom.org/uploadedFiles/Teaching_and_Learning/Assessment_Resources/PDF-Speaking_and_Listening_Competencies_for_College_Students.pdf.
- Nichols, Ralph G. "Factors in Listening Comprehension." *Speech Monographs* 15, no. 2 (1948): 154–163.
- . "Listening: Questions and Problems." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 33, no. 1 (1947): 83–86.

- . “The Struggle to be Human,” from the International Listening Association website, www.listen.org/Resources/Documents/14.pdf.
- Oliver, Robert T. “Conservation in the Speech Curriculum.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 18, no. 1 (1932): 108–111.
- Pelsma, J.R. “Standardization of Grades in Public Speaking.” *Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking* 1, no. 3 (1915): 266–271.
- Philipsen, Gerry. “The Early Career Rise of ‘Speech’ in Some Disciplinary Discourse, 1914–1946.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 93, no. 3 (2007): 352–354.
- Plax, Timothy G. Patricia Kearney, Ted J. Ross, and J. Christopher Jolly. “Assessing the Link Between Environmental Concerns and Consumers’ Decisions to Use Clean-Air Vehicles.” *Communication Education* 57, no. 4 (2008): 417–422.
- Pooley, Jefferson D. and David W. Park. “Communication Research.” In *The Handbook of Communication History (ICA Handbook Series)*, edited by Peter Simonson, Janice Peck, and Robert T. Craig, 76–92. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Purdy, Michael W. “Listening, Culture, and Structures of Consciousness: Ways of Studying Listening.” *International Journal of Listening* 14, no. 1 (2000): 47–68.
- . “Qualitative Research: Critical for Understanding Listening.” In *Listening and Human Communication in the 21st Century*, edited by Andrew D. Wolvin, 33–45. Oxford: Blackwell, 2010.
- Ratcliffe, Krista. *Rhetorical Listening: Identification, Gender, Whiteness*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2005.
- The Research Committee. “Research in Public Speaking.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 1, no. 1 (1915): 24–32.
- Rubin, Donald L. and Sally Hampton. “National Performance Standards for Oral Communication K–12: New Standards and Speaking/Listening/Viewing.” *Communication Education* 47, no. 2 (1998): 183–193.
- Rubin, Donald L., John Daly, James C. McCroskey, and Nancy A. Mead. “A Review and Critique of Procedures for Assessing Speaking and Listening Skills among Preschool through Grade Twelve Students.” *Communication Education* 31, no. 4 (1982): 285–303.
- Rubin, Rebecca. “Assessing Speaking and Listening Competence at the College Level: The Communication Competency Assessment Instrument.” *Communication Education* 31, no. 1 (1982): 19–32.
- Russell, David. “Writing across the Curriculum in Historical Perspective: Toward a Social Interpretation.” *College English* 52, no. 1 (1990): 52–73.
- Schafer, Murray. *The Soundscape: Our Sonic Environment and the Tuning of the World*. Rochester, VT: Destiny Books, 1994.
- Schiappa, Edward and Emmanuelle Wessels. “Listening to Audiences: A Brief Rationale and History of Audience Research in Popular Media Studies.” *International Journal of Listening* 21, no. 1 (2007): 14–23.
- Schuler, Edgar A. *Survey of Radio Listeners in Louisiana*. Baton Rouge: General Extension Division, Louisiana State University, 1943.
- Slattery, Karen and Ana C. Garner. “Mothers of Soldiers in Wartime: A National News Narrative.” *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 24, no. 5 (2007): 429–445.
- “Speaking Instruction in College Military Units.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 29, no. 4 (1943): 399–400.
- Sterne, Jonathan. *The Audible Past: The Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006.
- Swift, W.B. “Psychological Parallelisms between Speech Disorder and Oral English.” *Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking* 3, no. 3 (1917): 224–228.
- Trahana, Brenda Comeaux and Patricia Rockwell. “The Effects of Listening Training on Nursing Home Assistants: Residents’ Satisfaction with and Perceptions of Assistants’ Listening Behavior.” *International Journal of Listening* 13, no. 1 (1999): 62–74.
- Tyson, L.B. “The Radio Influences Speech.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 19, no. 2 (1933): 219–224.

- Villaume, William A. and Tami Reid. "An Initial Investigation of Aging, Aligning Actions and Presbycusis." *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 18, no. 1 (1990): 8–31.
- Watson, Kittie W., Cathy J. Lazarus, and Todd Thomas. "First-Year Medical Students' Listener Preferences: A Longitudinal Study." *International Journal of Listening* 13, no. 1 (1999): 1–11.
- West, Robert. "Speech and Hearing." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 21, no. 2 (1935): 178–188.
- West, Robert and Helen Larsen. "Some Statistical Investigations in the Field of Speech." *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education* 7, no. 4 (1921): 375–382.
- West, William. "Speech and the Signal Corps." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 30, no. 2 (1944): 151–154.
- Whan, Forest L. "Training in Listening and in Voice and Diction for the Airplane Pilot." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 30, no. 3 (1944): 262–265.
- Wiemann, John M. "Assessing Communication Literacy." *Communication Education* 27, no. 4 (1978): 310–315.
- Wigley, Charles J. "Verbal Aggressiveness and Communicator Style Characteristics of Summoned Jurors as Predictors of Actual Jury Selection." *Communication Monographs* 66, no. 3 (1999): 266–275.
- Wiksell, Wesley. "The Problem of Listening." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 32, no. 4 (1946): 505–508.
- Wilson, B. Paul, Frederick Sorensen, and Murray Elwood. "A Functional Core for the Basic Communications Course." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 32, no. 2 (1946): 232–244.
- Winans, J.A. "Public Speaking 1 at Cornell University." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 3, no. 2 (1917): 153–162.
- Wolvin, Andrew D. and Carolyn Gwynn Coakley. "A Listening Taxonomy." In *Perspectives on Listening*, edited by Andrew D. Wolvin and Carolyn Gwynn Coakley, 15–22. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1993.
- Wong, D. "Finding an Asian American Audience: The Problem of Listening." *American Music* (Special Issue on Asian American Music) 19, no. 4 (2001): 365–384.
- Woolbert, Charles H. "The Organization of Departments of Speech Science in Universities." *Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking* 2, no. 1 (1916): 64–77.