This annotated bibliography lists 36 references on lecturing. Topics are in the areas of method, format, technique, student expectations, improvement, content, expressiveness, and anxiety. (MS)
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Birkel analyzes six major criticisms of the lecture method. Many of the criticisms, he concludes, result from the misuse of the method by the instructor. He provides suggestions for improving the process.

Bowman, James S. The Lecture-Discussion Format Revisited. Improving College and University Teaching, 27 (1979), 25-27. Effective use of the lecture method can be enhanced by a three-pronged strategy: careful organization of the course material, student interaction in lecture, and discussion activities. Because Bowman feels "personal chemistry" helps the educational process, he outlines techniques that might facilitate classroom learning: casual interaction, extemporaneous speaking, awareness of attention spans, and small group discussions at the end of lectures.

Brown, G. A. and J. M. Daines. Can Explaining Be Learnt? Some Lecturers' Views. Higher Education, 10 (1981), 573-580. Ninety-three lecturers were asked to respond to a questionnaire which assessed the value and learnability of explaining. Forty items were rated from most to least valuable and most to least learnable. Most valuable were clarity, interest, logical organization, selection of appropriate content, etc. Least valuable were metaphors, loose structure, short sentences, etc. Most learnable were use of diagrams, illustrations, and examples, while the most difficult to learn were style, enthusiasm, and verbal fluency.

Buchanan, Edsel. An Analysis of Student Expectations Regarding Concepts of Teaching Format. January 1986. ERIC ED 280 351, 13pp. Buchanan studied the expectations of 432 college students with regard to six teaching formats: lecture, discussion, laboratory, personalized attention, computer-assisted instruction, and television instruction. Formats clearly preferred were the personalized and lecture approaches. The discussion format was a third choice with reservations possibly because of uncertainty with instructor expectations and students' ability to express themselves. Television was clearly a nonpreferred format.

Canter, Francis and Judith Gallatin. Lecture Versus Discussion as Related to Students' Personality Factors. Improving College and University Teaching, 22 (1974), 111-112 and 116. The authors examine student preferences for the lecture or discussion approach. The authors find no support for the idea that authoritarian or dogmatic personalities will prefer lecture to discussion methods, nor for the concept that discussion methods will regularly be preferred over lecture methods.

Cashin, William E. Improving Lectures. Idea Paper No. 14. September 1985. ERIC ED 267 721, 5pp. Cashin summarizes much that has been written about improving lecturing. He defines lecturing as teaching by the spoken word with emphasis on the teacher talking and the student listening. After identifying the strengths and weaknesses of lecturing, he provides recommendations for preparation and organization, presentation and clarity, stimulation and interest, and feedback and interaction.

Chaudron, Craig, and Jack C. Richards. The Effect of Discourse Markers on the Comprehension of Lectures. April 1985. ERIC ED 259 565, 33pp. Macro markers indicate the overall organization of a lecture. Micro markers function as fillers and indicate links between sentences. Four versions of an American history lecture were developed: (1) one with no special signals; (2) one with macro markers, (3) one with micro markers, and (4) one with both macro and micro markers. Student comprehension was measured by three instruments. It was found that macro markers lead to better recall of text material.

Collingwood, Vaughan, and David C. Hughes. Effects of Three Types of University Lecture Notes on Student Achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 70 (1978), 175-179. An experiment was performed to test the efficacy of three different kinds of lecture notes used by students: (1) duplicates of the lecturer's detailed notes; (2) outlines of the lecturer's notes with key points, diagrams, and tables; and (3) the student's own notes. Analysis of achievement scores indicates that all groups performed better when given some form of lecture notes. The authors conclude that the effectiveness of lectures can be improved by distributing some form of lecture notes.
Dedmond, Donald N. Lecturing as Oral Communication. Central States Speech Journal, 19 (1968), 188-195. Dedmond describes obvious problems with the lecture and offers solutions that are reversals of the problem. He stresses the importance of exacting preparation, attention to delivery, and concern for ideas.

Ellis, H. P. and A. D. Jones. Anxiety About Lecturing. Universities Quarterly, 29 (1974), 91-95. The authors discuss aspects that provoke the most anxiety for lecturers: public speaking ability (delivery); creating and maintaining student interest (content); lack of social interaction (feedback); and risk of nervous prostration (stage fright). Ways to cope with these anxieties are offered.

Ellis, Lee, and Dan Mathis. College Student Learning from Televsion Versus Conventional Classroom Lectures. A Controlled Experiment. Higher Education, 14 (1985), 165-173. Two student sections of introductory sociology were exposed to either conventional classroom lectures or identical lectures broadcast live in an adjacent room on a television monitor. Class attendance and learning under the two modes were statistically equivalent. The results confirm findings of past studies.

Frederick, Peter J. The Lively Lecture—8 Variations. College Teaching, 34 (1986), 43-50. These techniques for providing variety and effectiveness within the lecture format are described: oral essay, participatory lecture, problem-solving approach, alternating mini-lectures and discussions, modeling analytical skills, debate, simulation, role playing, and the affective/emotional media lecture.

Gleason, Maryellen. Ten Best on Learning: A Bibliography of Essential Sources for Instructors. College Teaching, 33 (1985), 8-10. Ten reference works for improving instruction were selected, covering topics as note-taking, learning styles and theories, examinations, cognitive processes, student attention, critical thinking, problem-solving, creativity, and lecturing. Most can be adapted to lecture situations.

Grove, Robert P., Timothy J. Pettitbone, and David W. Martin. Effects of Lecturer Pace on Noise Level in a University Classroom. The Journal of Educational Research, 61 (1973), 73-75. The authors show that a relationship exists between instructional pace and student-generated noise. A slow pace bores students; a fast pace may lose students; a moderate pace maximizes attention and minimizes student-generated noise. They conclude that a slower pace would be more appropriate than a fast pace and noise can be controlled.

Gruner, Charles R. and Dwight L. Freshley. Retention of Lecture Items Reinforced with Humorous and Non-Humorous Exemplary Material. November 12-16, 1979. ERIC ED 193 725, 9pp. College students in nine intact beginning speech classes tested the effects of humor in a lecture on student recall. The lecture was audiotaped once with humorous illustrations, once with non-humorous illustrations, and once with no amplification. The humorous lecture was perceived as more humorous than the non-humorous version, but no difference in recall among the three conditions was found for either immediate or delayed recall.

Hamagil, Howard J. and Gordon E. Greenwood. The Doctor Fox Effect: A Paired Comparison of Lecturer Expressiveness and Lecture Content. 1980. ERIC ED 187 179, 21pp. The Dr. Fox effect on students (the importance of lecturer expressiveness vs. lecture content) was investigated. Results indicate that expressiveness may be the primary influence on students' rating of instructors and that students are unable to distinguish levels of content between lectures. These results "raise serious questions" about the sole use of student-ratings to evaluate instructors. "Dr. Fox Effect" has received much attention.

Hank, William A. and Norman A. Stahl. A Meta-Analysis of the Effect of Notetaking on Learning from Lecture. 1985. ERIC ED 258 533, 15pp. Meta-analysis is a research technique that allows for both the computation of the strength of an effect within studies and the determination of mean effect sizes averaged across related studies. Fourteen studies comparing note-taking with non-notetaking were examined. The main research question was: Does notetaking enhance recall? Results indicated that the process of taking notes in itself does little to enhance recall; however, when permitted to review their notes, students achieved superior recall.

Herrmann, Thom and Peter Leppmann. PSI: Personalized for Whom? 1981, 19pp. ERIC ED 210 575. Analyses were performed to determine variations in study patterns among students enrolled—according to their preference—in the personalized system of instruction (PSI) or the lecture/seminar sections of an introductory psychology course. Successful PSI students were "orderly, systematic hard workers who emphasized the printed word," whereas the successful lecture/seminar students studied differently for the test, needed more aid organizing and studying for tests, and were as concerned with the spoken word as the written word.
Kelly, Brenda Wright and Janis Holmes. The Guided Lecture Procedure. Journal of Reading, 22 (1979), 602-4. Since students have difficulty listening, thinking, synthesizing, and recording accurate lecture notes, the authors suggest that they refrain from taking notes during the lecture but, instead, engage in an intensive listening and thinking process. After 30 minutes of lectures, students are then instructed to write down all recalled information. The lecturer takes 5 minutes to review information, then students work in small groups to prepare their lecture notes.

Lowman, Joseph. Mastering the Techniques of Teaching. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Higher Education Series, 1984. Lowman examines elements of good teaching and ways to master effective teaching techniques. Although a wide range of techniques are provided, he directs some attention to speech, movement, and suspense in the classroom, selecting and organizing material for the lecture, enhancing learning through classroom discussion, and planning course content to maximize interest.

McLeish, John. The Lecture Method. The Psychology of Teaching Methods: The Seventy-Fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Ed. M. L. Gage. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976, pp. 252-299. This lengthy piece covers a history of the lecture, an attack and defense of the method, systematic experiments on the method, students' attitudes, and suggestions for improvement. McLeish supports the need for a diversification of activities and suggests that the lecture be converted into a step-by-step presentation, with, perhaps, half-a-dozen intervals of recapitulation and informal testing of the students' assimilation and ability to apply the materials presented.

McMann, Francis, Jr. In Defense of Lecture. The Social Studies, 70 (1979), 270-74. McMann offers three strategies for improving the lecture through extensive planning and preparation: (1) develop rationales and criteria; (2) identify behavioral objectives and taxonomy levels; (3) develop guidelines. The author also insists that the lecture should provide new or supplemental material, never repeat material from the text, and make students aware of the lecturer's goals and logic.

Meredith, Gerald M. and Todd H. Ogasawara. Lecture Size and Students' Ratings of Instructional Effectiveness. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 52 (1981), 353-54. This study examined the effect of lecture size on instructional effectiveness. Seminar-size groups (25 or less) were favored over moderately small lecture classes (26-50) for these reasons: class members know each other well and the instructor encourages discussions/active participation by the students.

Napell, Sondra M. Updating the Lecture. Journal of Teacher Education, 29 (1978), 53-6. Napell offers suggestions for modifications of the lecture format so that students can communicate their needs in such a way that learning becomes an active, reciprocal, ongoing process. Suggestions and discussion cover lecture structure, timing, programmed instructions, query-directed learning, and small study groups.

Penner, Jon G. Why Many College Teachers Cannot Lecture: How to Avoid Communication Breakdown in the Classroom. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1984, 212pp. Penner discusses ways to prepare and present aspects of classroom communication. His treatment of common communication problems and how to overcome and avoid them is helpful. Penner takes the reader through all aspects of lecturing from background research on the lecture method, to planning, organizing, and outlining, and on through holding interest and attention, motivating, and delivering, to listening skills and feedback. A thorough, useful source.

Sistek, Valdimir. How Much Do Our Students Learn by Attending Lectures? 1986. ERIC ED 271 079, 10pp. What are the considerations that affect the type of teaching method employed in undergraduate studies and medical schools? Why the current emphasis on the lecture method instead of alternative educational experiences that require students to be active, independent learners and problem solvers? Sistek discovered that the major factors were (1) perceived academic priorities, and (2) allocation of professors' time. One possible solution is to offer incentives to faculty to introduce methods leading to more active learning on a limited basis.

Stanton, H. E. Small Group Teaching in the Lecture Situation. Improving College and University Teaching, 26 (1978) 69-70. Stanton outlines W. F. Hill's structured discussion method, then provides A. Northedge's alternative way of facilitating productive group discussion--a structure based on sub-grouping which requires 5 minutes of individual work, 10 minutes of work in pairs, 20 minutes of small group work (4-6 members), and 15 minutes for reporting to the whole group. The author then applies Northedge's approach to the lecture situation to provide a variant from the 50-minute monologue which so often characterizes lecture sessions.
ED numbers are educational documents announced in Resources in Education, the ERIC abstract journal.