Listening as Advocacy

How Trial Attorneys Can Use Different Types of Listening in the Courtroom

Michael DeBlis III, Esq.

Listening as Advocacy

- Trial lawyers are trained extensively in speaking—opening statements, examinations, objections, and closing arguments. Far less attention is paid to listening. Yet in trial practice, listening is not passive. It is an active, strategic skill that directly shapes examinations, objections, credibility, and persuasion.
- Great trial attorneys listen differently than ordinary participants in a conversation. They listen with purpose, discipline, and intention. Understanding the different types of listening—and knowing when to deploy each—can materially improve courtroom performance.

1. Informational Listening: Hearing the Facts Beneath the Words

- What it is: Informational listening focuses on accurately receiving and processing factual content. The goal is comprehension, not evaluation or rebuttal.
- Where it matters in trial: - Direct examination of witnesses - Opposing counsel's questions - Judicial instructions, rulings, and comments - Expert testimony
- How trial attorneys should use it:
- Trial lawyers often listen only for the moment they can object or respond. Informational listening requires resisting that impulse. Instead, the attorney listens carefully to:
- Exact word choices
- Chronology
- Quantifiers ("always," "never," "sometimes")

1. Informational Listening: Hearing the Facts Beneath the Words

- Unintended admissions or inconsistencies
- This type of listening allows counsel to: - Catch misstatements in real time - Spot openings for follow-up questions - Preserve issues for impeachment or closing
- Practice tip: During witness preparation, discipline yourself to not write your next question while the witness is speaking. Listen fully first; then decide whether to pivot, press, or move on.

2. Analytical (Critical) Listening: Evaluating Credibility and Structure

- What it is: Analytical listening evaluates the logic, coherence, and reliability of what is being said.
- Where it matters in trial: - Cross-examination - Expert testimony - Prosecutorial or opposing counsel arguments - Bench conferences
- How trial attorneys should use it:
- Here, the lawyer listens for: - Internal contradictions - Unsupported conclusions - Gaps between facts and opinions - Assumptions masquerading as evidence
- Analytical listening enables the attorney to dismantle testimony methodically rather than emotionally. Instead of reacting to what is said, the lawyer evaluates how it is constructed.
- This is especially critical when dealing with experts. The most effective cross-examinations arise not from memorized attacks, but from listening carefully to how an expert explains—or avoids explaining—their methodology.
- Practice tip: Ask yourself silently: Does this answer actually support the conclusion being offered? If not, that gap becomes your next question.

3. Strategic Listening: Anticipating the Next Move

- What it is: Strategic listening focuses on where testimony or argument is headed and how it fits into the broader theory of the case.
- Where it matters in trial: - Opening statements - Long narrative answers - Redirect examination - Closing arguments
- How trial attorneys should use it:
- Trial lawyers must listen with the end in mind. Strategic listening asks:
- How does this testimony advance or undermine the opposing theory?
- What will the jury remember from this?
- How can this be reframed later?
- This form of listening allows counsel to make real-time decisions—whether to object, let an answer linger, or save it for closing.
- Not every damaging answer should be challenged immediately. Strategic listening recognizes that some testimony is best neutralized later, when context and perspective can be restored.
- Practice tip: If an answer hurts you, pause mentally and ask: Is now the best moment to fight this—or is later better?

4. Empathic Listening: Understanding the Human Element

- What it is: Empathic listening seeks to understand emotions, motivations, and perspective—without necessarily agreeing.
- Where it matters in trial: - Direct examination of your own client - Cross-examination of sympathetic witnesses - Victim testimony - Sentencing hearings
- How trial attorneys should use it:
- Jurors and judges are acutely sensitive to tone. Empathic listening allows the attorney to:
- Adjust questioning style in real time
- Avoid appearing cruel or dismissive
- Build rapport and credibility
- This is especially important when examining vulnerable witnesses. An attorney who listens empathically can control the courtroom without alienating the factfinder.
- Empathy also informs strategy. Understanding why a witness believes something often reveals how that belief can be respectfully challenged.
- Practice tip: Match your pacing and tone to the witness's emotional state before gradually steering them where you need to go.

5. Judicial Listening: Listening for Signals from the Bench

- What it is: Judicial listening focuses on the court's reactions—verbal and nonverbal—to what is happening in the courtroom.
- Where it matters in trial: - Objections and rulings - Bench trials - Sentencing hearings - Motion practice during trial
- How trial attorneys should use it:
- Judges constantly communicate preferences through: - Interruptions - Follow-up questions - Body language - Tone of rulings
- An attorney who listens carefully to the court can adapt instantly—shortening arguments, reframing objections, or changing examination style.
- Ignoring these signals risks irritating the court and undermining credibility.
- Practice tip: Treat every ruling as information. Even an adverse ruling tells you how the judge is thinking.

6. Jury-Centered Listening: Hearing What the Jury Is Hearing

- What it is: Jury-centered listening involves monitoring how testimony and argument likely land with jurors.
- Where it matters in trial: - All phases of trial, especially openings and witness examinations
- How trial attorneys should use it:
- Listen with a juror’s ear: - Is this confusing? - Is this boring? - Is this emotionally off-putting?
- Trial lawyers often overestimate how much jurors understand or remember. Jury-centered listening keeps counsel grounded in clarity and persuasion.
- Practice tip: If you find yourself confused, the jury probably is too.

7. Self-Listening: Monitoring Your Own Advocacy

- What it is: Self-listening is awareness of your own tone, pace, and word choices.
- Where it matters in trial: - Cross-examination - Arguments to the court - High-stakes objections
- How trial attorneys should use it:
- Listening to yourself helps prevent: - Escalation - Sarcasm - Loss of control
- The most effective advocates sound calm and intentional—even under pressure.
- Practice tip: If your voice rises, slow down. Control of self precedes control of the courtroom.

How Listening Changes the Next Question

CROSS-EXAMINATION IN ACTION

Cross-Examination in Action

- Below are practical examples showing how each type of listening directly shapes the very next cross-examination question. These are moments where disciplined listening—not scripted questions—creates leverage.

1. Informational Listening → Precision Follow-Up

- Witness: “I arrived at the scene around 10:00 p.m.”
- What the lawyer hears (informational): - “Around” (approximation) - Potential uncertainty in timing
- Next question shaped by listening: > “When you say around 10:00 p.m., could it have been closer to 10:15?”
- Why it works: The lawyer exploits imprecision rather than assuming certainty. This small adjustment can later unravel timelines in closing.

2. Analytical Listening → Structural Breakdown

- Witness: “Based on my experience, that behavior indicates intent.”
- What the lawyer hears (analytical): - Conclusion offered without articulated foundation
- Next question shaped by listening: > “What specific behavior are you relying on to reach that conclusion?”
- Follow-up: > “And there’s nothing in your training that says that behavior always means intent, correct?”
- Why it works: The lawyer exposes the gap between facts and opinion without argument or hostility.

3. Strategic Listening → Delayed Attack

- Witness: “I never lost sight of the defendant.”
- What the lawyer hears (strategic): - Absolute language (“never”) - High impeachment value later
- Next decision shaped by listening: - No immediate challenge
- Later cross-examination: > “You testified earlier that you never lost sight of him. That was your testimony, correct?” > > “But you also told the officer your view was blocked for several seconds, didn’t you?”
- Why it works: Strategic listening recognizes when restraint creates a stronger contradiction.

4. Empathic Listening → Tone Adjustment

- Witness: “I was terrified. I didn’t know what was going to happen.”
- What the lawyer hears (empathic): - Fear, not exaggeration
- Next question shaped by listening: > “And when people are scared, it can affect what they think they see, correct?”
- Why it works: The lawyer reframes perception without attacking credibility, preserving jury goodwill.

5. Judicial Listening → Course Correction

- Judge: “Counsel, let’s move along.”
- What the lawyer hears (judicial): - Impatience with detail
- Next question shaped by listening: > “You did not actually see who threw the first punch, correct?”
- Why it works: The lawyer shortens the examination while landing the critical concession.

6. Jury-Centered Listening → Clarification

- Witness: “The accelerant caused a flashover event.”
- What the lawyer hears (jury-centered): - Technical jargon likely confusing jurors
- Next question shaped by listening: > “In plain English, that means the fire spread suddenly and unpredictably, right?”
- Why it works: The lawyer becomes the jury’s translator, building trust and clarity.

7. Self-Listening → Regaining Control

- Lawyer (internally): Notices voice rising, pacing increasing
- What the lawyer hears (self-listening): - Loss of control signals
- Next adjustment: > Pause. > > “Let me slow this down. You answered ‘yes’ to that question, correct?”
- Why it works: Control of tone restores authority and keeps the jury focused on substance, not emotion.
- Conclusion: Listening Is a Tactical Advantage
- These examples illustrate a core truth of trial practice: the best cross-examinations are built in real time. Scripted questions may start the process, but disciplined listening determines how it ends.
- Trial lawyers who listen well do not merely respond—they shape testimony, guide perception, and create record. In the courtroom, listening is not passive. It is power.