

Instructor's Manual

Chapter 2—Ethics Matters: Understanding the Ethics of Public Speaking

Section Learning Objective:

1. Explain how the three levels of the ethics pyramid might be used in evaluating the ethical choices of a public speaker or listener.

Chapter 2 – Sections 1–2 Outline

- I. The Ethics Pyramid, a model developed by Elspeth Tilley, proposes three basic concepts: intent, means, and ends.
 - A. Speakers will prepare their remarks with the intention of telling the truth, explains Dr. Tilley.
 1. Similarly, an ethical listener keeps an open mind, listening to the speaker before making judgments.
 2. One way to assess intent is to seek feedback from others; how ethical do they think a behavior or a remark is?
 3. A second way to assess intent is to check out existing codes of ethics.
 4. Third, consider whether a behavior is beneficial for the majority, or whether you would approve of the same behavior from someone else.
 5. Sometimes people can engage in unethical behavior unintentionally; plagiarism often occurs when a speaker uses a phrase or content, forgetting that he or she read it in someone else's work.
 - B. Means are the tools or behaviors we use to achieve a desired outcome.
 1. We have choices about which means to employ in persuading others.
 2. Threats and other forms of manipulation are unethical behaviors.
 3. Making a respectful request is ethical.
 - C. Ends are the outcomes you hope to achieve, say McCroskey, Wrench, and Richmond.
 1. Some end results could be good for the source (speaker) but bad for the receiver (listener).

2. An example would be persuading audience members to buy something they don't actually want.
 3. Your goal should be chosen according to ethical standards you and your audience expect from each other.
- D. Understanding ethics is a matter of balancing all three parts of the ethical pyramid.
1. Tilley recommends testing the ethics of a given behavior by asking:
 - a. "Have I discussed the ethicality of the behavior with others and come to a general consensus that the behavior is ethical?"
 - b. "Does the behavior adhere to known codes of ethics?"
 - c. "Would I be happy if the outcomes of the behavior were reversed and applied to me?"

Section Key Terms

Ends: the outcomes one desires to achieve

Intent: the degree to which an individual is cognitively aware of her or his behavior, the means one uses, and the ends one achieves.

Means: the tools or behaviors that one employs to achieve a desired outcome.

Section Exercises

1. Can you think of a time when you intended to have a "good" end and employed "good" means, but you ended up accomplishing a "bad" end? Why do you think our ends are not always in line with our intentions?

Possible outcomes:

A student, in the spirit of honesty, reveals information that spoils a surprise party.

A student, in the spirit of camaraderie, says to someone, "It's good to talk to you. I'll see you at the party." The second person has not been invited to the party, and now knows he/she is excluded.

A student, out of honest concern, conveys information about the threatened health about a third person. The third person's medical privacy is violated.

A student, intending to be supportive, offers advice to an acquaintance. That individual feels insulted and feels s/he is being treated as a helpless child.

Ends are not always in line with our intentions when there is important information that's unknown or misunderstood.

2. Ursula is developing a speech on the importance of organ donation. She has found lots of impressive statistics in her research but feels she needs an interesting story to really make

an impression on her audience and persuade them to become organ donors. Ursula can't find a true story she really likes, so she takes elements of several stories and pieces them together into a single story. Her speech is a huge success and six of classmates sign up to be organ donors immediately after her presentation. How do we decide whether Ursula's behavior is ethical?

Possible outcomes:

Someone might cite the three questions offered by Tilley as a way to assess ethical rigor. Someone might observe that Ursula is taking liberties with the truth.

Someone might comment that a true story ought to be more compelling than a contrived story.

Someone might claim that they would feel manipulated or betrayed if anyone had used such a dishonest tactic to persuade them to do something.

Some students might not see anything wrong with what Ursula did. In that case, the instructor might ask if students believe Ursula was honest in the fullest possible way. The instructor might also remind students of Tilley's third question: "Would I be happy if the outcomes of the behavior were reversed and applied to me?"

The instructor can cite the case of James Frey, author of *A Million Little Pieces*. The book was represented as a memoir of drug addiction and triumph over addiction. Oprah Winfrey selected the book for Oprah's Book Club, and many people read the book and found that it helped them. Then it was found that many events and details were embellished or exaggerated. Readers felt betrayed, and Oprah herself was so outraged that she invited Frey to her show a second time in order to publicly give him a piece of her mind.

The instructor can ask the class what they believe Ursula should have done instead of the strategy she used.

3. Pablo has been scheduled to work late several nights this week and is very tired by the time his Public Speaking class rolls around in the late afternoon. One of his classmates gives a speech about environmental sustainability and Pablo does not really pay attention to what his classmate is saying. After the speech, Pablo's teacher asks him to critique the speech. Because he doesn't really know what happened in the speech, Pablo makes a general statement that the speech was pretty good, that the delivery was okay, and that the organization was fine. Using the ethics pyramid as a guide, in what ways might Pablo's response be ethical? In what ways might it be unethical? What are Pablo's responsibilities as an ethical listener?

Possible outcomes:

Pablo probably does not follow Tilley's first suggestion about seeking the feedback about what he will say in his so-called critique.

Faking a critique violates many professional codes of ethics.

Pablo probably would not like it much if someone tuned his speech out and then gave unhelpful feedback about it.

Pablo's feedback about the organization of the speech might be ethical if he and his classmate had read each others' outlines, and if the organization of the speech actually was fine. However, if Pablo tuned the speech out, his feedback on delivery is entirely fictional.

Pablo's responsibilities as a listener are to be attentive and open-minded, to assess the speech after all the information had been delivered, and to provide truthful feedback.

Chapter 2 – Section 3

Section Learning Objectives:

1. Understand how to apply the National Communication Association's (NCA) Credo for Ethical Communication within the context of public speaking.
2. Understand how you can apply ethics to your public speaking preparation process.

Chapter 2 – Section 3 Outline

- I. The National Communication Association Credo for Ethical Communication is a statement of their values about ethics in human communication.
 - A. The credo emphasizes responsibility, dignity, fairness, and respect.
 - B. Through the credo, the NCA expresses its commitment to following principles of ethical communication (paraphrased):
 1. Truthfulness, accuracy, honesty, and reason.
 - a. Public speakers should be concerned with information honesty.
 - b. Public speakers should also be upfront about where their information comes from.
 - c. Public speakers should be careful to avoid plagiarism.
 - i. Plagiarism is using someone else's words or ideas without giving credit.
 - ii. There are eight reasons for why it's important to cite one's sources.
 - a. Citing sources helps you avoid plagiarism.
 - b. Citing sources allows others to find where you are getting your information from.
 - c. Citing sources is always a great way to bolster one's credibility.

- d. Citing sources allows one to demonstrate that her or his ideas are well researched.
 - e. Citing sources allows you to demonstrate one's understanding of the relevant literature on a topic and a speaker's intent to expand or challenge that literature.
 - f. Citing sources enhances the arguments a speaker is making.
 - g. Academics spend their entire career building their base of intellectual property and citing those sources ensures we do not steal from each other.
 - h. Citing sources is simply the ethical thing to do.
2. Freedom of expression, diversity of perspective and tolerance of dissent.
 3. Understanding of and respect for other communicators before passing judgment.
 4. Access to communication resources and opportunities for the purpose of promoting the well-being of families, communities, and society.
 5. Communication climates of caring, mutual understanding, and respect.
 6. Condemnation of distortion, intimidation, coercion, violence intolerance, hate speech, violence, or other behavior that degrades people.
 7. Support for the expression of personal convictions in pursuit of fairness and justice.
 8. Advocate sharing information, opinions, and feelings while respecting privacy and confidentiality.
 9. Responsibility for the short- and long-term consequences of our communication.
- C. We advocate truthfulness, accuracy, honesty, and reason as essential to the integrity of communication.
1. In a few cases, speakers blatantly lie.
 2. More often, speakers exaggerate or omit relevant facts.
 3. Either behavior distorts information.

4. Distortion violates the relationship between speaker and listener.
 5. Distorted information comes from sources with hidden agendas, such as the websites of hate groups.
 6. We are obligated to disclose the sources from which we obtain the information in our speeches.
 7. We are obligated to avoid all plagiarism.
 - a. The American Psychological Association says that ethical speakers do not claim “words and ideas of another as their own; they give credit where credit is due.”
 - b. When writing, we use quotation marks to delineate the words and ideas from other sources.
 - c. When speaking, we should state out loud what the source of our information is.
 - d. Plagiarism is such a serious offense that it has undermined the academic and professional careers of several highly placed people.
 - e. Plagiarism applies both to direct quotations and to paraphrased ideas.
 - f. Great care must be exerted to avoid misleading listeners or using citation shortcuts that could mislead listeners, but instead, quote directly from original sources.
 - g. Eight Reasons to Cite Sources
 - i. Citing sources helps you avoid plagiarism.
 - ii. Citing sources allows others to find where you are getting your information from.
 - iii. Citing sources is always a great way to bolster one’s credibility.
 - iv. Citing sources allows one to demonstrate that her or his ideas are well researched.
 - v. Citing sources allows you to demonstrate one’s understanding of the relevant literature on a topic and a speaker’s intent to expand or challenge that literature.
 - vi. Citing sources enhances the arguments a speaker is making.
 - vii. Academics spend their entire career building their base of intellectual property and citing those sources ensures we do not steal from each other.
 - viii. Citing sources is simply the ethical thing to do.
- D. We endorse freedom of expression, diversity of perspective, and tolerance of dissent to achieve the informed and responsible decision making fundamental to a civil society.
1. A civil society depends upon at least three things:
 - b. Freedom of expression
 - c. Diversity of perspective
 - d. Tolerance of dissent

2. Informed and responsible decisions can only be made if all members of society are free to express their thoughts and opinions – even those that disagree with accepted authority.
 3. Diversity of perspectives us to be more fully informed.
 4. Ethical communicators will be receptive to dissent no matter how strongly they may disagree with the speaker’s message.
- E. We strive to understand and respect other communicators before evaluating and responding to their messages.
1. We often let our perceptions . . . determine our opinions.
 2. We may find ourselves judging a speaker based on information we have heard about him or her from other people.
 3. We might find it difficult to listen to the content of the speech and, instead, work on creating a rebuttal the entire time the speaker is talking. When this happens, we do not strive to understand the speaker and do not respect the speaker.
 4. As speakers, we do ourselves and our audiences a disservice when we downplay, distort, or refuse to mention important arguments on the other side.
- F. We promote access to communication resources and opportunities as necessary to fulfill human potential and contribute to the well-being of families, communities, and society.
- G. We promote communication climates of caring and mutual understanding that respect the unique needs and characteristics of individual communicators.
1. Speakers should take a two-pronged approach to addressing audiences.
 - a. Caring about the audience means that you avoid setting up a manipulative climate. If you make an honest effort to speak to your audience with their best interests at heart, you are more likely to create persuasive arguments that are not just manipulative appeals.
 - b. Understanding your audience means learning as much as possible about the audience: audience analysis.
 2. We must be open with our audiences so that our intentions and perceptions are clear. Nothing alienates an audience faster than a speaker with a hidden agenda unrelated to the stated purpose of the speech.
- H. We condemn communication that degrades individuals and humanity through distortion, intimidation, coercion, and violence, and through the expression of intolerance and hatred.

1. Distortion occurs when someone purposefully twists information in a way that detracts from its original meaning.
 2. Expressions of intolerance and hatred, which should be avoided, include using ageist, heterosexist, racist, sexist, or any other form of speech that demeans or belittles a group of people.
 3. At the same time, it is important for listeners to pay attention to expressions of intolerance or hatred. Extremist speakers sometimes attempt to disguise their true agendas by avoiding bigoted “buzzwords” and using mild-sounding terms instead.
- I. We are committed to the courageous expression of personal convictions in pursuit of fairness and justice.
 - J. We advocate sharing information, opinions, and feelings when facing significant choices while also respecting privacy and confidentiality.
 1. This ethical principle involves balancing personal disclosure with discretion; your listeners have a right to know the difference between facts and personal opinions.
 2. Similarly, we have an obligation to respect others’ privacy and confidentiality; when you have a great anecdote one of your friends told you in confidence, it is best to seek permission before using the information in a speech.
 - K. We accept responsibility for the short- and long-term consequences of our own communication and expect the same of others.
 1. We live in a society where a speaker’s message can be heard around the world in a matter of minutes, sometimes with regrettable consequences.
 2. Washing one’s hands of responsibility is unacceptable. Although it is certainly not always the speaker’s fault if someone commits an act of violence, the speaker should take responsibility for her or his role in the situation.
 3. Furthermore, attempting to persuade a group of people to take any action means you should make sure that you understand the consequences of that action.

Section Key Terms

Ageist language: language that demeans an individual because of her or his age.

Credo: a formal statement of core beliefs and principles.

Distortion: purposefully twisting information in a way that detracts from its original meaning.

Heterosexist language: language that assumes that all members within an audience are heterosexual or is intended to demean non-heterosexual audience members.

Plagiarism: using someone else's words or ideas without giving credit.

Racist language: language that demeans an entire race of people or people within a specific ethnic group, or an individual because he or she belongs to a specific race of ethnic group.

Sexist language: language that demeans or excludes one of the biological sexes.

Section Exercise

1. Fill out the "Public Speaking Ethics Checklist" while thinking about your first speech. Did you select any "true" answers? If so, why? What can you do as a speaker to get to the point where you can check them all "false"?

Possible outcomes:

Students might comment that they don't understand how one would know which sources are credible (item 4). If the instructor is pre-acquainted with the section of Chapter 7 that addresses research, she or he could comment on the qualifications, reputation, timeliness, and completeness of the source. She or he might use a few examples. The issue of credibility is related to whether or not, in good judgment, one should trust a source. A speaker should resist the temptation, for example, to use the very first website they find that agrees with her or his opinion.

Students might comment that they don't know how to go about thinking of their audience's needs and desires (item 6). If the instructor is pre-acquainted with Chapter 5 on audience analysis, she or he can cite some specific examples of traits shared by all members of the audience and also some differences, such as majors, life goals, and so on.

Students might comment that asking them to consider the long-term consequences of their speech is asking too much. They might make the objection that they have no crystal ball and cannot possibly see into the future. The instructor can then point out the key terms (ageist language, etc.) to show students that they indeed can make some reasonable inferences about the responses of others.

Students might be reluctant to be truthful about their answers to the ethics checklist. If this happens, an instructor can talk about his or her own mistakes in the past and ask students if they have ever had similar experiences. For example, it is easy to make the mistake in item 10: "I sometimes blend in my personal opinions when discussing actual facts during the speech." Such an error sometimes occurs in a sentence that begins with, "Most people . . ." It is not always easy to distinguish between assumptions and opinions, and facts. This mistake is not always made with malice and forethought; it might simply be a mistake, though one that must be avoided.

2. Robert is preparing a speech about legalizing marijuana use in the United States. He knows that his roommate wrote a paper on the topic last semester and asks his roommate about the paper in an attempt to gather information. During his speech, Robert orally cites his roommate by name as a source of his information but does not report that the source is his roommate,

whose experience is based on writing a paper. In what ways does Robert’s behavior violate the guidelines set out in the NCA Credo for Ethical Communication?

Possible outcomes:

Students might refer to the first item: “We advocate truthfulness, accuracy, honesty, and reason as essential to the integrity of communication.” They might also quote the sentence, “The second part of the information-honesty is to fully disclose where we obtain the information in our speeches.” They, or the instructor, might further comment that any attempt to mislead the audience is unethical, no matter what the purpose of the speech is. Responses such as this will be easier for students who have a printout of the chapter than for students who rely fully on the electronic version.

A very thorough student might refer to distortion (listed in item 6) and say that although it doesn’t directly disparage anyone in particular, withholding details about the source does show disrespect for the audience by hiding the full truth.

Students might refer to the last item in the Credo: “We accept responsibility for the short- and long-term consequences of our own communication and expect the same of others.” If not, the instructor can mention it. Because of new communication technology and the sometimes irresponsible use of it, people are caught in lies and misrepresentations more often than ever. If audience members find out a speaker has played fast and loose with the truth, they might feel betrayed. The instructor might also point out the earlier question: “Would I be happy of the outcomes of the behavior were reversed and applied to me?”

Chapter 2 – Section 4

Section Learning Objectives:

1. Define the concept of free speech and discuss its origins.
2. Discuss the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution in terms of free speech.
3. Describe how free speech relates to other freedoms guaranteed by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Chapter 2 – Section 4 Outline

- I. What is Free Speech?
 - A. According to *Merriam Webster’s Dictionary of Law*, free speech entails “the right to express information, ideas, and opinions free of government restrictions based on content and subject only to reasonable limitations (as the power of the government to avoid a clear and present danger) esp. as guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.”
 - B. Why Free Speech is Important for Public Speakers

1. Expressing information and ideas is the purpose of public speaking.
2. Free speech allows us, as audience members, to hear and consider multiple points of view so that we can make more informed decisions.

II. The First Amendment to the Constitution

A. Free Speech is solidified in the Bill of Rights

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

B. Limitations to Free Speech

1. 2007 Supreme Court decision in the Morse et al. v. Frederick case or the “Bong Hits for Jesus” case.
2. Free speech is constantly being debated by politicians, judges, and the public, even within the United States, where this right has been discussed for over two hundred years.

Section Key Term

Free speech: The right to express information, ideas, and opinions free of government restrictions based on content and subject only to reasonable limitations.

Section Exercise

1. What are your campus’s internal codes on speech and free speech? Do you have free speech areas on campus? If so, how are they used and regulated?

Possible outcome:

Most students don’t even realize that college campuses have speech codes, so this is a good opportunity to discuss free speech on a college campus. You may even ask them to research the free speech codes prior to class to have a more robust discussion.

2. Some college campuses have experienced controversy in recent years when they invited speakers such as Ward Churchill or those who deny that the Holocaust occurred to campus. Discuss in a small group how these controversies reflect the importance of free speech in our society.

Possible outcome:

This exercise can easily and quickly turn into a debate, so it’s very important to set the parameters for the discussion upfront to avoid hostility within the class. The goal of this activity

is to discuss how controversies and listening to controversial people can actually be a worthwhile academic endeavor.