


1993

Teaching Ethics in Introductory Public Speaking: Review and Proposal

Jon A. Hess

University of Dayton, jhess1@udayton.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca>

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), [Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Commons](#), [Mass Communication Commons](#), [Other Communication Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hess, Jon A. (1993) "Teaching Ethics in Introductory Public Speaking: Review and Proposal," *Basic Communication Course Annual*: Vol. 5, Article 9.

Available at: <http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol5/iss1/9>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Communication at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Basic Communication Course Annual by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

Teaching Ethics in Introductory Public Speaking: Review and Proposal*

Jon A. Hess

One topic that is not a high priority in most public speaking classes is ethics. Gibson, Hanna, and Huddleston (1985) found this when they surveyed 552 institutions of higher education in the United States. They wrote, "Perhaps the more surprising finding is what is *not* ranked among the top ten topics in time spent in instruction. The absence of ethics and rhetorical criticism from the 'top ten' in classes using the public speaking orientation ... provide[s] interesting, if not puzzling, questions about instructional priorities" (pp. 286-287).

The failure to teach communication ethics in our introductory speech course is a serious problem. Public speaking is a tool that can be used for good or for bad purposes, and students need to consider the moral dimension of their public speaking. Although speech teachers cannot be sure that their students will use the skills they learned in their public speaking class ethically, they can at least be sure that if students speak unethically it is by choice, not out of ignorance.

One difficulty teachers face in teaching any content area is the brevity of a single course. It is difficult to cover any topic thoroughly, especially a complex topic like ethics. Although teachers cannot expect that students will command a thorough grasp of speech ethics after their first course, the

*An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL: November 1, 1992.

importance of including ethics in the introductory course goes beyond just the content students learn. Teaching ethics in the introductory course establishes the topic as one that is central to the act of public speaking. *Not* teaching ethics implicitly sends the message that the topic is less important than other topics, a message that is ill advised. Johnson (1970) suggested that "it may be that the most 'immoral' person is not he [or she] who makes 'wrong' decisions, but he [or she] who consistently neglects to consider the moral implications of decisions he [or she] does make" (p. 60). Todd-Mancillas (1987) echoed Johnson's concern when he wrote, "one of my greatest concerns is that we may well be helping an entire generation of students to presume the unimportance of asking fundamentally important questions about the rightness or wrongness of given communication strategies" (p. 12).

The need for teaching speech ethics is clear. In many cases, students are unsure (beyond basic issues) what is ethical in public speaking and what is not. In part, this may be due to a lack of role model or other source of ethical ideals for many people. Many of the examples set by our country's leaders are not conducive to positive moral growth. Jensen (1991) wrote, "The general public in recent years has been stirred to worry about ethics as a result of scandals in government, influence peddling, Pentagon waste, insider trading, exposes by whistle blowers, life and death issues in health care, raping of the environment, televangelist escapades, and media manipulations" (p. xi). Although some students will have learned ethical values at home, the high rate of broken families (Brehm, 1992) may mean that some students will not get adequate guidance there, either. The recent rash of sexual abuse cases within religious institutions suggests that even churches are not always successful at providing a strong moral foundation for youth. Furthermore, students who have had ample opportunity to learn ethical standards may not have considered ethical standards specific to public speaking. Thus, teachers should not assume that

students will be well versed in ethical choices or that they will consider ethical behavior to be an important aspect of public speaking if the issue is not included in the class.

A look at public speaking textbooks may shed light on why ethics are not taught much. A content analysis of top-selling introductory speech books revealed that explicit discussion of ethics averaged just 3.3 pages per text. By way of comparison, textbook authors wrote twice as much about selecting a topic, and three times as much about outlining (Hess & Pearson, 1992). A more extensive study of introductory speech texts found that ethics commanded just 2.0 pages per text, and in a third of the texts sampled ethics were covered in one page or less. That figure included three texts that did not even mention ethics (Hess, 1992). These studies show that introductory speech texts do not include much discussion of ethical choices.

It should be made clear that these content analyses only examined *explicit* discussion of ethics in introductory speech texts. Many people would argue that by discounting implicit discussion of ethics, the content analyses falsely minimize the treatment of ethics in public speaking texts. For example, most texts discuss proper documenting of sources, proper reasoning (as well as fallacious reasoning), and credibility. Clearly, these concepts come from expectations of ethical speech. Thus, by teaching the importance of citing sources, reasoning properly, and gaining credibility, public speaking textbooks ground their content in ethical ideals.

While this grounding is indeed a positive reflection on the integrity of the communication discipline, it does not help the student who has a question about whether a particular source needs to be cited in a speech, or who wonders whether a omitting relevant information at a certain point is unethical. Students need to be made aware of what the ethical questions are, and they need to be armed with ways to answer these questions. Only explicit discussion of ethics can create this type of awareness.

The preceding discussion may seem to imply that there is one clear conception of ethics that students need to learn for public speaking. That interpretation could not be further from the truth. If there were a simple code of ethics, it would be easy to put in a textbook or recite in a classroom lecture, and ethics would not warrant much discussion. Because there is great disagreement among scholars about what communication behaviors are ethical and what are not, the topic is important for classroom attention. Since both the questions and the answers are elusive, ethical issues are difficult to teach.

The downplaying of ethical considerations in most popular public speaking texts may lead to under emphasis of the topic in classroom lectures and discussion. If teachers simply follow their textbook's content, they will downplay the importance of ethical questions. In order to integrate ethical considerations fully into the course, instructors must supplement the text's material. Unfortunately, many educators are not well equipped to do so. Anecdotal evidence from Arnett (1988) and survey evidence from Gibson et al. (1985, 1990) indicates that many basic course instructors are graduate teaching assistants, adjunct faculty, and new instructors; these teachers may not be prepared to supplement the text when discussing ethics. Even seasoned professors whose interests lie outside communication ethics may not be well versed in ethical theory.

In this article I provide supplementary material for introductory public speaking teachers who wish to incorporate a more extensive discussion of ethics into their public speaking class than what their textbook offers. First, a review of what teachers can expect to find in texts is presented. Then, some theoretical foundations for conceptualizing ethics are presented. Finally, one possible outline for a class lecture and a smorgasbord of ideas are presented to provide concrete suggestions for teaching public speaking ethics. Of course, the

information presented here is just one possibility for teaching ethics, not the only correct way.

REVIEW OF TEXTS' CONTENT

Research on introductory speech texts indicated that explicit coverage of ethics is both minimal and inconsistent (Hess, 1992). The content analysis produced this outline of topics included in half or more of the texts surveyed (p. 269):

- I. Importance of ethics in public speaking
- II. Discussion of what is ethical (in general)
 - A. Suggested standards for making ethical decisions
- III. How to practice good ethics
 - A. Use ethical methods
 1. Prepare the speech well
 - a. Know the material well — be thoroughly informed
 2. Be honest and clear in your presentation of the material
 - a. Be honest — don't lie to the audience

As can be seen from the outline, discussion of ethics was not well developed in the textbooks. Introductory public speaking texts often provided arguments for why ethics are important, discussed some general ethical guidelines (not specific to public speaking), and then provided some suggestions for how to speak ethically. Although many texts suggested some ethical standards for decision-making (point IIA), each text had different information. Only two specific suggestions — be well-informed and be honest--were provided in at least half the texts studied. In some cases, textbooks contradicted each other's guidelines.

This research indicates that textbook treatment of ethics is typically a listing of a few sundry suggestions, confined to a

page or two of text. The wide variety in content among the books is important for instructors to be aware of, because they may wish to compare discussion of ethics when selecting a text. Furthermore, instructors should be aware that more recent texts seem to have a better treatment of ethics than the books of several years ago. One new public speaking textbook has a better discussion of ethics than the texts sampled in this study, and some of the texts analyzed have included more extensive discussions of ethics in 1993 editions.

SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHING ETHICS

Ethics are "principles used for determining what is good and right" (Haskins, 1989, p. 96; italics removed). Since scholars do not always agree about what is ethical and what is not, educators cannot simply prescribe a recipe approach to communication ethics. That is, they cannot say "Do this and you will communicate ethically." Rather, teachers must provide some guidelines for decision-making, and they need to prepare students with the critical thinking skills necessary to evaluate each situation and make the best possible judgment with the available information. The following principles are suggested as guidelines to help students understand the nature of communication ethics and to evaluate ethical merit to a communicative transaction. Four principles are discussed — rights and responsibilities, accountability, affirmative perspective, and degree of ethical quality.

Underlying Principles

Rights and Responsibilities. Two lines of ethical reasoning can be delineated in scholarly writings. The first is composed of theories that consider ethics a matter of assuring individual rights, or justice. An example is Kohlberg's work on moral development. Kohlberg's ethical system is based on "principles of justice, of reciprocity and equality of human

rights, and of respect for the dignity of human beings as individuals" (Kohlberg, 1981, p. 19). The second line of scholarship is composed of theories that consider ethics a matter of responsibility. Gilligan's work on an ethic of care exemplifies this type of theory. This ethical system is "...concerned with responsibility based on caring, empathy, and inclusion. Moral dilemmas are characterized by conflicting responsibilities among a web of enmeshed relationships..." (Bloom, 1990, p. 246).

These two lines of reasoning must converge to form a better conceptualization of ethics. Rights are privileges that a community owes an individual, and responsibilities are obligations the individual has to the community. By considering only one or the other in their theories, ethicists have ignored half the relevant data. Either concept can be oppressive if pushed to extremes. Organizations have often abused their power by suppressing dissent in the name of responsibility to the group, and unjustified slander has sometimes been excused because of the right to free speech.

Ethical behavior balances the rights of individuals with their responsibilities to the community. It is not simply an average of the two dimensions, but rather, a synthesis of the two. Some scholars have argued for this type of ethical standard. Bloom (1990) and Gilligan (1982) have argued for a transcendental ethic that combines elements from both male (justice: rights based) and female (care: responsibility-based) styles of communication and ethical reasoning. However, the way in which rights and responsibilities should be synthesized is not always clear.

Martin Buber's philosophy provides a good way to synthesize rights and responsibilities. Buber's concept of the narrow ridge embraces both concepts. As Arnett (1986) explained,

The "narrow ridge" in human communication involves a balancing of one's concern for self and others. One must be open to the other's viewpoint and willing to alter one's position based upon appropriate and just cause, if necessary.

However, ...being concerned for oneself and the other does not necessarily mean a compromise or an acceptance of another's viewpoint (p. 36).

To employ a narrow ridge perspective, the actor has to recognize both the rights to one's own viewpoint and the responsibility to listen to other's views. Narrow ridge thinking does not compel the actor to just find a middle ground (compromise), but rather it compels him or her to find a mutually satisfying solution based on commitment to some principle. This notion squares with Bloom's suggestion for a transcendental ethic that "would not be a simple combination of the justice and care orientation; it would be something quite different from either" (p. 251). Two examples demonstrate how a narrow ridge between rights and responsibility can be implemented.

The first example involves a recent controversy at Yellowstone National Park. In the spring of 1992, a national news network reported a conflict between land owners bordering Yellowstone Park and park officials. Land owners were drilling wells on their property; geologists and park officials believed that action would endanger the parks main attraction—its geysers. Park officials argued that the park had the right to prohibit the use of these wells to protect its geysers. Land owners argued that they had the right to do what they wanted with their land.

If ethics are conceptualized only in terms of rights, an impasse has been reached between the competing rights. However, if responsibilities are also considered, ethical behaviors can be determined. Although both parties do have the right to protect and use their land, they also have a responsibility to their community--the American public. Given that Yellowstone Park is a national treasure, the land owners have the responsibility to join the rest of the nation in preserving it. However, the U. S. government also has a responsibility to its citizens. Since land owners would be making a sacrifice for the community good by not drilling wells, the government

would need to compensate the land owners in some manner to facilitate their compliance. For example, tax credits might help the land owners afford a different source of water for their livestock (or swimming pool, in the case of one land owner).

A second case was described by Sandmann (1992), who addressed the issue of hate speech on college campuses. Sandmann argued that the rights to free speech and the rights of the victim conflict when hate speech happens. Without denying either side their rights, he argued that the most ethical solution was to consider the right of the victim to reply. Sandmann argued that if colleges are going to tolerate hate speech as a First Amendment right, they should also provide the victims a medium with which to respond to the charges.

This solution seems reasonable, but there is another way to analyze the situation: while people do indeed have the right to free speech, they also have the responsibility to the subject of their communication. This means that if the message is damaging to its subject, speakers have a responsibility to be sure the charges are accurate. Evidence for claims should be provided, reasoning should be carefully and honestly explained, and the speaker should not remain anonymous (as in the case of graffiti writers who paint hateful messages on walls).

In practice, this ethical system would address hate speech this way. If a hate-speaker wishes to say that people with a certain characteristic deserve to die, he or she needs to explain why those people are a threat to others, provide sound evidence, explain why death is the best solution, and then be willing to listen open-mindedly to contrary views. Given that hate speech will happen Sandmann's solution seems to be the most ethical *response*. The principles described here are intended to suggest the most ethical *alternative* to the potential hate-speech act.

Affirmative Perspective. Speech ethics are often taught as a list of limitations on communication behavior (e.g., do not knowingly use false reasoning, do not plagiarize, etc.). However, ethical principles actually create as many new options as they prohibit. An analogy from Shames (1989) makes this clear: the rules in baseball could be viewed as a prohibitive (if the batter did not have to hit the ball in fair territory, he or she would have more options on any pitch). However, the rules are what makes the game possible. Ethics should be viewed as affirmatively as the rules of baseball. Ethical standards make society possible. If there were no agreed-upon codes of conduct, no one could be trusted in any situation. Geewax (1992) noted, "Ethical behavior is the keystone of capitalism. Free markets cannot operate efficiently without participants being committed to keeping promises, telling the truth, and dealing fairly" (p. 11B).

Often, ethics are most salient when unethical behavior is desired by someone who finds certain unethical actions more profitable in some sense. Students may find that acting ethically prohibits something they would like to do (for instance, present an atypical example of how bad the school's bureaucracy is as an example of how the system always operates), but most of the time ethical behavior goes unnoticed and is beneficial to them. Students expect that when information is presented in a speech it has not been fabricated. The assumption of honesty is an example of how ethical standards guide routine decisions. Students should conceptualize ethics as guidelines for all decision-making, not just limitations to their options.

Accountability. Perhaps the single most important point to make to beginning speakers is that they are held accountable for everything they say in public. The notion that people can escape accountability for their words is not acceptable in our society. The fact that the words were spoken in a class setting does not grant the rhetor immunity from this principle. A speech in the classroom is very much part of the "real

world." Classroom speeches influence audience members, and should be subject to all the same ethical standards that a speech in a different arena is expected to uphold.

The principle of accountability is based on rights and responsibilities. In our society, speakers have the right to say whatever they want (the right to free speech), but they must take responsibility for the consequences of their communication. If a given communicative act has negative consequences for that speaker, he or she is obligated to accept them. Listeners have the right to expect a person's behavior to be consistent with his or her words. The affirmative view of ethics is especially relevant to accountability. If people were not held accountable for their words, coordinated social action would be dictated by the party with the power (however illegitimate that power may be) to subordinate others. Thus, ethics can be seen to have a constructive impact on social transactions.

The world is full of examples of speakers who have been punished for unethical speech. A university dean was fired for plagiarizing a speech, and an owner of a major league baseball team was recently suspended for alleged racist remarks. All public speakers, in the classroom or wherever, will be accountable for what they say.

Degree of Ethical Quality. Jensen (1985) argued that people should think of ethical quality as a continuum, not a dichotomy. Rather than ask "is it ethical?" students should ask, "how ethical is it?" He proposed this seven-point Likert scale to rate ethical quality (p. 327):

Unethical			Neutral				Ethical
Highly	Moderately	Slightly		Slightly	Moderately	Highly	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

There are two reasons the ethical quality idea is important. First, with just two categories students must assume that an act is either totally good or totally bad, which is clearly inadequate for dealing with the complexities of our human social transactions. Second, when using a dichotomy, once an act has been labeled unethical, there is no reason to evaluate it any further. However, if the scale is more flexible, students must think more carefully when evaluating. The ethical quality scale encourages students to put more thought into their judgments.

LECTURE IDEAS

Provided here is one possible outline for a lecture on ethics in public speaking. It is intended to help students think clearly about the importance of communicating ethically, to provide them with a basic understanding of the nature of communication ethics, and to provide some specific guidelines for ethical behavior. Obviously, this outline is intended to be heuristic in value. Instructors should tailor it to meet their own needs and interests.

The specific suggestions presented in this outline (point IV) were compiled from these introductory public speaking texts: Bradley (1991), DeVito (1990), Hanna and Gibson (1989), Lucas (1989), Nelson and Pearson (1993), Osborn and Osborn (1991), Samovar and Mills (1989), Sproule (1991), and Verderber (1991).

I. Importance of ethics

- A. Speech communication is a tool with that can have a profound impact on people. It can be used for good or bad ends. There are many reasons why speakers should want to speak ethically.
 - 1. A few reasons for communicating ethically
 - a. Ethical behavior is the glue that holds society together. If people don't act ethi-

cally, then violence and repression is the alternative to prevent anarchy.

- b. Life is much more difficult when you cannot trust your neighbor. Without honesty and integrity in communication, friendship is difficult.
 - c. If society's members acted ethically, billions of dollars would be saved in law enforcement, consumer protection, legal cases, etc. This money could be used to benefit everyone.
 - d. Unethical communication causes great pain and suffering in many cases (you might want to provide examples here — there is an inexhaustible supply).
2. Self-benefiting reasons (i.e., even if a speaker is only concerned with his or her own well-being, there are still good reasons to communicate ethically)
 - a. Unethical communication, when discovered, can have negative consequences. These consequences range from as minor as a verbal reprimand to as major as loss of job or divorce by spouse.
 - b. Ethical communication in tough situations can earn the respect of colleagues, friends, and the general public.
 3. What other reasons can students suggest for the importance of ethical public speaking?

II. Bases of ethical communication

A. Rights and responsibilities

1. Either concept alone can be oppressive

- a. **Unchecked, individual rights permit a person to commit offenses in the name of rights to free speech, etc.**
 - b. **Unchecked, responsibility to a group/ community eliminate a person's chance to go against the majority's will.**
- B. Affirmative perspective**
 1. **Ethical systems allow people to live together in harmony, providing guidelines for routine and mutually satisfying decisions.**
 2. **Consider ethics as guidelines for daily decision-making, not just a list of prohibited behaviors.**
- C. Accountability**
 1. **Speakers are accountable for everything they say. That is, they are expected to accept the consequences--positive or negative — of their communication.**
 2. **Suggestions**
 - a. **If you're not sure if information is correct, tell the audience.**
 - b. **Distinguish between your opinion and fact.**
 - c. **Do not attempt to mislead the audience in any way.**
- D. Degree of ethical quality**
 1. **Don't force ethical judgments into one of two categories: ethical or unethical. Realize that the complexities of our world mean that almost any action can have some ethical and some unethical qualities to it. Some acts are more ethical (or unethical) than others.**

III. General guidelines for ethical public speaking

A. Honesty is the best policy

1. While there arguably are a few occasions when deceiving the audience is ethical, the speaker bears the burden of proof. Reasons for deceiving the audience must be compelling; lying to the audience is *rarely* ethical.

B. Many strategies can be ethical or unethical, depending on how they're used. A few examples illustrate this:

1. Arousing emotion

- a. If it is justified (this is the difficult part to determine), then it is an acceptable strategy.
 - i. Consider Martin Luther King's "I have a dream speech" for an example of justified emotional appeal (appeal to ideals).
 - ii. Consider Adolf Hitler's rhetoric for an example of unjustified emotional appeal (appeal to prejudice).

2. Using statistics

- a. Statistics can be informative or misleading. If statistics are intentionally used to deceive, the speaker communicated unethically.

IV. Specific guidelines for ethical public speaking

A. Determining Purpose

1. Speakers should have an ethical goal

- a. The speaker should not be the only one who benefits from the suggested change(s) in a persuasive speech.

B. Getting Information

1. The speaker should be well-informed.¹
 - a. When doing research, you should seek out competing viewpoints to be sure that your case is representative of all relevant information.

C. Support Material

1. Speakers should report information as accurately as possible.² Among other things, this involves:
 - a. Differentiating facts from opinions
 - b. Not suppressing key information
 - c. Not oversimplifying
 - d. Quoting in context
2. Speakers should be honest about their intentions and biases
3. Speakers should give credit to their sources

D. Reasoning

1. Speaker should not knowingly use false reasoning.
2. Speaker should not use unacceptable emotional appeals such as:

¹Although a speaker should be well-informed, Schwartzman (1987) suggests that speakers need to be competent, not expert. Being expert still does not guarantee that the information is correct and unbiased. Furthermore, overdoing the need for expertise can repress the public and suppress challenges to authority. The key is balance — speakers have the responsibility to be well-informed, but need not be experts to speak ethically.

²It is important to distinguish between an honest mistake and unethical behavior. A speaker might fail to mention key information or quote out of context due to an honest error; while this is often the result of sloppy work it is not necessarily unethical. However, the issue that arises when the number of mistakes begins to climb is: at what point does sloppiness become neglect or irresponsibility, and thus eligible to be judged for ethical quality?

- a. Flattery
- b. Provocation and/or name calling
- c. Distraction
- d. Prejudice
- E. Language
 - 1. Use language to clarify, not to obscure, the facts.
- F. Persuasive Speaking
 - 1. Persuasive speeches should let audiences make up their own mind with full knowledge of all relevant facts.
- G. Listening
 - 1. Audience members should try to pay attention.
 - 2. Audience members should give the speaker a fair hearing.
 - 3. Audience members should give the speaker clear and honest feedback.

TEACHING IDEAS

In this section I present ideas for effectively teaching ethics. These ideas help clarify ethical standards for students, provide in-depth information on speech ethics, and get students actively involved in considering ethical standards.

Clarifying Ethical Standards. Students are often not aware exactly what a teacher considers ethical behavior, and what that instructor considers unethical. By making ethical expectations explicit, teachers can be sure that students understand what is expected, and students can easily see how teachers model their ideals. Two ways to implement this suggestion are provided.

1. *Be clear about your code of ethics.* Sikkink (1981) recommended that teachers should set up the code of ethics they will use for their class, explain it to the students (noting that it is not the only imaginable code, nor is it necessarily the best code in existence), and then use it throughout the course. This recommendation is helpful for several reasons. First, it requires both teacher and students to think carefully and explicitly about the ethical system they choose to adopt. Second, if students disagree with any part(s) of it, they will think critically about ethical choices. Finally, it emphasizes that ethics are a topic to be taken seriously in the class.
2. *Put your ethical standards in the syllabus.* Sikkink (1981) and Winsor and Curtis (1990) recommend putting ethical standards on the syllabus. The advantage to this method is that students can understand clearly what the instructor expects, and they cannot claim that they were not forewarned. Additionally, putting the standards on the syllabus emphasizes their importance.

Some instructors may prefer to discuss ethical responsibilities in communication with their students and mutually sculpt a code of ethics for the class. In this case, after the ethical ideals are agreed upon, the instructor should type a copy of the class's ethical standards and copy it for all the students. This will assure that there is no misunderstanding of what class members agreed upon.

Providing In-depth Information. Since introductory public speaking textbooks only provide cursory discussions of communication ethics, teachers may wish to provide alternative sources of information. There is a plethora of well-written material that has informative and/or provocative value for students. Several sources that are especially relevant to public speaking are listed in the last section of this paper. Instruc-

tors can find readings to stimulate thought or discussion and get copies to students, or put a supplemental class packet together.

Greenberg (1986) recommends creating study guides for outside readings on ethics. If students are given outside sources to read, instructors might want to try writing questions about the reading for students to answer. Questions can be written to be sure students understand the main ideas or to provoke them to think critically.

Getting Students Actively Involved. Because ethics are complex and are not clear-cut, students should be encouraged to actively consider ethical ideals. Challenging students with difficult ethical questions forces them to examine their own belief structures and to question the validity of their beliefs. Four different ways to encourage students to critically examine their ethical beliefs are suggested.

1. *Have students craft their own ethical standards.* Rather than just letting students passively hear ethical ideas from the lecture, teachers may wish to get them actively involved. Two methods have been proposed:
 - Sikkink (1981) suggests this exercise. In class, prior to teaching ethics, have students write a few sentences on what is ethical, and have them share with the class. Probably few of these ideas will ultimately prove useful. Then, have students rewrite their statements outside class to answer this question: "What limits, if any, would you at the present time impose on your efforts to use human communication to influence the others by modifying their beliefs, values, or attitudes?" (p. 4). Have students bring their responses to class and read as many as can be done in 20 minutes; spend the rest of the period in class discussion.

- Instructors may wish to have students formulate their own codes of ethics (Greenberg, 1986). This can be done by having students write an essay about their ethical system before the material is covered in class. Then, have students compare their ethical systems with the instructor's.
- 2. *Have students discuss ethics in small groups.* Teachers can put students in groups of four to seven and present them with a moral dilemma. They should state that groups have 20 minutes to come to consensus on the most ethical solution. Then, each group should present its solution to the class, and the class can hold large group discussion.
- 3. *Use case studies.* Smither (1989, 1992) recommended using case studies to help students learn more effectively. He argued that when students do case studies, they get in the habit of analysis (they learn to ask questions to better understand the situation, and they learn to make choices), and they learn the habit of responsibility (they must be prepared for class and contribute to it). Furthermore, case studies allow for integration of multiple perspectives and demand that students make choices.

Case studies may use factual or fictional sources. Many episodes of *Star Trek* and *Star Trek: The Next Generation* are based on moral dilemmas, and may provide good material for a case study. Articles from almost any newspaper can be used, as can case studies from books, personal experience, or hypothetical scenarios. When using case studies, instructors will find it helpful to ask students a set of specific questions. Instead of just asking "What's the most ethical solution?" they should try asking questions such as:

- How ethical (degree of ethical quality) were the actions of each person involved?
 - What is the most ethical solution to this problem?
 - What are the pros and cons of each solution?
 - Is there one clear best choice?
 - What relevant information was not provided but is necessary for resolving the issue?
 - How would you have handled this situation had you been each of the actors?
 - What alternative solutions can you propose? How ethical are your alternatives?
 - What could have been done earlier to prevent this ethical dilemma from happening?
 - What can be done to prevent a similar situation from happening again?
4. *Do role plays.* Students often learn best by doing. Instructors can put students into groups and assign each group a scenario with an ethical dilemma. Groups should be given 15 or 20 minutes to come to agreement on the most ethical solution, then each group should enact the role play for the class. Classmates should decide:
- Did the role play model the most ethical solution?
 - What alternatives could the group have chosen?
 - Were there alternatives that were equally ethical?
 - Did the solution present new ethical choices?

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Several articles and papers are available that instructors may find helpful either for preparing lectures or for supplementing the textbook. Of these articles, Eubanks's and Johannesen's articles are the most useful as supplemental reading for students.

- Eubanks, R. T. (1980). Reflections on the moral dimension of communication. *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 45, 297-312.
- Greenberg, K. J. (1986, May). The issue of teaching ethics in the introductory speech course. Unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Atlantic City, NJ. ED#271798
- Haskins, W. (1989). Teaching ethics in the basic survey speech communication course. In L. Hugenberg (Ed.), *Basic Course Communication Annual, I* (pp. 95-105). Boston: American Press.
- Jensen, J. V. (1985). Teaching ethics in speech communication. *Communication Education*, 34(4), 324-330.
- Johannesen, R. L. (1980). Teaching ethical standards for discourse. *Journal of Education*, 162(2), 5-20.
- Sikkink, D. (1981, November). Ethics in persuasion: An integrated teaching approach for increasing student awareness of ethical issues in persuasion. Unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Anaheim, CA. ED#209708

Several books also provide good background material. Instructors may wish to have students read selections from the following sources. The Arnett piece may be difficult for undergraduates to understand if not provided with background information. It is included in this list because it is rich with ideas and is a good text for stimulating classroom discussion. Particularly, students should consider what Arnett's conceptualization of the ethical community is, and how public speaking fits into that framework.

- Arnett, R. C. (1986). *Communication and community*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. (Chapter 6)

- Bok, S. (1978). *Lying: Moral choice in public and private life*. New York: Pantheon.
- Jaksa, J. A., & Pritchard, M. S. (1988). *Communication ethics: Methods of analysis*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Johannesen, R. L. (1990). *Ethics in human communication* (3rd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

CONCLUSION

Although ethics are not covered extensively in public speaking texts, a little extra attention from instructors can go a long way toward preparing students for responsible use of their newly improved skill. By emphasizing that it is important for students to speak ethically, supplying them with some conceptual background, and involving students in actively considering ethical choices, teachers can help students be more ethical in their public communication. The ideas presented in this paper should facilitate that process.

REFERENCES

- Arnett, R. C. (1986). *Communication and community*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Arnett, R. C. (1988). Communication ethics and the basic texts: An uncommon theoretical relationship. *Speech Association of Minnesota Journal*, XV, 23-48
- Bloom, M. M. (I 990). Sex differences in ethical systems: A useful framework for interpreting communication research. *Communication Quarterly*, 38(3), 244-254.
- Bradley, B. E. (1991). *Fundamentals of speech communication: The credibility of ideas* (6th ed.). Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.
- Brehm, S. S. (1992). *Intimate relationships* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

- DeVito, J. A. (1990). *The elements of public speaking* (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Geewax, M. (1992, August 23). Greed destroys Phar-Mor. *Dayton Daily News*, p. 11B.
- Gibson, J. W., Hanna, M. S. & Huddleston, B. M. (1985). The basic course in speech at U. S. colleges and universities: IV. *Communication Education*, 34(4), 281-291.
- Gibson, J. W., Hanna, M. S. & Leichty, G. (1990). The basic course in speech at United States colleges and universities: V. In L. Hugenberg (Ed.), *Basic Communication Course Annual II* (pp. 233-257). Boston: American Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women 's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Greenberg, K. J. (1986, May). The issue of teaching ethics in the introductory speech course. Unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Atlantic City, NJ.
- Hanna, M. S., & Gibson, J. W. (1989). *Public speaking for personal success* (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.
- Haskins, W. A. (1989). Teaching ethics in the basic survey speech communication course. In L. Hugenberg (Ed.), *Basic Course Communication Annual I* (pp. 95-105). Boston: American Press.
- Hess, J. A. (1992). "Wait-- something's missing!": The status of ethics in basic public speaking texts. In J. A. Jaksa (Ed.), *Conference proceedings of the second national communication ethics conference* (pp. 265-276). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.
- Hess, J. A., & Pearson, J. C. (1992). Basic public speaking principles: An examination of twelve popular texts. In L.

- Hugenberg (Ed.), *Basic Course Communication Annual IV* pp. 16-34, Boston: American Press.
- Jensen, J. V. (1991). Foreword. In K. J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Conversations on communication ethics* (pp. x-xii). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Jensen, J. V. (1985). Teaching ethics in speech communication. *Communication Education*, 34(4), 324-330.
- Johnson, R. C. (1970). Teaching ethics in the beginning speech course. *The Speech Teacher*, 29 (1), 58-61.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Lucas, S. E. (1989). *The art of public speaking* (3rd ed.). New York: Random House.
- Nelson, P. E., & Pearson, J. C. (1993). *Confidence in public speaking* (5th ed.). Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.
- Osborn, M. & Osborn, S. (1991). *Public speaking* (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Samovar, L. A. & Mills, J. (1989). *Oral communication: Message and response* (7th ed.). Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.
- Sandmann, W. (1992). Hate speech on college campus: What's the ethical civil libertarian to do? In J. A. Jaksa (Ed.), *Pre-conference proceedings of the second national communication ethics conference* (pp. 174-182). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.
- Schwartzman, R. (1987, April). Competence, expertise, and accountability: Classical foundations of the cult of expertise. Unpublished paper presented at the joint meeting of the Central States Speech Association and the Southern Speech Association, St. Louis, MO.
- Shames, L. (1989). *The hunger for more*. New York: Times.

- Sikkink, D. (1981, November). Ethics in persuasion: An integrated teaching approach for increasing student awareness of ethical issues in persuasion. Unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Anaheim, CA.
- Smither, R. D. (1989). Using plays and novels as case studies in the basic course. In L. Hugenberg (Ed.), *Basic Course Communication Annual I* (pp. 70-81). Boston: American Press.
- Smither, R. D. (1992, June). Using the case study method for teaching communication ethics. Unpublished paper presented at the Second National Communication Ethics Conference, Hickory Corners, MI.
- Sproule, J. M. (1991). *Speechmaking: An introduction to rhetorical competence*. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.
- Todd-Mancillas, W. (1987, October). Instructional communication: Current research activities and suggested research priorities. Unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the German Communication Association, Saarbrücken, W. Germany.
- Verderber, R. F. (1991). *The challenge of effective speaking* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Winsor, J. L. & Curtis, D. B. (1990, November). Ethics in higher education. Unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.