DOI: 10.17117/na.2016.05.02.017

<http://ucom.ru/doc/na.2016.05.02.017.pdf>

Поступила (Received): 24.05.2016

Адамбаева Н.К., Хужаметова Л.П. Этика в общественного разговоре

Adambaeva N.K., Khujametova L.P.
Ethics in public speaking

В этой статье мы познакомили вас с основами этики общественных выступлений. Зная об этике имеет важное значение, но еще более важно, чтобы быть этической оратором ставит эти знания на практике, продумывание возможных этических подводных камней до стоя и выступая

Ключевые слова: этика, общественный, спикер, связь, информация, плагиат

Адамбаева Наргиза Кадамбаевна

Преподаватель

Ташкентская медицинская академия Ургенчский филиал

г. Ургенч, ул. Ал-Хорезми, 25

Хужаметова Лола Пулатовна

Студент

Ташкентская медицинская академия Ургенчский филиал

г. Ургенч, ул. Ал-Хорезми, 25

In this article we've introduced you to the basics of thinking through the ethics of public speaking. Knowing about ethics is essential, but even more important to being an ethical public speaker is putting that knowledge into practice by thinking through possible ethical pitfalls prior to standing up and speaking out

Key words: ethics, public, speaker, communication, information, plagiarism

Adambaeva Nargiza Kadambaевна

Teacher

Urgench branch of Tashkent medical academy

Urgench, Al Khorezmi st., 25

Khujametova Lola Pulatovna

Student

Urgench branch of Tashkent medical academy

Urgench, Al Khorezmi st., 25

The study of ethics in human communication is hardly a recent endeavor. One of the earliest discussions of ethics in communication (and particularly in public speaking) was conducted by the ancient Greek philosopher Plato in his dialogue *Phaedrus*. In the centuries since Plato's time, an entire subfield within the discipline of human communication has developed to explain and understand communication ethics.

As public speakers, one of the first ethical areas we should be concerned with is information honesty. While there are cases where speakers have blatantly lied to an audience, it is more common for speakers to prove a point by exaggerating, omitting facts that weigh against their message, or distorting information. We believe that speakers build a relationship with their audiences, and that lying, exaggerating, or distorting information violates this relationship. Ultimately, a speaker will be more persuasive by using reason and logical arguments supported by facts rather than relying on emotional appeals designed to manipulate the audience.

It is also important to be honest about where all your information comes from in a speech. As speakers, examine your information sources and determine whether they are biased or have hidden agendas. For example, you are not likely to get accurate information about nonwhite individuals from a neo-Nazi website. While you may not know all your sources of information firsthand, you should attempt to find objective sources that do not have an overt or covert agenda that skews the argument you are making. The second part of information honesty is to fully disclose where we obtain the information in our speeches. As ethical speakers, it is important to always cite your sources of information within the body of a speech. Whether you conducted an interview or read a newspaper article, you must tell your listeners where the information came from. We mentioned earlier in this chapter that using someone else's words or ideas without giving credit is called plagiarism. The word "plagiarism" stems from the Latin word *plagiaries*, or kidnapper.

Speakers tend to fall into one of three major traps with plagiarism. The first trap is failing to tell the audience the source of a direct quotation. In the previous paragraph, we used a direct quotation from the American Psychological Association; if we had not used the quotation marks and clearly listed where the cited material came from, you, as a reader, wouldn't have known the source of that information. To avoid plagiarism, you always need to tell your audience when you are directly quoting information within a speech.

The second plagiarism trap public speakers fall into is paraphrasing what someone else said or wrote without giving credit to the speaker or author. For example, you may have read a book and learned that there are three types of schoolyard bullying. In the middle of your speech you talk about those three types of schoolyard bullying. If you do not tell your audience where you found that information, you are plagiarizing. Typically, the only information you do not need to cite is information that is general knowledge. General knowledge is information that is publicly available and widely known by a large segment of society.

The third plagiarism trap that speakers fall into is re-citing someone else's sources within a speech.

If everyone only listened to one source of information, then we would be easily manipulated and controlled. For this reason, we believe that individuals should be willing to listen to a range of speakers on a given subject. As listeners or consumers of communication, we should realize that this diversity of perspectives enables us to be more fully informed on a subject. Imagine voting in an election after listening only to the campaign speeches of one candidate. The perspective of that candidate would be so narrow that you would have no way to accurately understand and assess the issues at hand or the strengths and weaknesses of the opposing candidates. Unfortunately, some voters do limit themselves to listening only to their candidate of choice and, as a result, base their voting decisions on incomplete—and, not infrequently, inaccurate—information.

Listening to diverse perspectives includes being willing to hear dissenting voices. Dissent is by nature uncomfortable, as it entails expressing opposition to authority, often in very unflattering terms. Legal scholar Steven H. Shiffrin has argued in favor of some symbolic speech (e.g., flag burning) because we as a society value the

ability of anyone to express their dissent against the will and ideas of the majority. Ethical communicators will be receptive to dissent, no matter how strongly they may disagree with the speaker's message because they realize that a society that forbids dissent cannot function democratically.

Ultimately, honoring free speech and seeking out a variety of perspectives is very important for all listeners. Often managers have to deliver presentations with unpleasant content. The vice president has to announce that there is a hiring freeze or a downsizing. The human resource director speaks to the employees about a benefits package with fewer benefits. Because executives are often speaking in difficult situations, the more credibility they can develop, the more the content will be considered and accepted. Speakers will have little or no impact on audiences if audience members don't respect them and what they have to say.

What makes us trust a speaker or believe that he or she is a reliable source? Whom can we trust to have our best interests at heart? Let's look at some practical ways a speaker can maintain and enhance credibility.

Act in ways consistent with the message of the presentation. This can be as simple as showing concern in tone of voice and facial expression when talking about an issue that is facing the company. Acting disinterested or unconcerned when presenting bad news can offend your listeners. Showing enthusiasm in delivery by quicker movements, more variety, and a faster rate of speech when reading an exciting climax of a positive presentation can produce the same enthusiasm in your audience. A student began a persuasive speech by spreading garbage out on a table. She said, "What do all of these pieces of trash have in common? They can all be recycled." She gave a good speech on the need for recycling and how to set up community recycling programs. She finished to a nice round of applause; then she gathered up all of the recyclables from the table--and threw them away in the wastebasket in the corner. She obviously didn't understand the need for speakers to act in ways consistent with their messages in order to maintain credibility.

Good preparation is an ethical requirement as well as a practical one. Your audience has given you time and an opportunity, and audience members deserve to hear your best effort. That only comes through careful preparation. If the audience can tell you didn't prepare for them specifically, they will feel betrayed and won't respond positively to your message. Thus the executive should start preparing several days or weeks before an important presentation is delivered. It is hard to cram for a speech, and the audience can tell when preparation has not been adequate.

Show respect for your audience. Don't insult your audience in any way. Racial slurs and profanity are obviously unethical, but in addition, don't show disrespect for people's gender, backgrounds, positions, appearances, or nationalities. Don't put people down because of their lack of knowledge of a topic; sometimes their lack of information is the very reason you have been asked to speak. Don't embarrass any member of your audience. Don't play a joke on anyone without seeking permission first. Even if you do receive permission, playing a joke on an audience member can backfire because the rest of your group might become fearful they will bear the brunt of your next joke, causing them to lose trust in you. Poke fun at yourself instead.

Список используемых источников:

1. URL: <http://www.sboyd.com/>

© 2016, Адамбаева Н.К., Хужаметова Л.П.
Этика в общественного разговоре

© 2016, Adambaeva N.K., Khujametova L.P.
Ethics in public speaking