# **Impact Factor:**

ISRA (India) = 4.971 ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829 GIF (Australia) = 0.564 JIF = 1.500 SIS (USA) = 0.912 РИНЦ (Russia) = 0.126 ESJI (KZ) = 8.997 SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667 ICV (Poland)
PIF (India)
IBI (India)
OAJI (USA)

= 6.630 = 1.940 = 4.260 = 0.350

QR - Article

QR – Issue

SOI: 1.1/TAS DOI: 10.15863/TAS
International Scientific Journal
Theoretical & Applied Science

**p-ISSN:** 2308-4944 (print) **e-ISSN:** 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2020 Issue: 12 Volume: 92

Published: 14.12.2020 <a href="http://T-Science.org">http://T-Science.org</a>





**B. Kh. Koraeva**Moscow State Linguistic University
Professor

## LANGUAGE, SPEECH CULTURE AND EDUCATION

**Abstract**: The use of language tools in speech activities requires adherence to certain social, more precisely, enlightenment and cultural norms established by society. Withdrawals from them have not always been approved by language owners. Where there is a norm, there has always been culture. Normality in language and speech is referred to in linguistic theory and practice as linguistic culture, or rather, language and speech culture. These are relevant and unexplored areas not only in linguistics but also in linguodidactics.

 $\textbf{\textit{Key words}: } language, \textit{ culture, phenomenon, system, education, speech \textit{ culture, ethnoculture, linguodidactics.} \\$ 

Language: English

*Citation*: Koraeva, B. K. (2020). Language, speech culture and education. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 12 (92), 153-155.

Soi: http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-12-92-29 Doi: crosses https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.12.92.29

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

#### Introduction

Language is interrelated with the relationships of people in society and the processes of spiritual and material production, and at the same time is relatively independent. One of the peculiarities of language is the division of language units into certain parts: sentences, phrases, words, morphemes, and etc.

According to experts, in order to separate the social thing from the personal thing, the historically evolving system from the separate activity of man, the following definition was created: "The next history of language is the history of the liberation of speech from practice, the history of speech as an independent activity ...".

Language, which forms a unified dialectical unit and serves mainly communicative purposes in society, and its dynamic state, speech, is one of the most complex and multifaceted linguistic and philosophical categories. As unique social phenomena, each of them is also a unique and unique product of the cultural sphere, which forms the basis of the development of society.

The pursuit of the correct and appropriate use of language and speech units, which are the most universal linguistic (verbal) means of communication, has led to the formation of notions of civilized language and speech, scientific views.

The study of the question of the interdependence of language and cultural phenomena has been

complicated by the lack of a clear definition of the concept of culture, which in many cases is a complex, multifaceted, multifaceted social phenomenon. There are now hundreds of definitions of culture, including contradictory definitions of culture as a norm and a change in standards, adaptation and overcoming social inertia, accumulated experience, and self-improvement.

"Language cannot exist outside of culture. It is a collection of practical views and ideas that define our socially inherited way of life." It has been repeatedly emphasized by F.V. Humboldt.

Vocabulary (also from a culturological point of view) is important within the levels of the language system. It expresses, describes, and describes the being around man and his inner world, and can motivate him by defining the behavior of the owner of the language. The lexical structure of the national language preserves the peculiarities of ethnosociocultural norms and transmits them from generation to generation, thus ensuring the stability and coherence of the ethnic mentality. By studying the peculiarities of the use of words, we can obtain information about the spiritual health of a nation: by accurately assessing the facts, recording them in a consistent manner, determining the direction of dynamics, to some extent, we can predict the stages of development of this nation.



## **Impact Factor:**

ICV (Poland) ISRA (India) **= 4.971** SIS (USA) = 0.912= 6.630**РИНЦ** (Russia) = **0.126** ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829PIF (India) = 1.940**GIF** (Australia) = 0.564=4.260ESJI (KZ) **= 8.997** IBI (India) = 1.500OAJI (USA) = 0.350**SJIF** (Morocco) = 5.667

Certain phenomena are perceived by people on the basis of linguistic skills and norms formed in their society. Each language has its own view of the world. The difference between worldviews is also as much different as the languages are. But it is also doubtful to say that different languages show us worldviews. It deprives you of the opportunity to know what the world really looks like. Language simultaneously embodies the external features of being and the inner essence of thinking.

The emergence of a literary language as a result of the regulation of the national language on the basis of a number of linguistic and extralinguistic norms is also not a coincidence but a law. Many intralinguistic and extralinguistic factors (e.g., the division of labor, man's perception of the world, and the creation of different worldviews based on different perspectives, etc.) played an important role in this.

It is true that valuing the language like any other cultural heritage, passing on its unique and beautiful examples to future generations, enriching it with new life content and meaning, constantly preserving and striving for the language of the people as a literary language is both convenient, useful and spiritual. This allows not only the language of the people, but also the original social image of the speakers, the preservation of the status quo, not only in the solidification of the literary language itself, but also in a comprehensive dialogue, in a dynamic form literary speech. The aspiration of the people to express their national identity through their mother tongue and its supreme example, the literary form, and to perfection inherent in human nature and never to perish, is manifested in the form of a culture of speech in the scope of its linguistic activity.

Raising the level of speech culture has attracted the attention of intellectuals at all stages of language development. Its solution depends on the right attitude to the literary language, the solution of a number of issues, such as its preservation, enrichment, the struggle for purity.

In many studies, literary language has a number of distinctive features, it is recognized by all language owners, it is the highest form of the national language they know, and it is subject to certain linguistic norms, grammatical rules, manifested in written and oral forms, and therefore mandatory for all. such considerations have been acknowledged.

The fact that the literary language is divided into methodological branches determines another important feature of it - its polyvalence, polyfunctionality. This indicates that its scope and fields of service are much wider than those of dialect, slang, slang, and other common types. Literary language serves as a convenient, necessary, useful, important and powerful means of communication in all aspects of speech activity. The regular use of literary language has led to the development of special rules, certain norms, which ensure the effectiveness of

this activity. This, in turn, plays an important role in the creation of the doctrine of modern speech culture.

The current information age requires its educated, enlightened representatives to be extremely responsible in their speech when speaking in public. Such linguistic responsibility requires the acquisition of simple, essential skills and competencies that form the basis of a demanding speech culture.

Speech culture means, first and foremost, speaking without error in any communicative situation. Right thinking, right speech is recognized as a sign of culture. Being able to write without mistakes means "spelling, this is literacy. Literacy is a sign of culture."

Each type of speech culture has its own characteristics, which are determined by the ability of speech owners to speak. In particular, the culture of elite speech is an example of literate speech. Speakers of such speech should not violate the rules of communication: they should avoid rude, forbidden words and phrases, and, if necessary, use euphemisms and slang. But their open speech is like speech, made up of simple, lively sentences. It is not typical for the owners of an elite speech culture to respond rudely to any question or objection of the interlocutor. They show their respect for the listener with their speech." They will always have a good attitude towards their speech. To do this, he skillfully uses various means of artistic representation. However, such intellectuals are declining year by year. Even high school and media workers are not able to rise above the ranks of the carriers of the average literary speech culture.

The term elite type of speech culture should be distinguished from the concept of "good speech". Good speech can be observed not only in elite speech culture, but also at lower levels, such as average literary speech or simple speech, in the levels of speech in a literary language.

The characteristics of the average literary speech culture are as follows:

- The general cultural level of the owner of this type of language is much lower than the owner of the culture of elite speech:
- owners of such speech use two or three functional styles, do not know the rest well;
- in relation to the text, entertainment literature and other media texts are an example for them;
- this type of communicators can violate the norms of speech-ethics, (ie, moral) in relation to their addressee (use rude expressions instead of swearing), confuse the norms of oral and written speech, deviate from orthoepic, orthographic, grammatical norms, sometimes use foreign words in large quantities (sometimes). even without realizing it).

The high frequency of errors in this type of culture-specific communication practice, according to researchers, is the result of the formation of language on the basis of new norms. The prevalence of an average literary speech culture among educated



#### SIS (USA) ISRA (India) = 0.912ICV (Poland) **= 4.971** PIF (India) ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829**РИНЦ** (Russia) = **0.126 Impact Factor: GIF** (Australia) = 0.564**= 8.997** IBI (India) ESJI (KZ) = 1.500**JIF SJIF** (Morocco) = **5.667** OAJI (USA)

people is of concern to experts. Because this is one of the signs that the level of general speech culture in the society is declining.

### **References:**

- 1. Lurija, A. R. (1998). *Jazyk i soznanie*. pod red. E.D. Homskoj. (p.33). Rostov-n/D.: Feniks.
- 2. Kagan, M. S. (1996). *Filosofija kul`tury*. Sb. tr, SPb.: Petropolis.
- 3. Kogan, L. P. (1993). *Teorija kul`tury*: Ucheb. Posobie dlja vuzov, Ekaterinburg.: Centr.
- 4. Mamardashvili, M. K. (1992). *Kak ja ponimau filosofiu*. Moscow: Progress. Kul`tura.
- 5. Lotman, Jy.M. (1967). *K probleme tipologii kul`tury. Trudy po znakovym sistemam* / pod red. E.V. Permjakova, Tartu, Vyp. 3.
- 6. Gumbol'dt, V. Fon. (1984). *Izbrannye trudy po jazykoznaniu*. (p.193). Moscow: Progress.
- 7. Studenova, E. G. (2002). Princip jazykovogo sootvetstvija: sushhnost` i metodologicheskaja rol` v formirovanii jazyka nauki. (p.23). Moscow.
- 8. Vinogradov, V. D. (2001). Lingvodidakticheskie osnovy obuchenija russkomu jazyku i kul`ture

rechi.: sb. izbrannyh st. i dokl, Novgorod: NGPU.

= 6.630

= 1.940

**= 4.260** 

= 0.350

- 9. Vinokur, G. O. (1967). *Iz besed o kul`ture rechi*. Russkaja rech`.
- Golovin, B. N. (1980). Osnovy kul`tury rechi. -Moscow: Vyssh. shk.
- 11. Sirotinina, O. B. (1995). Ustnaja rech` i tipy rechevyh kul`tur. *Rusistika segodnja*. M,, Vyp. 4, pp. 3-21.
- 12. Kochetkova, T. V. (1998). Jevfemizmy v rechi nositelej jelitarnoj rechevoj kul`tury. *Voprosy stilistiki: Chelovek i tekst.* Saratov: Izd-vo Sarat. un-ta, Vyp. 27, pp. 168-179.
- 13. Fisher, I. S. (1995). *Ustnaja monologicheskaja rech*` (na materiale publicisticheskih teleperedach). Dis. . kand. filol. nauk. (p.8). Saratov.

