

Likhachev Sergey Vladimirovich

Doctor of Philology

Uzbekistan, Kokand State Pedagogical University.

Abstract: According to the definition of a small academic dictionary of the Russian language, ethics is understood as “norms of behavior, human morality”. The ethics of speech communication consists of the rules of speech behavior, among which there are strictly defined by the situation of the beginning or end of communication: greeting or farewell formulas, but there are also rules that can be used in various situations. Despite the existence of these rules, the ethics of speech is often understood only as a set of ready-made phrases of polite communication - speech etiquette.

Everyone pays attention to etiquette: both in the family and at school, giving education, the child is taught to say “bon appetit” - at meals, “very nice” - when meeting, “happy coming” before the new year.

Attention to etiquette is so great that A.G. Balakay even created the Dictionary of Russian Speech Etiquette.

Yet ethics is not reducible to etiquette. There are rules of speech ethics that are not applied in a particular etiquette case, not related to specific words, but defining those features of speech communication, the range of which is wide and does not correspond to specific situations or phrases. Nevertheless, the rules applicable in any situation are quite traditional, and are found in scattered form in the literature. Usually they are observed by people with a high culture of communication. The basic rules are well known, although they are often violated. However, due to the absence in books on the culture of speech of a section devoted to the actual general rules of ethics, or at least a list of them, these rules often remain unknown to either schoolchildren or students.

In this work, many of the situationally free rules of ethics are collected, although their list cannot be exhausted, since the ethics of speech communication is not closed and develops along with relations in society. To make the rules easier to understand, they are illustrated with examples.

1. Don't interrupt.

This rule, of course, is known to everyone, in modern society everyone learns it from their parents: "do not interrupt when the elders are talking," so no one will deny the need to respect the interlocutor's right to speak in full. But it's no secret to anyone that in conflict situations, for example, when returning low-quality goods to a store, arguing with a public utility official about payment, and, unfortunately, when discussing the fairness of a teacher's assessment by a student, interlocutors often begin to -rebivat each other, demand: "Let me finish, do not interrupt me", - "Do not interrupt yourself." Why is such a generally accepted rule violated?

Probably, the interlocutors already at the beginning of the conversation violated some other rules unknown to them, without which a correct conversation is not possible. Let's try to find them.

2. Listen.

This rule, like the previous one, is well known. However, its failure is not always noticeable: the interlocutor can think about his own without showing it outwardly: without looking out the window and without collecting dust from his clothes, nevertheless, without delving into what he heard.

Failure to comply with this rule reduces the meaning of communication to nothing: the listener will not learn anything from what was said, which is well known to teachers from the example of students. If a person knows how to listen carefully, he owns at least half of the necessary speech skills. The ability to listen carefully: look at the interlocutor, nod your head in agreement or say “yes”

is the key not only to successful communication with people, but also to authority, and even career growth of a specialist.

3. Don't leave what you hear unanswered.

To the skills of not interrupting and listening should be added the important ability to respond to what is heard. Even if the interlocutor, in the opinion of the listener, is clearly wrong, says useless things, you should answer, for example, like this: "Your thought is very interesting, but ...", "We will return to the discussion of this issue as soon as possible", "Such an opinion certainly deserves attention." In everyday speech, it is more appropriate to say "I understand you", "You need to think about this."

4. Describe actions, not personality.

Everyone has to criticize other people less often or more often. Of course, you can make silence a principle and pretend that others are never wrong. However, sooner or later, such a position will greatly damage the cause, which can lead to sharp criticism, a quarrel.

Meanwhile, you can point people to their mistakes without causing a negative attitude towards yourself. It is necessary to characterize specific mistakes, actions, deeds, without personally naming the interlocutor as committing these actions. In grammatical logic, one could say "when criticizing, use verbs, not nouns and adjectives."

For example, you should say not "You are a truant", but "You don't always come to class", not "You are angry", but "You were not kind to me", not "You are lazy", but "You don't do your homework too often task."

5. Do not characterize a person in relation to a group of society.

Each person is not only individual, but also, for himself, ideal. Even belonging to a social group, a person does not identify himself with its other representatives, in which, in fact, he is right. Therefore, the mention of nationality, party affiliation, religious views, social origin of a person is a gross violation of ethics and, in democratic countries, even the law. Mentions of the age group "Eh, youth", place of residence or birth "Village", as well as gender "Women's logic" will also turn out to be unethical.

Particularly unpleasant is the definition of a group in the political struggle, which was called "sticking labels": "This issue is not discussed with former communists."

6. Do not refer to the guessable motives of the interlocutor's behavior.

This rule is violated intentionally if they want to mislead a person and slander someone: "I know why he argues, he curries favor with his superiors, because he has been hoping to get my position for a long time." However, an astute interlocutor will understand that the speaker is unfair and will not draw negative conclusions about the person whose thoughts are "read". The one who regularly violates this rule will quickly acquire a reputation as a gossip.

7. Understand the words of the interlocutor directly, do not replace them with your own interpretation.

Replacing the interlocutor's statement with one's own is a frequent violation of ethics in discussion and dispute. Moreover, communication as a result, as a rule, is no longer possible and stops or may turn into a squabble.

- Dictation at such a pace is very difficult to listen to and write down, could you slow it down. If you don't want to study, don't study.

If the interlocutor replaced your statement with his opinion, you should immediately notice: "I didn't say that," or more strictly: "This is already your opinion."

8. Do not ask about what you know, what you want to assert.

Usually they ask about what they know, either wanting to speak out somehow, or in the hope of getting support for their opinion. In both cases it is necessary to find an affirmative formulation.

Otherwise, one has to expect as an answer a counter question about the opinion of the asker himself, often with ironic overtones, as in the case below.

- Tell me, please, what part of speech is “in conclusion”?
- What do you want?
- I want an adverb.
- Well, let there be an adverb.

9. Do not ask for what was regularly done at the previous request.

Repeated requests are a typical violation of the communication ethics of all people who control others - from parents to leaders. But if a child responds to his mother’s phrase, repeated every day: “Sasha, go get some bread at the bakery on the next street ...” - he can throw out discontent by answering: “Yes, I know, I know, mom, don’t buy in the stall around the corner, it’s tasteless”, then the secretary, at the next request of the director in the morning, to prepare letters in advance, does not dare to speak out loud, accumulating irritation in himself.

10. Do not talk about those present in the third person.

The first person denotes the speaker, the second - the interlocutor, the third - not participating in communication. Therefore, calling the person present in the third person “he”, “says”, we indicate that we do not communicate with him. Therefore, we will not wait for an answer to the phrase: “Nikolai Petrovich, who is present here, will confirm what was said to you.” Observing the rules of ethics, one should ask the question: “Nikolai Petrovich, will you confirm what was said?”

11. Do not formulate your wishes and suggestions in the form of a negative question.

This rule is known in the psychology of neurolinguistic programming, but you do not need to be a psychologist to appreciate its expediency. A negative question can be perceived as a hint at the refusal “Will you have tea with us?”, Sometimes as a direct coercion to refuse “Granddaughters, do you want me to buy you ice cream?” If the speaker is not interested in refusal, then he interferes with the realization of his own communicative intentions, formulating a question, the design of which implies a rather negative answer: “Do you want to become our regular client?”

The negative question is traditionally used in the polite formulation of the request “Would you be so kind ...”, but in the request it is appropriate precisely because the very genre of the request allows the possibility of refusal, saying “not”, we emphasize that we do not dare -em to force the interlocutor.

12. Do not use questions that impose an answer.

The so-called closed questions, which do not have a question word, require only a yes or no answer: “Have you already forgotten my request?” Despite the interrogative structure, these questions may contain a hidden statement. Moreover, the interlocutor, answering the question in any of two possible ways, inevitably recognizes the statement. An ethical violation is a hidden statement that discredits the interlocutor, for example: “Volodya, will you no longer spoil textbooks?” At the same time, nothing prevents the interlocutor from answering the question indirectly, ignoring the closed structure of the question: “Yes, I never spoiled them.” Naturally, the speaker will not achieve what he wants: the interlocutor does not recognize non-existent guilt. No matter how you formulate the question, the tension in relations that arose because of this question may persist for a long time.

Instead of conclusions after the listed rules, I would like to clarify only two circumstances: on the one hand, these rules, of course, were not invented by the author of the work, if they were invented by one person, they would not make sense in the communication of many. On the other hand, although each of these rules is recommended by someone: psychologists, logicians, linguists, the observance of situationally independent rules of ethics, like all others, is a matter of voluntary decision and habit. You can't force being cultured out of hand.

But the one who will observe these rules will be pleasing to people, will be successful, will keep old and make new friends, will protect himself from the unethical behavior of others. Those who

294	ISSN 2277-3630 (online), Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 11 Issue: 12 in December-2022 https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR
	Copyright (c) 2022 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

deliberately violate ethics themselves separate themselves from the society of other people. No need to rebuke them: they will already have to look for a way out when they are left alone.

Literature.

1. Balakai A.G. Dictionary of Russian speech etiquette., M., 2001.
2. Vvedenskaya L.A., Pavlova L.G., Koshaeva E.Yu. Russian language and culture of speech M. 2001
3. Golovin B.N. How to speak correctly. M. 1988
4. Golub I.B. Russian language and culture of speech. M. 2001
5. Graudina L.K. (ed.), Shiryaev E.N. (ed.) Culture of Russian speech. M. 2001
6. Kolesov V.V. The culture of speech is the culture of behavior. L. 1988
7. Maksimov V.I. (ed.) Russian language and culture of speech. M. 2001
8. Povarnin S.I. Dispute. On the theory of dispute. M., 1918.
9. Formanovskaya N.I. Speech etiquette and communication culture. M. 1989.