

## COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SPEECH ETIQUETTE IN HISTORICAL AND MODERN EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS

Kakharova Shohsanam Nabijon qizi

Farg’ona davlat universiteti, ingliz filologiyasi o’qituvchisi

[shohsanamkakharova@gmail.com](mailto:shohsanamkakharova@gmail.com)

### **Annotatsiya**

Ushbu maqolada ta’lim jarayonida qo’llaniladigan muloqot xulqining diaxronik va sinxronik ko’rinishlari o’rtasidagi o’zaro farqli va o’xshash jihatlari misollar yordamida qiyosiy tadqiq etilgan.

**Kalit so’zlar:** Nutq odobi, tarbiyaviy muloqot, o’qituvchi va o’quvchining o’zaro munosabati, sinf dinamikasi, o’qitishdagi madaniy siljishlar.

### **Annotation**

This article provides an overview and insight into the differences and similarities between diachronic and synchronic forms of communication behavior used in the educational process with the help of examples.

**Key words:** Speech etiquette, educational communication, teacher-student interaction, classroom dynamics, cultural shifts in teaching.

### **Аннотация**

В данной статье на примерах представлен обзор и понимание различий и сходств диахронических и синхронических форм коммуникативного поведения, используемых в образовательном процессе.

**Ключевые слова:** Речевой этикет, учебное общение, взаимодействие учителя и ученика, динамика класса, культурные сдвиги в обучении.

Speech etiquette, an integral part of educational instruction, has undergone significant transformations over the centuries. This article explores the differences and similarities between historical and modern teacher's speech etiquette, highlighting how cultural, technological, and pedagogical shifts have influenced teacher-student interactions. The study of speech etiquette occupies a special position

at the junction of linguistics, theory and history of culture, ethnography, country studies, psychology and other humanities. [1,p.4]

Historically, the teacher's role was authoritative, often linked to religious or moral instruction. Moving into the medieval period and the Renaissance, education was predominantly under the church's influence, where speech etiquette was formal and teachers were expected to embody and impart moral virtues. In classrooms of the 19th and early 20th centuries, especially within the Western context, a teacher's language was formal, directive, and often paternalistic. The teacher stood as the sole authority, and speech etiquette involved clear lines of respect and obedience, which were reflected in the formal use of titles and surnames.

Speech etiquette can be considered from the point of view of language norm. Thus, the idea of correct, cultural, normalized speech includes certain ideas about the norm in the field of speech etiquette. Moreover, violation of norms and rules literary language, especially if it looks as negligence, itself can be seen as violation of speech etiquette [2, p. 259]. Today, the landscape of teacher-student speech etiquette has transformed with the rise of progressive education theories like those proposed by John Dewey, who advocated for education to be designed on the basis of interaction and community. Modern classrooms emphasize collaborative learning environments where teachers often facilitate rather than direct learning. This shift is mirrored in the language used by teachers, which tends to be more informal, encouraging, and supportive, with an aim to promote engagement and mutual respect. Technology has also reshaped communication. Digital platforms have introduced new norms and forms of speech, from emails and chatrooms to forums and video calls, affecting how teachers communicate with students. The rise of social media and texting has further relaxed traditional formalities in teacher-student interactions.

Traditionally, teachers employed a formal mode of address, referring to students by their surnames, often prefixed with titles such as 'Mr.', 'Miss', or 'Master'. For instance, an interaction might be framed as, *"Mr. Smith, would you please recite the next verse of the poem?"* Contemporary educational practices favor a more

informal approach, where teachers often use first names or nicknames. This is exemplified by a teacher saying, *"Jamie, could you share your thoughts on this poem with the class?"*

Instructional commands were typically authoritarian and unidirectional, exemplified by directives such as, *"You shall remain silent and take notes while I explain this concept."* Modern pedagogy encourages facilitative instruction that promotes student engagement, as seen in statements like, *"I encourage you to take notes as we go along, so you can actively participate in the discussion afterward."*

Cultural contexts significantly affect speech etiquette. The practical application of speech etiquette is always somewhat different from the normative models, and not only because of the lack of knowledge of the participants of its rules. Deviation from the norm or too meticulous following it may be due to the desire of the speaker to demonstrate his attitude to the interlocutor or to emphasize his vision of the situation. [3,p.177] In many Eastern societies, the traditional respect for teachers continues to reflect in the formal use of language and titles. However, even these are gradually becoming more relaxed as global educational standards evolve and as Eastern educational systems increasingly interact with Western pedagogical strategies. The evolution of speech etiquette in educational contexts presents both challenges and opportunities.

The comparative study of historical and modern teacher's speech etiquette reveals a dynamic evolution influenced by changes in pedagogical theories, technology, and culture. Understanding these changes is crucial for educators to adapt their communication styles to best support and engage students in a continually evolving educational landscape.

### **References**

1. Формановская Н. И. The use of Russian speech etiquette. — М., 1982. 4–5 p.
2. Керекеша, И. А. Speech etiquette as a component of the cultural minimum / И. А. Керекеша. — Текст : непосредственный // Молодой ученый. — 2019. — № 7 (245). — С. 259-260. — URL: <https://moluch.ru/archive/245/56558/>

3. Формановская Н. И. Speech communication: communicative and pragmatic approach. М., 2002. — 177 p.