

## INNOVATIVE WAYS OF MODIFYING LANGUAGE POLICY PROPOSAL

Abduvoidova Gulchekhra Rustamovna

English teacher at school number 5 in Gulistan City.

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13852795>

**Abstract.** *This article focuses on goals and objectives of modifying a particular Language Policy Proposal on the sphere of teaching English as a foreign or second language.*

**Key words:** *language policy, multinational country, international education, main modifications, remarkable impacts, usage of curriculum, drawbacks*

## ИННОВАЦИОННЫЕ СПОСОБЫ МОДИФИКАЦИИ ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЙ ЯЗЫКОВОЙ ПОЛИТИКИ

**Аннотация.** *В данной статье рассматриваются цели и задачи изменения конкретного предложения языковой политики в сфере преподавания английского языка как иностранного или второго языка.*

**Ключевые слова:** *языковая политика, многонациональная страна, международное образование, основные изменения, заметные последствия, использование учебной программы, недостатки.*

Each country and state should have their own language policy concerning both the native and foreign ones. Even the language policy of one country could be solid and highly applicable, after some time there will be an urgent demand for modifying it. Over recent decades, English has been considered to be the global language through which different countries are able to communicate with each other in various spheres of life. Therefore, there have been a great number of efforts to teach English efficiently among many countries.

Hence, the Republic of Uzbekistan is officially regarded to be a multinational country and its official state language is Uzbek (Azizova, 2014). Nevertheless, as mentioned above, because of rapid growth in using English, the importance of this very language has been increasing in all aspects of our life (Uzbek people) after the declaration of independence. The main reason for learning English is to acquire international education (in many spheres:

Literature, IT, Medicine, Accounting, Engineering, Machinery construction and so on), get a satisfactory job in developed countries and build up a durable career. So, the English language has owned the main prestige as a foreign language in Uzbekistan. Upon this time, several trustworthy projects have been carried out to accomplish the goal set by the Ministry of Education (Uzbekistan) in cooperation with British Council, such as PRISETT (training assistant teachers) and EnSPIRe-U which has been founded to enhance English teaching in Higher Educational settings (West & Sheykhmetova, 2016). English is taught within four years at universities as the same as other subjects and it has commenced showing some disadvantages in students' learning processes.

Moving back to the outline of LPP, it is transparent that the main modifications in language policy planning are aimed to meet the needs of Gulistan State University (as a sample) in developing foreign language teaching. Actually, addressing to this issue may seem not to be feasible enough, yet it can have quite remarkable impacts on educational settings of the university.

The organization chosen to be modified concerning language planning policy exists in our real world, located in Gulistan city of Uzbekistan. The current plight of its foreign language teaching methodology needs much to be done because of unfruitful teaching strategy. Having a look its administrative organization may clearly represent some drawbacks of the current system: teachers seldom follow the correct implementation of lessons; they are so overloaded with unnecessary paperwork that it is occasionally possible to find extra time for good preparation to lessons; assistant and even professor teacher still have confusions with usage of curriculum.

Furthermore, the amount of technological equipment for conducting lessons is not adequate for all teachers: the order of classes has been set turn by turn (3 classrooms have projectors). Last but not least, only a few teachers implement CLT method in English classes, most of them still use grammar-translation method.

Modification is always an urgent and feasible option for any existing systems to increase the development. Therefore, the final LPP proposal will be clearly defining some changes in the current strategy of the university. These modifications will be witnessed in the followings:

- Administrative organization / proficiency level
- Sources / Technological equipment
- Teachers and their teaching approaches
- Assessment
- Actors

In order to make the administrative organization better, some innovative and modern approaches have been planned to implement during the process. Firstly, the quantity of paperwork (done by teachers) will be decreased significantly and teachers are required to deal with most documents through online control. Secondly, new positions will be declared for skilled mentors and assistant teachers to increase the proficiency of lessons. Finally, the number of teaching hours will be lengthened instead of some unnecessary subjects.

There have always been ongoing actions to supply the classes with modern technological equipment by the government. However, there are still some foundations lacking of enough technological devices in classrooms and that is what may prevent teachers from conducting modernized lessons. Nearly all classrooms should be filled with projects and students ought to be provided with Wi-Fi and PCs. Moving on to the source books, the exactly same books, articles and authentic materials will be selected for each term (teachers have not clear comprehension about choosing sources, so they search the web to find materials before lessons).

Most of the work is expected to be carried out among teachers and their methods.

Initially, almost all teachers will be required to use CLT methods in classes and they will have extra training courses to enhance their knowledge in using technology for conducting lessons.

The crucial modification here is to train teachers to be able to use online assessment systems, such as Canvas which may highly decrease the amount of plagiarism.

There are not many necessities for the modification of assessment and the role of actors in LPP. Nevertheless, the new version of assessment criteria will refer to all five principles of testing and assessment and teachers will have a chance to assess students through internet. The role of actors will be the same but with some political actions related to education.

The goals of the very LPP proposal are concerned to be quite feasible and adaptable for implementation. At first, the four-year-studying period will be shortened to the three-year-one since the four-year-term is too long for students to deal with learning foreign languages.

In fact, before entering the university applicants are required to get B1 and B2 (if their major is English) levels, so there is no point in studying four years if they have B2 level in their first year. Will they be increasing their B2 level to C1 within four academic years? If yes, that is not appropriate for the era in which science and technology are developing hour by hour. As a result, the studying year of students will be divided into three phases: Year 1, Year 2 and Year 3. In the year 1, students are expected to improve their four skills and obtain B2+ level; in the year 2, they will be working on translating journals, articles (in top newspapers), books, as well as being suitable for C1 level in the end of the term. Finally, in the year 3, students should be capable of using the English language in all areas of sciences and spheres of education.

To sum up, all goals and objectives should be clearly illustrated inside out in the final LPP proposal. Moreover, the funding and the role of exact actors ought to be estimated relevantly and demonstrated thoroughly.

#### REFERENCES

1. **Kaplan, R.B. (2011).** Macro language planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning: Volume 2* (924-935). New York: Routledge. (This source book contributes to define the elements of macro language planning and gives important data about its implementation)
2. **Chua Siew Kheng, C. & Baldauf, Jr., R.B. (2011).** Micro language planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning: Volume 2* (936-951). New York: Routledge. (With the help of this very article, it is easier to focus on the elements of micro language planning for the prestige of foundations, such as schools, lyceums and universities)
3. **Linton, A. (2009).** Language politics and policy in the United States: Implications for the immigration debate. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 199, 9-37. (It may seem strange to learn another country's language policy to modify the native one, but a lot of things will have advantages after contrasting and learning something from each other)
4. **Haryanto, E. (2013).** Language policy: Administrators and teachers' view on English as media of instruction implementation in Indonesia. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(2), 48-56. (After reading the article, I have gathered particular useful information about both benefits and drawbacks of the language policy set in Indonesia. Having been aware of some failures in this language policy, I have been trying not to make these very mistakes in my final LPP proposal)
5. **Zhao, S. (2011).** Actors in language planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning: Volume 2* (905-923). New York: Routledge. (Without reading this article, I will definitely be in dilemma about selecting relevant actors that would help to carry out my LPP proposal)