

# Language planning and policy

Giyosova Sevara

## Annotation.

This article is about language policy and language planning and some issues that some writers came across the challenges in drawing up a plan, formulating language policy, and implementing and assessing it. LPP is a try by an agent or agents, mainly not at the governmental level (a macro level) to affect an individual's or certain group's future language attitudes (a micro level).

In LPP, an issue is identified that needs to be solved by people who are designing and implementing a policy. If people targeted by the policy do not share the same perception of the issue, they may oppose its implementation by either doing so themselves or by changing it to suit their own interests or desires.

**Keywords** language policy, language planning, policy implementation, competitive ability, language planning policy, implementation of the LPP, political process, macro and micro policy, macro-top-down and micro-bottom-up processes

## Introduction.

LPP is considered a political process. Though outcomes might be language-based a few instances where underlying modifications in language education are not considered by ideological or political attitudes. Therefore, according to the fact that resistance may happen since underlying a policy of language can be decisions that might impact a group's identity, attitudes, economic status, or political effect and strength.

Kennedy said (1999) there that is a lack of fit between policy and its implementation. We all have witnessed a macro policy being pushed down to lower microplanning levels and then either not being implemented, being implemented just in part, or being implemented in ways that were not intended. Hoa & Tuan said (2007) that this less successfulness of implementation is deliberate (people who are working at lower degrees in the program may disagree with the policy), however, macro policymakers cancel or do not know of the cases operating at micro levels that may prevent implementation. Some researchers Baldauf, Kaplan, and Kamwangamalu (2011) discuss the issues of Primary school English and suggest several questions to be asked of ELT projects in this area. Enever and Moon (2009) said there are similar questions and extended some of the categories mentioned by Baldauf, Kaplan, and Kamwangamalu. They said that the earlier children start learning English the better the results. It is also said that there should be a relation between the primary and secondary education systems so that there might be a continuation. Enever and Moon said that in order to enrich the successful impact of those programs regular resources are demanded with ongoing teacher training and development, that teachers should have time and space to improve, and that their English knowledge plays an essential role in achieving success.

As for the accounts of LPP and language –in education planning were at a descriptive level and not exploring enough those agents are engaged in the planning, their beliefs and behaviors, their attitudes, and the causes for them.

Developed countries like China, Japan, and South Korea, have taken into consideration the importance of their citizens being able to talk internationally in the English language. Additionally, all three countries published course books that meet the demands of various teaching approaches and effects. The Ministry of Education, which has been tasked with carrying out decisions about national planning, is in charge of initiating and supervising the materials created for national projects. However, the materials of curriculum development and mismatches of policy and implementation might occur.

## Materials and Methods

Language learning specialists must be involved in the drafting of language planning policies to ensure that they are compatible not only with political, social, and educational ideals but also with language acquisition theory and language learning practice. This will ensure that language planning policy and the materials used to implement them are effectively matched.

Some scientists of language policy differentiate between language policy and language planning, the former is defined as intent, and the latter is described as implementation. LPP is organized not at a macro level but is assigned to create at a micro level which means a lot of effort is required from, language teachers. Orafi and Borg (2009) claimed that teachers in Libya at the micro-level of the language classroom act against a curriculum innovation (a part of macro-LPP implementation) in which the policy does not fit their behaviors and beliefs. In the article, several macro policies and their implementations are highly described. Additionally, it is claimed that macro policy is required to be implemented to lower microplanning degrees, while it is not implemented or partially implemented in unintended spheres.

LPP impacts sociopolitical domains-law, art media, government, business, and education system. To be educated in its institutions one of the important choices to be made is which language will be taught (Secondary and higher) and whether these subjects are taught according to the curriculum and syllabus. A staggered implementation, preferably with knowledge and insight gained through pilot projects, is advised because programs that are hastily conceived and implemented may not be beneficial. Both macro-top-down and micro-bottom-up processes that have institutional backing and include communities, parents, and schools are crucial.

## Results and Discussion.

Malaysian writers claim some samples of educational macro and micro policy in implementation. The Malaysian government worried that Malay graduates lost their competitive ability with international companies related to Malaysia because of their lack of knowledge of English. The authority found a solution to this issue that moving from a fully Malay- medium system of Science and Mathematics turned to teaching in English rather than being taught in Malay. I also approve of this decision because learning a subject in one's native language is a good choice however, if they are aiming at studying at foreign Universities or working in foreign companies, there might be more challenges to comprehending the subject while they are studying in the future. I would also suggest for students learn subjects in that language rather than studying them in their native language. The reason why I consider this is that a lot of students are enrolling in foreign Universities, for instance: Korea China, the US, and Italy are top choices for students. However, most of them don't know the language well and this can be the reason for them to lose interest in their chosen fields. Most of them quit their studies and started to work. Some students are facing challenges when they take exams during their freshmen years.

I also would suggest to our macro-level who are responsible for assigning course books for educational institutions to publish more relevant course books to develop students' creative thinking, critical thinking ability, and communication skills. Those skills are not developed appropriately in our syllabuses and as English teachers; we are actors who play what was given. As well as other countries those skills must be developed from the early school years.

## Conclusion

This article is mainly about Language planning policy and its implementation around the world. This article is also about different policies that were adjusted in different countries. For instance, I liked Malaysia's policy that aimed to teach some subjects in English rather than teaching them in Malay. Furthermore, in Japan and South Korea, they are publishing more course books for their

---

learners that focused on learner involvement and interaction, and traditional values are also taken into consideration. This is an amazing example of what we have known about the universal phenomenon –writers can implement LPP in ways aimed to be done on their experience. Since they can impose language planning decisions on them, local publishers must appear to many governments to be more likely to execute LPP successfully than multinational publishers. For instance, in Singapore, publishers are required to release three distinct editions of their secondary school course books: one that is more challenging for express courses, one with more scaffolding visual organizers, and one that is simplified for regular courses. It has been seen that almost all the developed countries are publishing course books that are specially designed for the learners' age, lacks, and needs. Cultural background and traditional way of life have also been taken into consideration. As we suggested ways in Language history, planning and policy I would recommend changing the syllabus that is created for school pupils as it is not organized properly. After having read the article, I would create a language planning policy that is aimed at creating syllabi and course books for School and Higher Education students to modify some patterns in those syllabuses.

### **Reference:**

1. Cummins, J., & Early, M. (2010), Identity texts: The collaborative creation of power in multilingual schools. Staffordshire: Trentham
2. Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2014 a). Transnational identity and a model of investment in language learners: The promise of digital storytelling. Education matters: The journal of Teaching and Learning, 2, (1), 55-66
3. Darvin, R., & Norton, B (2014b) Social class transitional identity and migrant students: Journal of Teaching and Learning. Identity & Education , 13(2), 111-117