

Language planning and policy

Khonzoda Makhramkulova
Master Student of

Uzbekistan State World Languages University
xonzodamaxramkulova@gmail.com

Ergasheva Guli

Scientific Supervisor, Doctor of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor
Uzbekistan State World Languages University
ergashevaguli327@gmail.com

Annotation. In this article, the concept of language policy and its planning, its development, how language policy and its planning practices were carried out on the example of different continents and countries in those regions will be explained. During the language policy and its planning, the process of various skills and the obstacles they face are highlighted. Also, what shortcomings were noticed during these activities, how they were eliminated, and what achievements were made. The study of language planning and policy (LPP) examines how social, educational, and political institutions purposefully shape language use, status, and structure. It entails initiatives to advance, control, or modify language in order to achieve social, political, or cultural objectives. Language status planning, which determines which languages are given official status; corpus planning, which creates or standardises language structure; and acquisition planning, which influences language instruction and learning, are among the important topics covered by LPP.

Keywords: Language planning, Language policy, Soviet Union, alphabet, language law, multilingualism, nation, official language

Tilni rejalashtirish va siyosati

Xonzoda Maxramkulova

O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti magistranti
xonzodamaxramkulova@gmail.com

Ergasheva Guli

Ilmiy rahbar, filologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent
O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti
ergashevaguli327@gmail.com

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqolada til siyosati tushunchasi va uni rejalashtirish, uning rivojlanishi, til siyosati va uni rejalashtirish amaliyoti o'sha mintaqalardagi turli qit'a va davlatlar misolida qanday amalga oshirilganligi tushuntiriladi. Til siyosati va uni rejalashtirish jarayonida turli malakalar jarayoni va ular duch keladigan to'siqlar yoritiladi. Shuningdek, mazkur tadbirlar davomida qanday kamchiliklar kuzatildi, ular qanday bartaraf etildi, qanday yutuqlarga erishildi. Tilni rejalashtirish va siyosatini o'rganish (LPP) ijtimoiy, ta'lim va siyosiy institutlarning tildan foydalanish, maqom va tuzilmani qanday maqsadli shakllantirganini o'rganadi. Bu ijtimoiy, siyosiy yoki madaniy maqsadlarga erishish uchun tilni rivojlantirish, nazorat qilish yoki o'zgartirish tashabbuslarini o'z ichiga oladi. Qaysi tillarga rasmiy maqom berilishini belgilovchi til holatini rejalashtirish; til tuzilishini yaratadigan yoki standartlashtiradigan korpus rejalashtirish; va tilni o'rgatish va o'rganishga ta'sir qiluvchi o'zlashtirishni rejalashtirish LPP tomonidan qamrab olingan muhim mavzular qatoriga kiradi.

Kalit so'zlar: *Tilni rejalashtirish, Til siyosati, Sovet Ittifoqi, alifbo, til qonuni, ko'p tillilik, millat, rasmiy til*

Языковое планирование и политика

Хонзода Махрамкулова
Магистрант Узбекского государственного университета мировых языков
honzodamaxramqulova@gmail.com

Эргашева Гули
Научный руководитель, доктор филологических наук, доцент Узбекского
государственного университета мировых языков
ergashevaguli327@gmail.com

Аннотация. *В этой статье будет объяснена концепция языковой политики и ее планирования, ее развитие, как языковая политика и ее методы планирования осуществлялись на примере разных континентов и стран в этих регионах. В ходе языковой политики и ее планирования освещаются различные навыки и препятствия, с которыми они сталкиваются. Также, какие недостатки были замечены в ходе этих мероприятий, как они были устранены и какие достижения были достигнуты. Изучение языкового планирования и политики (LPP) изучает, как социальные, образовательные и политические институты целенаправленно формируют использование, статус и структуру языка. Оно влечет за собой инициативы по продвижению, контролю или изменению языка для достижения социальных, политических или культурных целей. Планирование статуса языка, которое определяет, каким языкам присваивается официальный статус; планирование корпуса, которое создает или стандартизирует языковую структуру; и планирование приобретения, которое влияет на обучение и изучение языка, являются одними из важных тем, охватываемых LPP.*

Ключевые слова: *языковое планирование, языковая политика, Советский Союз, алфавит, языковой закон, многоязычие, нация, официальный язык*

Introduction

Language planning and policy (LPP), which influences how languages are used, taught, and valued in countries, is an essential part of nation-building and cultural identity. Managing linguistic diversity while maintaining national identity is becoming more and more difficult for nations as a result of increased global mobility, migration, and digital communication. LPP frameworks, which frequently take into account a nation's political, cultural, and historical background, handle issues of language status, teaching, and standardisation. Minority languages may be marginalised and social divisions may be strengthened, or these policies may promote inclusivity and protect linguistic history.

The evolution of language planning and policy in five different contexts—Korea, the US, Britain, the Middle East, and Uzbekistan—is examined in this article. Due to historical occurrences, social dynamics, and political objectives, each of these regions provides distinct insights into the motivations for and results of LPP activities. For instance, Korea's language policy has prioritised cultural nationalism and linguistic homogeneity, with a special emphasis on shielding the Korean language from outside influences. The United States, on the other hand, has taken a more decentralised approach to language policy because of its heterogeneous population, focussing on English to maintain national cohesion while negotiating many linguistic communities.

An example of how language policy intersects with social class, regional identities, and historical ties to former colonies is Britain, a country with complicated colonial legacies. In the midst of increasing modernisation, Middle Eastern nations struggle to maintain indigenous and minority

languages while also preserving Arabic as a unifying language. Last but not least, Uzbekistan's post-Soviet language strategy reflects its process of forming a national identity, with language serving as a key instrument for separating itself from Russian influence and preserving its cultural legacy.

This article aims to evaluate the larger social, cultural, and educational effects of language policy decisions by analysing the elements that influence them through these case studies. We can learn more about how language policies influence and are influenced by the political and social environments of various countries by contrasting these disparate methods.

Literature review

The study of language planning and policy (LPP) looks at how organisations and governments control language use, status, and education in order to achieve larger national goals. In their analyses of LPP in diverse cultural and geopolitical contexts, scholars including Liddicoat, Kirkpatrick, Jae Jung Song, Hyunsik Min, and Birgit Schlyter have demonstrated how language is employed as a means of negotiating social cohesion, constructing identity, and asserting political independence. In a variety of nations, such as Korea, the US, Britain, the Middle East, and Uzbekistan, these scholars have provided insights into the procedures, difficulties, and effects of LPP efforts.

According to Liddicoat's research, a nation's unique demands and sociopolitical conditions have a significant impact on language planning. He contends that rather than being a neutral process, LPP is inextricably related to identity and power and frequently acts as a means of preserving culture and fostering national development. Status planning, corpus planning, and acquisition planning are all components of his framework for analysing LPP. These three approaches each focus on a distinct facet of language use, ranging from linguistic standardisation and educational application to legal recognition.

Kirkpatrick's comparative study of East and Southeast Asian language policies examines how nations deal with the coexistence of regional languages and international languages, especially English. His writings are particularly pertinent to Korea, where English is viewed as a possible threat to Korean linguistic and cultural identity while also being supported for economic progress. Kirkpatrick draws attention to the intricate dynamics in Asia, where nations frequently seek to strike a balance between their national identities and their ability to compete globally by advancing both English language instruction and local language policies at the same time.

Jae Jung Song offers a comprehensive analysis of Korea's language policy, delving into the sociopolitical drivers of the country's initiatives to preserve and advance the Korean language. According to Song, Korean LPP has always been motivated by a strong yearning for linguistic autonomy that stems from colonialism and is strengthened by the forces of modern globalisation. Seeing language as essential to national identity and cultural sovereignty, he looks at initiatives that aim to restrict the use of English and prioritise Korean in the media, government, and educational system. Hyunsik Min goes into additional detail about the Korean environment by looking at how language policy has changed in reaction to technological breakthroughs and globalisation. Min's research focusses on how English is incorporated into Korean school and how this affects social equality. According to him, knowing English can widen socioeconomic gaps in Korean culture even though it is frequently marketed as a means of accessing opportunities around the world. His work shows that LPP is a tool for regulating the effects of outside language and cultural pressures on society as well as for fostering togetherness.

In her research on Uzbekistan and other Central Asian countries, Birgit Schlyter emphasises the importance of language policy in the development of post-Soviet identities. Schlyter looks at how the LPP in Uzbekistan sought to replace Russian in public life, education, and administration with Uzbek as the country's official language after gaining independence from the Soviet Union. Schlyter claims that Uzbekistan's LPP is indicative of a larger movement in post-Soviet nations to recover their sense of national identity and lessen their reliance on Russian, which was once the dominant language. The function of language policy in negotiating post-colonial legacies and promoting a unique national identity is demonstrated by Schlyter's analysis.

A corpus of all primary and secondary legislation from the UK and devolved governments from January 1918 to January 2021 that dealt with language was developed and evaluated for our study (Humphries & Ayres-Bennet, 2023). The collection of language policy publications created as part of the Arts and Humanities Research Council-funded Promoting Language Policy project contains this information. There are now separate administrations and parliaments or assemblies in each jurisdiction with varying powers to enact primary and secondary laws, thanks to the 1998 devolution of some powers from the UK government and parliament to Northern Ireland, Scotland, and Wales.

Together, these academics show how distinct historical, social, and political circumstances cause LPP to differ between nations. Policies in Korea show a great commitment to maintaining cultural integrity and language purity in the face of external challenges. The multicultural and multilingual character of American society is reflected in the country's mainly decentralised language policy. While Middle Eastern countries strike a balance between Arabic and minority languages to preserve cultural cohesiveness, Britain's language policy are impacted by regional dialects and social class differences. The LPP of Uzbekistan, which was influenced by its post-Soviet environment, emphasises the use of language to differentiate national identity from Russian influence. The research emphasises that LPP is a complex, context-dependent field that is influenced by a country's unique history, identity, and geopolitical environment rather than being a one-size-fits-all approach through these varied viewpoints. Comprehending these disparate methodologies offers valuable understanding of how language policy can promote national unity, demonstrate autonomy, and address the issues of globalisation and multiculturalism.

Methodology

Language planning and policy (LPP) development processes in five different geopolitical contexts—Korea, the United States, Britain, the Middle East, and Uzbekistan—are examined in this study using a comparative qualitative technique. The study integrates document analysis and secondary data evaluation to comprehend the LPP processes, motives, and impacts in each location, drawing on the frameworks and insights created by Liddicoat, Kirkpatrick, Jae Jung Song, Hyunsik Min, and Birgit Schlyter. The theoretical and empirical underpinnings offered by the authors' publications are invaluable, providing insights into the ways in which historical, social, and cultural issues influence LPP projects.

1. Literature-Based Analysis:

This study starts with a thorough literature review that frames the examination of LPP in each nation by synthesising important publications by Liddicoat, Kirkpatrick, Song, Min, and Schlyter. Liddicoat's conceptualisation of LPP processes—acquisition planning, corpus planning, and status planning—offers a framework for analysing how each country structures language use, defines language status, and encourages language learning. This framework is used in every location to guarantee a consistent method of comparison.

2. Document Analysis:

To capture the unique legislative and administrative approaches to language planning, government documents, policy papers, educational curriculum, and official declarations from each region are examined. This approach makes it possible to comprehend the goals and intentions of policy in a more sophisticated way. For instance, Song and Min study Korea's educational policies and language regulations to assess the state's dedication to linguistic purity and defence against outside influence. In Uzbekistan, an assessment of government Uzbek policies aimed at promoting Uzbek and reducing the usage of Russian complements Schlyter's research of post-Soviet language policy. The analysis uncovers the goals and tactics that underlie each nation's LPP by looking at these papers.

3. Secondary Data Analysis:

The study uses secondary data, such as demographic figures, educational statistics, and language competency assessments, to contextualise and validate the findings obtained from document analysis. These data sources demonstrate how language policies affect linguistic diversity, language

usage patterns, and educational outcomes, providing quantitative evidence to complement the qualitative insights gleaned from the literature and document evaluations. For example, Kirkpatrick's decentralised language policy approach is influenced by linguistic diversity, as evidenced by U.S. census data. Statistics on the Middle East's population and language usage show how difficult it is to preserve Arabic as a uniting language while promoting other languages.

4. Comparative Case Study Approach:

The distinctive and common characteristics of LPP in Korea, the US, the UK, the Middle East, and Uzbekistan are highlighted using a comparative case study approach. This method aids in spotting trends and differences among various national policies. For instance, the study looks at how the decentralised, multicultural strategy of the US, as mentioned by Kirkpatrick, contrasts with Korea's emphasis on language purity, as stated by Song and Min. In a similar vein, Schlyter compares Britain's complex language policies that balance regional dialects and standard English with Uzbekistan's post-Soviet language policies that emphasise national identity. This approach enables a thorough investigation of LPP by combining the ideas of influential writers with document and secondary data analysis. This method reveals both the common problems and distinctive solutions found in other locales, offering a comprehensive grasp of how each nation's language policies represent and react to distinct cultural, political, and historical forces.

Main Part

The term "language policy" describes the stated or unstated values, objectives, and regulations that govern language use in a certain community, organisation, or field. Language policy can be developed and implemented by a variety of actors, including communities, organisations, governments, and private citizens. A region's or a group's linguistic ecology, variety, and geography can all be impacted by language policy. Language policies might, for instance, support or impede language learning and preservation, award or reject linguistic rights, or promote or suppress certain languages.

The process of creating and implementing a language policy is known as language planning. Status planning, corpus planning, and acquisition planning are the three primary categories of language planning. The assignment of tasks and responsibilities to various languages in a society—such as official, national, or minority languages—is known as status planning. The creation and standardisation of linguistic resources and features, such as dictionaries, grammar, vocabulary, and spelling, is known as corpus planning. The goal of acquisition planning is to support and facilitate language learning and instruction through activities including curriculum development, teacher preparation, and evaluation.

Language policy and planning (LPLP) is a new field emerged in the late 1950s, focusing on language problems in developing nations post-WWII. It was initially imposed by governments and agencies, aiming to address multilingualism and address the challenges of newly independent states. Emerging nations realized that their official languages didn't solve political and social problems but instead created new ones, leading to ethical questions about top-down language planning (LPLP). Researchers scrutinized hidden agendas and unintended consequences. The collapse of communism and the Cold War led to a resurgence of interest in LPLP, focusing on internationalization, globalization, English as a world language, language endangerment, and migration, with challenges in connecting macro- and micro-levels.

A nation's identity and progress are fundamentally shaped by its language, which is also vital in forming its educational, communication, and cultural institutions. The problem of language planning and policy execution becomes a subject of considerable discussion and examination as nations move through various developmental stages. We may learn a great deal about the opportunities and difficulties that come with negotiating the complicated landscape of language development by looking at the historical background and experiences of other nations. Policymakers and educators can use these lessons to better encourage multilingualism and protect language diversity in their own nations. Furthermore, governments can make well-informed decisions

regarding their own language policies by knowing the triumphs and failures of language planning in various circumstances. While some nations, like Japan, have concentrated on advancing a standardised national language, others, like Canada, have adopted bilingual policies to suit their different linguistic communities. These methods take into account the distinct historical and cultural elements that affect language planning choices in every nation. Below, we will look at the history of development, its stages, and the many changes that have been made along this process using the example of different countries.

Language planning and policy: The case of the USA

Language relations inside a state are inextricably linked to interethnic relations, which are universally regarded by sociologists and politicians as the most precarious aspect of human coexistence within a social structure. As a result, the state's national policy always includes a vision of a complex language problem, and the methods for resolving it are appropriately referred to as "language policy and planning." "The term language planning referred to deliberate efforts to affect the structure or function of languages," Tollefson & Pérez-Milans add (Tollefson & Pérez-Milans, 2018). Although sociolinguists continue to try to characterise the most prevalent forms of language policy, each state that has a more or less complex language situation handles its issues in its own unique manner. The topic of the so-called "state language" is one of the primary concerns of language policy. A single language must be used for writing legislation, conducting centralised broadcasting, and conducting instruction in higher education institutions in a multinational state if its integrity is to be taken seriously. The state is formally represented in the international arena using this language.

The fact that the United States is still a "state without a state language" despite having an unequivocal majority of English speakers is noteworthy. Most politicians believe that attempts to provide the English language the constitutional status as a state language violate human rights. "Policies can be part of the mediation process, but it is problematic to see this mediation only in terms of the policy," according to Liddicoat (Liddicoat, 2018). It can be difficult to reconcile the conflict between the languages of the majority and the minority, and agencies as well as language policies should be used. Scots Gaelic, Welsh, and Irish language allegiance in Britain was the subject of the first issue of *Language Problems and Language Planning*, as stated by Spolsky (Spolsky, 2018). According to the journal, these issues were resolved via language planning. It is true that language assimilation processes can lead to extreme manifestations if they are not well managed. This phenomenon is referred to as a "linguistic shift" or "linguistic bias" and occurs when the majority language is preferred over the original tongue, particularly when it serves as the language of interethnic contact.

After examining these concerns, a teacher may reasonably conclude that they must promote multilingual education in order to guarantee appropriate language policies and planning at the micro level, such as in their classroom. "Bilingual education became a way of developing the bilingualism of language minoritized people that had experienced language shift and language loss as a result of monolingual schooling," according to García and Lin, who bolster that assertion (García & Linn, 2017). For language minorities, bilingual education offers a fantastic chance to not only learn their mother tongue but also to retain their cultural heritage. In addition, Jiang states that language planning and policies "constitute policies on language acquisition and use in the classroom; or on language learning and instructional practices in classrooms at elementary, secondary, or tertiary levels" (Jiang, 2017). Furthermore, learning a second language may provide those who speak it a greater understanding of other cultures and more positive outlooks for their future in education and employment. Numerous studies demonstrate how having a basic command of two or more languages benefits social, cultural, and biological facets of society.

Language planning and policy in Europe: The case of The UK.

In the UK, linguistic variety, historical influences, and English's dual status as a national and international language play a significant role in shaping language planning and policy (LPP). Welsh, Scottish Gaelic, and Irish are regional languages that have special status in their respective regions,

despite English being the most widely spoken language in the UK. This reflects efforts to preserve the UK's multilingual past. Many community languages, such as Polish, Urdu, Bengali, and Punjabi, have emerged as a result of immigration, which is another issue that the UK's language policy attempts to solve. Because of this diversity, there are many different aspects of language policy that try to strike a balance between cultural and linguistic tolerance and national unity.

English is widely used in government, education, the media, and public life in the United Kingdom, making it the *de facto* national language. The UK does not, however, formally declare English to be its official language, in contrast to many other nations. Because English has historically extended and become ingrained as a common language throughout the UK and abroad, its dominance in public life is mainly unregulated at the national level. Some academics contend that because of English's historical standing, there is no need for formalised language regulations because English is the dominant language, resulting in an implicit policy approach (May, 2012).

Significant efforts have been made by the UK government to protect and advance indigenous languages, especially Welsh, Scottish Gaelic, and Irish, all of which have had revitalisation initiatives meant to reverse language shift. Wales has taken a particularly active approach to language policy; the Government of Wales Act of 1998 and the Welsh Language Act of 1993 established Welsh equal status with English in Wales and required Welsh to be used in government, media, and education. By 2050, the Welsh government hopes to have one million Welsh speakers, having set high goals for the language's growth (Welsh Government, 2017). Despite the fact that Welsh is still more generally spoken, Scottish Gaelic is being promoted in Scotland thanks to the Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act of 2005. Efforts to maintain Scottish Gaelic as a cultural heritage language include bilingual signs, Gaelic-medium education, and financing for Gaelic media. Irish people in Northern Ireland benefit from cultural promotion, but they suffer political obstacles in their quest for the same recognition and prominence as Welsh or Scottish Gaelic (Mac Giolla Chríost, 2012)

Many community languages are spoken by the diverse population of the United Kingdom, which is a result of both historical migration from former colonies and more recent immigration from Europe and other countries. According to the 2011 Census, Urdu, Bengali, Punjabi, and Gujarati are the most spoken languages in the UK, with Polish coming in second. Many municipal authorities recognise the linguistic demands of various communities and support multilingual services in healthcare, education, and social services, even though English language acquisition is encouraged. Some schools, especially those in cities, embrace community languages and acknowledge their importance in promoting intercultural understanding (Edwards, 2016). However, there are disagreements regarding how much the UK should encourage multilingualism and continue community language programs because community language policies differ greatly by region and are frequently underfunded (Matras, 2015). Some call for more comprehensive multilingual education policies that acknowledge the linguistic diversity of the UK population, while others contend that inconsistent support for community languages results from a lack of centralised policy.

English continues to be the major language of instruction even though the UK has implemented a number of language education programs to promote studying foreign languages. English primary and secondary schools are required to teach foreign languages, with a particular emphasis on European languages like French, German, and Spanish. Despite this, the UK has had difficulty encouraging English speakers to become proficient in other languages, as seen by the sharp drop in pupils studying foreign languages at the GCSE and A-level levels in recent years (Tinsley, & Board, 2016). The UK's lack of proficiency in foreign languages may affect its ability to compete globally and comprehend other cultures, according to the British Council.

The pressures of globalisation must be balanced with the promotion of the UK's linguistic heritage, especially the preservation of Welsh, Scottish Gaelic, and Irish. English's dominance in the UK has been strengthened by its rise as a worldwide language, occasionally overshadowing initiatives to revive indigenous and minority languages. Discussions concerning the value of foreign language proficiency, the role of English, and the UK's adherence to its multilingual past have all been reignited

by the Brexit referendum and its aftermath. In order to preserve solid international ties and economic competitiveness in a post-EU environment, academics contend that Brexit may call for a stronger emphasis on studying European languages (Phillipson, 2019).

In the UK, language planning and policy show a complicated interaction between the realities of linguistic variety brought about by immigration, regional language preservation initiatives, and English's supremacy. Although Welsh, Scottish Gaelic, and Irish continue to have strong government support, English is still the *de facto* dominant language. This indicates the significance of linguistic heritage in particular areas. While LPP at the local level frequently depends on the resources and goals of the local government, community languages are recognised but receive varying degrees of support. This decentralised approach to language policy draws attention to the UK's linguistic diversity management strategy's advantages and disadvantages. Language policy is crucial for promoting inclusivity, conserving cultural history, and tackling the issues brought about by globalisation, as demonstrated by the writings of May, Edwards, and Matras, among others.

Language planning and policy: The case of Middle East

In the Middle East, a complex interplay of historical, theological, and social variables shapes language planning and policy (LPP). Arabic is widely used throughout the region as a uniting symbol that is intricately entwined with Islamic identity, in addition to being the main language of communication. Nonetheless, there is linguistic diversity in the Middle East, with sizable populations speaking languages like Hebrew, Turkish, Persian, Berber, and Kurdish. While balancing the existence of minority languages with the influence of international languages like English and French, the region's language policy show efforts to keep Arabic as the dominant language.

Due in great part to its affiliation with Islam and the Arabic-written Qur'an, Arabic is the primary language of government, education, and the media in the majority of Middle Eastern nations. Arabic is positioned as a language of cultural and religious unification across national borders due to its symbolic and functional character (Haeri, 2003). By requiring Arabic to be used in government and educational settings and portraying it as a source of pride and identity, language policies in nations like Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and the United Arab Emirates uphold the language's primacy (Schulthies, 2019). For example, Saudi Arabia upholds stringent language regulations to guarantee the use of Arabic in public settings, hence enhancing the language's significance as a component of social cohesiveness and national identity (Al-Issa & Dahan, 2011).

Significant linguistic minorities can be found in the Middle East, such as Hebrew and Persian speakers in Israel and Iran, Kurdish speakers in Iraq, Syria, and Turkey, and Berber speakers in North Africa. Minority languages are frequently marginalised in official contexts as a result of the policies that many nations have adopted to prioritise Arabic. For instance, Kurdish has previously been prohibited in public places in Turkey; but, recent reforms have allowed Kurdish to be used in media and school settings, albeit in a restricted way (Yildiz & Ferhad, 2011). Likewise, in Iran, the majority of the population speaks Arabic, Kurdish, and Azeri, yet Persian is the only official language. Although minority communities are always working to have their languages recognised, Iran's language policy prohibits the use of minority languages in public settings (Alam & Huissen, 2014).

English and, to a lesser extent, French have become more influential in the Middle East due to globalisation and international relations, especially in the fields of media, commerce, and education. English is widely used in business and higher education in nations like the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, and Bahrain. This reflects the region's aim to draw in international investment and integrate into the global economy (Karmani, 2005). English's widespread use sparks discussions about cultural preservation because some people worry that Arabic will be undermined and cultural links will be weakened by a reliance on foreign languages. Because of their colonial past, nations like Morocco and Tunisia have a longstanding association with French, and French is frequently used in government, economic, and educational contexts (Ennaji, 2005).

Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) is frequently emphasised as the medium of instruction in Middle Eastern educational policies, particularly in primary and secondary institutions. However,

MSA is very different from the regionally spoken colloquial Arabic dialects, which can make learning and understanding the language difficult. The goal of standardising Arabic in educational settings is to promote a single linguistic identity; yet, the function of regional dialects in education is still up for question (Ferguson, 2003). While some academics contend that teaching colloquial Arabic could increase students' understanding and participation, others see it as a danger to linguistic and cultural cohesion.

The tension between promoting Arabic as a unifying language and accommodating linguistic diversity is a recurring theme in Middle Eastern language policies. Countries like Lebanon, with its diverse religious and ethnic communities, often adopt a more pluralistic approach to language, allowing for French, English, and Arabic in official contexts to reflect its multicultural identity. Lebanon's approach contrasts sharply with more homogenous countries, where strict language policies emphasize Arabic as a means of reinforcing national identity (Joseph, 2004). Across the region, LPP faces the challenge of maintaining cultural and linguistic heritage while supporting the needs of a globalized economy.

The Middle East's LPP demonstrates a difficult balancing act between managing the region's multilingual realities, maintaining Arabic as a uniting language, and adjusting to linguistic influences from throughout the world. Although minority languages and foreign languages like English and French play significant roles in particular circumstances, Arabic's supremacy shows its cultural and religious significance. LPP will probably need to change to address both the preservation of Arabic and the linguistic rights of varied people as regional changes and globalisation continue to affect the Middle East. Scholars like Haeri, Schulthies, and Yildiz have shed light on these processes through their research, showing how language regulations in the area influence social cohesion, identity, and government.

Language planning and policy in Central Asia: The case of Uzbekistan

The Central Asian republics emerged from the Russian empire's expansion in the 18th and 19th centuries. The Soviet Union created these republics, with the Turkestan Soviet Federative Republic established in 1918 and the Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic in 1920. The early Soviet policy of indigenisation aimed to recognize ethnic identities, cultures, and languages, with all five republics predominantly Muslim. The division of Turkic-speaking republics significantly contributed to the development of specific national identities and languages within the Soviet world, fostering a sense of place (Grenoble, 2003).

Нация есть исторически сложившаяся устойчивая общность людей, возникшая на базе общности языка, территории, экономической жизни и психического склада, проявляющегося в общности культуры. [A nation is an historically constituted, stable community of people, formed in the basis of a common language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture.] (Stalin, 1946).

Before 1989, the Uzbek SSR declared Uzbek the official language, recognizing Russian as the language of interethnic communication. The law also allowed the use of other ethnic languages within the republic. In education, the law recognized Russian, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Tajik, and Turkmen as media of instruction. The law mandates Uzbek as the primary medium of instruction at all levels, requiring all students to study Uzbek in non-Uzbek medium schools and Russian. The 1989 language law introduced Arabic script for Uzbek writing, but it wasn't adopted until 1993. The Latin alphabet was adopted, but Cyrillic script remains widely used in government publications (Spechler, 2007).

The Education Law of 1992 in Uzbekistan allows parents to choose their children's language of instruction, but it is governed by the 1989 law. Uzbek is considered the normal language of schooling, with Russian and other recognized languages also available. The 1997 Education Law revokes this right (Republic of Uzbekistan, 1997). Despite this, Uzbek medium schools exist, with Russian being the second most widely used medium. However, Uzbek implementation faces challenges due to a lack of qualified teachers and teaching materials (Bydanova, & Rozmetov, 2014). The school system

is facing challenges due to the rejection of old Soviet-era materials and the change in script, rendering them obsolete.

Uzbek has become the sole official language of Uzbekistan, leading to increased emphasis on Uzbek in the education system. After the independence of Uzbekistan, opinions were raised about changing the Uzbek script from Russian script to script based on Latin script. This issue was thoroughly discussed in the mass media for a year with the participation of the general public, and on September 2, 1993, the law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On the introduction of the Uzbek alphabet based on the Latin script" was announced. The newly adopted Uzbek alphabet was defined as consisting of 31 letters and one apostrophe. The alphabet in the new version was as follows (31 letters and 1 symbol) (Kunu.Uz., 2021):

A a	B b	C c	Ç ç	D d	E e		F f	G g	Ğ ğ	H h	I i
J j	K k	L l	M m	N n	Ñ ñ	O o	Ö ö	P p	Q q	R r	S s
Ş ş	T t	U u	V v	X x	Y y	Z z	Ɲ ƞ		'		

But two years later, on May 6, 1995, the Oliy Majlis of the Republic of Uzbekistan adopted a law on making changes to the alphabet.

According to this document:

- it was established that the new Uzbek alphabet consists of 26 letters and 3 letter combinations (Kunu.Uz., 2021);

A a	B b		Ch ch	D d	E e		F f	G g	G'g'	H h	I i
J j	K k	L l	M m	N n	ng	O o	O' o'	P p	Q q	R r	S s
Sh sh	T t	U u	V v	X x	Y y	Z z		'			

- C c, Ɲ ƞ letters were removed from the alphabet;
- The form of the letters Ç ç, Ğ ğ, Ş ş, Ñ ñ was reformed.

The alphabet in the new version has the following appearance (26 letters, 3 letter combinations, 1 symbol):

The alphabet adopted in 1929 underwent 3 changes in 1934 (3 vowel letters were removed), 1 letter was added in 1993 (the letter s for the ts sound), the shape of 6 letters was changed, and 2 letters were removed from the alphabet in 1995 (C c, Ɲ ƞ letters), 4 letter forms were reformed.

Students are required to study a foreign language for two to four hours a week, with English being the primary medium of instruction (Pavlenko, 2008). Other universities teach in English.

Language planning and policy: the case of Korea

It's possible to draw comparisons between the circumstances in North and South Korea and those in the former East and West Germany. However, this is not a fair comparison because East

Germans were aware of life on the other side through West German television long before the Berlin wall was taken down. In contrast, few North Koreans dare listen to South Korean radio stations, and they are not allowed to view South Korean television. Similarly, South Koreans can watch a small amount of North Korean news broadcast on television these days, but they do not have direct access to North Korean television. For further information on how and why the circumstances in Korea are different from those in China and Taiwan or in the former East and West Germany, see C.-W. Kim (Kim, 1991).

The invention of the Hangul until 1945. One of the earliest examples of purposeful language design in history is the Korean phonetic alphabet, currently known as Hangul. Every choice pertaining to a Korean person's language planning an important example of purposeful language planning that influences sociolinguistic analysis and political decisions is the Korean phonetic alphabet, or Hangul. Chinese characters were the only foreign script utilised by the Koreans prior to the relatively late invention of Hangul. Because Korean is a polysyllabic language and Chinese is a monosyllabic language, the usage of this extremely complex writing system created significant issues. Around the first century A.D., the Koreans began using Chinese writing, and the classical Chinese language (in Korean, hanmun) was made an official language. Korea adopted Chinese character words, which now make up 60% of its vocabulary. Due to the difficulty in writing pure Korean words without modifying Chinese characters, Koreans used Chinese script to record their native language, leading to the development of idu, an official reading system that simplified Chinese character strokes. The Chinese developed idu, a writing system that simplified Chinese characters' strokes, using sounds and meanings, which was a precursor to the Japanese Katakana writing system. In 1443, King Sejong formulated a phonetic script called hangul, initially consisting of 28 symbols. It was royally promulgated in 1446 and is considered one of the most simple and scientific writing systems. Hangul became widely used in the 20th century as a symbol of modern national identity and independence, and is considered a significant event in Korean culture.

The Language Policy in South Korea after 1945. In 1949, North Korea banned the use of Chinese characters due to concerns about hindering literacy development and the spread of communism and Il-Sung Kim's personality cult (Song, 2001). However, in 1966, North Korea's leader Il-Sung Kim reintroduced Chinese characters into the educational system, teaching them at secondary and tertiary levels (Song, 2001). This decision aimed to maintain control over the population (Cooper, 1989). The government's drive for internationalization supports Hanca, citing Chinese characters as an international script. South Korea's President advised learning Chinese characters and English from primary school to raise internationalists (Cooper, 1989).

Language Policy in North Korea after 1945. The Stalinist regime of North Korea implemented isolationism, declaring the Pyongyang dialect as the new standard language, "the language of workers and peasants." This policy, sometimes referred to as a "language revolution," despite its resemblance to Seoul-centered standard Korean. The North's language planning can be divided into three periods: democratization (1945-1948), normalization (1949-1963), and munhwa-o (1964-). The democratization period aimed to abolish illiteracy, while the normalization period compiled new orthography rules and abolished Chinese characters. The munhwa-o period began in 1964, with a political campaign focusing on replacing foreign lexical elements, revealing similarities with South Korean purification movements due to nationalistic sentiment. Language divergence between North and South Korea is challenging, with vocabulary being the main difference. North Korean defectors face difficulties due to English terms in South Korea and Chinese characters. In today's globalized era, eliminating communication gaps between the two languages is crucial for closer understanding.

Conclusion

The urge to strengthen national identity after periods of external influence has a significant impact on language policy in Korea and Uzbekistan. One example of a post-Soviet nation-building strategy is Uzbekistan, which has made Uzbek a priority and gradually reduced the role of Russian in public life. In a similar vein, Korea's strategy prioritises the preservation of Korean culture and

language, with a particular emphasis on standardising language instruction to foster national cohesion and lessen the impact of foreign languages, particularly English. English is the primary language in the UK, although regional languages like Welsh, Scottish Gaelic, and Irish are also being preserved. Britain's dedication to cultural and linguistic heritage is reflected in its decentralised strategy; nonetheless, it has difficulties in fostering the growing diversity of community languages brought about by immigration. In contrast, the United States has a somewhat lax approach to language regulation, with states having differing positions on minority languages and bilingual education and English being the most widely spoken language without official status. This symbolises the freedom and pluralism of the United States, but it also makes it difficult to promote multilingualism and linguistic inclusion.

Arabic is a uniting language in many Middle Eastern nations, and its religious and cultural significance greatly influences language policy in the region. But the region also faces its own linguistic variety, with some populations placing a high value on languages like Kurdish, Persian, and Berber. Minority language rights are approached differently in the Middle East by different nations, and the impact of international languages like English and French has complicated LPP, particularly in the media and education sectors. In these areas, LPP has to strike a balance between maintaining linguistic traditions and adjusting to linguistic influences from throughout the world. The disparity between nations with more flexible approaches (like the UK and the U.S.) and others with more rigid language laws (like Uzbekistan and Korea) emphasises the different levels of government involvement in language development and preservation. In an increasingly interconnected world, the significance of LPP as a tool for fostering cultural identity, social cohesion, and inclusivity is shown by the continuous changes in language regulations in these nations.

References:

1. Alam, F., & Huissen, M. (2014). *Language politics and minorities in Iran*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
2. Al-Issa, A., & Dahan, L. (2011). *Global English and Arabic: Issues of language, culture, and identity*. Peter Lang.
3. Bydanova, L., & Rozmetov, D. (2014). Évolutions récentes du système éducatif de l'Ouzbékistan. *Revue internationale d'éducation de Sèvres*, 65, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.4000/ries.3671>
4. Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Edwards, V. (2016). *Multilingualism in the English-speaking world: Pedigree of nations*. Wiley-Blackwell.
6. Ennaji, M. (2005). *Multilingualism, cultural identity, and education in Morocco*. Springer.
7. Ferguson, C. A. (2003). *Diglossia and multilingualism: A perspective on Arabic language education in the Middle East*. Georgetown University Press.
8. García, O., & Lin, A. M. (2017). Translanguaging in bilingual education. *Bilingual and Multilingual Education*, 117-130.
9. Grenoble, L. A. (2003). *Language policy in the Soviet Union*. Kluwer.
10. Haeri, N. (2003). *Sacred language, ordinary people: Dilemmas of culture and politics in Egypt*. Palgrave Macmillan.
11. Hasanova, D. (2016). English education in Uzbekistan. In E. S. Ahn & J. Smagulova (Eds.), *Language change in Central Asia* (pp. 245–265). De Gruyter Mouton.
12. Humphries, E., & Ayres-Bennett, W. (2023). The hidden face of the UK's public language policy. *Languages, Society and Policy*.
13. Jiang, X. (Ed.). (2017). *Sociolinguistics: Interdisciplinary perspectives*. InTech.
14. Joseph, J. E. (2004). *Language and identity: National, ethnic, religious*. Palgrave Macmillan.
15. Karmani, S. (2005). Petro-linguistics: The emerging nexus between oil, English, and Islam. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 4(2), 87-102.

16. Kunu.Uz. (2021, April 6). *Lotin yozuvli o'zbek alifbosi: o'zgarishlar xronologiyasi*.
17. Landau, J. M., & Kellner-Heinkele, B. (2001). *Politics of language in the ex-Soviet Muslim states: Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Tajikistan*. University of Michigan Press.
18. Liddicoat, A. J. (2018). Constraints on agency in micro language policy and planning in schools. *Agency in Language Policy and Planning*, 149-170.
19. Mac Giolla Chríost, D. (2012). *Language, identity and conflict: A comparative study of language in ethnic conflict in Europe and Eurasia*. Routledge.
20. Matras, Y., & Robertson, A. (2015). *Multilingualism in a post-national era: Globalization, migration, and identity in Western Europe*. Routledge.
21. May, S. (2012). *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism, and the politics of language*. Routledge.
22. Pavlenko, A. (2008). Multilingualism in post-Soviet countries: Language revival, language removal, and sociolinguistic theory. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11(3-4), 275-314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050802271517>
23. Phillipson, R. (2019). *English and European integration: How Brexit challenges language policy*. Springer.
24. Republic of Uzbekistan. (1997). Таълим тўғрисида [Education law]. http://www.lex.uz/pages/getpage.aspx?lact_id=16188
25. Song, J. J. (2001). North and South Korea: Language policies of divergence and convergence. In N. Gottlieb & P. Chen (Eds.), *Language planning and policy: East Asian perspectives* (pp. 129-157). Curzon Press.
26. Spechler, M. C. (2007). Authoritarian politics and economic reform in Uzbekistan: Past, present and prospects. *Central Asian Survey*, 26(2), 185-202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02634930701517383>
27. Spolsky, B. (2018). Language policy: From planning to management. In *Un(intended) Language Planning in a Globalising World: Multiple Levels of Players at Work* (pp. 301-309).
28. Stalin, J. V. (1946). Марксизм и национальный вопрос [Marxism and the national question]. In J. V. Stalin (Ed.), *Сочинения [Essays]* (Vol. 2, pp. 290-367). Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoe literatury.
29. Schulthies, B. (2019). *The politics of Arabic in the Middle East*. Routledge.
30. Taylor, I., & Taylor, M. M. (1995). *Writing and literacy in Chinese, Korean and Japanese*. John Benjamins.
31. Tinsley, T., & Board, K. (2016). *Language trends 2016: The state of language learning in primary and secondary schools in England*. British Council.
32. Tollefson, J. W., & Pérez-Milans, M. (2018). *The Oxford handbook of language policy and planning*. Oxford University Press.
33. Welsh Government. (2017). *Cymraeg 2050: A million Welsh speakers*. <https://gov.wales>
34. Yildiz, K., & Ferhad, T. (2011). *The Kurds in Syria: The forgotten people*. Pluto Press.