6. Gorzycki, Meg. "Hybrid Course Design and Instruction." The Center for Teaching and Faculty Development. San Francisco State University, n.d. Web. 21 May 2015. http://ctfd.sfsu.edu/content/hybrid-course-design-and-instruction

7. "Hybrid Course Development." Instructional Technologies Support. Texas State University, n.d. Web. 21 May 2015. http://www.its.txstate.edu/departments/instructional_design/hybrid-coursedevelopment.html

8. "Hybrid Courses: Faculty Resources: Ten Questions for Course Redesign." University of Wisconsin Learning Technology Center, 2015. Web. 18 May 2015. http://www4.uwm.edu/ltc/hybrid/faculty_resources/questions.cfm

9. "Hybrid Courses: Faculty Resources: Tips." University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Learning Technology Center, 2015. Web. 18 May 2015. http://www4.uwm.edu/ltc/hybrid/faculty_resources/tips.cfm

10. Miller, Andrew. "Blended Learning: Strategies for Engagement." Edutopia. Herff Jones Nystrom, 12 Oct. 2012. Web. 20 May 2015. http://www.edutopia.org/blog/blended-learning-engagementstrategies-andrew-miller

11. Strong, Richard, Harvey F. Silver, and Amy Robinson. "Strengthening Student Engagement: What Do Students Want (and What Really Motivates Them)?" Educational Leadership. ASCD, 1995. Web. 21 May 2015. Strengthening-Student-Engagement@-What-Do-Students-Want.aspx> web 2.0. (n.d.). Dictionary.com Unabridged. Retrieved May 18, 2015, from Dictionary.com website: http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/web 2.0

ORGANIZING LANGUAGE CLASSES AT UNIVERSITIES

Turdiev Islomjon Mamadaminovich[*]

Abstract: *Language planning in different institutes are very urgent in today's communication demanded world to interact with other*

[*] Teacher of English language department, Alisher Navai Tashkent state university of uzbek language and literature

international organizations. The necessity of language planning has to be researched, in this article some works will be discussed, and suggestions and recommendations is supposed to be given.

The concept of language policy is complex, polysemous and socially contested. Generally, any organised effort to affect the existing patterns of language choice, structure and acquisition is a form of language planning (Ricento 2006; Tollefson 2008). Although language-planning practices permeate all spheres of social life, it is readily observable in the field of education where it is mainly concerned with decisions about the selection of the medium of teaching. This role can be appreciated because education is normally viewed as the cornerstone of political and social processes of integration. The result of this process is explicit or implicit language policy for a given institution (e.g. school): a set of norms or guidelines which are intended to direct linguistic behaviour (Tollefson 2008). Haugen (1959) was credited with the use of this term to cover both status and corpus planning in relation to standardisation of the Norwegian language. Language policy is heterogeneous and varies according to its object, levels of intervention, purpose, participants and institutions involved, underlying language ideologies, local contexts, power relations, and historical context, among others. Language policy and planning is also related to socio-political contexts: North American, European, African, 1 Cristine Severo would like to acknowledge the financial support by the Brazilian National Council for Scientific and Technological Development. Asian, Latin American and Russian/Soviet traditions, for example, do not share the same theoretical-methodological priorities and approaches. Despite such heterogeneity, the birth of language policy as an institutionalised field occurred parallel to the emergence of socio-linguistics. One institutional landmark of this emergence was a seminar organised by William Bright at the University of California in 1964, which gathered together scholars such as Einar Haugen, William Labov, John Gumperz, Dell Hymes and Charles Ferguson. We understand that the emergence of language policy as a discipline serves as an ideological framework that imposes a "domain of objects, a set of methods, a corpus of propositions considered to be true, a

game of rules and definitions, of techniques and instruments" (Foucault 1981: 59). This initial phase of the configuration of language policy in the West as a disciplinary field aimed at systematising and rationalising a model applicable to the description of the relationship between languages and their functions within the limits of the national state followed what we can call 'a politics of functionalisation'. This period isreflected in a field-shaping body of publications in the 1960s and 1970s, which linked language planning with processes of modernisation and nation-building. One example of the scholars' concern with national issues was the publication of Language Problems of Developing Nations in 1968 by Fishman, Ferguson and Das Gupta. The principle of "methodological nationalism" (Wimmer and Schiller 2002) oriented the practice of language planning toward a particular ideology of language. Language ideologies refer to commonsensical notions about language structures and functions, which normatively position their users in the social system, and they are enacted through institutional and everyday practices (Tollefson 2008; Rubdy 2008; Haviland 2003). Language ideologies embody conceptions about the functions, values, norms, expectations, preferences, predictions and roles that guide linguistic practice (Blommaert 2006). Language ideologies in turn articulate broader socio-political ideologies. Any institutionalised choice of a linguistic variety asthe official medium of conducting formal politics and education has significant stratificational effects on the groups and individuals whose varieties are systematically excluded and devalued. In this sense, we understand that "status planning decisions conform to ideologies of the power elite or respond to conflicting ideologies between those upheld by the power elite and those of other constituent groups" (Cobarrubias 1983: 62). In other words, the formative phase of the field of language planning was informed by a "reflectionist" (Silverstein 1985) view of language, where language is viewed as a corpus Language Planning and Policy 3 of words standing for independently existing things. However, as later critical theoretical developments showed, all policy discourses on language are performative in the sense that they are creative acts of social representation and thus they are associated with issues of power relations and inequality (Bourdieu 1991). Under the right institutional conditions, when an official policy 'names' 'a dialect' as 'a language', a new social construction is brought into being; a new symbolic

representation is imposed on the existing reality. Examples of an initial domain of objects and methods in language policy and planning include standardisation, hierarchical classifications of languages (vernacular, standard, classical, creole and pidgin) and the classification of language functions (teaching language, official, international, lexical modernisation, nationalisation and terminological unification, among others) (Lo Bianco 2004; Calvet 2007; Manley 2008; for a detailed review of the goals, see Hornberger 2006). Standardisation in the broad sense involves the selection, codification and implementation or imposition of a norm (Haugen 1983; Milroy and Milroy 1999). The discursivemechanisms of codification and institutionalisation impose order on the selected norm and they effect a binary opposition between standard and non-standard, and it isthese socially embedded values which guide the linguistic choices of individuals (Blommaert 1999) Hence, these mechanisms are strategies of effecting consensus, power and inequality because they establish systemically ratified linguistic hierarchies. In other words, standardisation enforces constraints to manage the functional distribution of linguistic varieties, and these restrictions result in unequal socio-linguistic repertoires that shape access to social opportunities (Blommaert 1999). It is a deep political process because it creates difference and hegemony through mechanisms of normalisation and naturalisation including the educational apparatus. Language planning and policy as theory and practice were implicated in projects of nation building and the construction of subjectivities. As noted by a number of scholars in the field of nationalism studies (e.g. Anderson 1991), standardisation as a process of linguistic regimentation or institutionalisation plays a fundamental role in the construction of 'nation states'. Thus, language planning has always been a political enterprise.

Language planning policies at universities typically involve decisions and strategies regarding the languages of instruction, support for bilingual or multilingual education, language requirements for admission and graduation, provision of language learning resources, and promotion of linguistic diversity. These policies can vary greatly depending on the specific context and goals of each university. Here are some common elements found in language planning policies at universities:

Language of Instruction: Universities may have a primary language of instruction, such as English, or may offer instruction in multiple languages. The choice of language(s) can depend on factors such as the university's location, internationalization goals, and the linguistic backgrounds of students and faculty.

Language Requirements: Universities may have language proficiency requirements for admission and graduation. These requirements could include standardized tests like the TOEFL or IELTS for non-native speakers of the primary language of instruction, or proficiency exams in other languages depending on the program or course requirements.

Support for Multilingualism: Universities may support multilingualism by offering courses or programs in multiple languages, providing language learning resources and support services, and promoting language exchange and cultural exchange programs.

Language Policies for Specific Programs or Departments: Some universities may have specific language requirements or policies for certain programs or departments, especially those with international or interdisciplinary focus. For example, a university's business school might require proficiency in a particular language for students focusing on international business.

Promotion of Linguistic Diversity: Universities may actively promote linguistic diversity by recognizing and celebrating the languages spoken by their students and staff, offering courses in less commonly taught languages, and providing support for heritage language speakers.

Accessibility and Inclusivity: Language planning policies should take into account the needs of diverse student populations, including those with different linguistic backgrounds and abilities. This might involve providing language support services, offering accommodations for students with language-related disabilities, and ensuring that language requirements do not create barriers to access for marginalized groups.

Internationalization Strategies: Many universities aim to attract international students and faculty as part of their broader internationalization strategies. Language planning policies may play a key role in these efforts by providing support for English language learners, offering English-medium instruction programs, and fostering a welcoming and inclusive linguistic environment.

Overall, language planning policies at universities are complex and multifaceted, reflecting the diverse linguistic landscapes of higher education institutions and their commitment to providing quality education and support for students and staff from diverse linguistic backgrounds.

REFERENCE

1. Bamgbose, A. (2000). Language and Exclusion: The Consequences of Language Policies in Africa. Münster: Lit Verlag.

2. Calvet, L.-J. (1974). Linguistique et colonialisme: Petit traité de glottophagie. Paris: Payot.

3. Collingham, E. M. (2001). Imperial Bodies: The Physical Experience of the Raj c.1800–1947. Oxford, UK: Polity.

4. Errington, J. (2008). Linguistics in a Colonial World: A Story of Language, Meaning, and Power. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

5. Hackert, S. (2012). The Emergence of the English Native Speaker: A Chapter in Nineteenth-Century Linguistic Thought. Berlin: Gruyter.

6. Hutton, C. M. (1996). Law lessons for linguists? Accountability and acts of professional classification. Language and Communication 16, 3: 205- 214.

7. Hutton, C. M. (1999). Linguistics and the Third Reich: Mother-tongue Fascism, Race and the Science of Language. London: Routledge.

8. Rajagopalan, K. (1997). Linguistics and the myth of nativity: comments on the controversy over 'new/non-native' Englishes. Journal of Pragmatics 27: 225-231.

9. Wright, S. (2016). Language Policy and Language Planning: From Nationalism to Globalisation. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

10. Zimmermann, K. and B. Kellermeier-Rehbein (2015). Colonialism and Missionary Linguistics. Berlin: Gruyter