

1.Introduction

Language policy is what a government does either officially through legislation, court decisions or policy to determine how languages are used, cultivate language skills needed to meet national priorities or to establish the rights of individuals or groups to use and maintain languages. The scope of language policy varies in practice from State to State. This may be explained by the fact that language policy is often based on contingent historical reasons. This research will show that there And explains that there is 'is more than one definition of language policy more than one type of language policy .Explains the basis for which countries choose their official language. Explains the national influence on the language and explains that most countries have more than one official language.

2. The Definition of Language Policy

It is not easy to find a definition of the phrase "language policy" in a dictionary, nor it is easy to find the same definition in the many books published on the subject or on related topics. Of all paper and online dictionaries we have consulted, none have an entry for 'language policy', the core of the present investigation. A very small research that it has personally conducted on the Web over the last two years has lead to believe that there are many university courses which bear that name, many discussion groups and sites which cover the subject or are entitled with it, but a clear definition of the phrase "language policy" is rarely given. Within the more specific ambit of linguistics, language policy is profusely treated under many other headings, such as 'language ideology' (Lippi Green 1997:182) (Milroy L. 1987:166), 'language planning' (Joseph 1996:98) (Bourhis,1997: 16 (1), 23-49), (Mazzon 2000:135-167), .Language ideology language evaluation involves discussions on the standardization of language, on prescriptivism and anti-prescriptivism.

Language planning instead, refers to precise governmental practices and programs aimed at forcing the emergence of one language over another. The latter may be considered as a sub-topic of the more general heading 'language policy' we are trying to define. Among the authors consulted, the only ones who seem eager to refer more specifically to the phrase are those concerned with minority languages, with bilingualism issues, particularly sociolinguists and dialectologists. Code-switching expert Carol Myers-Scotton devotes one chapter of her 1993 book to language policies in Africa (149-163), without ever defining the term. African-American linguist Geneva Smitherman, instead, gives her own

authoritative definition of the phrase: A language policy is a law, rules, or precepts designed to bring about planning undertaken by governments, schools and other institutional bodies. (2000:288) Thus, she connects the two concepts, those of policy and planning, together, to underline their dependence. She also maintains that change is the theoretical goal which moves any language policy decision. Language planning, language ideology and change will all be discussed in the present chapter. However, before proceeding to a detailed analysis of those issues, we want to pursue a clear understanding of this umbrella term, language policy. The second broad definition it have found has been provided by an expert of language policy in the United States, James Crawford, writer and supporter of the English Plus movement, denigrator and fighter of English-Only movements and campaigns, author of many essays and books on bilingual education and language-policy issues.' He provides this useful general definition: Language Policy

1. What government does officially — through legislation, court decisions, executive action, or other means — to (a) determine how languages are used in public contexts, (b) cultivate language skills needed to meet national priorities, or (c) establish the rights of individuals or groups to learn, use, and maintain languages
2. Government regulation of its own language use, including steps to facilitate clear communication, train and recruit personnel, guarantee due process, foster political participation, and provide access to public services, proceedings, and documents.

Crawford's definition gives high priority to language use and to language users' rights. Whereas Geneva Smitherman's seems more concerned with the positive contribution of change and to the role played by government actions in the achievement of change. On the other hand,

Crawford's chosen definition, without specifically making recourse to change, refers to the individuals' rights to "learn, use and maintain", and to the provision of access to public services and documents. Leaving aside the question of change for the time being, we would like to concentrate our attention on the relationship between governments and language users (Melis 2002: 136-137).

Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) define language policy as "part of the larger process of language planning :A language policy is a body of ideas, laws, regulations, rules and practices intended to achieve the planned language change in the societies, group or system. (Kaplan and Baldauf 1997: xi) Kaplan and Baldauf portray language policy as a set of laws or regulations or rules enacted by an authoritative body (like a government) as part of a language plan. Certainly, what Kaplan and Baldauf describe here is language policy but other activities can be considered language policy as well. Language policies do not need to be enacted by an authoritative body – they can emerge from a bottom-up movement or grassroots organization – and not all language policies are intentional or carefully planned.(Kaplan and Balduaf.1997: 216-217)

Also Schiffman defines it as "Language policy is primarily a social construct. It may consist of various elements of an explicit nature – juridical, judicial, administrative constitutional and/or legal language may be extant in some jurisdictions, but whether or not a polity has such explicit text·policy as a cultural construct rests primarily on other conceptual elements – belief systems, attitudes, myths – the whole complex that it is referring to as linguistic culture, which is the sum totality of ideas, values, beliefs, attitudes, prejudices, religious strictures, and all the other cultural ‘baggage’ that speakers bring to their dealings with language from their background.(Schiffman.1996:276).

3. Concept of Language policy

According to David Johnson A *language policy* is a policy mechanism that impacts the structure, function, use, or acquisition of language and includes:

1. Official regulations – often enacted in the form of written documents, intended to effect some change in the form, function, use, or acquisition of language – which can influence economic, political, and educational opportunity;
2. Unofficial, covert, de facto, and implicit mechanisms, connected to language beliefs and practices, that have regulating power over language use and interaction within communities, workplaces, and schools;
3. Not just products but processes – “policy” as a verb, not a noun – that are driven by a diversity of language policy agents across multiple layers of policy creation, interpretation, appropriation ,and instantiation;
4. Policy texts and discourses across multiple contexts and layers of policy activity, which are influenced by the ideologies and discourses unique to that context. An increasingly diverse and broadened group of definitions offers innovative new perspectives on what can be considered language policy, but it remains to be seen whether they will open the door to newer kinds of creative language policy research that inform the field in substantive ways or whether they, instead, will stretch the definition of “language policy” so far that all sociolinguistic research that examines language attitudes and practices will be considered language policy research. (David cassels Johnson.2013:9)

4. Types of language policy

As well as a general definition, it is useful to delineate the various types of language policies and sets of dichotomies (Table 1). While these terms are often used in the literature, they are defined and used in different ways and thus the model in Table 1 is offered as a starting point and heuristic, not a definitive framework.

Table (1) Language Policy Types

Genesis	<i>Top-down</i> Macro-level policy developed by some governing or authoritative body or person	<i>Bottom-up</i> Micro-level or grassroots generated policy for and by the community that it impacts
Means and Goals	<i>Overt</i> Overtly expressed in written or spoken policy texts	<i>Covert</i> Intentionally concealed at the macro-level (collusive) or at the micro-level (subversive)
Documentation	<i>Explicit</i> Officially documented in written or spoken policy texts	<i>Implicit</i> Occurring without or in spite of official policy texts

Language policies can be developed at the “top”, by some governing body – top-down language policy – while others can be developed by and for the communities they are meant to impact – bottom-up language policy. However, language policies are developed across multiple “levels” of policy creation and even a language policy typically considered bottom-up, like a policy developed *in* a school district *for* that

school district, can still be top-down for somebody (like, teachers or students); thus, the term *stop-down* and *bottom-up* are *relative*, depending on who is doing the creating and who is doing the interpreting and appropriating. As well, there is overlap within and across categories; that is, a policy can be both top-down and bottom-up: top-down and covert; bottom-up and explicit; etc.

The explicit/implicit distinction refers to the official status of a policy (official vs. unofficial) and how a policy is documented –whether formulated and detailed in some written document or not. Implicit policies can be powerful nonetheless. For example, there is no explicit language policy declaring English the official language of the United States but unofficially, or implicitly, it certainly is. (Schiffman (1996):124) equates the explicit/implicit distinction with the overt/covert distinction, describing the unofficial use of a particular language – for example, Nagamese in Northeast India – as a covert activity since the official language is English. (Shohamy (2006:78)), on the other hand, uses the term *covert* to describe a policy with hidden agendas, which are intentionally and covertly embedded by policy creators. (Schiffman. 2010:452-469) includes this collusive quality within his definition of “covert” but also notes that covert policies can be subversive, for example when a group or organization actively resists an overt language policy. In this way, covert language policy can refer to either bottom-up or top-down processes and organizations.

However, it does seem useful to distinguish the explicit/implicit dichotomy from the overt/covert distinction and the distinguishing characteristic proposed here is intent; that is, the notion of “covert” carries with it strong connotations of something that is intentionally concealed and, therefore, a covert policy is one which is intentionally hidden or veiled (following Shohamy), not openly shown, for either

collusive or subversive reasons (following Schiffman). The *de jure* and *de facto* descriptors are used slightly differently. Literally meaning “concerning law” and “concerning fact,” respectively, the terms are typically used to connote policies that are based on laws (*de jure*) versus what actually happens in reality or in practice (*de facto*). For example, racial segregation in the U.S. in the 1960’s is sometimes referred to as *de facto* segregation since it was *not* supported by law. Concerning language policy, in Morocco, the official languages are Arabic and Tamazight (an indigenous Berber language) but, in practice (and in education), many Moroccans use French. While the notion of *de jure* does seem to line up with overt and explicit language policies, all of which reference the “official-ness” of a policy, an activity that is *de facto* is not necessarily covert or implicit or even a “policy” in the traditional sense – it is an activity that occurs in practice despite whatever the *de jure* policy states.

This does appear to imply that whatever happens in practice is somewhat different than what is officially stated as a *de jure* language policy. For example, even within schools and classrooms which are officially monolingual, teachers can include the multilingualism of their students as resources for classroom practice (Skilton-Sylvester 2003;168-184) (Cincotta-Segi 2011:195-209).

In this case, *de facto* refers to both the classroom policy as created by the teacher and the classroom practices, which are closely related but (here proposed as) distinct nonetheless; thus *de facto* refers to locally produced *policies* that differ from what is explicitly stated (in law) and local *practices* that may be in line with local *de facto* policies but do not reflect what is officially documented in *de jure* policies. (David cassels Johnson.2013:10-11-12)

5. National language

A national language is a language (or language variant, e.g. dialect) that has some connection—de facto or de jure—with people and the territory they occupy. There is little consistency in the use of this term. One or more languages spoken as first languages in the territory of a country may be referred to informally or designated in legislation as national languages of the country.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_language

Nationalization This term is associated with the notion of the nation that certain languages are viewed as representing the ideology of the nation-states, although there may be other languages that can be considered official. It is especially noted in situations in which there are a number of official languages in a given political entity, often competing with or complementing one another. Declaring a given language as the national language implies granting higher status to the speakers of the languages over others as they become the public representation of the nation-state. (Elana shohamy.2005.77) .

5.1 Language Policy and National Development

The role of language in national development remains the most controversial issue in language planning (Ndukwe 1988:114). There is little doubt though that a consensus has to be reached on the matter in formulating a language policy for the nation. One profitable manner in which the issue of language and national development may be discussed is through focusing on the main point of disagreement among language planning theories. This relates to the provision of a definite and comprehensive outline of national beyond language planning.

A viable national language policy would be one, which should seek to maximize the participation of the people with regards to various sectors of development. “The essential strands of argument point some what gloomily to the fact that Nigeria’s timid language policy and the blind glorification of English language by the ruling class have conspired to undermine the local language and rob them of their utilitarian values in the – important national development drive” (Agbedo 2000: 196). In this connection for instance, Agbedo (2000) posit the concept of exclusion and shows how the efficacy of language as an instrument of exclusion has been used by the milieu diligent to exclude the vast majority of Nigerians from participating in the overall national development process.

Having a national language policy will give us a focus like other countries and it will be a symbol of unity. On the existence of English as the official language in Nigeria, we inherited English from our colonists. Recently, because of the need to be bi-lingual, Nigeria had to adopt French as second national language and we are doing every thing to promote that. But we are talking about a national language policy. Adenipekun (2010) notes Fufunwa who identifies a wonderful idea in the early 1970s through an experiment in which some primary school pupils were taught in Yoruba and their counterparts were taught in English. It was found that those who were taught in Yoruba had an edge over their counterparts taught in English when a comparative analysis of their achievement was carried out. So, if you are taught in a particular language which is cultural to you, you are likely going to excel beyond translating your thoughts from your native language to a foreign language. Yes, English is our official language. better in the language one speaks most as a first language. You can see the striving force to translate

ones thoughts into English. Indeed, having a national language policy will give us a focus like other countries and it will be a symbol of unity. On the existence of English as the official language in Nigeria, we inherited English from our colonists. Recently, because of the need to be bi-lingual, Nigeria had to adopt French as second national language and we are doing every thing to promote that. But we are talking about a national language policy. Adenipekun (2010) notes Fufunwa who identifies a wonderful idea in the early 1970s through an experiment in which some primary school pupils were taught in Yoruba and their counterparts were taught in English. It was found that those who were taught in Yoruba had an edge over their counterparts taught in English when a comparative analysis of their achievement was carried out. So, if you are taught in a particular language which is cultural to you, you are likely going to excel beyond translating your thoughts from your native language to a foreign language. Yes, English is our official language. However, is it possible to form a policy in which to promote our languages for instructional, transactional, diplomatic, and commercial purposes. If you go to Indonesia, they speak English but everybody speaks Bahasa-Indonesia. Why can we do the same in Nigeria?. China is ruling the world today because everything is done in Chinese language. Malaysia and Singapore are thriving because they create ideas in their languages. The same thing goes for Japan and Russia. The paper is not saying that we should translate to one language in Nigeria. What we are saying is that we must create a platform in which we say these are the languages we want to promote. How the existing policy supports the national language policy.

5.2 Nationalistic influence on language

Deliberate interference with the natural course of linguistic changes and the distribution of languages is not confined to the facilitating of international intercourse and cooperation. Language as a cohesive force for nation-states and for linguistic groups within nation-states has for long been manipulated for political ends. Multilingual states can exist and prosper; Switzerland is a good example. But linguistic rivalry and strife can be disruptive. Language riots have occurred in Belgium between French and Flemish speakers and in parts of India between rival vernacular communities. A language can become or be made a focus of loyalty for a minority community that thinks itself suppressed, persecuted, or subjected to discrimination. The French language in Canada in the mid-20th century is an example. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, Irish Gaelic, or Irish, came to symbolize Irish patriotism and Irish independence from Great Britain, and Irish became Ireland's first official language at that country's independence. Government documents are published in Irish and English (the country's second official language), and Irish is taught in state schools, though it remains under the significant international pressures exerted by English that are described above.

A language may be a target for attack or suppression if the authorities associate it with what they consider a disaffected or rebellious group or a culturally inferior one. There have been periods when American Indian children were forbidden to speak a language other than English at school and when pupils were not allowed to speak Welsh in British state schools in Wales. Both these prohibitions have been abandoned. After the Spanish Civil War of the 1930s, Basque speakers were discouraged from

using their language in public as a consequence of the strong support given by the Basques to the republican forces. Interestingly, on the other side of the Franco-Spanish frontier, French Basques were positively encouraged to keep their language in use, if only as an object of touristic interest and consequent economic benefit to the area.

<https://www.britannica.com/topic/language/Language-and-culture>

6. Rules and Regulations of Language Policy

the most commonly used devices that directly affect and create de facto language practices and thereby turn ideology into practice, in private as well as in public domains. It is often the case that central governments develop a series of official mechanisms and devices to maximize their control over language behaviors. Being in authority, governments have the tools that enable them to do so, as they can produce policy documents and create laws and regulations that declare the official languages to be used in society. Yet, such policies are often introduced by other groups, such as religious communities or other collective groups as the languages to be used in different contexts. The mechanisms discussed in this chapter includes policy documents, language laws, officiality, nationalization, language academies and citizenship laws. The extent to which they can really affect language practices will be discussed as well, pointing to the “bottom-up” and grassroots initiatives taking place to resist, protest about and negotiate on these declared policies and to propose alternatives. The main purpose of this chapter is to examine the mechanisms and devices that are used by different agencies to perpetuate these declared policies so as to put the language ideologies into practice

The policy devices Language laws These refer to legal and official devices used by central authorities to perpetuate and impose language behaviors, in political and social entities, such as nation-states and other social and political groups; these may include global and international groups, municipalities accompanied by some type of abiding legislation. Laws are especially powerful mechanisms for affecting language practices, as they are supported by penalties and sanctions and can therefore ensure that policies are carried out and turn from ideologies into practice. Thus, it is in the power of language laws to affect the personal freedom of individuals and groups with regard to language behaviors. Language laws are considered, therefore, to be among the most powerful devices used in democratic states. Once there are language laws that grant certain languages a preferred status and rights in public and private domains, most people have no choice but to comply. Thus, language behaviors can be imposed, since those in authority have the power of enforcing on people the use, or forbidding the use, of certain language(s) in private as well as public space. Violating and not obeying laws can lead to harsh penalties, fines and sanctions, and even imprisonment. Language laws are manifested in various ways, such as through the use of the language(s) of public signs and businesses, studying certain languages in schools and as mediums of instruction, and the use of those languages in public domains, especially in government offices. A common situation in a number of countries is for language laws to be mandated through parliament. It is also important to note that even laws that state that people should not be discriminated against because of language are considered to be language laws. One known example of language laws is in Quebec, which granted preferred status to the French language over

English. This was accompanied by a series of laws as to the use of language in public spaces, especially with regard to the stipulation to post signs in French forcing businesses to display the languages on shops, road signs and other public places of representation. Similar laws were introduced in the Baltic States after they obtained their independence in 1990. While the introduction of language laws “have the power of law” and can at times perpetuate the domination of languages as is the case in Quebec, which led to the actual changes of all signs and the introduction of French in public places, there are numerous cases where such laws are not obeyed, as people continue to use languages according to their own ideologies, especially in the private domain

Officiality is generally viewed by the public in subtractive terms rather than in additive ones. It is rare to find people who will reject the notion of English as an official language, as they are not aware of the fact that by declaring a specific language as official, the meaning is actually rejection of “other languages”, especially with regard to weak languages in society. In most cases, officiality should be used for weaker languages as one step for protecting language rights, so it should not imply any legitimacy to exclude others; although the sole declaration of officiality does not guarantee implementation but only intentions. Another criticism of “officiality”, even when it is most inclusive and multilingual, is that it rarely represents the whole population, as there will always be those whose languages are left out. Such is the case in South Africa where eleven languages were declared official but other languages were omitted; as much as the officiality policy is inclusive it almost always represents only a portion of the population and this device is often questionable. Clearly, while officiality is a widespread mechanism for

manipulating languages in most nations, it is often criticized on the grounds that it is undemocratic, since it is a means for imposing language policies top-down, and thus turning various ideologies into practice, using the device of languages. At times, it indoctrinates and perpetuates the power of the majority group, as is the case in “US English”, a language that is widely used in the USA, implying that the main reason for declaring a certain language as official may be to perpetuate the powerful and reject the others. On the other hand, as was noted, officiality can lead to decisions that may empower language groups whose languages are in a weak position and the intention, along with penalties and sanctions, can work in their favour, in relation to situations when no such official status exists. (Elana shohamy.2005.99-100-101)

7. Standardization

Having *standards* is seen as something desirable for a range of things –take the notion of standard time, standard measurements, standard CD sizes, standard tyre sizes, standard bulb sizes, standard bathroom fittings or (more-or-less) standard shoe sizes for granted. Are standards *always* necessary though?

The problem is that language is a little bit like those other things (standard time, measurements, etc.) which are used for academic or more learned purposes where exactness, economy and non-ambiguity are highly desirable. But language is also used for other things like play, informal communication, artistic and cultural expression where the notion of a standard sits less comfortably. So what *is* a standard language? Tentatively, we can say that it is the language that is associated with important and careful contexts of use – such as literary writing, learned writing, legal writing or the Bible – and enjoys a high degree of prestige. (Notice that we tend to think about the *written* rather than the *spoken* variety when we discuss the standard.) It also tends to be the version of the language that is taught to foreigners. Here are some definitions.

1. ‘the process of one variety of a language becoming widely accepted throughout the speech community as a supra-dialectal norm – the “best” form of the language – rated above regional and social dialects’ (Ferguson 1968: 27-35)
2. ‘the codification and acceptance, within the community of users, of a formal set of norms defining “correct” usage’ (Stewart 1968: 531-45)

3. 'a codified form of the language accepted by and serving as a model to the larger speech community' (Garvin and Mathiot 1968: 365-74)
 4. 'a prestige variety of a language used within a speech community. "Standard languages/varieties/ dialects" cut across regional differences, providing a unified means of communication, and thus an institutionalised norm which can be used in teaching the language to foreigners, and so on. Language forms which do not conform to this norm are then referred to as sub-standard or (with a less pejorative prefix) non-standard . . .' (Crystal 1985)
 5. 'we shall see standardisation as a project, which took different forms at different times. It is only with hindsight, after all, that we can interpret the process at all: things may have felt very different in the past. One thing we can be clear about is that the process of standardisation cannot be seen as merely a matter of communal choice, an innocent attempt on the part of society as a whole to choose a variety that can be used for official purposes and, in addition, as a *lingua franca* among speakers of divergent dialects. It involves from the first the cultivation, by an elite, of a variety that can be regarded as exclusive. The embryonic standard is not seen as the most useful, or the most widely-used variety, but as the best' (Leith 1997: 33). Note the notions being appealed to.
1. **Commonality**: the notion of it being a *lingua franca* among speakers of divergent dialects.
 2. **Prestige**: the notion of it being the 'best', 'proper' or 'correct' and set apart from other regional and social dialects. It is also used in highly regarded writing.

3. **Prescriptivism:** it is the version that is set in grammar books, dictionaries and style guides (therefore *codified*) and the version of the language taught.
4. **Yardstick or benchmark:** it begins to serve as the point of reference when comparing dialects.

8.1 The Processes of Standardization

Standardization is generally thought of as a process that involves four stages. We need not think of them as being chronological. Indeed, the process of standardization is an on-going one, and a whole range of forces are at work

1. **Selection:** Variability is a fact of life for almost all languages. There are different regional dialects, class dialects, situational varieties. Standardisation represents an attempt to curtail, minimise if not eliminate this high degree of variability. The easiest solution seems to be to pick (although not arbitrarily) one of these varieties to be elevated to the status of the standard.
2. **Acceptance:** The ‘acceptance’ by the community of the norms of the variety selected over those of rival varieties, through the promotion, spread, establishment and enforcement of the norms. This is done through institutions, agencies, authorities such as schools, ministries, the media, cultural establishments, etc. In fact, the standard language comes to be regarded not just as the best form of the language, but as the language itself (eg consider the claim that Mandarin is Chinese in Singapore). The other varieties are then dialects, which tend implicitly to get stigmatised as lesser forms, associated with the not too highly regarded people, who are seen as less educated, slovenly, uncouth, etc.

3. Elaboration: For the variety selected to represent the desired norms, it must be able to discharge a whole range of functions that it may be called upon to discharge, including abstract, intellectual functions. Where it lacks resources to do so, these are developed. Thus a standard language is often characterized as possessing ‘maximal variation in function, minimal variation in form.’
4. Codification: The norms and rules of grammar, use, etc. Which govern the variety selected have to be formulated, and set down definitively in grammars, dictionaries, spellers, manuals of style, texts, etc.

Haugen (1972) summarized this in the form of a table

	Form	Function
Society	Selection	Acceptance
Language	Codification	Elaboration

Table 1 (from Haugen 1972: 110)

(Haugen, E. (1972):.97–111.) (Haugen,E (1966): 922–935.)

Conclusions :

1. Many countries have a language policy designed to favor or discourage the use of a particular language or set of languages.
2. There are various types of language policies and sets of dichotomies.
3. Language as a cohesive force for nation-states and for linguistic groups within nation-states has for long been manipulated for political ends.
But linguistic rivalry and strife ‘Multilingual states can exist and prosper can be disruptive.
4. Few countries these days have populations that speak only one language. Sometimes it’s because the country’s boundaries always contained different language groups.
5. Every country has a language, which is used to reflect its communal individuality to the world. National language has more prominence in any country over other dialects or languages spoken by the citizens.
6. A language may be a target for attack or suppression if the authorities associate it with what they consider a disaffected or rebellious group or a culturally inferior one.
7. Most countries choose one or more “official” languages to use.
These are the languages used by government departments and generally any documents or official communication will be available in these languages.
8. Standardization is another device used by central governments to impose and manipulate language behavior is standardization

References :

- Bourhis, R. (1997). "*Linguistic Landscape and Ethnolinguistic Vitality: an Empirical Study*", Journal of language and Social Psychology, 16 (1), 23-49.
- Crystal, David (1985). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ferguson, Charles (1968). 'Language development', in Joshua A. Fishman *et.al.* (eds.) Language Problems of Developing Nations. New York: John Wiley p.p. 27-35.
- Garvin, Paul L. and Madeleine Mathiot (1968), "*The urbanization of the Guarani language: a problem in language and culture*". in Joshua A. Fishman *et al.* (eds). Readings in the sociology of language. The Hague: Mouton. pp. 365-74.
- Joseph, Brian D .(1996). Language history, language change, and language relationship : an introduction to historical and comparative linguistics. Berlin ; New York : Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997). English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States. London: Routledge.
- Milroy L. (1987). Observing and Analyzing Natural Language : A Critical Account of Sociolinguistic Method. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Stewart, William A (1968), 'A sociolinguistic typology for describing national multilingualism', in Joshua A. Fishman *et al.* (eds), *Readings in the Sociology of Language* (The Hague: Mouton), pp. 531-45

- Mazzon,G.(2000) "Special Relation and Forms of Address in the Canterbury Tales," In: D Kastovsky, and Mettinger (eds.) The History of English in Social Context. A Contribution to Historical Sociolinguistics .Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter,.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. Elite Closure as a Powerful Language Strategy: The African Case. International Journal of the Sociology of Language 103: 149–163.
- Melis, L.F. (2002). Race, ethnicity and dialects: language policy and ethnic minorities in the United States. Milano, Italy : FrancoAngeli
- Kaplan, R. B. and Baldauf, R. B. (1997). Language Planning: From Practice to Theory. Clevedon : Multilingual Matters.
- Schiffman, H.G. (1996). Linguistic Culture and Language Policy. London and New York: Routledge.
- Johnson ,D.C. .2013.Language policy . Palgrave Macmillan; edition.
- Shohamy, E. (2006). Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches. London and New York: Routledge.
- Schiffman, H.F. (2010). South and Southeast Asia. In J.A. Fishman and O. García (eds.) Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity: Disciplinary and Regional Perspectives. Vol. 1, 2nd edition, pp. 452–469. Oxford University Press.
- Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2003). Legal discourse and decisions, teacher policymaking and the multilingual classroom: Constraining and supporting Khmer/English biliteracy in the United States. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 6(3&4): 168–184.

- Cincotta-Segi, A. (2011a). Talking in, talking around and talking about the L2: three literacy teaching responses to L2 medium of instruction in the Lao PDR. *Compare* 41(2): 195–209.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica. Language and Culture. WRITTEN BY: David Crystal Robert Henry Robins LAST UPDATED: 1-5-2018 See Article History
- BBC News, February 7, 2005
- Crystal, David (1985), *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (Oxford: Blackwells).
- Ferguson, Charles (1968), ‘Language development’, in Joshua A. Fishman *et al.* (eds), *Language Problems of Developing Nations* (New York: John Wiley), pp. 27-35.
- Garvin, Paul L.; and Madeleine Mathiot (1968), ‘The urbanization of the Guarani language: a problem in language and culture’, in Joshua A. Fishman *et al.* (eds), *Readings in the sociology of language*, (The Hague: Mouton), pp. 365-74.
- Stewart, William A (1968), ‘A sociolinguistic typology for describing national multilingualism’, in Joshua A. Fishman *et al.* (eds), *Readings in the Sociology of Language* (The Hague: Mouton), pp. 531-45

- [Haugen, E. (1972), 'Dialect, language, nation', in J. B. Pride and Janet Holmes (eds), *Sociolinguistics* (Harmondsworth: Penguin), pp.97–111. (Originally published in *American Anthropologist* 68 (1966): 922–935.)]
- Shohamy, E. *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. 2005. Routledge.
- Adenipekun, O. (2010) “ *Nigeria: Language Policy Will Engender National Development*”. Available in [Http://:www.vangaurdngr.com](http://www.vangaurdngr.com) accessed on 06 /05 /2011
- Ndukwe, P. (1988). “National Language Policy for Nigeria: some theoretical and Practicala.
- Agbede, C.U (2000). *General Linguistics: An introductory Reader*. Nsukka: ACE Resources Konsult.
- Abekah, A. (2010) *Language Development and Implementation Policies in Africa*. Retrieved from [Hpp//:languadevafrica.com](http://:languadevafrica.com) on 09/05/2011