

Language choices by teachers in EFL classrooms in Cyprus: bidialectism meets bilingualism with a call for teacher training programmes in linguistic variation

Androula Yiakoumetti* and Marina Mina

Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge, UK; Y.K. English Learning Centre, Limassol, Cyprus

(Received 19 August 2011; final version received 23 October 2012)

This study focuses on the interface between bidialectism and bilingualism and provides empirical support for the call for language educators to be trained in issues relating to linguistic variation. Drawing on the sociolinguistic setting of Cyprus, the study investigates the linguistic behaviour of bidialectal teachers in the English foreign-language classroom. The findings reveal that, despite the popular belief that the standard variety of the first language (Standard Modern Greek) is used alongside English, the Greek Cypriot dialect is, in fact, more prevalent. Teachers use the regional dialect in a consistent and circumstance-dependent manner. However, they express surprise and embarrassment when told about their linguistic behaviour. Language teacher training in linguistic variation may convey distinct advantages in educational contexts where bidialectism and bilingualism meet. Sociolinguistically informed training which celebrates linguistic diversity has the potential to empower teachers to appreciate and make use of all the linguistic varieties available to them.

Keywords: bidialectism; bilingualism; EFL teaching; linguistic diversity; teacher training programmes

Introduction

Linguistic variation and, in particular, dialectal variation has received a great deal of attention from both scholars and lay persons. For linguists, terms such as standard variety and nonstandard variety are free of social value judgment. For most lay people, however, these terms are socially loaded and, in most cases, standard varieties are viewed as superior. Undoubtedly, such value-laden views have implications for speakers of nonstandard varieties that can profoundly affect successful communication between diverse speech communities, social inclusion, and professional development.

Educational implications associated with dialectal variation are of enormous importance in bidialectal (or multidialectal) speech communities where two (or more) related varieties of the same language are concurrently used. Traditionally, language policies in such communities have chosen to promote the standard variety alone as both the medium and object of instruction and to exclude the students'

*Corresponding author. Current address: School of Education, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, UK. Email: androula.yiakoumetti@cantab.net

(and, in some cases, the teachers') nonstandard mother tongues from the school realm (Siegel 2010). Studies carried out in a number of countries around the world indicate that nonstandard varieties as well as their speakers are subject to bias and highlight that education becomes an arena for linguistic prejudice (Edwards 1979; Wilberschied and Dassier 1995; Haig and Oliver 2003). It must be noted that, very often, bidialectal speakers' first-acquired variety (i.e. first dialect) is the nonstandard variety and their second-learned variety (i.e. second dialect) is the standard. This fact alludes to the likelihood that, in bidialectal communities, native speakers of nonstandard varieties are failed by language policies which ignore their valuable native varieties. What happens when bidialectism meets bilingualism in the classroom? Language education in linguistically diverse classrooms is unavoidably complex. On one hand, one would expect linguistically diverse speakers to have more opportunities for practising and learning existing as well as new linguistic varieties. On the other, new challenges may be added to the already complex demands placed on teachers. We view the role of the teacher as a pedagogue for linguistically diverse learners as immensely demanding and one that deserves considerable research attention. Teachers are therefore the focus of this article. Drawing on the complex sociolinguistic setting of Cyprus, the study investigates the linguistic behaviour of bidialectal teachers in the English foreign-language classroom. Specifically, the teachers' language choices are explored with the aim of identifying consistent and circumstance-dependent patterns in the use of the Cypriot dialect and Standard Modern Greek. The study is an interpretative exploration which deals with a topic which has not traditionally received adequate attention: teachers' standard and nonstandard language use in the foreign-language classroom.

Dialectal variation in education

To demonstrate the often inappropriate treatment of dialectal variation by educational language policies, we review studies which describe the exclusion of home varieties and the hegemony of standard varieties in education. We focus on European bidialectal speech communities and on non-European English-speaking bidialectal contexts.

Especially prominent discussions on dialectal variation come from countries in which regional dialects are spoken. As early as the 1970s, using the matched-guise technique in school environments, Ammon (1978, cited in Ammon 1989) demonstrated that German nonstandard speakers were considered to be less intelligent by both standard speakers and nonstandard speakers themselves. Similarly, in Cyprus, it has been demonstrated that nonstandard-speaking students view their own mother tongue as inappropriate in formal education (Sciriha 1996). Some even consider their own speech to denote a distinct lack of education (Papapavlou 1998). Even in the more liberal bidialectal community of Northern Jutland in Denmark (where there is agreement that the teachers should know and appreciate the regional dialect and accept it in the school), parents favour teaching of Standard Danish (Jørgensen and Pedersen 1989). In Wales, Garrett, Coupland, and Williams (1999) identified that teachers felt more affinity with those students who strove for Received Pronunciation rather than with the Valleys speakers who were not stereotypically associated with Received Pronunciation.

Outside Europe, discussions on educational issues that relate to dialectal variation within the English language are mostly prevalent in the US, Canada and

Australia. In the US, research on education and dialectal variation mainly relates to African-American English (Rickford 1999; Wolfram, Adger, and Christian 1999; Mordaunt 2011). It has been shown that vernacular-speaking parents prefer their children to be educated in Standard American English and, in many cases, they view nonstandard dialects as inferior (Hoover 1978; Hoover, McNair, Lewis, and Politzer 1997). In Canada, the issue of dialect and education has been discussed in relation to First Nations English dialects and Standard English (Ball and Bernhardt 2012) and, in the context of Saskatchewan, researchers have argued that schools in the region marginalise Indigenous English speakers, who are made to feel like outsiders (Heit and Blair 1993; Sterzuk 2008). In Australia, failure to speak Standard Australian English has been associated with lower ability in students (Haig and Oliver 2003). Berry and Hudson (1997) explain that Aboriginal English has low prestige in the eyes of its own speakers as well as others. The authors describe how an initiative which aimed to teach Aboriginal children how to reserve Standard Australian English for use in certain domains, was met with suspicion by even Aboriginal staff. The fear shared by parents and teachers was that their children would be taught to read and write in Kriol (English-based variety) alone and not in the variety spoken by the group associated with power.

It is clear from the preceding examples that dialectal variation exists in educational systems around the globe. Unfortunately, it is associated with unjustified stereotypes (Yiakoumetti 2012a). Language policies that promote the standard variety alone and suppress speakers' nonstandard varieties play a significant role in undermining linguistic neutrality. In contrast, policies that respect and promote dialectal diversity are associated with positive educational outcomes. Research carried out in many of the aforementioned linguistic settings has indicated that introducing dialectal diversity into the classroom leads to students' academic advancement. In the US, dialect awareness programmes which teach students about the structure of African American English, its role in speech communities, and the linguistic differences between this English variety and Standard American English led to improved student language performance (Taylor 1989; Harris-Wright 1999). In Canada, Standard English as a Second Dialect programmes have recently been introduced in several provinces. Early findings indicate improvement of Aboriginal students' reading skills (Battisti, Friesen, and Krauth 2009). In Australia, the implementation of a two-way bidialectal education led to students' repertoire building (Malcolm and Truscott 2012). In Europe, a Norwegian study demonstrated that students' reading proficiency increased when children were exposed to both standard and nonstandard varieties in the classroom (Bull 1990). Similarly, positive educational outcomes were recorded in the Netherlands (Stijnen and Vallen 1989), Switzerland (Ender and Straßl 2009) and Cyprus (Yiakoumetti 2006, 2007). This previous research makes it clear that harnessing students' native nonstandard varieties is educationally advantageous.

Challenges faced by language teachers in bidialectal communities

Teachers face an important and apparently difficult choice of which linguistic varieties to use in the classroom. On one hand, teachers are told that the standard variety should be the medium of communication in formal education. This argument is supported by the fact that the standard variety is considered to be essential

for future employment (Atkins 1993). Many vernacular speakers would like their children to be taught in the standard variety (Epstein and Xu 2003) so that there are additional occupational options opened to them. The standard variety is viewed as the vehicle which allows access to and social inclusion within the dominant social groups. On the other hand, teachers are told that students' nonstandard mother tongues are a major part of their identity and teachers are therefore advised to allow students to use their nonstandard varieties in the classroom.

Very often, it is left up to language teachers to inform and educate students about the fact that their dialectal mother tongues reflect their history and experiences as people and that these varieties are a symbol of solidarity. Not all teachers are in a position to do so. Some may be standard-speaking teachers with no awareness of or sensitivity to nonstandard varieties and their speakers. Others who are bidialectal may still feel helpless due to the fact that they never received training in sociolinguistic issues related to dialectal variation. Of course, some teachers may have extensive knowledge of the different linguistic varieties and their functions used in their speech community simply by being local speakers of the community. Although this knowledge is helpful, it may not be explicit. Teachers therefore need clear directions if they are to effectively utilise the linguistic varieties which are available to them in their classrooms.

In addition, teachers are not normally given clear instructions as to how much students' nonstandard mother tongues can be used in the class or when and for what purposes. In some cases, such as in the Netherlands, the result is that the non-standard dialect is simply not used in the class, despite the very liberal Dutch language policy towards dialects (Hagen 1989). Hagen explained that although teachers in Kerkrade hold positive attitudes towards the regional dialect, their behaviour in the classroom suggests that teachers are subject to the hegemony of the standard.

One might think that, in bidialectal settings, language teachers would choose to utilise both standard and nonstandard varieties to facilitate student learning. Such pedagogical practice would undoubtedly foster appreciation for both types of varieties, awareness of the functions of each variety, understanding of the similarities and differences of the varieties, and sensitivity towards linguistic variation. However, multiple studies have demonstrated that teachers usually feel ashamed when told that they use nonstandard varieties in class. For example, research in Flanders, the Dutch-speaking part of Belgium (Van de Craen and Humblet 1989), demonstrated that teachers declare that they cannot speak 'as they should' and that they express feelings of guilt about this. In addition, many teachers deny using nonstandard varieties or they demonstrate a remarkable tendency to upgrade their language variant. When teachers are confronted with the question of which kind of Dutch they speak, they often incorrectly judge their regional dialect to be *Umgangssprache* (an intermediate variant between regional dialect and Belgian Dutch), *Umgangssprache* to be Belgian Dutch, and Belgian Dutch to be Standard Dutch. The trend is clear: teachers wish to upgrade the status of each variety.

Teachers' challenges become even more complicated when a foreign language (L2) is added (Yiakoumetti and Mina 2011). Teachers are first faced with the challenge of how much to use students' first language (L1) when teaching the L2. Secondly, they face the question of which L1: the students' actual mother tongue, the educational standard, or both? This is a very important question but one which has

mainly been neglected due to the fact that the L1 standard has been unquestionably promoted in formal education.

Setting and significance of the study

The speech community under investigation is the Greek Cypriot community. Any discussion referring to Cyprus should be understood in terms of this community alone. Cyprus provides an excellent vantage point for the investigation of the interface between bidialectism and bilingualism in education. Cypriots have the Cypriot dialect (CD) as their mother tongue while Standard Modern Greek (SMG) serves as their educational variety. (For a discussion of linguistic features of the CD, see Newton 1983, 1983–1984 and, for a discussion of the domains of usage of each of the varieties, see Papapavlou and Pavlou 1998.) In addition, English is normally Cypriots' first foreign language. (For a discussion of the role of English in Cyprus, predominantly in response to the economic forces of modern life, see McEntee-Atalianis and Pouloukas 2001.) English is popular and is considered essential for Cypriots' career development. This is evidenced in the Cypriot educational system where English is a compulsory subject from the age of nine (i.e. fourth grade of primary education). More importantly, private English language tuition is the norm, with almost every child from around the age of eight attending afternoon classes in English as a foreign language.

The phenomenon of bidialectism in education on the island of Cyprus has received particular attention from researchers over the last decade, resulting in reports of (i) speakers' language attitudes towards the CD and SMG (Papapavlou 1998, 2001; Yiakoumetti et al. 2005); (ii) students' performance in the standard variety (Yiakoumetti 2006, 2007); (iii) teachers' perceptions of their language choice (SMG or the CD) as a medium of instruction in the Modern Greek language lessons (Pavlou and Papapavlou 2004; Sophocleous and Wilks 2010); and (iv) the impact of bidialectism on the teaching of Greek as a foreign language (Pavlou and Christodoulou 2001). No research has dealt with the effect of bidialectism on learning English as a foreign language. The only study that has dealt with bidialectism and foreign-language learning was that of Pavlou and Christodoulou (2001). However, this work concentrated on the learning of the standard as a foreign language. It thus dealt with non-Greek speakers learning Greek as a foreign language in Cyprus rather than with the foreign-language learning of bidialectal speakers.

Put succinctly, the focus of our study is the interface of bidialectism and bilingualism as it is manifested in Cyprus. This focus is perhaps particularly relevant at this time when Cyprus, which recently entered the European Union, is reconsidering its foreign-language policy and is striving to promote multilingual and multicultural awareness.

Research methods

The study was conducted between 2006 and 2007 in two private afternoon schools in the towns of Limassol and Larnaca. The schools are attended by Greek Cypriots who wish to learn English as a foreign language (EFL). The specific schools were primarily chosen because all teaching staff are qualified EFL teachers who can teach at all EFL levels (i.e. elementary, intermediate, and advanced).

Two classes participated in the study based on the teachers' evaluations of their own language use: the two teachers (one teacher from each school) claimed to use both the L1 and L2 in their EFL teaching. The two participating teachers were Greek Cypriot and had been teaching at the schools for a number of years. They had tertiary Bachelor's-level EFL qualifications which is the norm for EFL teachers at Cypriot private language schools.

Data were collected in the form of field notes, audio and video recordings, and teacher interviews. These data were primarily collected from three observed lessons (of one hour each) from each teacher's teaching of the Passive Voice (PV). Three hours is a typical amount of time devoted to the teaching of the PV in private afternoon schools in Cyprus. The researchers sought permission to conduct the study from the Directors of Studies, the teachers, students' parents and students themselves. This permission was granted and school, teacher and student anonymity were fully preserved.

This paper concentrates on teachers' classroom language use and its analysis focuses on teachers' use of SMG and of a basilectal form of the CD. As far as we can ascertain, this is the first empirical study which explores teachers' language use in linguistically diverse classrooms with a view to elucidating the interface between bidialectism and bilingualism so as to inform teacher training guidelines.

Findings and discussion

Initial observations

In general, it was evident from our field notes that the teachers primarily used the CD alongside English despite the mandate that SMG (and not the CD) is to be used in formal teaching situations. This finding deserves attention because it suggests that the L1 use in an L2 classroom environment is much more dialectal and thus less standard than the L1 use in an L1 classroom environment. It appears that it is more accurate to describe teachers as users of what Arvaniti (2006) calls Cypriot Standard Greek than as users of SMG. According to Arvaniti (2006), Cypriot Standard Greek is different to both SMG (as it is used in Greece) and to basilectal forms of the CD, and this spoken variety is used by Cypriots in semi-formal and formal situations. Because Cypriot speakers do not use SMG as it is spoken in Greece, the differences between the CD and SMG become gradually consolidated while users remain unaware of these differences. Other researchers too have recently paid attention to this semi-formal/formal form of the CD and have called it 'urban Cypriot Greek' (Tsiplakou, Papapavlou, Pavlou, and Katsoyannou 2006).

Our paper has a more directed focus upon teachers' use of (i) basilectal forms of the Cypriot dialect (rather than on the way Cypriots use the CD in semi-formal and formal situations) and (ii) Standard Modern Greek in teaching English. These two distinct forms of usage are investigated because they demonstrate a departure from the default situation which was the use of urban Cypriot Greek.

As far as the code of transcription is concerned, extracts from teachers' language use are numbered. Teachers' authentic speech is first presented, followed by an English translation in square brackets. Commentary is provided in parentheses.

Use of a basilectal form of the Cypriot dialect

The data revealed that the teachers switched to a more basilectal form of the CD in three situations. The first occurred when the teachers attempted to motivate students, the second occurred when the teachers aimed to lightly reprimand students, and the third occurred when the teachers aimed to reprimand in a humorous fashion. It should be noted that a basilectal form was mostly employed when the teachers addressed each student individually rather than as a class group.

Examples 1 and 2 below demonstrate how the teachers helped students individually to form the targeted grammatical feature. In the first example, the student was aware that the Past Participle was to be formed as he said 'in V3'. 'V3' relates to the metalanguage the teacher and the students were using and refers to 'the verb that appears in the third column, the Past Participle' (e.g. *to bring* (Infinitive), *brought* (Past), *brought* (Past Participle)). However, the student was not in a position to form the construction and started giving up. To re-awaken his interest and to motivate him, the teacher switched to a more basilectal CD and asked him what he was thinking about. She then urged him to commence the construction at his own pace. After that, the student steadily formed the grammatical construction. Similarly, in the second example, the teacher first motivated the student and then offered to assist the student in arriving at the targeted grammatical form. This motivation on the part of the teacher is provided in a basilectal variant of the CD.

1. Teacher: Place the verb
(the teacher is expecting the student to continue her sentence.)
Student: into position V3
Teacher: Do it.
(The student does nothing; he hesitates.)
Teacher: Νταν που σκέφτεσαι; Άρκεψε σιγά-σιγά.
[What are you thinking about? Start slowly, slowly.]
(The student slowly performs the correct grammatical construction.)

2. Teacher: Άτε βάρτεξ δυνάμεις σου. Εννά σε βοηθήσω να το κάμουμεν μαζίν.
[Come on, try your best. Let's construct it together.]
(The student gains motivation and attempts the grammatical construction with the help of the teacher.)

The second pattern of movement to a more basilectal form of the CD happened on occasions on which the teacher reprimanded the students, but only when she wished for the reprimand to be taken lightly. Example 3 below shows the manner in which the teacher reprimanded a student who did not do his homework. The teacher's last utterance was pronounced in a scolding tone. However, the reprimand was meant to be taken lightly as she used the basilectal 'χάτε' [come on!] (a form which is used at home and is not expected to be used in formal occasions) to emphasise her close relationship with her pupil. The fact that the reprimand was to be taken lightly is further supported by the teacher's affectionate usage of 'μου' ['my' John] when addressing the student by name. In a similar fashion, example 4 shows how the teacher moved to a more basilectal form of the dialect (that would

not usually be used in formal occasions) to scold students for their lack of attention and participation in the lesson. She was, however, aware that the hot classroom environment was part of the reason for students' uncharacteristically lax behaviour so she was not overly strict. Her basilectal use of 'πυρά' [heat] served for the reprimand but, at the same time, indicated her affection towards the students. The finding that teachers resorted to basilectal forms of the CD when scolding students is in accordance with the findings of Ioannidou's (2007) case study. Her data revealed that teachers in the Cypriot state school that she studied primarily used dialect variants and 'heavy dialect' (172) to reprimand students.

3. Teacher: Who hasn't done exercise 13?
(A student raises his hand.)
Teacher: Γιάννη, Γιάννη μου do it now ντάξει; Χάτε πάμεν.
[John, my John, do it now, OK? Come on, let's go.]
4. Teacher: Andrea, clean the board. Άτε ρε ξυπνάτε λλίον! Νταν που ταν τούτο;
[Come on everyone, wake up! What was that all about?]
Student: Τι; [What?]
Teacher: Μιλάτε μεταξύ σας. [You are talking amongst yourselves.]
Student: Εν μπορώ κυρία εν πυρά. [I can't, Miss, it's too hot.]
Teacher: Εν πυρά εντάξει. [It's hot, it's OK.]

Example 5 below also evidences teachers' use of a more basilectal form of the CD to reprimand students. This time, however, the teacher intended her utterance to be perceived by the students as funny. Indeed, the use of a village-influenced dialectal form combined with visible arm shaking made students laugh. Students' laughter added a lighter note to the lesson after the teacher had administered a reprimand. This finding corresponds to the findings of a study by Papapavlou and Pavlou (2005) which examined the attitudes of 133 teachers from 14 schools in Cyprus and established that the use of the CD by teachers was more acceptable when this choice aimed to create a relaxed atmosphere. The present study thus suggests that Pavlou and Papapavlou's findings, which were revealed in the L1 classroom, may also pertain to the L2 classroom.

5. Teacher: Εννά σας κουπανίσω με το μασδράτζιν αν δεν φέρετε τον νου σας αμέσως!
[I'll hit you with the rolling pin if you don't use your brains immediately!]
(Students laugh.)
Student: Όπως μες το σκετς κυρία. [Just like in the TV sketch, Miss.]

Use of Standard Modern Greek

The data revealed that the teacher chose to switch to SMG when she sought to deliver teaching to students in a formal and concerted manner. Specifically, the instances in which she resorted to the standard always related to her addressing the class as a whole. Such language use was associated with a more formal context that

required the attention of the entire class. Example 6 below shows the teacher's switching to SMG in the middle of her explanation to address all the students and not just the one with whom she started the conversation. The teacher switched to SMG with a self-correction. She first used the CD verb 'κάννεις' [to make] and then changed to the SMG 'βγάζεις' [to extract]. The video recording revealed that even though she was using the second person singular, she was no longer addressing the specific student alone but the entire class. The switch to SMG which was a sign that the whole class had to listen was also accompanied by her relocation within the classroom: she stopped looking at the specific student, moved to stand by her desk, and looked at and addressed all the students. Her tone was formal and her aim was to provide information. Similarly, example 7 demonstrates the teacher reverted to using SMG when she recommenced addressing the entire class. This switch rendered these lesson-instances more formal and was reminiscent of public-school L1 teaching.

6. Teacher: The phrase 'it must have been' is a logical assumption. Κάννεις (self-corrects and switches to SMG)
βγάζεις εσύ ένα συμπέρασμα. Πρέπει να ήταν αυτή. Αναφέρεσαι στο παρελθόν. Χρησιμοποιείς 'modal' 'must have' plus 'V3' γιατί αναφέρεσαι στο παρελθόν.
[The phrase 'it must have been' is a logical assumption. You make (self-corrects and switches to SMG) extract a conclusion. It must have been her. You refer to the past. You use 'modal', 'must have' plus 'V3' because you refer to the past.]
7. Teacher: That's a good reason, Mario. Μπορείτε να σκεφτείτε κάτι άλλο; Οι άνθρωποι πιστεύουν ένα σωρό πράγματα για ένα σωρό θέματα. Κάθε φορά θα λέμε 'οι άνθρωποι πιστεύουν';
[Can you all think of something else? People believe a number of things for a number of issues. Are we going to say 'people believe' in every case?]
- Student: Οί. [No.]
- Teacher: We can say 'it is believed that'.

As described at the beginning of this section, the L2 teachers primarily employed the Cypriot dialect when they did not use the target variety, English. Realistically, the teachers had two codes other than English from which to choose: SMG (the variety required by the educational policy) or the CD (their and the students' mother tongue). Despite the fact that the standard variety is the one associated with education as well as the one designed for formal teaching, the teachers employed the regional dialect. Why was this the case? Why was the teachers' language in the L2 classroom less standard? Is it because the target variety was neither a first dialect (D1) nor a second dialect (D2) but an L2 (English)? Certainly, when the target variety is a D2 (SMG), teachers try to use a more D2-like medium of instruction. Further investigation is needed before these questions can be answered conclusively.

Additionally, the teachers (perhaps subconsciously) used more basilectal forms of the dialect in a consistently circumstance-dependent manner (in motivating, lightly reprimanding, and humouring students). The current study therefore initiates

a potentially conclusive demonstration that, despite the popular belief that SMG is the language of the classroom, a number of L1 codes do co-exist in the L2 classroom. Of course, students and teachers may largely lack conscious awareness of this co-existence. The fact that the teachers were not aware of their frequent usage of different linguistic varieties was borne out in the interviews which followed after the completion of the observations. When the teachers were shown the video recordings, they were so surprised by their language practices that they felt they had to apologise. The teachers' behaviour alludes to Wolfram and Fasold's (1969) warning that speakers who use stigmatised speech forms sometimes have the same low opinion of forms as do the speakers who do not use them. Despite the fact that our study (which investigated the language choices of just two teachers) was small in scale, we are confident in our assertion that teacher training that emphasises the equality of linguistic varieties is necessary if teachers and students are to cease to feel defensive of their mother tongues.

Call for teacher training programmes in linguistic variation

We commenced highlighting the difference in opinion of linguists and the general public when it comes to assessing the value of nonstandard varieties. This difference in opinion puts teachers in a difficult position. How can linguists equip teachers so that they can carry out their valuable work without social prejudice and unjustified stereotypes? Our answer is that teachers can be empowered to inform and alter public opinion through teacher training programmes that focus on linguistic diversity. This is not a new proposition. Researchers from around the globe have drawn on their studies within linguistically diverse communities in deciding to advocate such training (Baugh 1999; Meier 1999; Ball and Lewis 2005; Godley et al. 2006; Yiakoumetti and Esch 2010; Yiakoumetti 2012b). However, although it is routinely recognised that such programmes would be beneficial, they remain extremely scarce.

Below are some guidelines on which teacher training programmes could profitably be based in settings in which bidialectism and bilingualism meet.

- Teachers should be educated about terms such as regional/social nonstandard varieties, standard varieties, bidialectism/multidialectism, and bilingualism/multilingualism. Knowledge of the characteristics of such sociolinguistic concepts and phenomena will help teachers understand and utilise their own contexts better.
- Teachers should be educated about the domains of usage of each of the linguistic varieties spoken in their communities. They should be informed that the patterns of usage observed in their settings do not necessarily correspond to patterns observed in other settings. Such informed knowledge will allow teachers to make appropriate judgments regarding the roles of each of the varieties spoken in their contexts.
- Similarly, teachers should be educated about the status attached to the varieties spoken in their speech communities. They should know that languages dominant in one society may not necessarily hold a similar status in other societies. Such knowledge will prevent teachers risking offending parents or

students by emphasising language varieties which are met with suspicion by these locals.

- Teachers should be given clear instruction as to how they can harness bidialectal students' first and second dialects when teaching foreign languages. By having clear guidelines regarding the roles of previously acquired dialects, teachers will be in a position to better utilise them in the foreign-language classroom.
- Teachers should be educated about the pedagogical advantages of codeswitching so that misplaced embarrassment ceases to be a barrier to codeswitching for specific didactic purposes. Through codeswitching, teachers and students will be given more opportunities to understand language issues as they relate to multiple varieties.
- Teachers should be informed about the social, cognitive, linguistic, and pedagogical benefits of linguistic diversity. Such information will motivate teachers to incorporate linguistic diversity into the classroom for the benefit of their students.

The above guidelines do not aim to provide an exhaustive list of recommendations but rather to focus on some of the most prominent recommendations that are based primarily on the role of the sociolinguistic landscape in linguistically diverse speech communities. We are aware that implementation of the above recommendations is undoubtedly an enormous task but it is clearly one which is worth undertaking for language educators' professional development. Only when language educators are fully equipped with sociolinguistically informed educational training will they feel empowered to carry out the challenging task of meaningfully educating our children. We hasten to add that the above recommendations are also potentially beneficial for the professional development of educators whose subjects lie outside foreign language teaching. Future research on the incorporation of sociolinguistic information into training programmes in non-language subjects will elucidate how all of the linguistic codes of students can be maximally utilised for the learning of especially difficult concepts.

The limited scope of our study, its small number of participants, and the short durations of lesson observations are all factors that limit the applicability of our guidelines. Future work which builds on our findings to clarify how the interface between bidialectism and bilingualism manifests itself in the realm of education will provide us with more confidence to generalise about key influences from the sociolinguistic landscape and beyond on teaching efficacy.

Conclusion

The study aimed to investigate EFL teachers' linguistic behaviour in classrooms in which bidialectism and bilingualism co-occur. The findings reveal that teachers in Cypriot EFL classes mostly use the Greek Cypriot dialect (and not the anticipated Standard Modern Greek) alongside English. In addition, the use of basilectal forms of the regional dialect is consistent and circumstance dependent. Despite official language policies, the teachers do tend to fall back on the variety that is most intimate to them and to their students. The findings clearly highlight the complex role of language educators in settings which are characterised by the interface between bidialectism and bilingualism. Appropriate training in sociolinguistic education can

help to reduce the complexity such that teachers can optimise their language teaching. Teacher training programmes that celebrate language diversity have the potential to allow teachers and their students to appreciate and make use of all the linguistic varieties available to them.

Notes on contributors

Androula Yiakoumetti is an applied linguist at the School of Education, Oxford Brookes University. She has published on the topics of bidialectism, bilingualism, the interface between language attitudes and linguistic performance, EFL learning, and language-teacher training. She lectures on second-language acquisition, bilingual education, and multilingualism and language planning.

Marina Mina is a senior teacher co-ordinator at the Y.K. English Learning Centre, Cyprus. Her research interests include sociolinguistic approaches to EFL teaching and learning, and the interface between bidialectism and bilingualism. Her current teaching focus is English for native Greek speakers.

References

- Adger, C. T. 1997. "Issues and Implications of English Dialects for Teaching English as a Second Language." *TESOL Professional Papers*, no. 3. <http://www.tesol.edu/pubs/profpapers/adger1.html>.
- Ammon, U. 1989. "Aspects of Dialect and School in the Federal Republic of Germany." In *Dialect and Education*, edited by J. Cheshire, V. Edwards, H. Münstermann, and B. Weltens, 113–138. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Arvaniti, A. 2006. "Linguistic Practices in Cyprus and the Emergence of Cypriot Standard Greek." In *San Diego Linguistic Papers 2*, edited by S. Fukuda and G. Gibbard, 1–24. San Diego: University of California, San Diego.
- Atkins, C. 1993. "Do Employment Recruiters Discriminate on the Basis of Nonstandard Dialect?" *Journal of Employment Counseling* 30 (3): 108–118.
- Ball, J., and B. H. Bernhardt. 2012. "Standard English as a Second Dialect: A Canadian Perspective." In *Harnessing Linguistic Variation to Improve Education*, edited by A. Yiakoumetti, 189–225. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Ball, J., and M. Lewis. 2005. "Using Indigenous Parents' Goals for Children's Language to Guide Speech-Language Practice and Policy." Paper presented at the World Indigenous People's Conference on Education, Hamilton, New Zealand, November 27–December 1.
- Battisti, M., J. Friesen, and B. Krauth. 2009. "Non-Standard English at School: Can Targeted Funding Improve Student Achievement?" Paper presented at the European Association of Labour Economists conference, Tallinn, Estonia, September 10–12.
- Baugh, J. 1999. "Considerations in Preparing Teachers for Linguistic Diversity." In *Making the Connection: Language and Academic Achievement among African American Students*, edited by C. T. Adger, C. Donna, and O. Taylor, 81–95. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Berry, R., and J. Hudson. 1997. "The Story of Feliks: Bidialectal Education." Paper presented at the conference of the Applied Linguistics Association of Australia, Toowoomba, Australia, October 2–3.
- Bull, T. 1990. "Teaching School Beginners to Read and Write in the Vernacular." In *Tromsø Linguistics in the Eighties*, edited by E. H. Jahr and O. Lorentz, 69–84. Oslo: Novus Press.
- Edwards, V. 1979. *The West Indian Language Issue in British Schools: Challenges and Responses*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Ender, A., and K. StraBl. 2009. "The Acquisition and Use of German in a Dialect-Speaking Environment: Facets of Inclusion and Exclusion of Immigrant Children in Switzerland." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 19 (2): 173–187.
- Einstein, R. I., and L. X. J. Xu. 2003. *Roots and Wings: Teaching English as a Second Dialect to Aboriginal Students, a Review of the Recent Literature*. Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan.

- Garrett, P., N. Coupland, and A. Williams. 1999. "Evaluating Dialect in Discourse: Teachers' and Teenagers' Responses to Young English Speakers in Wales." *Language in Society* 28 (3): 321–354.
- Godley, A. J., J. Sweetland, R. S. Wheeler, A. Minnici, and B. D. Carpenter. 2006. "Preparing Teachers for Dialectically Diverse Classrooms." *Educational Researcher* 35 (8): 30–37.
- Hagen, A. M. 1989. "Dialect, Frisian and Education in the Netherlands." In *Dialect and Education*, edited by J. Cheshire, V. Edwards, H. Münstermann, and B. Weltens, 48–61. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Haig, Y., and R. Oliver. 2003. "Language Variation and Education: Teachers' Perceptions." *Language and Education* 17 (4): 266–280.
- Harris-Wright, K. 1999. "Enhancing Bidialectalism in Urban African American Students." In *Making the Connection: Language and Academic Achievement among African American Students*, edited by C. T. Adger, C. Donna, and O. Taylor, 53–60. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Heit, M., and H. Blair. 1993. "Language Needs and Characteristics of Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Students: Implications for Educators." In *Aboriginal Language and Education: The Canadian Experience*, edited by S. Morris, K. McLeod, and M. Danesi, 103–108. Oakvill, ON: Mosaic Press.
- Hoover, M. R. 1978. "Community Attitudes toward Black English." *Language in Society* 7 (1): 65–87.
- Hoover, M. R., F. McNair, R. S. A. Lewis, and L. R. Politzer. 1997. "African American English Attitudes Measures for Teachers." In *Handbook of Test and Measurements for Black Populations*, edited by R. Jones, 383–393. Hampton, VA: Cobb.
- Ioannidou, E. 2007. "This ain't My Real Language, Miss: The Use of the Cypriot Dialect and Standard Modern Greek in a Typical Classroom Interaction." In *Sociolinguistic and Pedagogical Dimensions of Dialects in Education*, edited by A. Papapavlou and P. Pavlou, 165–191. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Jørgensen, N. J., and K. M. Pedersen. 1989. "Dialect and Education in Denmark." In *Dialect and Education*, edited by J. Cheshire, V. Edwards, H. Münstermann, and B. Weltens, 30–47. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Malcolm, I. G., and A. Truscott. 2012. "English without Shame: Two-Way Aboriginal Classrooms in Australia." In *Harnessing Linguistic Variation to Improve Education*, edited by A. Yiakoumetti, 227–258. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- McEntee-Atalianis, L. J., and S. Pouloukas. 2001. "Issues of Identity and Power in a Greek-Cypriot Community." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 22 (1): 19–38.
- Meier, T. 1999. "The Case for Ebonics as Part of Exemplary Teacher Preparation." In *Making the Connection: Language and Academic Achievement among African American Students*, edited by C. T. Adger, C. Donna, and O. Taylor, 97–114. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Mordaunt, O. G. 2011. "Bidialectalism in the Classroom: The Case of African-American English." *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 24 (1): 77–87.
- Newton, B. 1983. "Stylistic Levels in Cypriot Greek." *Mediterranean Language Review* 1: 55–63.
- Newton, B. 1983–84. "Cypriot Greek Revisited." *Glossologia* 2–3: 137–147.
- Papapavlou, A. N. 1998. "Attitudes Toward the Greek Cypriot Dialect: Sociocultural Implications." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 134 (1): 15–28.
- Papapavlou, A. N. 2001. "Mind your Speech: Language Attitudes in Cyprus." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 22 (6): 491–501.
- Papapavlou, A. N., and P. Pavlou. 1998. "A Review of the Sociolinguistic Aspects of the Cypriot Greek Dialect." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 19 (3): 212–220.
- Papapavlou, A., and P. Pavlou. 2005. "Literacy and Language-in-Education Policy in Bidialectal Settings." *Language Planning* 6 (2): 164–181.
- Pavlou, P., and N. Christodoulou. 2001. "Bidialectism in Cyprus and its Impact on the Teaching of Greek as a Foreign Language." *International Journal of Applied linguistics* 11 (1): 75–91.

- Pavlou, P., and A. Papapavlou. 2004. "Issues of Dialect Use in Education from the Greek Cypriot Perspective." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 14 (2): 243–258.
- Rickford, J. R. 1999. "Language Diversity and Academic Achievement in the Education of African American Students: An Overview of the Issues." In *Making the Connection: Language and Academic Achievement among African American Students*, edited by C. T. Adger, C. Donna, and O. Taylor, 1–29. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Scirih, L. 1996. *A Question of Identity: Language Use in Cyprus*. Nicosia: Intercollege Press.
- Siegel, J. 2010. *Second Dialect Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sophocleous, A., and C. Wilks. 2010. "Standard Modern Greek and Greek-Cypriot Dialect in Kindergarten Classroom Interaction: Teachers' and Learners' Language Attitudes and Language Use." *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 23 (1): 51–69.
- Sterzuk, A. 2008. "Whose English Counts? Indigenous English in Saskatchewan Schools." *McGill Journal of Education* 43 (1): 9–19.
- Stijnen, S., and T. Vallen. 1989. "The Kerkrade Project: Background, Main Findings and an Evaluation." In *Dialect and Education*, edited by J. Cheshire, V. Edwards, H. Münstermann, and B. Weltens, 139–153. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Taylor, H. 1989. *Standard English, Black English, and Bidialectalism: A Controversy*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Tsiplakou, S., A. Papapavlou, P. Pavlou, and M. Katsoyannou. 2006. "Levelling, Koineization and their Implications for Bidialectism." In *Language Variation – European Perspectives*, edited by F. Hinskens, 265–276. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Van De Craen, P., and I. Humblet. 1989. "Dialect and Education in Belgium." In *Dialect and Education*, edited by J. Cheshire, V. Edwards, H. Münstermann, and B. Weltens, 13–29. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Wilberschied, L., and J.-L. P. Dassier. 1995. "Increasing the Number of Minority FL Educators: Local Action to Meet a National Imperative." *The Modern Language Journal* 79 (j): 1–14.
- Wolfram, W., C. T. Adger, and D. Christian. 1999. *Dialects in Schools and Communities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wolfram, W., and R. W. Fasold. 1969. "Toward Reading Materials for Speakers of Black English: Three Linguistically Appropriate Passages." In *Teaching Black Children to Read*, edited by J. C. Baratz and R. W. Shy. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Yiakoumetti, A. 2006. "A Bidialectal Programme for the Learning of Standard Modern Greek in Cyprus." *Applied Linguistics* 27 (2): 295–317.
- Yiakoumetti, A. 2007. "Choice of Classroom Language in Bidialectal Communities: To Include or to Exclude the Dialect?" *Cambridge Journal of Education* 37 (1): 51–66.
- Yiakoumetti, A. 2011. "Re-invigorating Teacher-training Programmes in Linguistic Variation." In *Teaching Teachers: Approaches in Improving Quality of Education*, edited by I. M. Saleh and M. S. Khine, 195–214. New York: Nova Science.
- Yiakoumetti, A. 2012a. "The Dangers of Dialects: Debunking (or Substantiating) the Myths." In *Harnessing Linguistic Variation to Improve Education*, edited by A. Yiakoumetti, 293–315. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Yiakoumetti, A. 2012b. "Bidialectism and Aboriginal Language Education: Sociolinguistic Considerations Pertinent to Australia's Aboriginal Communities." In *The Sociolinguistics of Language Education in International Contexts*, edited by E. Esch and M. Solly, 169–194. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Yiakoumetti, A., M. Evans, and E. Esch. 2005. "Language Awareness in a Bidialectal Setting: The Oral Performance and Language Attitudes of Urban and Rural Students in Cyprus." *Language Awareness* 14 (4): 254–260.
- Yiakoumetti, A., and E. Esch. 2010. "Educational Complexities Inherent in Bidialectal Communities and the Potential Contribution of the Common European Framework to Second-dialect Development." In *Language Learner Autonomy: Policy, Curriculum, Classroom*, edited by L. Carson and B. O'Rourke, 291–312. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Yiakoumetti, A., and M. Mina. 2011. "The Influence of First-language Bidialectism in the Foreign-language Classroom: Observations from Cyprus." *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 24 (3): 287–297.