

THE INFLUENCE OF A BIDIALECTAL LANGUAGE INTERVENTION PROGRAMME ON LEARNING OF STANDARD MODERN GREEK IN AN URBAN AND A RURAL CYPRIOT SCHOOL

ANDROULA YIAKOUMETTI, CHURCHILL COLLEGE,
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Abstract

This study addresses bidialectal language education by using the bidialectal situation in Cyprus as a reference point. The focal issue is the possibility of learning the standard by exploiting the dialect as a facilitating tool. To address this aim, a bidialectal language model was designed and then applied through an intervention programme in an urban and a rural primary school in Cyprus. This model was comparative/contrastive in nature in that it drew on an explicit and conscious comparison of learners' regional dialectal mother tongue with the standard variety. Specifically, the model was designed to encourage formal and conscious reflection on language differences and similarities between bidialectal speakers' two related codes. Once students were made aware of the linguistic features that fall within and without the targeted standard variety, the aim was to transfer this awareness into students' oral and written performance. The focus was the reduction of dialectal transference. Various assessment exercises were conducted before and after the intervention. Synergistic use of quantitative and qualitative analyses revealed a marked improvement in learners' standard production, in that dialectal occurrences were reduced.

Keywords: bidialectism, dialectal transference, language intervention, oral/written performance, urban/rural performance.

Introduction

This study provides an empirical evaluation of the effects of the introduction of learners' dialectal mother tongue into the classroom environment

language, one can see that the targets as well as the means for achieving them (teaching material, strategies) are identical in the two countries. This is quite problematic in view of the fact that the mother tongue of Cypriot children is the CD and not the standard variety. It must be stressed that, in the whole of the curriculum, no acknowledgement is made as to which is the actual mother tongue of Cypriots; on the contrary, SMG is presented as their language. No allusion is made to differences between the variety of the home and the school variety, or to any transitory stage to fill the gap. The reason for the lack of acknowledgement of the CD may be that the Cypriot language educational policy views keeping the CD out of the classroom as the way to lessen dialectal interference. However, as other studies have shown, such a practice can have traumatic effects on the learners (James 1996; Garrett *et al.* 1994). It must also be noted that, despite the advocated strict SMG enforcement, the CD is still present in the classroom (Yiakoumetti *et al.* in press).

Aim of the study

The compartmentalisation of language usage and the total absence of the dialect from the National Curriculum has recently attracted a great deal of attention from linguists and educationists (Papapavlou 2004; Pavlou and Papapavlou 2004; Yiakoumetti *et al.* 2005). It is suggested that the phenomenon of bidialectism affects Cypriots' performance in the standard, leading to dialectal interference in their SMG school production. 'Dialectal interference' has no negative connotations. It simply refers to dialectal occurrences in Cypriot students' production of the standard variety.

The overall aim of the study presented here was to measure students' performance in the standard and, through an intervention programme which focused on the similarities and differences of the two varieties, to improve it. Improvement was monitored by measuring reduction of dialectal occurrences. Primacy was placed on the standard to be consistent with the interests of Cypriots who view SMG as a more appropriate code for educational purposes (Papapavlou 1994, 1998, 2001, 2004; Pavlou 1997; Pavlou and Papapavlou 2004).

Quantitative and qualitative analyses were carried out. The current manuscript aims to provide a qualitative account of the effect of the intervention programme in terms of learners' pedagogical treatment, school location and test types (*viz.* oral interviews and written language essays). For a quantitative account, see Yiakoumetti *et al.* (2005) and Yiakoumetti (in press).

Research Methods

For a detailed description of the research methods (design, population, treatment and assessment), see Yiakoumetti (in press). For convenience, a summary of the research method is also provided below.

An intervention-based study determined by a quasi-experimental design was applied. 182 final-year primary school children from an urban and a rural school in the Larnaca district participated in the study. 92 students served as the experimental group and 90 students as the control group. The language ability of the two groups was tested prior to the programme and it was revealed that the two groups were of a similar level (*i.e.* no statistically significant difference was detected when examining students' CD occurrences). This allowed for their valid comparison. The treatment was exposure to a textbook which drew on the similarities and differences between the CD and SMG and trained experimental-group students to consciously separate their two linguistic codes and transfer from their mother tongue to the standard without including dialectal features.

As already noted, the current manuscript provides a qualitative account of the project. Eight students out of the 92 who were subject to the intervention programme were chosen (prior to the programme, based on the language grades they were given by their teachers) as subjects for which detailed assessment may be especially revealing. Four – two boys and two girls – were students in a rural school and the other four – again two boys and two girls – attended an urban school. The speech of these students was transcribed, analysed and compared to the speech of four students out of 90 from the control group, who were chosen on the basis of two criteria: (i) that their overall ability was similar to that of the experimental-group students; and (ii) that their production of CD items matched that of the experimental-group students. Ability, reflected in the students' language grade, was therefore the main criterion for selection. Although it is possible that teachers allocated grades differently, this undesirable variation was assumed to be minimal on the following basis. The guidelines of the educational system in Cyprus (described in the Cypriot National Curriculum (1996)) are identical for all schools and teachers must abide by similar assessment methods to fulfil the requirements of the Ministry of Education and Culture.

Students' performance was measured via oral (interviews) and written (essay writing) tests using error analysis. For the purposes of this study, error analysis refers to the procedure whereby dialectal interference in students' production of the standard is measured. Error analysis in this context has no negative connotations. In fact, as previously emphasised, the new language model treats the dialect as a valuable linguistic source. Nevertheless, the model

does focus on the standard with an aim of improving its production by reducing dialectal occurrences. It must be noted here that dialectal interference refers to interlingual and not intralingual errors. Interlingual errors occur when dialectal grammatical and lexical features and dialectal expressions enter the standard variety. The procedure of error analysis is unambiguous as a multitude of dialectal differences have been provided by previous researchers (Newton 1972, 1983-84; Contossopoulos 1994).

For the purposes of the current study, qualitative analyses are applied to data such as video recordings and test materials of case-study students. Statistical analyses are used to inform on the prevalence and relative importance of the qualitative observations.

Results and Discussion

Experimental and Control Differences

Several differences in the linguistic performance of students exposed to the new bidialectal language model were found in comparisons to the performance of students who continued their traditional language learning (*i.e.* learning of SMG without reference to the CD). Useful comparisons were based on the occurrence of CD features in students' production and on the relative progress of students of the same ability in the different groups.

In speech, the experimental group showed significant reduction in CD occurrences in comparisons between the pre-intervention and post-intervention tests ($P < 0.001$). On the other hand, there was no significant change in the performance of the control group.

The most common CD item appearing in students' speech was the final *-v*. This item appeared in the case-study students' pre-intervention tests, varying in its occurrence from one to 15 times within three minutes of discussion with the researcher. Seven out of eight of the experimental-group students completely eliminated this item in the post-intervention interview, whereas the control-group students continued to use it repeatedly. A single male student from the experimental group continued to use the final *-v* in the post-intervention test but, even so, its occurrence was reduced from 15 times in the pre-intervention test to just two in the post-intervention test. A similar pattern was seen with the morphological prefix ϵ -: all five students from the experimental group who used the prefix prior to the programme had completely eliminated it by the time of post-intervention test. The most prominent dialectal feature was the sound $\tau\check{\zeta}$. Again, all five experimental-group students who had produced it before the intervention ceased to include it in their post-intervention test interview. However, the control-group students who made use of it in the

pre-intervention test consistently repeated it in the post-intervention test. Similar patterns were seen with all the other CD occurrences. Students from the experimental group either completely eradicated the interference or reduced it dramatically, whereas the interference in the production of students from the control group continued at a similar level. (For contrasting extracts of experimental and control students' oral pre- and post-intervention tests, see Appendix A.)

The analysis also revealed that students of the same ability progressed differently depending on the group to which they belonged. This effect was mainly due to the fact that experimental-group students of all grades drastically reduced their dialectal interference over the period of the study while the grade-dependent interference observed in control-group students continued at levels similar to those initially observed. For example, a C-grade student from the control group showed the same pattern of CD utterances in the pre- and the post-intervention tests. On the other hand, a C-grade student from the experimental group completely eliminated any CD interference when assessed shortly after the intervention programme. Similarly, a B-grade male student from the experimental group did not include a single CD utterance in his post-intervention test. All the CD items were totally eliminated, including the strongest dialectal indicator /dʒ/, which he had used in his pre-intervention test 27 times. Conversely, in his post-intervention test, a B-grade boy from the control group repeated all types of CD occurrence he had previously committed in the pre-intervention test. The same was true for students of all abilities. (Extracts from oral pre- and post-intervention tests of matched-grade experimental and control students are found in Appendix B).

In writing too, the experimental group showed a significant difference in the presence of CD occurrences between the pre-intervention and post-intervention tests ($P < 0.001$). Lexical and morphological occurrences were the most common types of interference prior to the intervention. After the treatment, this interference was reduced in the experimental group alone. It is worth mentioning that students from both groups continued to commit spelling mistakes: the post-intervention tests included many orthographical errors. Orthography was not included in the intervention programme (as it is an intralingual and not an interlingual error). This evidence provides a strong indication that the experimental-group students' improvement was based on the programme and not on other factors. One could argue that factors such as increased motivation in the experimental group may have influenced linguistic performance. The re-appearance of the spelling mistakes makes this unlikely as the broad performance of students (including aspects such as orthography,

division of paragraphs, calligraphy and spelling²¹), rather than merely the aspects targeted by the programme, should have improved.

It must also be noted that, although it was markedly reduced, CD interference in the production of students from the experimental group still occurred after exposure to the programme. It should be borne in mind that the teachers were also Cypriots who had not received any professional training on specialised linguistic issues (except in the meetings they had with the researcher). The change was due to the fact that both teachers and students were now aware of the differences between the CD and SMG and of their own CD interference and were making an effort to reduce it. The few CD items which appeared in students' oral post-intervention test were phonological (mainly gemination and assimilation). A typical example occurred in a boy's interview in which he used the word *κασέττα* (*kasetta*) rather than *κασέτα* (*kaseta*) meaning 'tape'. This was minor interference, since it is rather difficult to change this specific pattern of speech without sounding 'fake' or 'pretentious', as the teachers explained. However, it is worth noting that, at the beginning of the conversation, the boy avoided this pattern when he used the word *πλότος* (he did not pronounce it *πλόττος*) (meaning 'pilot'). Perhaps his focus had begun to lapse by the end of the interview.

Urban and Rural Differences: CD Occurrences in Students' Production of SMG

The pre-intervention tests revealed that the speech of rural children included two patterns of CD features not found in the speech of urban children. These formed the only differences in terms of CD pattern interference – every other CD feature was shared. The two additional features were the verb ending *-τε* for first person plural (SMG: *τραγουδούμε*, CD: *τραγουδούμεντε*; 'we sing') and the usage of *τες* as the article for feminine plural accusative (SMG: *τες αδελφές μου*, CD: *τες αδελφές μου*; 'my sisters'). These differences undoubtedly contributed towards the significant urban-rural difference detected in the pre-intervention test. Indeed, as this difference was only just significant ($P = 0.041$), it would not have been detected in the absence of the two uniquely-rural features. Regardless of the reasons for the difference, it is important to note that students from both locations did include CD features in their oral SMG production. However, overall, no statistically significant difference was detected between urban and rural children. Both groups performed similarly (when assessing the presence of CD occurrences) in the overall oral tests.

²¹ All these aspects are emphasised by the traditional language teaching in Cyprus.

Analysis also revealed a rural-urban difference in that urban children did occasionally use several lexical items from SMG for which rural students had used a CD equivalent (*e.g.* SMG: κούνιες, CD: σούσες, 'swings' – drawn from the children's daily lexical bank.) The explanation for this is not clear. Urban students do use the CD equivalents during the break amongst themselves, as rural students do. The use of the SMG equivalents in the classroom by the urban children might therefore be related to non-school activities (*e.g.* the reading of novels at home).

In written production, CD interference was quantitatively different in the rural and the urban classes with the rural students including more CD occurrences in their language essay writing ($P = 0.030$). However, when assessing type of CD interference, the only CD element that appeared in the writing of rural children but not in the writing of urban children concerned intonation. Few rural children used Cypriot intonation in their SMG writing (SMG: έκαναν, CD: εκάναν, 'they did'; SMG: δάσκαλοι, CD: δασκάλοι, 'teachers').

Oral and Written Differences: Students' Language Style

Analysis of oral pre-intervention tests of case-study students revealed that they did include a great deal of CD interference. Although some of them made a distinct effort to use SMG and to avoid using the dialect in their speech as much as possible, they were often unable to provide the Greek equivalents.

Lack of explanatory sentences was also recorded in the language class prior to the commencement of the intervention programme. Students used SMG to answer the questions set by their teachers that were based on the passage they had read in the classroom. Their answers were short, generally consisting of a single sentence with a very limited number of propositions. Even simple 'yes' or 'no' responses were prevalent. There was normally no voluntary expression of detailed descriptions and, if the teachers did not ask for a justification of students' answers in their original questions, the students did not offer any. The phrasing of the students' answers is also illuminating. The wording of their responses was so close to the passage that it became clear that students were in the habit of merely regurgitating the passage itself with minimal modification, rather than offering a new set of words to explain what they meant. The language classes in the official and supposed mother tongue were thus eliciting responses from the students that might normally be expected only in a foreign-language class. It was obvious that any slight modification in the teachers' wording in relation to the wording of the text created difficulties for the students who became hesitant to answer and remained silent until the teachers used phrasing similar to that of the passage. As soon as teachers asked students to

thoroughly criticise a point – something that required creativity in language – the number of volunteer respondents dropped to near zero. Normally, those who did respond came from the higher-grade levels and offered answers in SMG with minor CD morphological interference (without any strong phonological dialectal indicators). It is interesting to note that the pattern of students' answers (*i.e.* the reproduction of the textbook's language) was also found in the written activities they were assigned at home. Students were required to read their language-homework answers aloud. Even these answers which were prepared without time restriction were extremely similar to the original text and lacked creativity and critical appraisal. One might therefore conclude that the low quality of students' oral production was entrenched and not challenged by the teachers. The students possibly felt at ease offering rather simple reproductions of original texts and the teachers did not sufficiently encourage the students to try harder.

However, there was a difference in students' style of essay writing attributable to students' grades: those with high-grades used Greek words for things that form part of their everyday lexical inventory in the dialect, such as for games they play at school. For example, a student who used the Cypriot words for 'hide and seek' (χωστό) and 'running' (βουρητό) in her speech, applied the SMG equivalents in her writing (κρυφτό and τρεχτό respectively) – (for an example of difference in language style in the same student's oral and written tests, see Appendix C). The writing of those with low grades, on the other hand, lacked confidence and was repetitive. An interesting example concerned the occurrence of parataxis. Sentences such as this were not uncommon: 'The excursion began with music, fun, jokes. After the fun, the music, the jokes it was time for dancing. Then, after the music, the fun, the jokes, the dancing it was time for games.'

Summary

Qualitative and quantitative assessment of students' oral and written performance revealed the following:

- Treatment had a highly significant effect ($P < 0.001$). In the pre-intervention tests, students from the control and experimental group performed similarly when examining students' CD occurrences. In the post-intervention tests, however, experimental students alone showed reduction of CD interference ($P < 0.001$). Case-study students' performance too revealed that students from the experimental group dramatically reduced dialectal interference, whereas the interference in the production of students from the control group continued at a similar level.

- The overall effect of location was not significant for oral performance ($P = 0.968$). In other words, both rural and urban students included a similar amount of CD features in their SMG oral production. However, case-study students' performance revealed that rural students included features like $-\tau\epsilon$ and $\tau\epsilon\zeta$ that did not form part of urban students' repertoire.
- The effect of location was statistically significant for written production ($P = 0.030$), with rural students including more CD features in their SMG writing. In terms of types of CD interference, rural children alone used Cypriot-influenced accent placement in their SMG writing.
- Case-study students' performance indicated that the most common CD features appearing in students' SMG production were the final $-v$, the morphological prefix $\epsilon-$ and the sound $\tau\zeta$.

Conclusion

Analysis of students' oral and written performance (pre-intervention tests) confirmed the beliefs of educationists and linguists on the island: the subjects' SMG production was influenced by their local mother tongue to a great extent. The language intervention programme subsequently designed to encourage formal and conscious reflection on language differences and similarities between bidialectal speakers' two related codes led to improved language use. The programme explored students' inherent intuitive language ability (Tinkel 1985) and aimed to raise it into conscious/explicit knowledge through the processes of 'noticing' and 'mismatch-correction-transfer'. With the application of this new language model, the improvement in the experimental-group students' SMG production (*i.e.* reduction of dialectal transference) was clearly detectable. The result was that students' attention was drawn to the formal similarities and differences of the two varieties, a process which consequently led to correct usage of the target variety in the classroom. In other words, implicit knowledge was first raised to awareness and, later, awareness was transferred into oral and written performance. Once children were made aware of the features that belong to SMG or not, they applied their knowledge to their usage. The study provides empirical confirmation that such a pedagogical approach can be the key to effective bidialectal learning.

Future studies may do well to examine the relationship between the use of the dialectal mother tongue in the classroom and linguistic performance in both the target standard and the mother tongue. The present study concentrated on one of bidialectal speakers' two codes: the standard variety. Research on the other code (*i.e.* the dialect) could offer insight into the topic of language development or even language attrition because emphasis on one linguistic variety (when two are in contact) could lead to loss of certain items of the other.

Further studies should also assess whether the introduction of the mother tongue in the school affects students' performance in non-language related subjects. Such evidence will further our understanding of the issue of bidialectism and cognition. Finally, longitudinal projects could elucidate issues of language development through tests that measure proficiency repeatedly for an extended period following the cessation of the treatment. Certainly, although students' abilities in the standard were not entirely flawless during the period of the intervention programme reported here, and despite the fact that a progressive deterioration may have ensued after its termination, there is good reason to suggest that an extended learning programme based on the model used in this study would have lasting long-term effects.

References

- Browning, R. (1983) *Medieval and Modern Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cheshire, J., Edwards, V., Münstermann, H. and Weltens, B. (1989) Dialect and education in Europe: a general perspective. In Cheshire, J. Edwards, V. Münstermann, H and Weltens, B. (eds) *Dialect and Education: Some European Perspectives*.
- Contosopoulos, N. G. (1994) *Dialects and Idioms of Modern Greek* (revised edition). [in Greek]. Athens: Academy of Athens.
- Garrett, P., Griffiths, Y., James, C. and Scholfield, P. (1994) Use of the mother tongue in second language classrooms. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 15(5): 371-383.
- Illich, I. (1981) Taught mother language and vernacular tongue. In Pattanayak, P. D. (ed) *Multilingualism and Mother Tongue Education*.
- James, C. (1996) Mother tongue use in bilingual/bidialectal education: implications for Bruneian Dwibahasa. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 17(2-4): 248-258.
- Karyolemou, M. and Pavlou, P. (2001) Language attitudes and assessment of salient variables in a bi-dialectal speech community. *Paper presented at the First International Conference on Language Variation in Europe*, Barcelona.
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (1996) *Cypriot National Curriculum* [in Greek]. Nicosia.
- Moschonas, S. (1996) Language dimorphia in Cyprus [in Greek]. In *Weak-Powerful Languages in the European Union* (pp. 121-128). Thessaloniki: Greek Language Centre.
- . (2000, 1 August) The Greek the Cypriots speak [in Greek]. *Alithia*.

- Newton, B. (1972) *Cypriot Greek: Its Phonology and Inflections*. The Hague: Mouton.
- . (1983-1984) Cypriot Greek revisited. *Glossologia*, 2-3: 137-147.
- Panayotou, T. A. (1999) Modern Greek in modern Cyprus [in Greek]. In *Symposium on the Greek Language 1976-1996* (pp. 283-289). Athens: University of Athens: University of Athens.
- Papapavlou, A. (1994) *Language Contact and Lexical Borrowing in the Greek Cypriot Dialect*. Athens: N. C. Grivas.
- . (1998) Attitudes toward the Greek Cypriot dialect: sociocultural implications. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 134: 15-28.
- . (2001) Mind your speech: language attitudes in Cyprus. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 22(6): 491-501.
- . (2004) Verbal fluency of bidialectal speakers of Standard Modern Greek and the role of language-in-education practices in Cyprus. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 168: 91-100.
- Papapavlou, A. and Pavlou, P. (2001) The interplay of language use and language maintenance and the cultural identity of Greek Cypriots in the UK. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(1): 75-91.
- Pavlou, P. (1997) Children's attitudes toward Cypriot Greek and Standard Modern Greek in Cyprus. *Paper presented at the 3rd International Conference on Greek Linguistics*, Athens: University of Athens.
- Pavlou, P. and Papapavlou, A. (2004) Issues of dialect use in education from the Greek Cypriot perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(2): 243-258.
- Siegel, J. (1999) Stigmatized and standardized varieties in the classroom: interference or separation? *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(4): 701-728.
- Simmons-McDonald, H. (2004) Trends in teaching standard varieties to creole and vernacular speakers. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24: 187-208.
- Stijnen, S. and Vallen, T. (1989) The Kerkrade project: background, main findings, and an evaluation. In Cheshire, J. Edwards, V. Munstermann, H and Weltens, B. (eds) *Dialect and Education: Some European Perspectives*.
- Tinkel, A. J. (1985) Methodology related to language awareness work. In Donmall, G. (ed) *Language Awareness: NCLE Papers and Reports No. 6*.
- Van den Hoogen, J. and Kuijper, H. (1989) The development phase of the Kerkrade project. In Cheshire, J. Edwards, V. Munstermann, H and Weltens, B. (eds) *Dialect and Education: Some European Perspectives*.
- Yiakoumetti, A. (2006) A bidialectal programme for the learning of Standard Modern Greek in Cyprus. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(2): 295-317.

- (in press) Choice of classroom language in bidialectal communities: to include or to exclude the dialect? *Cambridge Journal of Education*.
- Yiakoumetti, A., Evans, M. and Esch, E. (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., Papapavlou, A. and Pavlou, P. (in press) The degree of dialectal transference by Cypriots in a strict Standard Modern Greek context. *Selected Papers from the 17th International Symposium of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*. Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

Appendix A

Code of Transcription: The extracts below are taken from students' oral tests (interviews) and written tests (essay writing). Any CD occurrences are indicated in bold characters and, at the end of students' answers, their type is noted in parentheses (e.g. phonological, morphological, syntactic or lexical). Where an entire sentence was orally produced in the CD, it is written in bold and specific CD items are indicated in italics. For written production, errors relating to orthography are indicated in italics. Students matched for comparison are identified by the same letter (e.g. a B-grade student from the experimental group, Student Eb, is matched to a B-grade student from the control group, Student Cb.)

Appendix A: Contrasting extracts of experimental and control students' oral pre-intervention and post-intervention tests.

Student E: **experimental** group; oral **pre-intervention** test.

Researcher: Πώς περνάς το διάλειμμα στο σχολείο;
How do you spend your time during the school break?

Student: Τον ελεύθερο μου χρόνο μπορεί να παίζουμε ποδόσφαιρο, μπορεί να παίζουμε **γιαλέττες**.
In my free time, we might play football, we might play with marbles.

(*morphology: word final -v; lexicon*)

Researcher: Ποιο είναι το αγαπημένο σου παιχνίδι;
What is your favourite game?

Student: Το ποδόσφαιρο.
Football.

Researcher: Γιατί;
Why?

Student: Το ποδόσφαιρο μ' αρέσει γιατί έχω συγγενείς τζαι με βοηθούν για το ποδόσφαιρο για να γίνω καλός αθλητής. Λένε ότι είμαι τζαι καλός τζαι γι' αυτό θέλω να ακολουθήσω ποδόσφαιρο.
I like football because I have relatives who help me in order to become a good athlete. They say I am good so I want to pursue football.

(*morphology: word final -v; phonology: sound τζ*)

Researcher: Σ' αρέσει να παίζεις στη θέση εκείνου που είναι κοντά στα δίκτυα;
Do you like to play in the position by the net?

Student: Του **πορτάρη**; Ο(χ)ϊ.
The goalkeeper? No.

Lexicon; phonology)

Researcher: Ποιο είναι το αγαπημένο σου μάθημα;
What is your favourite lesson?

Student: Μαθηματικά τζαι γυμναστική.
Mathematics and physical education.

phonology: sound τζ)

Researcher: Γιατί;
Why?

Student: Τα μαθηματικά μου άρεσαν που μικρός γιατί που μικρός έπαιζα με τα δάκτυλα μου τζάι μέτρωνν ένα δύο τρία. Τζάι η γυμναστική, αρέσκει μου να αθλούμαι τζάι έτσι αρέσκει μου
I liked mathematics since I was little because I used to count using my fingers, one, two, three ... And physical education ... I like to exercise, that is why I like it.

*Lexicon; phonology: sound τζ; morphology: augmentative ε- prefix in the past tense; syntax: post-position of clitics)***Student E: experimental group; oral post-intervention test.**

Researcher: Πώς πέρασες χτες το απόγευμα σου;
How did you spend your afternoon yesterday?

Student: Παίζοντας ποδόσφαιρο με τον αδελφό μου και παρακολουθώντας τηλεόραση. Ακόμη έπαιζα κρυφτό με τα γειτονόπουλά μου. Ανακαλύψαμε και ένα καταφύγιο λίγα τετράγωνα πιο κάτω και αποφασίσαμε να το ονομάσουμε το κρησφύγετο της γειτονιάς. Σήμερα θα κάνουμε πιο πολλές εξερευνήσεις.
I played football with my brother and I watched television. I also played hide and seek with my neighbours. We discovered a shelter a few blocks from my house and we decided to name it the 'hide-away' of the neighbourhood. Today we will explore some more.

Researcher: Αποφάσισες τι θα 'θελες να γίνεις όταν μεγαλώσεις;
Have you decided what you want to do when you grow up?

Student: Θα 'θελα να γίνω καθηγητής φυσικής αγωγής ή αθλητής. Θέλω να προσφέρω πολλά μετάλλια στην πατρίδα μου. Θέλω να γίνω γνωστός όπως τους Ολυμπιονίκες μας, που είναι πασίγνωστοι σ' όλο τον κόσμο.
I would like to become a P.E. teacher or an athlete. I want to win a lot of medals for my country. I want to become famous like our Olympic champions who are famous all over the world.

Student C: control group; oral pre-intervention test.

Researcher: Πώς περνάς τον ελεύθερο σου χρόνο στο σπίτι;
How do you spend your free time at home?

Student: Τον ελεύθερο μου χρόνο βλέπω τηλεόραση. Κάποτε πη(γ)αίνω στους φίλους μου τζαι παίζουμεν. Κάποτε διαβάζω ένα βιβλίο του Αλέξανδρου Παπαδιαμάντη, τα 'Παιδικά Διηγήματα'. Ακούω ραδιόφωνον.

In my free time I watch television. Sometimes I go to visit my friends and we play football. Sometimes I read a book by Papadiamantis, 'Ta Pedika Diigimata'. I listen to the radio.

(morphology: word final -v; phonology: voiced fricative dropping of γ in intervocalic position; phonology: gemination; phonology: sound τζ)

Researcher: Τι θέλεις να γίνεις όταν μεγαλώσεις;
What would you like to do when you grow up?

Student: (Δ)Εν ηξέρω (α)κόμα.
I don't know yet.

(phonology: voiced fricative dropping of δ; morphology: prothetic η after words ending in -v; phonology)

Student C. control group; oral post-intervention test.

Researcher: Πώς πέρασες στην εκδρομή σου;
Did you have a nice time on your school excursion?

Student: Ακούγαμεν ραδιόφωνον, παίζαμεν βόλεϊ, ποδόσφαιρον. Πηγαίναμεν κάτω που εν η θάλασσα. Επήγαινα με τον ανηψιό μου... με τον ξάδελφο μου (he corrects himself), παίζαμεν στο γρασιδίον.
We listened to the radio, played volleyball and football. We went down to the shore. I went there with my cousin. We played on the grass.

(morphology: word final -v; morphology: augmentative ε- prefix in the past tense; phonology: gemination; lexicon)

Researcher: Ποιο είναι το αγαπημένο σου πρόγραμμα στην τηλεόραση;
What is your favourite programme on television?

Student: Το 'WWF'. Έχει δράση. Παλεύκουν.
'WWF'. It has a lot of action. They fight.

(phonology)

Appendix B

Extracts from oral pre-intervention and post-intervention tests of matched-grade experimental and control students.

Student Ec: experimental group; pre-intervention test; language grade C.

Researcher: Ποια παιχνίδια παίζετε το διάλειμμα;
What games do you play during the school break?

Student: ...Κρουστόν, σχοινάκιν, λάστιχον, χωστόν.
...Krousto, shinaki, lastiho, hosto. [Other Cypriot games]

(morphology: word final -v; lexicon)

Researcher: Τι είναι το κρουστό;
What is krousto?

Student: Άμαν πετάξεις την μπάλαν και κοιτάσεις μία συμμαθήτρια σου βγαίνει έξω.
You throw the ball and the player it hits has to leave the game.

(lexicon; morphology: word final -v; phonology: gemination)

Student Ec: experimental group; post-intervention test; language grade C.

Researcher: Ποιο είναι το αγαπημένο σου μάθημα;
What is your favourite lesson?

Student: Γυμναστική και μουσική. Η γυμναστική μου αρέσει γιατί γυμναζόμαστε και κάνουμε ωραίο σώμα. Μουσική γιατί μου αρέσει να παίζω τον αυλό.

Physical education and music. I like physical education because when we exercise we have a nice body. I like music because I like playing the flute.

Student Cc: control group; pre-intervention test; language grade C.

Researcher: Πώς περνάς το χρόνο σου το διάλειμμα;
How do you spend your time during the school break?

Student: Παίζουμε με τους φίλους μου. Κάθε μέρα πάμεν εις τον κήπον. (Δ)Εν μλούμε όπως παλιά.
I play with my friends. Every day we go to the park. It's not like it used to be.

(morphology: word final -v; lexicon; phonology: voiced fricative dropping of δ)

Researcher: Αύριο θα πάτε εκδρομή. Ποια είναι τα σχέδιά σου;
Tomorrow you are going on a school excursion. What are your plans?

Student: Θα πάρομεν μπάλαν. Εννά χορεύουμε με κορούδες.

162 The Influence of a Bidialectal Language Intervention Programme on Learning of Standard Modern Greek in an Urban and a Rural Cypriot School

We will take a ball. We will dance with the girls.

(morphology: word final -v; lexicon; morphology)

Student Cc: control group; post-intervention test; language grade C.

Researcher: Σκέφτηκες τι θα 'θελεις να γινεις όταν μεγαλώσεις;
Have you thought what you want to do when you grow up?

Student: Τουριστικός σύμβουλος. Αρέσκει μου. Αρέσκου μου τα ταξίδια.
Τζάι ο παπάς μου εν τουριστικός σύμβουλος. Εννά πάμε Συρία στο τέλος του μηνός τζάι έτσι εννά γνωρίσω τουρίστες.
Travel agent. I like it. I like going on trips. And my dad is a tourist consultant. We are going to Syria at the end of the month and there I will meet a lot of tourists.

(morphology; syntax: post-position of clitics; phonology: sound τζ; lexicon)

Appendix C

An example of a student who uses the Cypriot word *χωστόν* in her oral pre-intervention test but the SMG equivalent *κρυφτό(ν)* in her written pre-intervention test.

Student E: experimental group; oral pre-intervention test.

- Researcher: Τι παιχνίδια παίζετε το διάλειμμα;
What games do you play during the school break?
- Student: ...Κρουστόν, σχοινάκιν, λάστιχον, χωστόν.
...Krousto, shinaki, lastiho, hosto. [Other Cypriot games]
- morphology: word final -v; lexicon)*

Student E: experimental group; written pre-intervention test.

Η σχολική μου εκδρομή

Ήθες την Τρίτην πήγαμε εκδρομή στον Πρωταρά στο ξενοδοχείο Πολυξενεια Ισαάκ. Εκεί όλα τα παιδιά έπαιζαν χαρούμενα στο χορτάρι και όλα μαζί. Καθίσαμε να φάμε όλα τα παιδιά της τάξης μας ευτυχισμένα. Όταν τελειώσαμε από το φαγητό μας βάλουμε το ραδιο και καθίσαμε να σκεφτούμε όλα τα παιδιά τι θα παίξουμε. Όλα τα παιδιά ήμασταν 16. Κάθε ομάδα είχε 8 παιδιά. Οι τερματοφύλακες της μιας ομάδας ήταν ο Αντρέας και της άλλης ομάδας ο Πανίκκος. Η ομάδα του Αντρέα νίκησε και είχε τη θα παίξουμε. Συμφωνήσαμε να παίξουμε βόλεϊ. Μερικά παιδιά ήθελαν να παίξουν στο χορτάρι τρεχτόν και άλλα παιδιά κρυφτόν. Παίξαμε πρώτα τρεχτόν και σε λίγη ώρα παίξαμε κρυφτόν. Μετά πήγαμε στη θάλασσα για να βγάλουμε φωτογραφίες με όλα τα παιδιά της τάξης μας. Μετά καθίσαμε όλοι κάτω από το δέντρο για να ξεκουραστούμε και να χορέψουμε και να μιλήσουμε. Στη θάλασσα που πήγαμε είχε και τουρίστες κι εκάνα(ν) μπανιο. Η θάλασσα ήταν καταγάλανη. Ο καιρός ήταν ηλιόλουστος και καθαρός από σύννεφα. Μετά οι δασκάλο(ί) μας φωνάξαν να μετριθούμε και να πάμε στο λεωφορείο για επιστροφή στο σχολείο και να πάμε στα σπίτια μας. Αυτή η εκδρομή η αξέχαστη! Θα ήθελα να ξαναπάω και σε άλλες εκδρομές και να παίρνω καλά.

My school excursion

Yesterday we went on a school excursion to Protaras to the Poliksensia Issak restaurant. All the students played happily on the grass. We all sat together and had lunch. Then we listened to the radio and decided to play. There were 16 of us so we were divided into two groups of eight and played football. Andreas' team won and they decided that we should play volleyball. Some wanted to run; others wanted to play hide and seek. We played both. Then we went to the sea and took pictures. We rested under a tree and danced and talked. There were tourists swimming. The sea was deep blue and the sky clear with no clouds. Our teachers counted us and we got on the bus to return to our school. This excursion was unforgettable! I would like to go on others and have a lot of fun.

164 The Influence of a Bidialectal Language Intervention Programme on Learning of Standard Modern Greek in an Urban and a Rural Cypriot School

(morphology: word final -v; phonology: assimilation of vowel to that of a following syllable; lexicon; phonology: gemination; phonology: misplacement of accent; morphology; phonology: absence of tri-syllabic intonation pattern; 5 spelling mistakes)