



## BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Gardner-Chloros, Penelope and McEntee-Atalianis, Lisa and Finnis, K. (2005) Language attitudes and use in a transplanted setting: Greek Cypriots in London. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 2 (1), pp. 52-80. ISSN 1479-0718.

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/325/>

*Usage Guidelines:*

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact [lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk](mailto:lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk).

# Language Attitudes and Use in a Transplanted Setting: Greek Cypriots in London

**Penelope Gardner-Chloros and Lisa McEntee-Atalianis**

*School of Languages, Linguistics and Culture, Birkbeck College, London, UK*

**Katerina Finnis**

*Department of Humanities, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, UK*

In this paper we explore language attitudes and use in the Greek Cypriot community in London, England. Our study is based on an earlier survey carried out in Nicosia, Cyprus and we compare attitudes to language and reported language use in the two communities. We thereby highlight the significance of sociolinguistic variables on similar groups of speakers. We further extend our investigation to include code-switching practices in the London community.

Analysis of language attitudes and use within the Greek-Cypriot population of London, and comparisons with findings in Nicosia, reflect symbolic forces operating in the two contexts. Despite obvious differences between the two communities, (most obviously the official languages and distinct cultural backgrounds of the two nations), the Greek Cypriot Dialect continues to play an active role in both. English is however the 'default choice' for young Cypriots in the UK and Standard Modern Greek occupies a much more limited role than in Cyprus. It is argued that differences in language attitudes and use can be interpreted in light of different market forces operating in the nation (i.e. Cyprus) and the Diaspora (i.e. UK).

**Keywords:** attitude studies, codeswitching, Greek-Cypriot diaspora, migration

## Introduction

In this paper we have conjoined a more or less traditional language maintenance/shift/attitude study with the theoretical concept of the linguistic marketplace ('The Theory of Practice', Bourdieu, 1997). The empirical work consists of an exploration of language use and attitudes in the Greek-Cypriot community of London, and serves as a basis of comparison with the findings of an earlier survey carried out in Nicosia, Cyprus (McEntee-Atalianis & Pouloukas, 2001). Our aim was to investigate similarities and differences in the value of similar linguistic products (i.e. English, the Greek-Cypriot Dialect and Standard Modern Greek) in different marketplaces. We further extend our investigation to include codeswitching (CS) practices in the London community and discuss issues of hegemony and language shift.

We begin with a consideration of issues pertinent to migration, before presenting a select review of research on the communities in Nicosia, Cyprus and London, England.

**Migration: Issues of identity, economics and globalisation**

Within Europe, migration frequently constitutes an economically or politically motivated process involving individuals from former colonial countries or political refugees (Extra & Verhoeven, 1993). Immigrants often move to the host country seeking employment and a better standard of living; this goal achieved, other family members also move to the host country (Extra & Verhoeven, 1993). In most cases, these first immigrants have no intention of remaining in the host country permanently, and there is a persistent 'myth/dream of return' (Anthias, 1992; Grillo, 2001). However life in the host country gradually takes on greater permanency; members of minorities become citizens and a second generation of immigrants is born. Studies of immigrant intergenerational language use indicate that language shift takes place roughly over three generations (e.g. Grosjean, 1982; Wei, 1994), with a bilingual stage before language shift is complete.

A number of factors are significant to the process and rate of language shift (Stubbs, 1985; Williamson, 1991) e.g. the status and sociolinguistic background of the group in the home country; the socioeconomic status of the group and its potential for social mobility within the host country; the relationship between host and home country; demographic factors including group size, birth rate, marriage patterns, distance from home country, concentration of settlement and self sufficiency of group. The structure and nature of the minority group within the host country are also important, for example the provision and functioning of: community schools, community centres, religious observance and support from the State. Other considerations include maintaining contact with relatives, friends and colleagues in the home country, maintaining political and economic links with the home country, and attitudes of members towards the host and home countries.

Particular attention has been drawn to the influence of economics in determining language use, maintenance and shift. As Edwards (1985) observes, the lack of economic advantage or pragmatic motivation attached to the use of a community language are among the most significant factors in its abandonment. A conflict may arise between the need for maintenance of the language and culture of the country of origin, and a need to assimilate to the host society in order to have equal rights with the indigenous population and a better standard of living. Due to this desire for economic stability and self-enrichment, individuals of higher social status and better education may be less fluent in the minority language than those of lower socioeconomic standing, as they derive their status from the society of the host country rather than their community of origin. Anthias, referring to Greek Cypriots in London, writes that individuals who achieve in education may distance themselves from Cypriot identity and social life (1992: 121–122). In contrast, those of lower socioeconomic status choose to remain within the community, which constitutes an autonomous economic and social unit.

Similarly, with reference to the Asian community in the UK, Rex and Josephides (1987: 31) write that 'Sooner or later, the cult of individual success is likely to make the maintenance of communal obligations and cultural forms difficult, and individuals who succeed will be attracted to the cultural forms

associated with individualism'. These community members will have the opportunity to access capital in the public domain of the (consumer) society in which they live, as well as the benefits of mainstream education in Britain, abandoning more traditional features of community life, such as working hard and living meagrely (Rex & Josephides, 1987: 31).

Even at the national level, concerns have emerged regarding the maintenance of national languages and identities. As in immigrant communities, both centrifugal and centripetal forces are at work. On the one hand, there is a tendency towards ethnic assertion and a need to maintain cultural and linguistic identity; on the other, there is a need for social and economic homogenisation and unification, as exemplified internationally by the expansion of the European Union and the introduction of the Euro as common currency. In response to these forces of globalisation, many studies have focused on the increased penetration of *linguae francae* and especially English (ENG) into global markets (see Cenoz & Jessner, 2000; McEntee-Atalianis, 2004). Discussion has focused on whether global concerns and economic and political advancement are powerful enough to lead to a decrease in the use of national varieties, or whether the latter are such strong symbols of autonomy and tradition, and so instrumentally important, that they will continue to be used alongside dominant global languages.

### **The Greek-Cypriot community in Nicosia: Cultural and linguistic identity**

Cyprus, the third largest island in the Mediterranean, is situated 60 miles west of Syria and 46 miles south of Turkey. Due to its geographical location, throughout history, it has lured conquerors and been coveted and dominated by numerous peoples and cultures (Pantelis, 1990). British colonial rule terminated in 1960, leading to the establishment of a bicomunal, independent State. However in 1974 the Turkish invasion of the island separated the North from the South, physically separating the majority of both Turkish and Greek Cypriots and leading to the establishment of the internationally unrecognised Turkish-Cypriot pseudo-state in 1983 (Pantelis, 1990). To date, the capital city of Nicosia is the last divided capital in Europe. New negotiations at the time of writing to resolve this division, especially in light of Cyprus's accession to the EU, have proven fruitless. A referendum favouring reunification under the conditions prescribed by the 'Anan Plan' was overwhelmingly rejected by the Greek Cypriots in April 2004. Subsequently, only the Greek-Cypriot south of the island has entered the EU in its most recent wave of enlargement. Over recent years however, movement (under strict conditions of visitation) within the island has been more fluid, permitting Greek Cypriots to enter the Occupied area and Turkish Cypriots the recognised State via the Green Line.

Papapavlou and Pavlou describe the Greek-Cypriot community of Cyprus as di- or triglossic in the Greek-Cypriot Dialect (GCD), Standard Modern Greek (SMG) as spoken in mainland Greece, and Katharevousa/Puristic Greek. GCD is used in most social settings and SMG in more official domains. While, in many cases, the two varieties are in complementary distribution,

they do conflict at times (Moschonas, 1996; Papapavlou, 1997; Papapavlou & Pavlou, 1998; Sciriha, 1995).

McEntee-Atalianis and Pouloukas (2001) point out that English pervades Cypriot society in many spheres beyond English language media: for example there are many English-language-medium private schools and tertiary education colleges. English also maintains an important position in the professional sphere as the economy of the island relies heavily upon tourism: many offshore companies are resident on the island, and Cyprus trades and works with many other nations through the medium of English. Moreover, English is dominant in political discussions with the pseudo-state in the North of the island, the UN in relation to the 'Cyprus Problem' and in discussions with the EU.

Since the mid-1980s, discussion in Cyprus has similarly revolved around the forces of modernity and globalisation and the maintenance of national languages and identities. Some reports have raised concerns about the maintenance of a Greek-Cypriot cultural and linguistic identity due to the ever-increasing exposure to, and use of English. This, it is argued, is leading to the formation of 'split personalities' or an 'identity crisis' (Ioannou, 1991; Karoulla-Vrikkis, 1991). Others (e.g. McEntee-Atalianis, 2004; McEntee-Atalianis & Pouloukas, 2001; Papapavlou, 1997; Sciriha, 1995) have, by contrast, reported the strength of both national and linguistic identity.

McEntee-Atalianis and Pouloukas (2001) identified the strength of the national (GCD and SMG) and international (ENG) codes by reference to the 'linguistic marketplace' (Bourdieu, 1997). Their investigation of reported attitudes and language use by a cross-section of the population showed the strength of the national codes, both instrumentally and symbolically as markers of ethnic identity, and clarified the role of English in the linguistic repertoire of the community. By reference to Bourdieu's (1997) 'Theory of Practice', the authors conclude that those with greatest socioeconomic standing are able to 'code-resource' and 'exploit multiple social identities' (McEntee-Atalianis & Pouloukas, 2001: 19).

### **The Greek-Cypriot community in London**

The Greek-Cypriot community of London expanded markedly during the 1950s–1970s, when political and economic events in Cyprus led many to leave the island in search of a better standard of living and comparative security. It is estimated that the Greek-Cypriot population in London currently numbers 180,000–200,000 (Christodoulou-Pipis, 1991), while that of Nicosia is 200,000–250,000 (Department of Statistics and Research, Ministry of Finance, Cyprus). The two communities are therefore numerically comparable.

The first immigrants to arrive in London were of low socioeconomic status; they spoke GCD, but due to limited education, were not competent in SMG. They never needed to acquire ENG in Cyprus or London as all aspects of their lives revolved around the Greek Cypriot community. Subsequent generations were exposed to GCD in the home environment and had the opportunity to

learn SMG at Greek schools run by the Greek Cypriot Education Mission and the Church. Today most of the younger Greek Cypriots, particularly those born in the UK, consider ENG as their mother tongue, whilst GCD is used for interaction mainly with grandparents, whose knowledge of ENG is limited. In addition, many families have access to, and communicate via GCD in other domains, e.g. satellite television, radio and in institutions such as banks, travel agencies, community centres, restaurants and entertainment venues such as bars and nightclubs. They also maintain contact with relatives and friends in Cyprus through the medium of GCD.

As in reports of the Greek-Cypriot community in Cyprus, concern has been expressed regarding the future of SMG/GCD in the London community. While references to language are made in various studies of this community, overall no extensive research has focused on attitudes to language, language shift and the hegemonic influence of English.

The most extensive work has been carried out by Christodoulou-Pipis (1991), who concludes that 'the most striking phenomenon in the language of the Greek-Cypriot immigrants appears to be lexical borrowing and code-switching' (Christodoulou-Pipis, 1991: 165). She describes this code-switching and -mixing, commenting on differences in the Greek Cypriot spoken in London, and that in Cyprus.

Information on language use and attitudes can be found in various unofficial publications (Charalambous *et al.*, 1988). The language issue is often referred to at community meetings, such as the World Cypriot Youth Conference held in Nicosia in the summer of 2002, where strategies to overcome language and identity loss were discussed.

Finally, attitudes to language are discussed in the work of Josephides, who mentions that

language [...] is considered important by young people, most of whom like the idea of speaking their 'own' language, even if they get angry and frustrated when they are teased by older Cypriots for making mistakes and speaking with an odd accent. This can reach such a pitch of defensiveness that they refuse to speak any Greek at all or exaggerate their lack of fluency. (Josephides, 1987: 57)

Discussing second-generation Greek Cypriots and Muslim Pakistanis in London, Kelly (like Papapavlou, 1997 and McEntee-Atalianis & Pouloukas, 2001 in Cyprus) expresses disagreement with the notion that

as a result of the conflict between the values, lifestyle and ideologies of their mother culture and their adopted country, second-generation members of minority communities experience a form of 'crisis in identity' which leads to damaged self-concept and self-devaluation.

Rather '... the members of the second generation will use the fusing of such ideologies as a source of both strength and potential for an ongoing process of ethnic redefinition' (Kelly, 1989: 80–84).

### **Contact between the communities**

The Greek-Cypriot communities in Cyprus and the UK maintain strong ties despite their geographic separation and share common political, economic, social and linguistic concerns. Some of these concerns relate directly to the homeland; for example many Greek Cypriots living in London were displaced due to the Turkish invasion of the island in 1974 and still harbour desires to return to their homes. Others have, since their emigration to the UK, invested in property and land in Cyprus to which they return for holidays and/or plan to return in their retirement. Families in both England and Cyprus maintain strong connections through frequent visits or telephone conversations and correspondence. Moreover, both communities appear to share a desire to preserve their language and culture in the face of global and national change.

### **Aims of this Paper**

Despite claims of shifting identities and language loss, to date no empirical investigation has been undertaken to ascertain the status and strength of varieties within this immigrant population. This study therefore attempts to compare attitudes to language and reported language use in two related communities, highlighting the significance sociolinguistic variables have on similar groups of speakers. Direct comparisons are made between McEntee-Atalianis and Pouloukas (2001) and the present study in London.

Whilst acknowledging both the benefits of the more classical ethnographic approaches (e.g. Milroy, 1987; Wei, 1994) in the investigation of language shift, and the need for a more extensive investigation of the communities in Cyprus and London using these approaches, this study draws on a different paradigm – attitude studies, which have traditionally been used to examine the relationship between ethnic/social identity and language use by individuals occupying dissimilar social space in varied linguistic markets. Our research design and interpretation of the data is informed by ‘the theory of practice’ (Bourdieu, 1997), mirroring that of the study presented in McEntee-Atalianis and Pouloukas (2001). We, as they, argue that this marriage of anthropological/sociological and psychological perspectives permits

a meaningful empirical investigation of linguistic identity, hegemony and language use [within minority communities] . . . consider[ing] the status – cultural/economic/social/symbolic – afforded to ‘products’/varieties in various sectors of the linguistic market-place . . . [and] that an investigation of the potential hegemonic effect of English upon language use and identity . . . can best be examined through the consideration of the economics of linguistic exchange.

(McEntee-Atalianis & Pouloukas, 2001: 22) (see ‘The Greek-Cypriot community in Nicosia’ above). This method of data collection further permits the net to be thrown quite widely throughout the community, soliciting data from a larger number of informants than a more traditional network approach, for example, would permit.



It will be argued that differences in language attitudes and use can be interpreted in light of different market forces operating in the nation (i.e. Cyprus) and the diaspora (i.e. UK). (For a more comprehensive review of 'Attitude Studies' and the 'Theory of Practice' and more extensive arguments in support of the 'Bourdieuian' approach, see McEntee-Atalianis & Pouloukas, 2001).

This paper aims to:

- (1) determine whether there is evidence of a national linguistic consciousness amongst the Greek Cypriots living in London, and the nature of this phenomenon;
- (2) investigate the different values (cultural, economic, social, symbolic) attached to GCD, SMG and ENG, as expressed through reported attitudes towards these varieties, and identify the demographic variables that significantly affect attitudes and language use;
- (3) determine the domains of language use of these varieties and the strength of each variety in each domain (e.g. family, work, media);
- (4) determine whether English constitutes a threat to the identity of the Greek Cypriots of London; and
- (5) compare (1) – (4) above with the Greek-Cypriot population in Nicosia, Cyprus.

## **Methodology**

### **The Nicosia study**

McEntee-Atalianis and Pouloukas's (2001) questionnaire in Nicosia consisted of:

- (a) 26 statements relating to attitudes towards the use of English, SMG and GCD in various domains;
- (b) questions about subjects' linguistic competence and language use in different domains (e.g. home, work, socially), with different interlocutors (such as mother, father, Greek Cypriot friends) and for different functions (e.g. thinking about abstract problems); and
- (c) demographic information.

Out of 1000 questionnaires distributed, 421 were returned and 353 were used for analysis.

### **The London study**

The London questionnaire was adapted to reflect the different sociocultural context. For example the London community consists of several generations of immigrants/individuals occupying differing social networks, each experiencing different degrees and types of involvement with the Greek-Cypriot communities of London and Cyprus. Among parameters of variation are country of birth, contact with Cyprus, amount of time spent in the Cypriot community and nationality of parents. The heterogeneous nature of the community was taken into consideration in designing the questionnaire.



In Section 1 of the questionnaire, 40 statements were constructed, expanding on the 26 statements used in the Nicosia questionnaire. SMG and GCD were distinguished, thus creating a tripartite distinction between ENG, SMG and GCD. The Nicosia study focused on the distinction between international (ENG) and national (SMG and GCD) varieties. For example, the statement 'Greek is part of our cultural heritage' used in the Nicosia study was deconstructed into two separate statements for the London study: (1) *Greek Cypriot* is part of our cultural heritage, and (2) *Greek* is part of our cultural heritage.

Secondly, certain statements were added in order to explore issues relating to the sociolinguistic experience of Greek Cypriots living in the British society, and the inevitable penetration of the English language and culture in their everyday lives. Examples include: 'Contact with the English community in London is changing the Greek Cypriot language', and 'The Greek Cypriot community should take measures to preserve the Greek language in London'. Statements referring to CS (defined as the alternate use of two or more varieties in the same, or between sentences) were inserted in the London questionnaire, such as 'I consider it advantageous to use both Greek Cypriot and English in the same conversation'.

In order to target a representative sample of the Greek-Cypriot community, the questionnaires were distributed to centres frequented by Greek Cypriots i.e. Greek schools, Greek Cypriot community centres and business centres/institutions (e.g. tourist agencies, London Greek Radio, banks). As in Nicosia, a 'snow-ball' technique was adopted: recipients were asked to distribute further questionnaires to their immediate contacts e.g. their pupils, customers etc. Both standard Greek and English questionnaires were distributed, so that respondents could use whichever variety they felt most comfortable with. As expected, overall the older generations preferred the Greek version, while younger respondents (second/third-generation immigrants) chose the English version. As in Nicosia, a minimum age of 16 was imposed.

Fewer questionnaires were returned in London: many Greek Cypriots were relatively wary of such research, being suspicious of possible political motivations behind the questions posed – an obstacle also experienced by Gardner-Chloros (1992: 113). (The community is highly politicised because politics is one of the elements that binds it: issues relating to Cyprus's role in Europe, and the relationship of Cyprus with Greece and Turkey are under frequent debate.) Due to the additional length of the questionnaire, some subjects reported that they found it tiresome and failed to complete it; this was especially the case amongst those from lower socioeconomic and educational backgrounds. Consequently, in London, out of 800 questionnaires distributed, 159 were analysed. Lastly, a few members of the older generation 'completed' the questionnaire by being asked the questions orally. This overcame problems of literacy. All respondents apart from some of the older generation (65+) had at least completed high school.

## Results

### Language attitudes

#### *Statistical analysis*

The first section contained 40 statements relating to language attitudes. From these, those relating to participants' sociocultural and sociolinguistic experience were grouped into a single variable ('factor'). Cronbach's Alpha Reliability tests confirmed that these groupings were congruent.

Table 1 contains three variables/factors extracted from the statements. The mean factor scores indicate the degree of agreement–disagreement of the respondents with the sociolinguistic element expressed in the factor, based on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree).

The attitudes examined related to

- (a) the use and preservation of SMG and GCD in the family and in the wider community, including the importance of SMG and GCD in cultural heritage, e.g. 'Greek Cypriot is part of our cultural heritage' (Statement 1); 'Knowing Greek in London in a considerable cultural advantage' (Statement 40);
- (b) the use of English and multilingualism in general, e.g. 'It is advantageous for a country to be multilingual' (Statement 23); 'English will remain the dominant language in the world for the next 25 years' (Statement 29);
- (c) the importance of English for social advancement in London, *and* the importance of maintaining SMG and GCD as varieties spoken within the home. This third factor has been labelled 'coexistence of varieties' and contains statements such as: 'Knowledge of English is useful and necessary for economic and professional advancement in the Greek-Cypriot community' (Statement 20); 'Greek/Greek Cypriot should be the first language learned at home in Greek-Cypriot families' (Statements 6 & 7).

Results from analysis of Factor 1 (Table 1) indicate that, overall, the respondents scored between 'undecided' and 'agree', leaning more towards positive attitudes towards SMG and GCD as desired and necessary community codes. Their maintenance and promotion are also desired.

An interesting contrast emerges when statements relating to the symbolic value of SMG and GCD (see Statements 1–4 in Table 2) are examined

**Table 1** Variables derived from London study and mean scores

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Mean scores</i>
1. Attitudes towards use and preservation of SMG and GCD	3.34
2. Attitudes towards ENG (as a threat to the maintenance of GCD/SMG)	2.83
3. Coexistence of English and SMG/GCD	3.64

**Table 2** Comparison of means: Attitudes towards symbolic value of SMG/GCD and attitudes towards necessity of knowing SMG/GCD for involvement in the community

<i>Statements</i>	<i>Individual means</i>	<i>Overall means</i>
1. GCD is part of our cultural heritage	4.40	4.25
2. SMG is part of our cultural heritage	4.26	
3. Knowing Greek is a considerable cultural advantage	4.22	
4. Greek Cypriots should try to preserve their language	4.12	
5. It is necessary to learn SMG in order to be involved in the community	3.14	3.14
6. It is necessary to learn GCD in order to be involved in the community	3.13	

separately from those relating to the necessity of knowing GCD/SMG in order to participate in the Greek-Cypriot community (see Statements 5 and 6 in Table 2). As above, the mean factor scores indicate the degree of agreement–disagreement of the respondents with the sociolinguistic element expressed in the factor, based on the five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree).

In the former case, respondents scored slightly above ‘agree’ (4.25). However, they did not seem to consider knowledge of these varieties as important for Greek Cypriots’ participation in the community. This is evident in the lower mean scores derived from the last two statements in Table 2, the average of which is just above ‘undecided’ (3.14).

As for Factor 2 (Table 1), it seems that respondents do not view ENG as a threat or as having a negative impact on their ethnic identity or their dialect.

Results from the third factor in Table 1 indicate that the respondents scored between indecision and agreement when embracing the coexistence of SMG/GCD and ENG. This arguably indicates that the respondents generally seem to feel that English and SMG/GCD can fulfil different functions, and that these functions can coexist in their social and personal lives. They support the use of SMG and GCD in the home and for life in the wider community, also recognising the importance of these codes for their cultural heritage. However, they also acknowledge the value of English for social, professional and financial purposes.

### *Significance tests*

Significance tests carried out on the London data indicate that ‘age’ is statistically significant for Factor 1 (‘Attitudes towards the use and preservation of SMG and GCD’) at the 5% level. For Factor 2 (‘ENG as a threat to identity’), significance was found at the 1% level. In addition, the statement ‘English is useful and necessary for economic and professional advancement’

**Table 3** Mean scores for Factor 1 ('Attitudes towards use and preservation of SMG and GCD'), Factor 2 ('Attitudes towards English as a threat') and Statement 20 ('Knowledge of English is useful and necessary for economic and professional advancement in the Cypriot community in London'), and 'age'

Age	Means scores for 'Attitudes towards use and preservation of SMG and GCD'	Means scores for 'Attitudes towards English as a threat'	Mean scores for statement 'Knowledge of English is useful and necessary for economic and professional advancement in the Cypriot community in London'
16–35	3.23	2.70	3.87
36–55	3.45	3.09	4.15
56+	3.69	3.13	4.47

Note: the mean scores are based on the following scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree.

(which was analysed separately and not as part of a factor) and 'age' were found to be significant at the 5% level, while 'occupation' was also significant, at the 1% level for this statement.

Further analysis of responses to Factor 1 reveals that the younger generation lean towards indecision whilst the older generation lean more towards agreement (Table 3).

Analysis of Factor 2 revealed that the younger generation agreed comparatively less with statements referring to ENG as a threat to identity (e.g. 'You are denying your own culture if you speak ENG with fellow Cypriots', 'ENG should not appear on community publications') and those referring to the need for SMG and GCD to be spoken in the family domain (e.g. 'SMG/GCD should be the first language learned in Greek Cypriot families', 'Spouses should learn GCD'). The younger respondents do not view the use of English as a threat to their cultural identity; they agree that English should appear in community newspapers, that one can speak English without denying one's cultural and ethnic identity, and they view multilingualism as a positive skill (Table 3).

Finally, as regards the statement 'English is useful and necessary for economic and professional advancement', further analysis of the significance of 'age' indicates that the older the respondents, the more they agreed with the statement. The younger generation also agreed with the statement, but, perhaps surprisingly, not so positively. The results for these three analyses can be viewed in Table 3, where the mean factor scores are based on the Likert scale used in the previous analyses.

For the statement 'Knowledge of English is useful and necessary for economic and professional advancement in the Cypriot community in London', *occupation* was also found to be significant at the 1% level, with

**Table 4** Mean scores for statement 'Knowledge of English is useful and necessary for economic and professional advancement in the Cypriot community in London', and 'occupation'

<i>Occupation groups</i>	<i>Mean scores</i>
Professional	4.33
Office	4
Service	4
Manual	5

*Note:* the mean scores are based on the following scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree.

those from the lower social stratum agreeing to a greater extent than those with a higher social status (see Table 4).

## Language use

### *Statistical analysis*

Language use statements (Section 2 of the questionnaire), relating to a particular domain of use, were grouped into a single new variable (factor). The domains analysed were:

**Table 5a** Factors derived from the 'cognitive', 'home' and 'emotive' domains

<i>Factors</i>	<i>GCD</i>	<i>SMG</i>	<i>ENG</i>
1. Use of language for cognitive activities	2.74	2.87	1.40
2. Use of language at home	2.19	3.03	2.13
3. Use of language in emotive/personal contexts	2.30	2.54	1.68
4. Use of language with friends/colleagues/clients	2.97	3.35	1.43

**Table 5b** Factors derived from 'media' and 'work' domains

<i>4. Use of language and the media</i>		<i>5. Use of language in the workplace</i>
<i>How often do you watch Greek/Greek-Cypriot videos</i>	<i>What radio stations do you listen to?</i>	<i>How important is it for you to speak Greek in your work?</i>
1.98*	2.3**	2.87***

\*The mean scores are based on the following scale: 1 = very often, 2 = sometimes, 3 = rarely.

\*\*The mean scores are based on the following continuum: 1 = only SMG/GCD, 2 = both GCD/SMG and ENG, 3 = only ENG stations.

\*\*\*Mean scores are based on the following continuum: 1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = moderately important, 4 = not very important, 5 = unimportant.

- (1) Language use in a range of cognitive activities, including 'having a serious discussion', 'doing calculations in your mind', and 'thinking about abstract problems'.
- (2) Language use at home, such as which language is used when speaking to different interlocutors e.g. parents, siblings etc.
- (3) Language used in emotive/personal contexts, such as 'telling a story', 'expressing feelings' and 'singing'.
- (4) Language use with friends/colleagues/clients etc.
- (5) Language use and the media: how often respondents watch Greek/Greek-Cypriot videos and listen to Greek radio stations.
- (6) Language use in the workplace, investigating how important it is for the respondent to use Greek at work.

Table 5a below presents the results from the analysis of language use in the first three domains (cognitive, home, social and emotive), while Table 5b presents the results extracted from the analysis of the final two domains (media and work). The mean factor scores in Table 5a indicate the degree of use of the varieties in specific domains, and are based on the following continuum: 1 = 'always', 2 = 'often', 3 = 'sometimes', 4 = 'rarely', 5 = 'never'.

Analysis of the results indicates that the use of English is greater overall than that of SMG/GCD. However, in the home domain, ENG and GCD are reported to be spoken roughly to the same extent.

As for language use and the media, scores indicate that respondents sometimes watch Greek videos and listen to both Greek and English radio stations. Finally, in the workplace, Greek is considered 'moderately important'.

### *Significance tests*

For the London data, significance tests (post hoc tests) were carried out for all six domains of language use. The results for the significance of the treatments of *age*, *occupation* and *level of education* are presented below.

*Age.* As indicated by results in Table 6, the treatment of *age* is significant for all domains apart from the use of English with friends, and language use in the workplace.

Further analysis carried out on the significance of the variable of age yielded the following results: in the use of GCD for cognitive activities, it was found that the older generation (56+) 'always' use GCD, those aged between 36 and 55 years 'often' use GCD, and the younger generation (16–35) only 'sometimes' use the dialect. The results for the use of SMG were similar, the only difference being that the older generation indicated greater use of SMG as opposed to GCD – possibly an over-reporting of what to them is the prestige form. The older generation was the only age group to indicate a difference in attitudes towards SMG versus GCD in the domain of cognitive activities.

Finally, further analysis of the use of ENG in this domain indicated that the younger generation used English to a greater extent than the older generation, scoring nearer the 'always' point on the continuum, whereas the older generations scored nearer the 'often' point.

**Table 6** Language use in cognitive, home, and emotive domains and with friends, and 'age'

Age	Cognitive domain			Home domain			Emotive domain			With friends		
	GCD**	SMG**	ENG**	GCD**	SMG*	ENG**	GCD**	SMG**	ENG**	GCD**	SMG**	ENG
16-35	3.14	3.16	1.26	2.41	3.18	2.16	2.55	2.73	1.54	3.34	3.63	1.39
36-55	2.16	2.11	1.62	1.82	2.40	1.89	1.93	1.93	1.92	2.43	2.63	1.48
56+	1.3	2.25	2.45	1.39	2.91	3.06	1.20	2.42	2.69	1.64	2.78	1.61

\*Significant at the 5% level.

\*\*Significant at the 1% level.

Note: The mean scores are based on the following scale: 1 = always, 2 = often, 3 = sometimes, 4 = rarely, 5 = never.



Table 7 Media, work, and 'age'

Age	Media		Work
	*Mean scores for frequency of watching Greek/Greek-Cypriot videos	**Mean scores for listening to Greek radio	***Mean scores for importance of SMG in work domain
16–35	2.15	2.38	2.96
36–55	1.8	2.24	2.68
56+	1	1.87	2.63

\*The mean scores are based on the following scale: 1 = very often, 2 = sometimes, 3 = rarely.

\*\*The mean scores are based on the following continuum: 1 = only SMG/GCD, 2 = both GCD/SMG and ENG, 3 = only ENG.

\*\*\*Mean scores are based on the following continuum: 1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = moderately important, 4 = not very important, 5 = unimportant.

Similar results (see Table 6) were found in the home, emotive and friendship domains.

As far as the media is concerned, results are significant at the 1% level, and indicate that the older generation tends more towards the use of Greek media, whereas the younger generation report a preference for English media. Finally, in the domain of the workplace, although no significance was detected, it is unsurprising to note that the younger generation reported a similar lack of inclination towards SMG. Results for these two domains are presented in Table 7.

*Occupation.* The variable of *occupation* is significant for the use of GCD and ENG in all domains and activities (except the work domain) but not for SMG (with the exception of language use and the media) (see Table 8).

As regards use of GCD in the domain of 'cognitive activity', results indicate that those from the lower social stratum use GCD to a greater extent than other social groupings (professionals, those working in the service industry and office workers), who scored between 'often' and 'sometimes' on the continuum. Unsurprisingly therefore, results for the use of ENG indicate that those of lower social status use ENG to a lesser extent than the other social groupings. Respondents from the higher social groups reported that they 'always' use English in the domain of cognitive activity. Moreover, in the home domain, results indicate that those from the lower social stratum use GCD 'always' compared to the other social classes, who report using GCD 'often'.

As regards use of ENG in the home, findings replicate those reported above and indicate that those from the lower social stratum use it less than the other classes, scoring between 'sometimes' and 'rarely' on the continuum. All other social groups reported using English 'often' in the home domain.

Regarding emotive/personal contexts, those from the lower social stratum reported using GCD 'always' compared to the other social groupings who use GCD 'often'. The higher social strata also report the highest use of English ('always' or 'often'). Further analysis based on occupation and the domain of

**Table 8** Language use in the cognitive, home, emotive and friendship domains, and 'occupation'

Occupation groups	Cognitive domain			Home domain			Emotive domain			With friends		
	GCD**	SMG	ENG**	GCD**	SMG	ENG*	GCD**	SMG	ENG**	GCD*	SMG	ENG
Professional	2.63	2.61	1.47	2.13	2.97	2.01	2.29	2.30	1.80	2.77	2.99	1.47
Office	3.15	3.56	1.48	2.44	3.61	1.91	2.63	3.02	1.6	3	3.58	1.51
Service	2.83	2.58	1.53	2.67	3.02	1.80	2.25	2.33	1.6	3.4	2.92	1.21
Manual	1.19	2	3.33	1.11	4.75	3.5	1.11	3	2.83	1.48	4.17	1.63

\*Significant at the 5% level.

\*\*Significant at the 1% level.

Note: The mean scores are based on the following scale: 1 = always, 2 = often, 3 = sometimes, 4 = rarely, 5 = never.

**Table 9** Frequency of watching Greek/Greek-Cypriot videos, listening to Greek radio, and 'occupation'

<i>Occupation groups</i>	<i>*Means for watching Greek/ Greek-Cypriot videos</i>	<i>**Means for listening to Greek radio</i>
Professional	2.12	2.42
Office	2.17	2.25
Service	2	2.42
Manual	1	1.67

\*Significant at the 1% level. Mean scores are based on the following scale: 1 = very often, 2 = sometimes, 3 = rarely.

\*\*Significant at the 1% level. The mean scores are based on the following continuum: 1 = only SMG/GCD, 2 = both GCD/SMG and ENG, 3 = only ENG.

language use with friends/colleagues/clients indicated that the lower social stratum used GCD 'always', while individuals from the other social groupings use it 'sometimes'.

The results for these four domains are presented in Table 8.

Further analysis of language use and the media (Table 9) indicated that those from the lower social stratum scored between 'only [using] Greek' and using 'both Greek and English', while the other social groupings scored between 'both Greek and English' and 'only English'.

*Level of education.* Finally, the treatment of *level of education* is significant for the use of SMG and GCD in cognitive activities, the use of SMG in emotive/personal contexts, the use of GCD with friends/colleagues/clients and the use of Greek in the workplace. Further analysis indicated that those with lower educational backgrounds used SMG less in the domain of cognitive activity than those with a higher education. Other results from the analysis of the education variable and the domain of cognitive activity were not remarkable. Overall, all groupings use ENG more in this domain.

No significance was found linking this variable and use of language in the home; however further analysis indicated that those with lower educational backgrounds used SMG to a lesser extent to express themselves. Similarly results for language use in the presence of Greek-Cypriot friends/colleagues/clients indicate that overall, those with a lower level of education speak GCD with friends/colleagues/clients to a lesser extent than others. However, while it is not significant, results indicated that those with a lower level of education also spoke SMG to a lesser extent with friends/clients than those with higher education. Analysis of language use in the media and the work domain showed no significant results. These results are presented in Table 10.

Finally, in the domain of the workplace, results were significant at the 1% level. Findings for this analysis indicate that those with an undergraduate and postgraduate education find that SMG is between 'important' and 'moderately important' for their work. Those with further education reported that SMG was 'important' for their work, while those with secondary education scored just above the 'moderately important' point on the continuum (between

**Table 10** Language use in the cognitive, emotive domain, and with friends, and 'level of education'

<i>Education groups</i>	<i>Cognitive domain</i>			<i>Emotive domain</i>			<i>With friends</i>		
	<i>GCD**</i>	<i>SMG*</i>	<i>ENG</i>	<i>GCD</i>	<i>SMG**</i>	<i>ENG</i>	<i>GCD**</i>	<i>SMG</i>	<i>ENG</i>
Postgraduate	2.94	2.57	1.51	2.27	2.36	1.97	2.84	3.15	1.56
Undergraduate	2.25	2.32	1.31	2.1	2.14	1.68	2.62	2.92	1.5
Further education	3.17	2.84	1.36	2.52	2.46	1.67	3.10	3.27	1.42
Secondary school	3.1	3.46	1.3	2.5	2.97	1.47	3.46	3.78	1.3

\*Significant at the 5% level.

\*\*Significant at the 1% level.

The mean scores are based on the following scale: 1 = always, 2 = often, 3 = sometimes, 4 = rarely, 5 = never.

**Table 11** Work and 'level of education'

<i>Education groups</i>	<i>Mean scores for importance of SMG in work domain</i>
Postgraduate	2.63
Undergraduate	2.65
Further education	2.18
Secondary	3.24

Mean scores are based on the following continuum: 1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = moderately important, 4 = not very important, 5 = unimportant).

'moderately important' and 'not very important'). These results are presented in Table 11.

### Results particular to London

#### *Codeswitching*

As far as CS between GCD and ENG is concerned, the following statements were presented to the respondents:

- (1) It is common for Greek Cypriots who live in London to mix Greek Cypriot and English when they speak (Statement 26).
- (2) I consider it advantageous to use both Greek Cypriot and English in the same conversation (Statement 27).
- (3) I disapprove of people mixing both Greek Cypriot and English in conversations (Statement 28).

Overall, people acknowledged that it was common for Greek Cypriots living in London to codeswitch, and did not seem to hold negative attitudes towards this speech behaviour. The latter finding contrasts with some earlier studies (Chana & Romaine, 1984; Zentella, 1997).

Significance tests carried out indicated that the variable 'age' was significant for the second and third CS statements at the 5% level, and the variable 'level of education' was significant for the second and third CS statement at the 1% level, while the variable 'occupation' was also significant for the third CS statement at the 5% level of significance. The younger

**Table 12** Mean scores for CS statements and 'age'

<i>Age</i>	<i>CS advantageous</i>	<i>Disapprove of CS</i>
16–35	3.32	2.40
36–55	2.82	3.09
56+	2.47	2.87

*Note:* The mean scores are based on the following scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree.

**Table 13** Mean scores for CS statements and 'occupation'

<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Disapprove of CS</i>
Professional	3.14
Office	2.3
Service	2.33
Manual	2

*Note:* The mean scores are based on the following scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree.

**Table 14** Mean scores for CS statements and 'level of education'

<i>Level of education</i>	<i>CS advantageous</i>	<i>Disapprove of CS</i>
Postgraduate	2.19	3.56
Undergraduate	2.83	2.83
Further education	3.42	2.58
Secondary school	3.51	2.21

*Note:* The mean scores are based on the following scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree.

respondents agreed more with the view that CS is advantageous than the older generation, and they leaned more towards disagreeing with the statement 'I disapprove of CS'.

As far as attitudes towards CS and 'occupation' go, the results found are shown in Table 13. While the professional group was undecided as to whether they disapproved of CS (scoring 3.14, just over the 'undecided' point), respondents from the lower occupational groups disagreed with this statement, i.e. had a more favourable attitude towards CS.

Similarly, further analysis of 'level of education' indicated that the more educated the respondents, the less favourable their attitude towards CS, as indicated in Table 14.

#### *Differences in attitudes towards SMG and GCD*

As far as differences in attitudes towards SMG and GCD are concerned, responses to the following were analysed.

- (1) *Greek Cypriot* is part of our cultural heritage versus *Greek* is part of our cultural heritage.
- (2) *Greek Cypriot* should be the first language learnt at home in Greek Cypriot families versus *Greek* should be the first language learnt at home in Greek Cypriot families.

Not all the results presented below are significant, however the patterns seem to be consistent and one may tentatively hypothesise that a more extensive quantitative study would yield significant results.

**Table 15** Differences between attitudes towards GCD and SMG, and 'age'

<i>Age groups</i>	<i>GCD part of cultural heritage</i>	<i>SMG part of cultural heritage</i>	<i>GCD first language learnt at home</i>	<i>SMG first language learnt at home</i>
16–35	4.3	4.14	3.22	3.21
36–55	4.47	4.44	3.72	3.94
56+	4.69	4.5	3.65	3.93

*Note:* The mean scores are based on the following scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree.

**Table 16** Differences between attitudes towards GCD and SMG and 'occupation'

<i>Occupation groups</i>	<i>GCD part of cultural heritage</i>	<i>SMG part of cultural heritage</i>	<i>GCD first language learnt at home</i>	<i>SMG first language learnt at home</i>
Professional	4.43	4.42	3.27	3.77
Office	4.6	4.4	3.7	3.3
Service	4	4.17	2.83	2.83
Manual	4.56	4.22	3.67	3.14

*Note:* The mean scores are based on the following scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree.

Overall, all age groups agreed with the statements referring to SMG and GCD as part of their cultural heritage, but more so with the statement referring to GCD (see Table 15). Moreover, overall younger respondents feel less strongly towards SMG and GCD as being part of their cultural heritage than the older generations.

As far as the need for SMG to be the first language learnt at home, results indicated that the younger generation agreed less than the older generation with this proposal. Scores were significant at the 1% level, with the younger generation scoring just above the undecided point, and the older generations scoring just below the agree point.

As for attitudes towards SMG and GCD and the variable of 'Occupation', the lower occupational groups are less inclined to view SMG as being part of their cultural heritage and more inclined to want GCD to be learnt as a first language at home. The higher occupational group favoured SMG over GCD (see Table 16).

Finally, as for 'level of education', the more educated respondents place more importance on SMG as being part of their cultural heritage and the need for it to be learnt as a first language in Greek-Cypriot families. The lower educational groups, in contrast, consider GCD more important. In addition, while the higher educational groups agreed that SMG should be learnt as a first language in Greek-Cypriot families, the lower educational groups were undecided. This result is significant at the 1% level.



## Comparison with Nicosia

### *Language attitudes*

In the Nicosia study, respondents overall viewed SMG/GCD as desired community codes, as part of their cultural heritage, and similarly expressed a desire for their maintenance in the community (see McEntee-Atalianis & Pouloukas, 2001: 29). They also acknowledged the cultural, economic, social and symbolic value of English, but considered it as secondary to GCD/SMG.

Therefore, while in London respondents do not view ENG as a threat or as having a negative impact on their ethnic identity or their dialect, responses from Nicosia to the 'Negative impact of English on ethnicity, national identity and dialect' (see McEntee-Atalianis & Pouloukas, 2001: 29) were more undecided, whilst responses to the factor, 'Attitudes towards the use of English in familial and friendship domains' were between disagreement and indecision.

Age was, however, found to be a significant variable in both Nicosia and London for the factors 'Attitudes towards the use and preservation of GCD' and 'SMG/GCD as necessary/desired community codes'. The older generation in both communities expressed the greatest concern for the preservation of the national varieties.

In contrast, attitudes towards 'The negative impact of English on ethnicity, national identity and dialect' differed in the two communities: in Nicosia the younger Cypriots reported a greater wariness compared to the older respondents; the reverse being reported in London. However, in Nicosia it was found that the younger generation were more favourable towards the use of English in different family and social domains (see McEntee-Atalianis & Pouloukas, 2001: 29).

Finally, in Nicosia, as in London, social class was found to be significant for the usefulness and necessity of English as symbolic capital at the 1% level (as reflected in the statement 'Knowledge of English is useful and necessary for economic and professional advancement in the Greek Cypriot community', Statement 20 in the London study). Further analysis revealed that the Cypriots in the lower social stratum agreed to a greater extent with the statement than those of higher social status.

**Table 17** Differences between attitudes towards SMG and GCD and 'level of education'

<i>Education groups</i>	<i>GCD part of cultural heritage</i>	<i>SMG part of cultural heritage</i>	<i>GCD first language learnt at home</i>	<i>SMG first language learnt at home</i>
Postgraduate	4.25	4.44	3.06	4.07
Undergraduate	4.57	4.67	3.29	3.79
Further education	4.34	4.08	3.29	3.16
Secondary school	4.36	4.1	3.35	3.1

*Note:* The mean scores are based on the following scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree.

### *Language use*

The Nicosia data revealed that SMG/GCD is almost always used in a range of cognitive and physical activities in the home and at work. Unsurprisingly, ENG is reported as being used less in Cyprus in these domains than in London. Finally, both in Nicosia and London, ENG, SMG and GCD are reported to be used equally when accessing the media.

In the Nicosia study, it was found that age was significant for all domains of language use: the younger the subject, the more they use English at home, in cognitive, social and physical activities, and the media. These results were replicated in London. Finally, in the London study the younger generation reported lower use of SMG in the work domain, and similarly the young in the Nicosia study reported increased use of ENG.

## **Discussion of Results**

The aim of our study was to investigate whether various sociolinguistic variables influence the use of, and attitudes towards, similar linguistic products in two related populations (indigenous and transplanted) operating in different market places. Overall, our findings suggest that there are significant similarities between the two communities; however some interesting differences also emerge. Concentrating first on the results from the London study, if we reflect upon the aims of the study (see p. 6 above), in the case of objective (1), results suggest that SMG and GCD are both desired community codes, and respondents want to support their maintenance (see Table 1). These codes are, however, assets restricted to the confines of the Greek-Cypriot community and not marketable in the wider community.

Analysis of objectives (2) and (4) suggests that different members and groupings within the community hold different attitudes to the four factors. For example, while the younger generation in London regard SMG and GCD as part of their cultural identity (therefore valuing their social and symbolic status) and appear confident of their continued use, they do not regard these varieties as necessary for involvement in the Greek Cypriot community. Moreover, attitudes towards the status and threat of English differ across groupings. The younger generation, and those of higher social standing do not see ENG as a threat to the identity of Greek Cypriots, in contrast to those of lower social standing and of greater maturity. Both these groups nevertheless consider English as a necessary code for economic, social, cultural and symbolic advancement in the Greek-Cypriot community and the larger community of the UK.

It is in (3) that patterns of shift can most clearly be identified in London. The younger generation report using English to a greater extent than the older generation in all domains investigated. This is unremarkable given that the majority of young informants were born in the UK and mix predominantly with English speakers outside the home. However they also report predominant use of English *in* the home and for cognitive and personal/emotive activities. Many of these respondents reported speaking GCD 'sometimes' or 'rarely', while the older generation claimed to use GCD nearly 'always'. Those from higher social groupings similarly

reported greater use of English in all domains of use under investigation, confirming the assertions of Anthias (1992, see p. 2 above). Older individuals, those working in low-paid jobs and professionals serving the community (e.g. politicians, those working in the Greek media or businesses orientated towards SMG/GCD speakers in London/Cyprus), reported greater everyday use of SMG/GCD.

Two of the variables were not investigated in Nicosia: codeswitching and differences in attitudes towards SMG and GCD. It would appear that CS is a common practice in the community, and overall attitudes towards it are not unfavourable, although the younger generation are more favourable towards it than the older generation. Amongst the younger generations, CS has come to constitute an important communicative device used to create and express identity in the community, that of the British-born Greek Cypriot (see also Gardner-Chloros & Finnis, 2003). Moreover, the younger Greek Cypriots' knowledge of GCD is not as good as that of the older generations. However, as several studies have shown, GCD still plays an important role in their interactions within the community. Fluency in the dialect is not a criterion used to indicate or confirm membership in the community, but qualitative use of GCD, such as the insertion of GCD words in interaction to create or reinforce humorous discourse, is 'indexical' of in-group membership (Gardner-Chloros & Finnis, 2003). Respondents from lower occupational backgrounds hold more favourable attitudes towards CS, while those from higher social groups are undecided; their less favourable attitudes are perhaps influenced by linguistic purism conveyed through the educational system.

As for differences in attitudes towards SMG and GCD, while both codes were considered as being part of the respondents' cultural heritage, overall GCD seemed more 'popular'. Consistent with this, the lower social classes favour GCD over SMG, whereas more educated individuals held more favourable attitudes towards SMG. Results further pointed towards a greater differentiation between SMG and GCD within the older generations and within the lower occupational groupings. The younger respondents did not make such a sharp distinction between the two. Overall, the younger generation seem more 'detached' from the standard variety of Greek. They are less exposed to it, and it is not as 'instrumental' for them as for the older generation.

In relation to objective (5), despite inherent differences between the two communities, direct and interesting comparisons can be made. In both studies the variables of age and social class constitute significant factors in responses to questions regarding attitudes to language and reported language use, and provide an important area of comparison.

In the case of reported attitudes, in both communities there is agreement with the statement 'Knowledge of English is useful and necessary for economic and professional advancement in the Greek Cypriot community' (Statement 20). Respondents from lower occupational backgrounds agreed more strongly with this statement. These results replicate those found in Nicosia and can equally be explained as a 'disparity between

those who only recognise and aspire to the power of “authorised usage” of a legitimate language, compared to those who have “knowledge” and are therefore able to exploit the legitimate/prestige code(s)’ (Bourdieu, 1997: 71).

In London, those with a higher education also agreed more strongly with this statement, although this result is not significant. Clearly the community codes (GCD/SMG) do not provide these individuals with the necessary capital to advance economically and socially in British society. This is consistent with observations from other researchers such as Edwards (see p. 2 above), who found that individuals with high social status and educational backgrounds are less fluent in the minority language, as their status is derived from the language of the host country (Anthias, 1992; Edwards, 1985).

Differences were found in attitudes towards the potential threat of English to Greek-Cypriot identity – it would appear that the younger generation in Cyprus were fearful of the potential hegemony of English – whereas the reverse appeared to be the case in London.

Reported language use also provides an interesting basis for comparison between the two communities. The findings in London are superficially similar to those of the Nicosia study, the younger respondents reporting greater use of ENG in familial and work domains, cognitive activities and the media. Unlike Nicosia however, the young in London reported almost ‘always’ using English. McEntee-Atalianis and Pouloukas (2001) observe that the forces of modernity bringing with them such opportunities as education, travel, use of technology and European/American influences, have granted the younger generation access to markets which encourage and reward competence in English. In the context of London, English is the ‘default’ language of competence for everyday interaction in British society for the younger generation.

Finally, examination of the variables of *social class* (occupation) and *level of education* in London reveals that those of lower socioeconomic status report greatest use of GCD and least use of English. The lower social groups reported least use of SMG. It seems likely that those from lower social and educational backgrounds rely on the community to a greater extent for status, and therefore use the national codes to a greater extent than other speakers. This affords them the capital they require to gain profits in the particular market in which they function. According to Bourdieu (1997: 71):

... the unification of the market is never so complete as to prevent dominated individuals from finding, in the space provided by private life, among friends, markets where the laws of price formation which apply to more formal markets are suspended.

This idea is closely allied to the sociolinguistic concept of ‘covert prestige’, which refers to the prestige attaching to the use of vernacular or non-standard forms in subgroups within the wider community (Labov, 1972; Trudgill, 1974).

## Conclusion

Analysis of language attitudes and use within the Greek-Cypriot population of London, and comparisons with findings in Nicosia, reflect the symbolic forces operating in two distinct settings. Despite obvious differences between the two linguistic communities (most obviously the 'official' languages and distinct cultural settings of the two nations), similar market forces exist, related to the economics of linguistic exchange (Bourdieu, 1997).

In London (as in Nicosia), those competent in both the 'legitimate/official' language of the community and English possess the greatest market share, enabling them to exploit, and profit from, all facets of cultural, economic, social and symbolic capital in both communities. This advantage and prestige is bestowed upon those of high socioeconomic and educational standing and the young. They are able to exploit their mastery of different linguistic and cultural identities (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985) in both the Greek-Cypriot community and the extended national community of Britain. In Britain they use their mastery of the national language in a much larger market enabling them to participate in more varied and often lucrative transactions than those within the smaller Greek Cypriot community. Conversely, restrictions are placed upon those solely in possession of the community languages who are forced to derive and exploit their linguistic capital only within the confines of the community. Perceptions confirm that benefits are limited and the profit gained comparatively poor. These individuals, of low socioeconomic and educational standing, are clearly unable to exchange their resources so readily within the larger community.

By contrast, in Nicosia, the national codes (GCD/SMG) 'afford [the bearers] the benefits of group solidarity, in addition to cultural, economic and symbolic capital in all domains of use' (McEntee-Atalianis & Pouloukas, 2001: 33). Different market forces are therefore operating in the Greek-Cypriot communities of Cyprus and Nicosia.

Our results suggest that these capital forces may lead eventually to language shift in the Greek-Cypriot community of London: the young report comparatively little use of the community codes. Despite this, however, the Cypriot community at large report a strong desire to maintain their language, identity and associations with their nation, asserting a desire to maintain boundaries between themselves and their host country. This finding complements similar results and conclusions by Clyne (1982) in his investigation of Greeks in Australia, and Hadzidaki (1995) in her discussion of Greek communities internationally. Moreover, Smolicz (1984, 1985) argues that Greek immigrant communities are a typical example of migrant groups that consider language as constituting a core value (along with Orthodoxy and family values). According to his theory, communities have particular values that are held in high esteem and take longer to dissolve over time. Smolicz accounts thus for Greek immigrants maintaining their ethnic language in the host country to a greater extent and for longer than other immigrant groups.

As to the issue of identity, some studies investigating migration and language shift suggest that it is misguided to take an essentialist approach and to postulate a two-fold identity based on a rigid dichotomy between the culture of the host and the home countries (Anthias, 1992; Grillo, 2001; Stubbs, 1985). For example, referring to the process of assimilation, Rex and Josephides (1987) argue that seeing the Greek Cypriots in the UK as 'a well-bounded common culture and then encountering a different well-bounded common culture which they either adopt, resist, or part adopt and part resist, is simplistic to the point of being false' (Rex & Josephides, 1987: 34). Our findings appear to support this view.

Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985) go yet further and argue that groups have no existential locus other than in the minds of speakers, suggesting that individuals should be grouped, not according to a system but according to their behaviour and how they identify or distance themselves from other speakers. As such, both 'languages' and 'groups' may become more or less highly focussed or diffuse in the sense that the behaviour of members of a group may become more or less alike. We consider that this notion of fluid or shifting identities is to be preferred over a rigid approach treating identity as a fixed or pre-existing entity. This study has illustrated the numerous ways in which the overall sociolinguistic setting interacts with, and impinges on, the practices and attitudes of the Greek-Cypriot community in London. In spite of sustained contacts and continuing cultural proximity between the community in London and in Cyprus, it is clear that the differing linguistic markets in each of those settings strongly affect usage and trends within them. In London, English is all pervasive; Standard Greek is remote from the experience of many young Greek Cypriots. In Cyprus, English plays a very important role, but SMG and GCD are the dominant codes of interaction. Intergenerational differences were noticeably more marked in London, as the younger generations are increasingly caught up in British life and refer less to the linguistic and other values of their parents' country of origin.

Further research could usefully focus on the continuing mutual effect of the sustained contact between the London and Cyprus communities, whose repertoire theoretically consists of the same varieties, but for whom these varieties have such different 'market values'.

### **Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank the Leventis Foundation, London, for the generous grant, which allowed this research to be carried out. They would also like to thank Birkbeck College for additional funding under the School of Languages, Linguistics and Culture's Research Priority Scheme, and Dr Sarah Lawson for statistical assistance. Also, they would like to thank both the Ministry of Culture and Education in Nicosia and Mr Savva Pavlidi at the Cyprus Education Mission in London, for their support in allowing the authors to access schools in London to distribute the questionnaires. Finally, they would like to thank Menicos Kouvaros and the other



members of the National Federation of Greek Cypriot Youth for their continual support.

### Correspondence

Any correspondence should be directed to Dr Penelope Gardner-Chloros, School of Languages, Linguistics and Culture, Birkbeck College, 43 Gordon Square Bloomsbury, London WC1H 0PD, UK (p.gardner-chloros@bbk.ac.uk).

### References

- Anthias, F. (1992) *Ethnicity, Class, Gender and Migration: Greek Cypriots in Britain*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Bourdieu, P. (1997) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Cenoz, J. and Jessner, U. (eds) (2000) *English in Europe: The Acquisition of a Third Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Chana, U. and Romaine, S. (1984) Evaluative reactions to Panjabi/English code switching. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 6, 447–473.
- Charalambous, J., Hajifannis, G. and Kilonis, L. (1988) The Cypriot community of the UK. Issues of Identity. Conference proceedings, organised by the National Federation of Cypriots in Great Britain, June 1988. PNL Press.
- Christodoulou-Pipis, I. (1991) *Greek Outside Greece III. Research Findings: Language use by Greek-Cypriots in Britain*. Nicosia: Diaspora Books, Greek Language Research Group.
- Clyne, M.J. (1982) *Multilingual Australia*. Melbourne: Riverside Press.
- Edwards, J. (1985) *Language, Society and Identity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Extra, G. and Verhoeven, L. (eds) (1993) *Immigrant Languages in Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (1992) The sociolinguistics of the Greek-Cypriot community of London. *Plurilinguismes* 4, 112–135.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. and Finnis, K. (2003) Code-switching, gender and politeness: A study in the London Greek-Cypriot community. *Estudios de Sociolingüística* 4 (2), 505–532.
- Grillo, R.D. (2001) Transnational Migration and Multiculturalism in Europe. Working Paper Series (University of Oxford: an ESRC Research Programme), University of Oxford: Transnational Communities programme.
- Grosjean, F. (1982) *Life with Two Languages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hadzidaki, A. (1995) I diatirisi tis Ellinikis apo Ellines metanastes- Koinonio – Glossologiki Prosegisi (The maintenance of the Greek Language from Greek Immigrants – A Sociolinguistic approach). Proceedings of the 15th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece.
- Ioannou, Y. (1991) The language problem in Cyprus today. *Cyprus Review* 3 (1), 15–41.
- Josephides, S. (1987) Associations amongst the Greek Cypriot Population in Britain. In J. Rex, D. Joly and C. Wilpert (eds) *Immigrant Associations in Europe*. Aldershot: Gower.
- Karoulla-Vrikkis, D. (1991) The language of the Greek Cypriots today: A revelation or an identity crisis? *The Cyprus Review* 3 (1), 42–58.
- Kelly, A. (1989) Ethnic identification, associations and redefinition: Muslim Pakistanis and Greek Cypriots in Britain. In K. Liebkind (ed.) *New Identities in Europe: Immigrant Ancestry and the Ethnic Identity of Youth*. Aldershot: Gower.
- Labov, W. (1972) *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Le Page, R.B. and Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985) *Acts of Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McEntee-Atalianis, L. (2004) The Impact of English in post-colonial, post-modern Cyprus. *Journal of the Sociology of Language* 168, 77–90.



- McEntee-Atalianis, L. and Pouloukas, S. (2001) Issues of identity and power in a Greek-Cypriot community. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 22 (1), 19–38.
- Milroy, L. (1987) *Language and Social Networks* (2nd edn). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Moschonas, S. (1996) I Glossiki dimorphia stin Kupro (Linguistic Diglossia in Cyprus). *O Politis* 27, 42–44.
- Pantelis, S. (1990) *The Making of Modern Cyprus: From Obscurity to Statehood*. Nicosia: Interworld Publications.
- Papapavlou, A. (1997) The influence of English and its dominance in Cyprus: Reality or unfounded fear? *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 7 (2), 218–249.
- Papapavlou, A. and Pavlou, P. (1998) A review of the sociolinguistic aspects of the Greek Cypriot dialect. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 19 (3), 212–220.
- Rex, J., Joly, D. and Wilpert, C. (eds) (1987) *Immigrant Associations in Europe*. Aldershot: Gower.
- Rex, J. and Josephides, S. (1987) Asian and Greek Cypriot associations and identity. In J. Rex, D. Joly and C. Wilpert (eds) *Immigrant Associations in Europe*. Aldershot: Gower.
- Sciriha, L. (1995) *A Question of Identity: Language Use in Cyprus*. Cyprus: Intercollege Press.
- Smolicz, J.J. (1984) Minority languages and the core values of culture: Changing policies and ethnic responses in Australia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 5 (1), 23–41.
- Smolicz, J.J. (1985) Greek-Australians: A question of survival in Multicultural Australia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 6 (1), 17–29.
- Stubbs, M. (ed.) (1985) *The Other Languages of England*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Trudgill, P. (1974) *The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wei, L. (1994) *Three Generations, Two Languages, One Family: Language Choice and Language Shift in a Chinese Community in Britain*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Williamson, R. (1991) *Minority Languages and Bilingualism: Case Studies in Maintenance and Shift*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Zentella, A.C. (1997) *Growing up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Oxford: Blackwell.