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The acquisition, fostering and further development of literacy in bilingual situations has been widely studied but similar issues in bidialectal settings where nonstandard and standard languages coexist have not attracted sufficient attention. This is the second of a series of studies investigating the use of nonstandard languages or dialects in the Cyprus educational setting. The first paper (Pavlou & Papapavlou, 2004) examined teachers' attitudes towards the use of the Greek Cypriot dialect (GCD) in primary education and their own linguistic behaviour inside and outside class. The present paper reviews the current language policy in Cyprus in relation to literacy acquisition and development and (1) investigates primary teachers' views on the use of GCD and how this usage affects students' literacy acquisition (i.e. linguistic performance, educational attainment, and psychological welfare), (2) examines how teachers view the adequacy of GCD as a linguistic system, (3) delineates those factors that shaped teachers' attitudes towards GCD, (4) discusses the relation between dialect use and ethnic identity, and (5) explores teachers' stance on language policy matters.
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Introduction

One of the main goals of education is the acquisition of literacy skills by the learners which will then allow them to access and use information, develop intellectual skills, express themselves through the medium of language and finally better understand themselves and their social and cultural environment. It is commonly accepted and supported by UNESCO that education is most successful, and therefore, the above-mentioned goals can be most effectively achieved, if it is conducted in the learners' home language. Therefore, the issue as to whether children who speak nonstandard languages or dialects should be educated in a standard language and thus be denied access to education through the medium of their home language has concerned researchers for many years. The literature on this issue is complex, diverse, and contentious and the subject, in many ways, even to this day, remains unresolved (see Cheshire et al., 1989; Driessen & Withagen, 1999; Hollingsworth, 1997; McKay & Hornberger, 1996; Sonino, 1986).

The arguments for and against the use of nonstandard dialects in education can be summarised as follows. Those in favour of nonstandard languages argue that children should be given the opportunity to use and practise in school the language they speak in their home environment, and be given the chance to develop their own identity and strengthen ties with their own cultural tradition. Cripper and Widdowson (1978), who are strong proponents of first language education have the following to say about nonstandard languages and dialects: 'Dialects ... express a way of life and sense of cultural identity just as much as do more prestigious language types' (Cripper & Widdowson, 1978: 197). In addi-
tion, the authors argue that "by conducting education in the standard version of
the language one might change the values of the learners, which bind them to
their background and thereby cut them off from their cultural heritage" (Cripper
& Widdowson, 1978: 197). Similarly, Romaine argues that, "... it can easily be
shown that nonstandard varieties of language are just as structurally complex and
rule-governed as standard varieties and just as capable of expressing logical argu-
ments as standard speech" (Romaine, 2000: 214). Furthermore, James (1996)
reviewing several studies (Garrett et al., 1994; Kharma & Hajjaj, 1989; Ramirez &
Yuen, 1991; Swain, 1996) advocates the use of nonstandard languages. The argu-
ments for the 'beneficial' use of nonstandard languages or dialects in education
-especially when these nonstandard languages or dialects are the students' first
language- focus on the enhancement of children's cognitive development, on the
fostering of literacy in the most efficient and resourceful way, on the development
of a positive self-image and self-esteem, and on the appreciation of one's cultural
values.

The inclusion of nonstandard languages or dialects in education finds further
support from experts engaged in research on multiple literacies, biliteracies and
In particular, Street (1994) advocates that "...local languages and literacies have
a positive and constructive contribution to make to world development and
change, whilst the uniformity assumed by mindless pursuit of a single language
and a single literacy is damaging and impoverishing for all of us" (Street, 1994:
10). Moreover, Street points out that

 whilst language and literacy are frequently closely connected with local or
regional identity, international co-operation in many areas, especially
education, is encouraging the spread of a limited number of major interna-
tional languages and literacies ..., sometimes at the expense of these local
languages and literacies. (Street, 1994: 9)

This practice is also observed on national and regional levels where standard
languages and literacies are promoted, thus ignoring local or regional or
nonstandard dialects and literacies.

Research on the effects of language attitudes on language planning and literacy
are very limited in the Cyprus context. One study (Papapavlou, 2004b) indicates
that while participants (Greek Cypriot university students) do not appear to ques-
tion the linguistic adequacy of the Greek Cypriot dialect (GCD), they admit that
the use of Standard Modern Greek (SMG) poses several problems for Cypriot chil-
dren. While participants acknowledge the numerous beneficial effects that the use
of the dialect in the classroom could bring about, they unanimously reject the
introduction of the dialect as a medium of instruction and rather propose the intro-
duction of bidialectal education in state schools (which they understand to be an
equal or nearly equal exposure and use of both SMG and GCD in the classroom).
Thus, bidialectal education, or multiple literacies, is seen as a way of elevating the
status of the dialect, enriching speakers' confidence and self-esteem, appeasing
national sensitivities and securing equal competencies in both codes.

On the other hand, those promoting the use of standard languages (e.g. Di
that in some language situations primary education in the home language
language and gain knowledge about his or her linguistic tradition by reinforcing the diachronic elements of the language currently in use. The Ministry of Education and Culture, the document reiterates, shows respect and affection towards all works of Cypriot literature as many of these works, mainly written in GCD, are true masterpieces that can contribute to Cypriot self-awareness and understanding of Cypriot culture. For these reasons, the Ministry incorporates them in the curricula and encourages the study and promotion of such masterpieces for the literary empowerment of Cypriot students.

The document continues by stating that both teachers and students are generally expected to use Koini Neaelliniki in the classroom. It also states that GCD should be treated respectfully and may be used on special occasions such as in theatrical performances and school events. The use of GCD is also legitimate, according to the document, when students face difficulties in oral discourse, especially in the lower grade levels of elementary school. All of these recommendations, the document states, should be carefully thought out and should not undermine the cultivation of Koini Neaelliniki which is the national and official language of Cyprus.

The widespread use of the dialect for oral communication among Greek Cypriots is well attested in another document entitled The Teaching of Greek as a Foreign Language (Council of Europe, 1996: Threshold, Volume A, Appendix C). The document attests to the fact that learners of Greek as a foreign language in Cyprus come into contact with the local dialect, especially as a means of oral communication. Therefore, it is considered necessary to provide learners of Greek as a foreign language in Cyprus a description of the basic differences between the dialect and the standard. In order to meet this need, a committee comprised of members from the Ministry of Education of Culture (Cyprus) and the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs (Greece) has prepared an appendix which provides some background information on the dialect, clarifies the current linguistic scene in Cyprus and illustrates the major characteristics of the dialect (lexical, phonological, morphological, syntactic and pragmatic) by providing numerous examples in each category (such examples can also be found in Pavlou & Christodoulou, 2001). Finally, it is strongly emphasised in this document that Greek Cypriots are privileged to be able to express themselves in Standard Greek and the GCD itself.

Thus, it may be deduced from these documents that, although Cypriot students are not encouraged to speak their dialect in the classroom, there is an indirect admission that their home language is indeed GCD and that it can be appropriately used in certain situations (for example, in theatrical plays and school functions and for providing explanations of difficult concepts to younger learners). In general, the various documents suggest that the dialect should be respected, and that it can be creatively exploited for the enrichment of Cypriot students' linguistic awareness and language competence.

The education authorities, however, choose to ignore the reality of actual classroom practices concerning the role and use of the dialect in the classroom. Moreover, the authorities do not appear to be concerned as to whether changes in language policy are needed and this lack of interest is evident from the fact that no official discussions have taken place recently. The lack of serious concern with language policy and literacy matters is further evidenced by the recent work in the Ministry of Education and Culture (Cyprus). The Ministry recently commis-
sioned a seven-member committee comprised of academics from Cyprus and Greece with the mandate of reviewing the present education system of Cyprus. The aim of the review was to generate recommendations for the restructuring, reformulation and modernisation of the system and language issues legitimately fall within the scope of such a review. The committee, after a year’s work, in August 2004, published a 360-page document, which included 18 chapters. Although the document addresses numerous issues and is very comprehensive, no mention of any kind is made about language policy and planning relevant to issues such as literacy in the home language, language of instruction, and so on. Moreover, no relevant recommendations are presented regarding the need, if any, for re-examining the existing policy. While the committee provides specific recommendations for the restructuring, reformulation and modernisation of the system (having as models several European systems of education), there is no reference to literacy issues and to language policies followed by other European states or the various directives of the EU, which recommend respect for minority languages and dialects and their inclusion in school curricula. Since the entire educational system is currently under review, one would have hoped that this would have been an opportune time to address the role of GCD in education.

As a way of considering the status of GCD and its implications for literacy development and schooling in general, in the current study an attempt is made to investigate primary school teachers’ opinions on the students’ use of GCD in class and whether this usage has any effects on students’ literacy acquisition in terms of linguistic performance, educational attainment and psychological well-being, examine teachers’ views on the adequacy of GCD as a linguistic system and the factors that have shaped their attitudes towards GCD; look into perceptions of the relationship between dialect use and ethnic identity; and explore the role that teachers could play in language policy matters.

Method

The study collected information from 133 Greek Cypriot elementary school teachers who were randomly selected from 14 schools in the major urban centre of the island, Nicosia, using a questionnaire, the use of which for attitudinal studies is aptly justified by Cargile et al. (1994).

The four-part questionnaire was prepared for this study (see Appendix). Participants were asked to indicate whether they agree or disagree with a series of statements by using a five-point Likert scale. Statements in Part One of the questionnaire focused on teachers’ attitudes towards the use of GCD by students in the classroom and the teachers’ own linguistic behaviour inside and outside the classroom. The second part of the questionnaire examined teachers’ opinions on students’ use of GCD and how this usage affects students’ literacy acquisition. The third part investigated the opinion and attitudes teachers hold towards GCD and the fourth part focused on teachers’ understanding of the relationship between dialect use and identity, as well as their views on language policy matters.

The completed questionnaires were tabulated and analysed statistically. For statistical purposes, for all parts of the questionnaire the responses for ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’ are represented as a combined value labelled ‘agree’ and for
Results and Discussion

Attitudes towards the use of GCD in the classroom and teachers’ linguistic behaviour

The study of attitudes and linguistic behaviour, reported in detail in Pavlou and Papapavlou (2004), revealed several interesting findings. Teachers consider it their duty to correct pupils when they use the dialect in class (more so in writing than in speaking). Because of repeated corrections, children are often made to feel, perhaps unintentionally, that their own natural way of speaking is erroneous, substandard or impolite. As a result, children appear uneasy when using their native code and gradually come to believe that this code is incorrect, unintelligent and improper, in other words, they speak xorkadika ‘peasant-like talk’. Teachers appear to be less strict over the use of the dialect in class in certain domains, such as when it is used for being humorous, or witty, or for complaining or chatting on everyday issues. On the other hand, teachers prefer to use SMG when reprimanding students, as this is the code that represents officialdom and authority. Teachers also find the use of the dialect more appropriate when it serves such purposes as joking, counselling a student, using humorous expressions and when they need to provide explanations for concepts that students have difficulty comprehending. While SMG predominates in class, the great majority of teachers confess that they often use GCD with colleagues outside the classroom. Apparently, feelings and intentions are normally perceived as more sincere and honest when expressed in the dialect while the use of the standard form immediately signifies the existence of a distance between speakers.

Overall, these results have implications for the ways in which literacy is developed in Cypriot schools. When teachers express negative attitudes towards dialect forms and dialect use, they inadvertently create an unfavourable environment which may prevent students from expressing themselves freely in their native code, especially those who feel much more comfortable in the local dialect, because such contributions are treated as language errors. SMG and GCD are not seen as components of students’ language abilities and GDC, and practices constructed using GCD, may be stigmatised. Consequently, this negative environment may affect students’ communication since it discourages them from speaking and practising their language skills, and from being intellectually active and creative. Such mental inertia is not conducive to the enhancement of literacy in the most effective way.

Teachers’ evaluation of students’ use of GCD in class

The second part of the questionnaire examined teachers’ opinions on students’ use of GCD and how this usage affects students’ literacy acquisition. Figure 1 shows teachers’ opinions on eight issues relating to the effects of GCD usage on the mastery and use of SMG, how correcting and reprimanding students’ GCD usage affects their self-confidence and finally whether users’ place of residence (rural vs. urban) and family environment has any adverse effects on scholastic achievement.
Figure 1 Teachers' evaluation of students' use of GCD

As can be seen from Figure 1, the majority of teachers (75.8%) agree that students are discouraged when repeatedly corrected for using GCD in class and 73.7% agree that students from rural areas encounter far more serious problems when expressing themselves in SMG rather than students from urban areas. Also, a large number of teachers (71.7%) agree that students feel much more comfortable when using GCD rather than SMG in class and 69.9% think that students encounter far more serious problems when expressing themselves exclusively in SMG. Also, 64.4% agree that students' self-confidence is negatively affected when reprimanded for using GCD in class. On the other hand, almost half of the teachers (49.2%) disagree that when students express themselves in GCD they are considered to be using an unsophisticated and 'coarse' language. Furthermore, 39.4% of the teachers disagree that the encouragement of GCD usage in class and in the family environment (30.8%) leads to lower levels of scholastic achievement.

Globally, the results of Figure 1 reveal that teachers recognise the detrimental effects that repeated corrections may have on students' linguistic behaviour and are also aware that students' place of residence (rural vs. urban) plays a major role in mastering SMG. In addition, teachers appear to be familiar with the fact that students experience problems in expressing themselves in SMG, that they feel much more comfortable when using GCD and that their self-confidence is affected if they are reprimanded for using it in class. However, teachers do not
seem to be in agreement that GCD is an unsophisticated and 'coarse' language and finally, teachers do not accept that the use of GCD in class and with family members adversely affects students' scholastic achievement.

If a wider definition of literacy is adopted, that is, one that goes beyond the ability to read and write and includes a person's capability of accessing and using information, the results of this section imply that students may be perceived as having imperfect or substandard literacy because they are evaluated, by teachers and by the educational system itself, against the linguistic standards of SMG and not GCD. The use of GCD is seen in deficit terms and rural students are seen as having a greater language deficit than urban students. If students were allowed to express themselves in whatever code they felt most comfortable with, and without the fear of being repeatedly reprimanded, then they might have much more to talk about and in a more heartfelt way, and thus their verbal abilities would be judged as more elaborated, (cf. Bernstein, 1971; Labov, 1969) than they currently are, when use of the home language is seen as an error.

**Teachers' evaluation of and attitudes toward GCD**

The third part of the questionnaire investigates teachers' opinions and attitudes towards GCD and the results appear in Figures 2 and 3. Figure 2 shows teachers' opinions on the adequacy of the GCD as a linguistic system in comparison to SMG.

Figure 2 shows that 68.1% of the teachers believe that GCD is equally effective as a means of communication as SMG and an almost equal number (65.7%) consider GCD to be an autonomous and fully-fledged system of communica-

![Figure 2 Evaluation of GCD: Linguistic aspects](image-url)
The number of teachers who disagree with these two views of GCD is rather small (17.4% and 21.3% respectively) but, even so, this result does show that almost a third of the teachers question the dialect's status as a fully-fledged language, reflecting a negative perception of the variety. Furthermore, 64.8% of the teachers disagree that GCD is less expressive than SMG and more than half (56.9%) do not accept that the vocabulary of GCD is limited and insufficient for accurate, effective and thorough communication. However, again it cannot be ignored that a third of the teachers have reservations about the dialect's potential to meet speakers' expressive needs and to provide them with the requisite vocabulary for thorough communication, reflecting a deficit view of GCD. Overall, Figure 2 reveals that a large number of teachers do not hold negative attitudes towards GCD since they do not appear to question the effectiveness of the dialect as a means of communication nor do they believe that the dialect is less expressive than SMG. On the contrary, more than half of the teachers consider GCD to be a fully-fledged language with sufficient vocabulary to ensure accurate, effective and thorough communication, although such views are not universal.

As a majority of teachers do not question the dialect's effectiveness as a means of communication and further admit that it is not less expressive than SMG, it would appear that the variety could have a legitimate place in school contexts. It is therefore problematic that authorities in Cyprus insist on maintaining and glorifying a national language at the expense of local dialects, rather than accommodating both. Such approaches to language planning in education make it obvious that language policies and issues relating to literacy are more the result of political and ideological considerations rather than purely linguistic assessments.

Figure 3 presents teachers' self-assessment of the degree to which four factors (family background, social standing, university education and ideological orientation) may have shaped their attitudes towards GCD. As we can see, a large number of teachers (60.9%) disagree that their ideological orientation is directly related to their attitudes towards the use of GCD in class. About half of the teach-
ers reject the suggestion that their own social standing (48.9%) or family back-
ground (45.4%) have shaped their attitudes towards the use of the GCD in class. 
From the data it appears that education may be the most important factor in 
affecting teachers' attitudes: 40.9% of the teachers agree and 40.2% disagree that 
their attitudes towards the use of the GCD in class are directly related to the 
education they received as university students. The results for the impact of 
education are rather unsurprising since teachers are trained to use the official 
language of the state, SMG, and are also expected to impart feelings of patriotism 
and national pride through this medium. Teacher education is therefore 
constructed as learning to teach and teach in SMG.

**Teachers' views on language and identity**

The fourth part of the questionnaire focuses on teachers' understanding of the 
relationship between dialect use and identity, as well as, their views on language 
policy matters; these results are shown in Figures 4 and 5. Figure 4 presents 
teachers' opinions on the impact of dialect use on local culture and identity. 
Figure 4 shows that three out of four teachers (73.5%) agree that the use of the 
local dialect contributes positively towards the enrichment of the local culture. A 
little over half of the teachers (55.4%) believe that the encouragement of GCD 
usage in class leads to the reinforcement of a Cypriot identity, and a much greater 
number (72.5%) do not accept that promoting a Cypriot identity may distance 
Cypriots from a broader Greek identity. Therefore, from these results one may 
conclude that teachers are very much aware of the valuable effects that the 
 dialect may have in enriching the local culture and in fostering a Cypriot identity 
and that they are not seriously concerned that the development of a Cypriot iden-
tity would isolate Cypriots from the broader Greek identity. Since it is well 
known that language and identity influence each other (Edwards, 1985), it is not 
unreasonable to conclude that Cypriot language planning may be having an 
effect on perceptions of identity, by undermining perceptions of the value of 
GCD, and consequently of the identity of those who use it. If people want to 
influence identity, Pool suggests, they might 'consider language planning as a 
means' (Pool, 1979: 6).

![Figure 4 Views on GCD: Identity](image-url)
Teachers' views on language policy matters

Figure 5 presents teachers' views on current language policy matters and delineates those factors that should be taken into account when language policies are decided upon. Figure 5 shows that three out of four teachers (74.7%) declare that a language policy should be based on linguistic criteria rather than on ideological considerations and a large number of teachers (63.6%) believe that the language variety to be used for instruction should be explicitly stated in a future language policy. On the other hand, only 37.7% of the teachers agree that the language of instruction should be the students' home language; that is, GCD, while 40.0% of the teachers are unsure about this issue, and 22.3% disagree, showing a lack of consensus on this issue. Only 39.8% believe that teachers should be consulted in choosing the language variety to be used for classroom instruction, whereas 31.3% of the teachers are unsure about this issue, and 19.1% disagree. It is evident from the results shown in Figure 5 that while teachers are very much against the use of ideological criteria in the development of a future language policy, they do not take a clear stand on the use or non-use of the dialect as a medium of instruction, nor do they appear to be strongly in favour of actively taking part in selecting the language variety to be used in education. This means that, although teachers recognise that the use of SMG poses problems for some students and may consider GCD to be a fully developed language and have generally positive attitudes towards it, they are unlikely to be advocates of its use in education.

![Figure 5 Views on GCD: Language policy (LP)](image)

Concluding Remarks

In many places in the world, and Cyprus is no exception, there is often a tension between local and national literacies because language and literacy are closely associated with local and national identities. As a consequence, local languages and dialects are usually excluded from education for reasons such as the effects of past colonisation, the presence of heterogeneous ethnic groups,
linguistic pluralism, ethnic allegiances and loyalties to motherlands (other speech communities that share the same language and culture) and ambivalences in ethnic identity. It appears that nations such as Cyprus, with ethnocentric cultures and long histories, tend to promote national literacy in a single prestigious language variety, while nations with less ethnocentric tendencies may be more likely to advocate multiple literacies.

The overall implications of this study allow us to make the following remark. If oracy is seen as part of literacy then we can say with certainty that Cypriot children entering school have certain literacy practices that are neither appreciated nor utilised by the system. When literacy skills, based on the students' home language (even if this is not the standard language) are exploited early on by the system and when teachers modify their negative attitudes towards the dialect, then it is strongly believed that subsequent schooling could definitely support the development of students' linguistic and intellectual skills. Such a proposal receives support from research in other settings. For example, Romaine points out that several studies have shown that the use of home language in early literacy is effective even in cases where the vernacular is a nonstandard variety. She provides the case of Norway and Sweden where studies revealed 'the advantage of teaching children to read first in their own variety before switching to the standard' (Romaine, 2000: 223). Language planning in Cyprus currently focuses on the use of SMG only and this raises a question about the role and use of the students' own variety in education, and the impact that decisions about these may have on their literate lives and identities.

As an initial investigation of the role and use of GCD in education, in this study an effort was made to obtain information about primary teachers' attitudes towards GCD (its adequacy in meeting pupils' communicative needs, its probable use in education and its effects on linguistic performance, educational attainment and ethnic identity), and identify the factors that shaped teachers' attitudes towards GCD and their role in literacy and language policy matters. Such information can be important and valuable prior to introducing any changes in language policy, no matter how necessary these changes are deemed to be for educational purposes. While the policy in Cyprus regarding the use and role of the dialect remains rather unclear, any future changes in policy would be dependent on teachers (and to a lesser degree the general public) becoming more receptive towards GCD as an appropriate language of classroom use, because without support from teachers, greater and more systematic use of GCD in schooling is unlikely to succeed.

The results obtained through the use of questionnaires shed light on a number of relevant matters. In terms of teachers' assessment of students' use of GCD, it can be argued that teachers are very much aware that repeated corrections of students' GCD usage has detrimental effects on their confidence and self-esteem and that students, especially from rural areas, feel more at ease and express themselves much more freely when using GCD rather than SMG. Interestingly enough, and contrary to public opinion (Papavoulou, 1998, 2001), more than half of the teachers who took part in the study do not find GCD an unsophisticated and coarse language, nor do they accept that its use in class and in the family environment has any adverse effects on students' scholastic
achievement. Also, more than half of the teachers do not appear to hold negative attitudes towards GCD and this is evident from the fact that teachers do not question the effectiveness of GCD as a means of communication and consider it to be a fully-fledged language. They also reject the notion that the dialect is less expressive than SMG. The positive attitudes towards GCD can also be seen in the fact that the majority of teachers recognise the valuable effects that the dialect has on the local culture and on fostering a Cypriot identity. Although the majority of teachers are positive, however, a substantial minority of teachers do not share these views.

Furthermore, it appears that the attitudes teachers hold towards GCD, whether positive or negative, stem much more from their education as teachers rather than from their family background, social standing or ideological orientation. Although one may have expected ideological orientation to play a more significant part in shaping teachers’ attitudes towards GCD in a highly politicised place like Cyprus (where even football matches and beer brands are seen in this way), this is not borne out from the data. Finally, it is evident from the results obtained that teachers are very much against the use of ideological criteria when planning for innovations in language policy, but they do not take a clear position on the use or non-use of the dialect as a medium of instruction in primary schools. This uncommitted stance towards such a highly sensitive issue (or should we say politicised matter as language planning) is perhaps expected in a place like Cyprus where forces beyond linguistic concerns are at play in the everyday lives of Greek Cypriots. It may be that, at the formation of the Republic of Cyprus in 1960, language planners avoided presenting an overt language policy since such an attempt would have sparked off heated debates and probably conflicts among different parts of the Cypriot population who have differing ideological and political orientations.

It is hoped that examining language attitudes, their decisive role in language planning and consequently their impact on literacy, will be of great help when changes in language policy are contemplated in educational reforms. As can be seen, additional thorough studies on this matter could enhance the successful implementation of language policies in places where the use of local dialects and nonstandard languages is not fully appreciated, the advantages of their use are deemed doubtful and their endorsement in the educational arena is cautiously and sceptically viewed.
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Notes
1. The questionnaire included 14 five-point Likert scale statements (for the actual questionnaire, see Pavlou & Papapavlou, 2004: 258) focusing on teachers' attitudes towards the use of GCD by students in class and teachers' own linguistic behaviour inside and outside class. The questionnaire for the remaining parts is reproduced in the Appendix.
2. The secondary education in Cyprus is divided into two cycles: (1) the Gymnasium (for
three years) is compulsory for students who completed six years of primary education and (2) the Lyceum, for three years, preparing students for higher education.
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Appendix: Questionnaire (Parts 2-4)

(Note: The original questionnaire distributed to primary school teachers was in Greek. This is a translation of the original.)

Instructions

The questionnaire consists of four parts. Firstly, please provide the personal information requested and then indicate your agreement or disagreement to certain statements by using the Likert scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). Simply circle the number of your choice at the end of each statement.

Personal Information

Sex: ___ Male ___ Female
Nationality: ___ Cypriot ___ Non-Cypriot
Total teaching experience: ___ years; in rural areas ___ in urban areas ___
Grade level you are teaching now: ___
Do you hold an administrative position now? Yes ___ No ___

Part 2: Teachers' evaluation of students' use of GCD in class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students encounter serious problems when expressing themselves exclusively in Standard Modern Greek (SMG).</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students are discouraged when repeatedly corrected by their teachers when using the Greek Cypriot dialect (GCD) in class.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students from rural areas encounter far more serious problems when expressing themselves in SMG rather than students from urban areas.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When expressing themselves in GCD in class, students are usually considered to be using unsophisticated and 'bad' language.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students feel much more comfortable when using GCD rather than SMG.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students' self-confidence is negatively affected when reprimanded for using GCD in class.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Encouraging the use of GCD in class leads to lower levels of scholastic achievement.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The use of GCD in the family environment affects adversely a student's scholastic achievement.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part 3: Teachers’ evaluation of and attitudes towards GCD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The GCD is an autonomous and fully-fledged system of communication.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The GCD is equally effective as a means of communication as SMG.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The vocabulary of the GCD is limited and insufficient for accurate, effective and thorough communication.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The GCD, like all dialects, is less expressive than SMG.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My attitudes towards the use of GCD in class are directly related to my family background.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My attitudes towards the use of the GCD in class are directly related to social standing.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My attitudes towards the use of the GCD in class are directly related to my education as a university student.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My attitudes towards the use of the GCD in class are directly related to my ideological orientation.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 4: Teachers’ views on identity and language policy matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The use of the local dialect contributes to the enrichment of the local culture.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Encouraging the use of GCD in class leads to the reinforcement of a Cypriot identity.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Promoting a Cypriot identity may distance Cypriots from the national (Greek) identity.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The goals of the current language policy are explicitly stated.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There ought to be an explicit language policy regarding the language variety to be used in education.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The language variety chosen for instruction in schools should only be the students’ home language (i.e. GCD).</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A future language policy should not be based on ideological considerations but rather on linguistic criteria.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The language variety to be used in education should be decided on in consultation with teachers as well.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>